

militancy." They plan communications networks and methods of quickly leaving one location for another in order to cause police even more problems.

This, then, is the white militants' response to black rebellions planned for this summer.

Certainly the proper law enforcement agencies must be aware of these plans. Surely they can read "movement" publications

spreading the line to all young revolutionaries. Are all the rest of us just to become sitting ducks waiting for the kill? Can't we rely on Congress to see to it that an end is put to anarchy and internal guerrilla warfare before it begins? Counter-revolution is the only alternative to proper law enforcement—and that is exactly what Marxist-Leninists are counting on. They know law-

abiding citizens will be forced to fight back individually and chaotically if police and the military have their hands tied by politicians on a high level. Congress must insist that virtual disarmament of law-enforcement forces be ended; that they be armed and be permitted to shoot to kill when necessary to put down revolutions planned for this summer.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, April 24, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Frank Flisser, pastor, St. John's Windish Lutheran Church, Bethlehem, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father of our spirits, again we come to this place of common concern for our Nation, and for our world. Before they begin their deliberations, we lift our minds and hearts to new levels of faith through prayer and praise. Again we seek communion with Thy spirit. Again we come to be instructed and renewed by Thy power. Deeply we feel the need of more than human resources of spiritual strength if we are to live up to life during these days of confusion. So we come seeking Thee. We thank Thee that when we seek after Thee with sincerity of heart we find that Thou in Thy turn hast been seeking after us.

Humbly we pray for forgiveness and cleansing. Forgive our lack of patience and understanding. Make us more humble, more gentle. Forgive us when we have not acted like true followers of Thy way. Help us to do what is right when the right may be hard and costly.

O Lord, our God, help us to meet the problems with courageous faith and the future with confidence in Thine overarching love and care. Strengthen our confidence, we beseech Thee, in the ultimate triumph of Thy purposes for us.

May we go forth this day to meet the experiences with peace and stability of mind and heart. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE REVEREND FRANK FLISSER

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district was honored by the House of Representatives today in having the opening day prayer delivered by Pastor Frank Flisser of the St. John's Windish Lutheran Church of Bethlehem, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, with Reverend Flisser today are his lovely wife, Martha, and their daughter Diane and son Frank, and 60 members of his congregation. I take this opportunity to welcome them to Washington.

Pastor Flisser's church, St. John's Windish Lutheran, is the largest Lutheran Church in the city of Bethlehem. The church has more than 2,200 members.

Unique is the fact that St. John's is the only Windish Lutheran Church in the United States. It derives its name, and draws the majority of its membership from Windish citizens of the Bethlehem area whose forefathers immigrated from Yugoslavia and Germany.

Pastor Flisser has served his Bethlehem congregation for the past 17 years, having previously served as pastor at Christ Lutheran Church in Trenton, N.J.

I am extremely pleased that Reverend Flisser has had this opportunity to offer spiritual inspiration as this House begins its deliberations today.

SOVIET UNION IS SUPPLYING EGYPT WITH GROUND-TO-GROUND MISSILES

Mr. FARBSTEIN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it was reported in the press today that the Soviet Union is supplying Egypt with ground-to-ground missiles, capable of firing some 45 miles. This dispatch is the latest in a long litany of reports of Russia's unilateral escalation of the arms race in the Middle East. There can be no doubt that the Soviet Union seeks a resumption of the war in the Middle East. Yet Israel, which did not ask for war last year, seeks only to liquidate its effects save for the assurance of its own security. It is the Arab States that will not permit a settlement of outstanding issues.

Our country now has no choice but to match Russia's rearmament campaign. I urge our Government to send to Israel enough planes to deter the Arab States and their Russian masters from starting hostilities. We must make a gesture of support to Israel. In the name of peace, Mr. Speaker, I urge an end to the American embargo and the immediate shipment of first-rate aircraft as requested by Israel.

EATING AND WORKING

Mr. PASSMAN. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, in this day when the Federal Government is talking of providing a guaranteed income for everyone, regardless of whether or not he works, we wonder what the Apostle Paul of Christ's time on earth would have said on that subject.

To find out what Paul thought in the day in which he did live, we have only to read I Thessalonians 2:10-11, in which he said:

For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KASTENMEIER. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this 1 minute for the purpose of making a personal explanation.

Mr. Speaker, on April 9, I attended the funeral services for the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in Atlanta. During the proceedings of the House that day, there were two record votes and three quorum calls. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on roll No. 92 and "yea" on roll No. 93.

On April 22, there were two record votes and one quorum call. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on roll No. 98 and "yea" on roll No. 99.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 705, EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR VIETNAM ERA VETERANS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1125 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 1125

Resolved That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 705) to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or else-

where in obtaining suitable employment. After general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the concurrent resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 102]

Anderson, Tenn.	Hagan	Pickle
Andrews, Ala.	Hansen, Idaho	Relnecke
Ashley	Hansen, Wash.	Resnick
Ashmore	Hawkins	Roudebush
Ayres	Herlong	Roybal
Bow	Holland	Satterfield
Collier	Irwin	Selden
Conyers	Jacobs	Stanton
Dawson	Johnson, Calif.	Stephens
Dent	Jones, N.C.	Stubblefield
Diggs	Kee	Teague, Tex.
Dow	Kluczynski	Vanik
Dowdy	Long, Md.	Waldie
Fallon	Mailliard	Walker
Felghan	Miller, Calif.	Whalley
Galifianakis	Minshall	Wilson,
Gardner	Mosher	Charles H.
Gibbons	Murphy, Ill.	Wright
Green, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.	Wyatt
Gubser	Nedzi	
	Nix	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 374 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 14940, AMENDING THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14940) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I understand this request for a conference is on the disarmament bill and authorizations for the further support of that Agency?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And the other body, in

view of the austerity program of the President—if it can be called that—reduced the monetary authorizations rather substantially.

It would be my hope, Mr. Speaker, I will say to the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, that the House conferees would join with the other body in the cuts that have been made in the authorizations for this purpose.

Mr. MORGAN. I will assure the gentleman from Iowa we will do our best.

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

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORGAN, ZABLOCKI, Mrs. KELLY, Messrs. HAYS, ADAIR, MAILLIARD, and FRELINGHUYSEN.

VIETNAM

Mr. HALPERN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford held out a profound promise of hope last Tuesday. In his speech to newspaper executives, our newest member of the President's Cabinet clearly emphasized that the South Vietnamese have at least achieved the capability of undertaking their own military security.

Based on the Secretary's statement we can gratefully conclude that the United States has fulfilled its military purpose in Vietnam and can now devote itself unreservedly to meaningful peace and to those critical tasks here at home which are urgently crying out for consideration.

No matter what direction the current peace efforts take—and men of good will everywhere pray they will be fruitful—as the Defense Secretary has indicated, America can honorably begin disengaging from the battlefield. Thank God for that.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 705, EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR VIETNAM ERA VETERANS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN], and now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is no controversy at all on this bill. I know of none on the bill itself.

There is a rather strange kind of unanimity which I imagine will be brought out in general debate on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 1125, provides for 1 hour of

debate under an open rule on House Concurrent Resolution 705.

This is a resolution to assist the veterans of the Vietnam era in obtaining suitable employment.

The purpose of the concurrent resolution is to promote both in the Government and private industry a program of opportunities of employment for veterans who return from military duty during the Vietnam era. This measure was recommended by the President in his veterans message to the Congress earlier this year.

Under the terms of the resolution all Government departments and agencies: First, shall try to provide employment opportunities for veterans; second, shall give preference, as provided by law, to veterans in selecting employees; and third, attempt to use proper means to secure voluntarily from private industry a priority in hiring veterans.

This program is to remain in effect until the Congress declares it no longer in the public interest.

Since existing facilities of the Veterans' Administration, the Civil Service and the Department of Labor are to be used, no material cost to the Government is anticipated.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1133 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1133

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15986) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the authorization of appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 15986, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 3135, and it shall then be in order to consider the Senate bill in the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy

on this resolution. It provides for 1 hour of debate under an open rule on a bill which is somewhat controversial. I therefore reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1133 provides for an open rule, 1 hour of debate, on H.R. 15986, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934.

This legislation was passed by the House a year ago and became law. It set up a corporation to handle public broadcasting in this country. The Corporation would have a 15-member board of directors appointed by the President, with the consent of the Senate. Each Director would serve a staggered 6-year term. Not more than eight may be from the same party.

The bill provides for authority to operate in three related fields: to stimulate education with cultural television programming on noncommercial television stations. First, it is authorized to make grants to local noncommercial educational stations so that they can produce and broadcast educational and cultural programs for local audiences.

Second, it can make grants to production companies and employ writers, actors, and so forth, to develop and produce imaginative quality television programming which will be made available to noncommercial stations.

Third, it will provide financial assistance for interconnection. This last is to set up methods so that noncommercial stations can all be broadcasting a particular program at the time they desire, even with respect to live shows.

The Corporation is not to create, however, a network. It is prohibited from owning or operating any stations.

H.R. 15986 extends the authorization for fiscal year 1969. The bill passed a year ago provided for authorization only for fiscal year 1968. It provided for an authorization of \$9 million. A year ago we were told that there was great urgency in passing this legislation, but yet many months passed before the President sent up to the Senate the names of those he wished to nominate for Directors of this Corporation.

The Corporation was not actually incorporated in the District of Columbia until last month. As a consequence, the Appropriations Committee did not appropriate any funds, and that is the reason for the extension of this authorization for the fiscal year 1969 so that the \$9 million can be appropriated for this Corporation to operate.

We were told a year ago—and this was one of the main bones of contention in the debate on the floor of the House—as to what would be the permanent funding program of this Corporation. And we were told a year ago that it was then under study and within a year's time an answer would be provided, that it was under study by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

In questioning the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in our Rules Committee yesterday, on this bill, it appears that still no

report has been received from these agencies as to what they propose to recommend in regard to permanent funding for this program.

I would also like to bring to the attention of Members, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation are both making substantial grants in this area.

I called the Ford Foundation in New York City yesterday and was told by the gentleman with whom I talked that the Ford Foundation in 1968 would be granting between \$20 and \$25 million in the field of public broadcast and educational TV.

The Carnegie Foundation is also making grants in this same area. Let me quote from the Carnegie Commission report which was received by the committee on this legislation:

The corporation will require from Federal funds approximately \$40 million in its first year and \$60 million a year in the following years allowing for moderate build-up.

This kind of program is not any different from other governmental programs that are started, and once we get this thing started, although they are asking for a \$9 million authorization at the present time, here is the Carnegie Foundation report that says it needs \$40 million at least for the first year and \$60 million at least in subsequent years.

We have network commercial television operations at the present time, and also in the field of radio, operated completely under private enterprise. There is a great danger, Mr. Speaker, in my mind, as to the propriety of having Federal funds appropriated for a public broadcast corporation of a very powerful medium—TV—which could be controlled by the Federal Government and by bureaus and by personnel involved in the Federal Government. There is a very great danger, Mr. Speaker, that, although it would be handled in a most careful manner and under restrictions, propaganda broadcasts could emanate from Washington to the people of the country over TV. This, I think, is completely improper and foreign to the republican type of government we have in this country.

Another point I want to make: In view of the serious fiscal situation and the monetary crisis which faces this Nation today, this is a new program of \$9 million. It is admitted by every Member on the floor of the House that we have to curtail Federal expenditures. There is a great deal of talk about increasing taxes in order to be fiscally responsible and bring our budget into closer balance. If we are going to do all these things we all believe in, and which the American people want us to do, it is time now not to enact this program today that is going to call for \$9 million of new spending. Here is a good chance for the Members of the House to vote the way they talk.

I approve the rule, and I know of no opposition to the rule, but I am in opposition to the legislation itself. It is a very dangerous piece of legislation, not only because of what could occur under operating a public television corporation in this country, but also because of the serious monetary crisis in which we find ourselves today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15986) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the authorization of appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15986, with Mr. GALLAGHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, the bill which I bring to the House today is simplicity itself and I will not take much time to explain it. It merely strikes out "1968" at two places in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 and inserts in each place "1969." This would permit funds authorized last year by the Congress for the Public Broadcasting Corporation to be appropriated as part of fiscal year 1969 funds rather than as part of fiscal year 1968. It does nothing more.

These funds are seed money to enable the Corporation to begin its operation while a permanent plan for financing its activities is being developed and placed in operation.

As most Members of the House know, the Corporation is going to promote the development of educational broadcasting. This will include: First, assisting in developing educational programs of high quality; second, facilitating the availability to educational broadcast stations of educational programs; third, assisting in the establishing and development of one or more systems of interconnection to be used for the distribution of educational television and radio programs; and fourth, assisting in the establishment and development of one or more systems of educational television or radio broadcast stations.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 is one of the most important laws passed by the Congress in the last decade. It holds great promise for the people of the United States. But in order that this promise be realized, the bill before the House must be enacted.

We conducted lengthy debate on the

Public Broadcasting Act last year, I believe for some 5 hours, and we went into the merits of it. Many, many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are filled with that debate. That bill was passed.

The Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting did not get appointed until March. It was incorporated in the District of Columbia very recently. They have not had their first organizational meeting yet, and will not have it until Friday.

There have been several reasons for this delay. One is that the Chairman, Frank Pace, former Secretary of the Army and former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, was stricken, taken to the hospital, and operated on. He is now back in good health.

The Corporation Directors have been appointed. They are among the outstanding men and women of America. I am sure when the Members of the House know who they are they will have explicit confidence in these men and women doing a good job.

I name a few of them:

James R. Killian, Jr., of Cambridge, Mass., chairman of the Corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Milton S. Eisenhower of Baltimore, Md., president emeritus of Johns Hopkins University.

John D. Rockefeller III, of New York City, chairman of the board of trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation.

Joseph D. Hughes, of the Mellon Institute of Pittsburgh, a governor and vice president of T. Mellon & Sons.

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

These are typical of the men and women who have been appointed by the President to serve on the Board of this Corporation. I believe they engender the confidence of every man and woman in America.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman say the appointments were not made until March of this year?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. That seems to be a common complaint about the Great Society. Congress authorizes committees, commissions, advisory boards and so on and so forth, and it is months before the members are appointed.

This leaves me to question and perhaps leaves other Members to question the necessity for it in the first place.

Mr. STAGGERS. I might answer the gentleman in this way: I am sure that he would want the President to get the best qualified people for the job. I think the Board of Directors of the Corporation consists of 15 people. The President had to talk to them and get their consent to their appointment and so forth. He is to be complimented on the Corporation members that he has selected for this job. I think you would have confidence, also, in all of those he has selected. I certainly compliment him on the selection of these people.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, let me ask this question: What has been the expenditure thus far?

Mr. STAGGERS. There has been no money expended by the Corporation.

Mr. GROSS. No money at all? No expenditure of any other funds anywhere in the Government?

Mr. STAGGERS. The Corporation has not been organized.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that your committee has made every effort to see to it that this Corporation will probably represent the public well insofar as noncommercial broadcasting is concerned. I have complete confidence in you, Mr. Chairman, in the manner that your hearings were held and the manner in which the legislation is drawn and the attitude of the committee generally insofar as the public is concerned.

As you will recall, last year I offered an amendment to the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 directing that commercial broadcasting contribute toward the cost of educational television. At the same time I also requested that the Federal Communications Commission hold hearings to determine the extent to which commercial broadcasting corporations shall help or assist in funding educational television. What I would like to know is whether or not in the intervening period this question was at all gone into as to the degree to which commercial broadcasting should aid in supporting educational television. Also I would like to know whether or not the Federal Communications Commission has any ideas or any views in this connection and whether this with all be public moneys that will be expended. I take it the \$9 million to be appropriated for this purpose will be public moneys. Would the chairman be good enough to comment on that?

Mr. STAGGERS. I certainly would. As I recall telling the gentleman last year, this is one of the purposes of the new Corporation. They have not been organized. They are going to try to go into all phases of this. Then they will come back to our committee, and we will take a look at it. As I assured the gentleman last year, this will be done at the proper time. We have not had a chance to do it as yet.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, may I request the chairman of the committee, then, on this Public Corporation's becoming active, to say that it is the sense of the Congress or that it is your belief or the sense of your committee to the effect that the problem of funding educational television shall be gone into and that it will be expected that commercial broadcasting, besides all other phases of both Government and industry, shall support to some degree or to the degree feasible educational television? I say this because obviously \$9 million will certainly not be enough to operate a public broadcasting system without some financial assistance.

Mr. STAGGERS. It is our expectation to go into the question of long range financing of the Corporation at the appropriate time.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the distinguished chairman yielding to me. I am interested in the same point or perhaps a corollary thereof, to the point the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] just made. This corollary would be perhaps any news media has a responsibility, such as an editorial responsibility as the responsibility of a paper. So does any news media including commercial television, or public television, or radio, or what-not as to editorial placement, headlining, and the opinions of their staff. Knowing the interest of the gentleman and having served for the last 3 years on the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress, I am interested in the surveillance, the oversight, and the review functions of the various committees. Would it be the gentleman's purpose in his committee to continue oversight of such public television as far as its becoming too political or as far as its headlining or as far as introducing dogma and doctrine into the minds of the public is concerned without complete information being given to them so that they might evaluate and perform a judgment factor in that regard?

Mr. STAGGERS. I may say to the gentleman that this is the intention of the committee. That would be our duty, to do just that. As you know, last year, along with your colleague on that side, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], we wrote into the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 guarantees of the very safeguards that the gentleman is talking about here.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman's answer is very reassuring and I certainly hope we will follow through because if we have ever had demonstrated in our time the question of some type of national hypnosis or mob psychology it can be demonstrated as it has been in large part due to the overuse or action of the news and television media as to what they use as a headline, whether they place it in the proper place and whether when a correction is made it is made in a similar headline and place in the paper or the other news media.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure we are all familiar with the old Lord Beaverbrook case.

Is the gentleman familiar with the organization known as the National Citizens Committee for Public Television.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, did the director of that organization Mr. Ben Kubasik testify at the hearings and testify as to the need for the change in the first bill?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, he appeared before our committee.

Mr. HALL. I have a copy of a speech which he recently made wherein he says—and I realize the danger myself of reading it out of context—

If turning over large-scale scheduling to provide answers to America's most demanding problem—

And I will insert, parenthetically "public television"—

sounds revolutionary, so be it. We are in a revolution, to television's conscience-molding credit, largely of television's making, and it is up to public television to make itself available to give meaning and direction to what is happening in America today.

I read this only to point out what I believe in my heart that if such a bill must pass at this time it should reflect aims and objectives of the communities and, certainly, the surveillance and oversight of the committee, the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the gentleman from West Virginia is chairman. This has often been said in the well of this House today. However, the problem which is before the House today is to bind and to heal the wound and not to pour salt therein.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would say to the gentleman that Mr. Kubasik appeared before the committee and placed a statement in the record in which he said that the citizens committee was in favor of the bill now before the House.

Mr. HALL. Yes, but if the gentleman will yield further, my point is that his attitude and his public statements and utterances would be something that I believe we should be leery of, because all of us seek to perform whatever miracles television can do through evolution and not revolution; at this time we recognize that. And I think it is time to recognize that. I think it would be within the surcharge of the distinguished gentleman's committee to see that these people do not as vociferously and vocally as they seem to be in their testimony, and make this approach evolutionary rather than revolutionary.

Mr. STAGGERS. I agree with the gentleman.

I would like to read into the RECORD several telegrams in support of the legislation before the House:

NEW YORK, N.Y.
April 23, 1968.

Representative HARLEY STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign and Interstate Commerce, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

As chairman of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting I respectfully urge that the House of Representatives favorably consider an authorization for the Corporation under title II of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. Last year pursuant to congressional action educational television was established and just three weeks ago this new instrumentality was incorporated in the District of Columbia. Its first board meeting will be held on Friday. From the beginning it was contemplated that the Corporation would be funded by a combination of public and private support. Even in the short period of its existence private funds have been made available, and the enthusiasm which has greeted the formation of the Corporation augurs well for further private funding. But without evidence of congressional support at this time no further private contribution can be expected. The momentum created by the congressional act would be lost and in my judgement could not be regained for some time to come. The ability to attract qualified personnel becomes questionable. There are vital things to be done. Public broadcasting effectively used could be a major deterrent to civic disturbances. It has

particular capabilities available nowhere else in this field. The public broadcasting stations properly supported can enrich the lives of citizens of our communities and provide opportunities for self-improvement in the best American tradition. Communication with the people of our major cities and citizen identification with the community are attainable. As a former director of the budget I know the pressure of priorities. In terms of long range significance this program properly implemented has more to contribute to the preservation of the American way of life than almost any program I have observed. The membership of the Corporation's board is a solid assurance that Federal funds will be usefully and carefully spent. The way in which the Corporation operates with such funds will provide the Congress with a measure of its judgment and effectiveness when long range financing plans are considered. I urge you to support this authorization modest in relation to the need and to thereby permit this Corporation to begin its task.

FRANK PACE, JR.,
Chairman.

MORGANTOWN, W. VA.,
April 24, 1968.

Congressman HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge your support of H.R. 15986 to amend appropriation authorization for corporations for public broadcasting. These funds important to West Virginia's first public TV station as well as to total national picture.

JAMES G. HARLOW,
President, West Virginia University.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 24, 1968.

Representative HARVEY O. STAGGERS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

National Association of Broadcasters endorses H.R. 15986 and urges House passage of this legislation.

VINCENT T. WASILEWSKI,
President.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 24, 1968.

Congressman HARLEY STAGGERS,
Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

ABC reaffirms its support for the Public Broadcasting Corporation and urges passage of H.R. 15986 which makes possible support for the Corporation as previously authorized by Congress.

LEONARD H. GOLDENSON.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 24, 1968.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

NBC has been advised that the House of Representatives will consider today H.R. 15986, which would extend the present authorization of appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. We wish to reaffirm our support for non-commercial broadcasting and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, as previously expressed in my testimony before your committee. We hope that the House of Representatives will act favorably on the pending bill.

Respectfully,

JULIAN GOODMAN,
President,
National Broadcasting Co., Inc.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 24, 1968.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.
DEAR CONGRESSMAN STAGGERS: Westinghouse Broadcasting Company reaffirms its

support to Public Broadcasting Co. and urges the House to pass H.R. 15986 providing the full amount previously authorized by Congress to apply to fiscal year 1969.

Sincerely,

DON MCGANTON,
President,
Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, am I correct that this Corporation for Public Broadcasting is already in operation, and it has been conducting programs throughout the past year?

Mr. STAGGERS. The Corporation has not as yet even been organized. It will have its first organizational meeting on Friday of this week.

Mr. BELCHER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much reassured to hear that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will continue oversight on this legislation, and the resulting Public Broadcasting Corporation, particularly in view of the fact that in another area of the committee's structure in this regard, and in the problem of public information or freedom of information, we have recently had what I consider to be a step backward by the closing out of the subcommittee in the Committee on Government Operations that has had oversight over freedom of information in the executive branch of the Government.

I believe it would be an unfortunate thing if we allowed that subcommittee to disappear from the structure in the House of Representatives, and did not at the same time have very careful oversight over the work of a public broadcasting corporation trying to promulgate information to the public.

Hopefully we will have at least one of these areas where we have full congressional oversight.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would like to reassure the gentleman from Ohio that the committee will continue its oversight of all matters within its jurisdiction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be helpful to those who are here and who are interested, in the history of this legislation, to recall a little of what took place on September 12, 1967, when this bill passed the House.

At that time the vote on the passage of the bill was 265 yeas and 91 nays. The bill had overwhelming approval at that time.

What has happened in the meantime in which the Members might be interested since September 12, 1967?

Some have asked the question, and one

of the members of the Committee on Rules raised the question as to why had not this Board, which controls the Corporation of 15 members, not been finally appointed until about 6 weeks ago?

I believe I might have to take some responsibility for that delay. I insisted long before the bill was brought to the floor of the House, and I insisted even stronger here on the floor of the House, as well as with the White House after the bill was finally signed by the President, that the success of this bill depended almost entirely upon the quality of the appointments to the Board of Directors which would run this Corporation, and unless this Board was so distinguished and so above what I would call partisanship that it could administer this in the public interest, that it would be a failure, and we would be all disappointed that we had ever voted for it. I did have confidence that if this Board were properly appointed we could succeed.

I asked the President to please take his time in making these appointments to be sure that we had 15 members whose standing in this country was sufficient to guide this kind of very sensitive public media.

Those of you who are interested can look at page 10 of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Communications and Power on March 27 of this year and you will see that there are 15 persons appointed. I doubt if you could find 15 more distinguished or more qualified people to run this Corporation.

For this reason I do not find fault with the Chief Executive in delaying these appointments until he was sure that he had men of that quality.

I do not believe that this Corporation can succeed unless you have such people running the Corporation.

This caused some of the delay, and then the Chairman of the Commission for the first year, Frank Pace, Jr., was in the hospital, which was a further delay. They have only been organized within the last month. So I want the House to know why there has been a delay from September 12 until about a month ago in getting this Corporation organized.

What happened when we passed the bill on September 12 of last year with reference to money? We authorized \$9 million to run this Corporation for the remainder of 1968, until July 1, 1968, when the fiscal year 1969 will begin.

Since they did not get organized until about a month ago, they have spent no money for this fiscal year and they are in the position of getting their staff together and they do not intend to spend any money in the remainder of fiscal year 1968.

Now, what are we asking by this piece of legislation? Simply one thing—the \$9 million which was put in the legislation last year and authorized to be spent in fiscal 1968 we are asking to be put in fiscal year 1969. We are not asking for any new money. We are asking for the money which was not spent in fiscal year 1968 to be authorized for fiscal year 1969.

Where does this go in in relation to the budget for fiscal year 1969? The administration in its budget requested \$20

million. In other words, it proposed \$20 million for fiscal year 1969, the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968. So, if you want to apply it to the 1969 budget, which we are asking for in this legislation, it is a reduction from the budget figure of approximately 55 percent.

There has been raised here the question by some distinguished Members about the danger and the possibility that this could be used by a government to put out its own propaganda. I think the members of that committee will recall very well one important amendment—and unless that amendment had gone in, I doubt very much if that bill would have ever left the committee—and that amendment said that programing done by the Public Broadcasting Corporation had to be—and I quote these words—“had to be balanced and objective.”

Second, there could be no editorializing.

Without those two protections in this legislation, I doubt if it would have passed out, and if it had not been in there, I would not have supported it on the floor of this House.

We felt when this bill was before the committee last year that there ought to be a built-in protection for the minority.

Therefore, on this board which was set up to head this Corporation provided that there could not be any more than eight members from one party. This is the same built-in safeguard that we have in all of the seven Federal regulatory agencies wherein majority party may have only one more member on those Commissions than the minority party.

So we tried to build into this a guaranteed objectivity.

The objection has been raised that we do not have the views from HEW on future costs. I would have been disturbed myself if we had not had those costs and this Corporation had been formed last October, because I think it would have been the business of the Corporation to get the views of HEW on this question. But I will admit that since the Corporation is not active, and has not spent any money, there is no experience in the field. But I would expect that next year HEW will come before our hearings with an estimate of what they think this will cost for a year or two.

A moment or two ago a member of the Rules Committee said on the floor of the House that he had talked with representatives of either the Rockefeller or the Ford Foundation and they said \$40 million next year, and \$60 million the following year. I will tell you that I do not rely on either of those foundations for any opinion as to what this Corporation will cost. I am going to listen to the evidence as it comes to the committee and make up my mind on what I think this Corporation should spend during the next few years. I do not intend to rely on any outside information as to what I think this Corporation ought to spend—and I think with very good reason.

Second, I want it to be known that this Corporation has nothing to do with the Public Broadcasting Laboratory which is being financed by the Rockefeller or the Ford Foundation—absolutely nothing to

do with it. Some of you have seen programs this last year by the Public Broadcasting Laboratory. All were privately financed. There is nothing we could do about it if we wanted to. That is all entirely private in nature and privately financed.

Lastly, I wish to make this clear, I hope, to all my friends who are either for or against the bill, that, in the formation of this Corporation, we are not in any conflict, in any way, with private TV or the networks. We have had testimony from all three of the networks and all three of them have given us a good word in behalf of this Corporation. CBS has offered \$1 million as its part, at least, in the beginning, to show its good will toward this Corporation. But I do believe the only issue here really—and I have taken some time to give what I thought the Members ought to have as to what we have done since September 12, 1967—but the only issue here today is that we are asking that you strike out “1968” and insert the word “1969” to authorize the \$9 million for 1969 that the Corporation will have to spend in 1968 had it been in existence. It seems to me that that is not more than a reasonable request.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Has the gentleman abandoned the idea that the Public Broadcasting Corporation will find some other direct means of financing besides appropriation?

Mr. SPRINGER. I have not abandoned that by any means, but I do believe that it is going to take something voluntary. I do not think there is any way we can compel anyone to come in and give money. In the beginning I was very hopeful that the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation itself would come forward. But thus far, insofar as I have been able to find out, they have not.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Has the CBS money actually been put into the project for this year?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not believe there has been any money actually delivered because the Corporation has been in existence for only a little over a month. I do not know whether they intend to give that \$1 million this month or this year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Presuming that they do plan to give it this year, which I understood they had committed, then the Corporation would actually have \$10 million this year if we appropriate the \$9 million, and the authorization of \$9 million for 1969?

Mr. SPRINGER. I would say if the gentleman's assumption is true, that is correct. I do not assume that they are going to use any money.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then there would be \$20 million for 1969. The gentleman is not suggesting that we should have appropriated and someone should have expended the \$9 million last year when there was no board of directors for the Public Broadcasting Corporation?

Mr. SPRINGER. Oh, no. Does the gentleman mean I was implying they should have spent \$9 million last year? Was that the question?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I said, the

gentleman said we originally authorized \$20 million for 1969 fiscal year, and \$9 million in 1968.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman misunderstood me. I do not believe I said it, but if I did, I will correct it. The President's budget for 1969, proposed \$20 million. Now the request is for \$9 million in this legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The point I would like to make, if I may, is that the original legislation which authorized this program called for the expenditure of \$9 million in the first year. The Board of the Public Broadcasting Corporation was not named until, as the gentleman pointed out, just a few weeks ago, so in effect \$9 million does not represent a cut, but it merely represents the deferring of the action of the authorization of \$9 million for the first year to 1969, which is when the Corporation got into being.

Mr. SPRINGER. I should say it will be in operation in 1969. Yes; I believe the gentleman's last statement is true. I believe that is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to ask this one other thing: On the ultimate cost of this program, does the gentleman feel the Carnegie Foundation estimate, that this will ultimately cost approximately \$270 million, is inaccurate or questionable?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; I believe it is questionable, very questionable.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Would the gentleman care to put an ultimate price tag on this program?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not believe anyone can say what this will cost. I will say probably a great deal will depend on how well this Corporation does its job and how serious the demand is for this type of programming.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Would it be a fair assumption to say it will cost far in excess of \$9 million annually?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; I think certainly they would need, providing they are successful, next year far more than \$9 million. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Illinois indicated, this legislation today just does one thing. It provides an authorization for \$9 million that was previously authorized for fiscal year 1968, which was not appropriated, to be applied to fiscal year 1969, which begins on July 1.

I think in examining the overall fiscal situation of our Nation today, we should take into consideration particularly the economic crisis we are facing, and the remarks of William McChesney Martin and others. The fact is the President for over 7 months has been demanding that the Congress enact a surtax to help meet this particular crisis. He has berated the Congress for failing to give this to him, but he does not seem to recognize Con-

gress represents the views of the people, and it is the people who are not feeling they should be taxed further to finance the many programs that cost a lot of money. I think inasmuch as there has not been any disposition on the part of the Congress, at least up until this time, to enact additional taxes and inasmuch as the people do not want additional taxes, and no disposition on the part of the administration to cut expenses, we can forgo this \$9 million for at least another year.

I would invite the attention of the Members to the committee report that was issued on April 4, 1968, and specifically to pages 6 and 7, where the minority views appear, signed by six members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, setting forth a number of the reasons we originally resisted the Public Broadcasting Act when it was passed in 1967. Many of the things that we suggested are coming to pass.

The public corporation has just been recently activated, but on my desk and I think on the desks of all Members this morning there appeared a copy of a speech entitled "Public Television—Now," which was an address given by Ben Kubasik, executive director of the National Citizens' Committee for Public Television, apparently an address that occurred a week ago today, on April 18, before the National Society for the Study of Communications. Risking the possibility of having someone say some of his remarks are being lifted out of context, I would just point out a few of the things that Mr. Kubasik said in pleading for the implementation of this particular legislation.

He said that television itself, and not just public television, "gave birth to the civil rights movement as we know it today."

He says:

Television has wrought changes in attitudes toward war, disassociation from traditional party politics, and commitments in justice and love to all men. Because these changes have come to us through one medium, the relationship between war, politics and race is strikingly clear.

He says:

This participation must become more responsible. This participation must mature. This participation involves a fuller commitment to reality and to change.

And he submits that—

It is Public Television where our participation and involvement to change and reality can take place as it can nowhere else.

And that—

Nowhere near the amounts that public broadcasting really needs to begin operating as it should are contained under the act passed in 1967.

He adds:

This corporation will require * * * approximately \$40 million in its first year and \$60 million a year in the following years. And Heavens knows how much each year thereafter.

He says:

The \$10.5 million facilities money alone, which was to have been appropriated for fiscal 1968—

That is the subject of this legislation here—

and was properly expected by the public broadcasters and their audiences as a simple extension of the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962, are desperately needed by the Public Television and Radio stations of this country.

He goes on to point out that public television "is movement and excitement and entertainment and education and humanity and joy—all scheduled regularly—on public television."

Let us look at what they have been doing. He says:

There is "NET Journal," the excellent series of broadcasts which this season included "What Harvest for the Reaper?" "Roots of Prejudice" and "North Vietnam."

Any Members who saw any of those can make their own judgments as to whether they think it was unbiased, straight reporting.

He also says:

There is the every-other-week "News in Perspective," the perceptive news analysis series with Lester Markel and top *New York Times* correspondents.

Which of course they are promoting.

There was the second annual NET coverage and probing analysis of the President's State of the Union Message.

Again we wonder. I ask my colleagues if they endorse managed news?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I quote further from Mr. Ben Kubasik's address:

Let me stop here for a moment to say what I have heard many others reiterate. "PBL's" report on Martin Luther King, the Sunday following his assassination on Thursday, told more about him, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the responsibility with which King and his people were forging their Poor Man's March on Washington, than anything else that was broadcast or printed before or since that sorrowful period. This was Public Television at its greatest. This is what it should strive always to be.

He says also:

Public Television station personnel of this country meet to discuss and act upon what they can further do in ghetto programming, a crucial area where Public Television has the time on its schedule to provide an unparalleled public service of unparalleled necessity.

He further adds:

If turning over large-scale scheduling to provide answers to America's most demanding problem sounds revolutionary, so be it. We are in revolution, to television's conscience-molding credit, largely of television's making, and it is up to Public Television to make itself available to give meaning and direction to what is happening in America today. It is no longer enough to think of programming for a long hot summer, with the whites doing the programming.

He says:

We live now in a long hot twelve-months-a-year, every year, year-in and year-out—and the challenge in conscience, justice and love has to be met.

He adds:

It is television which has made us look at war in the faces of an alien people's crushed and wounded children and, in that alien country, our own people's maimed and dying youth.

He concludes that "it," meaning public television—

It alone among our communications media, be they broadcast or print, is capable at all times of reaching out to all our people and helping set aright the disorder and chaos reflected daily in spoken or written headlines.

This, of course, would indicate to you that public television has to implement your knowledge and give you direction, because you cannot believe everything that you see or hear or read in the newspapers. In effect, in my analysis of his speech, he is saying that public television will be giving you the guidelines that you need and you will not get them from any other source. It seems to me another big step in the direction of socialistic orientation, where we authorize the expenditure of public funds to create another public body to centralize thinking power, authority and control, away from our basic free enterprise system. I feel it can create a dangerous bureaucracy for news management.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. Would it come under the purview of this committee, if this educational TV bill passes and the Commission is established and rules and regulations and guidelines are drawn up, to supervise and investigate or at least to inquire into the question and the effect that might be had by computers plus a legitimate sample taking which is done on election days and the broadcasts and estimates made long before the polls are closed in the other latitudes of the Nation?

Mr. DEVINE. If I understand the gentleman's question correctly, it would not fall within the purview of this corporation that is created by this committee. The jurisdiction for that particular matter would still remain in the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. HALL. This would change nothing with regard to that because, if there is anything that our Nation needs, it is to realize that just because something is in print or you see it on television it does not necessarily make it so.

Mr. DEVINE. In all fairness, Mr. Chairman, I am including the entire speech of Mr. Kubasik, in order that it can be read in its full context:

PUBLIC TELEVISION—Now

(An address by Ben Kubasik, executive director, National Citizens Committee for Public Television, April 18, 1968, before the National Society for the Study of Communication, New York, N.Y.)

As with all speeches that I have ever been involved with, their titles are made up one or two months in advance to fit any contingency. "Future Directions and Dimensions of Public Television" is such a title. My life has been spent in news—on newspapers and in broadcasting—and so perhaps I have more of a crisis mentality than most. I always expect that I have to be free to move in any direction based on any emergency that might

come up no matter what I am talking about. Enough has happened this past two and one-half weeks to justify my propensity for open-ended titles.

"The future directions and dimensions of Public Television" are taking their final form now. Everything I have to say today is based upon that premise.

Better than many, those of you assembled here have your own ideas as to the effect that mass communications, notably television, can and does have on its audiences. While there are attempts to determine the size of television audiences, there really is no effective measuring device by which to know television's impact on ourselves, as individuals and as a nation. Undoubtedly, all of television, from the most crass to the most significant, has its effects. We intuitively can grasp where television's impact is the greatest. We cannot deny, for example, that what is chosen to be shown and what we choose to watch tells us much about ourselves, as individuals and as a nation.

The Vietnam War, at any other point in our history, could have been and probably would have been remote to most Americans, despite the fullest coverage by newspapers, magazines, even radio. But death and devastation as shown on television are seen with devastating clarity. The imagination does not ignore or erase or turn into mock heroics actual sights of suffering. The debate, the dissent over Vietnam and its immeasurable consequences on our society comes, more than from anywhere else, from television.

Political candidates, those seeking office and those disclaiming such ambitions, are made into the reality they become not so much because of what they say but because of how they say it or appear to be saying it—and how we react to what they are saying—on television. These men cannot ignore the communications capability of their age. The degree to which they can communicate themselves, their programs, their policies and their accomplishments to the rest of us will determine the degree to which they will be successful in seeking or remaining in office.

It is said that television gave birth to the civil rights movement as we know it today. That is unquestionably true. This nation's most recent tragic assassination was not merely the reporting or recording of an event; it was a commentary on ourselves, as individuals and as a nation. So were the many years of the sequential and unforgettable series of moving events that television brought to us to sear our minds and hearts and consciences—from Bull Conner's dogs to Martin Luther King's March on Washington to the sorrow and shame of a nation that we experienced only a few days ago.

Television is not only an observer. It is a participant. Watching television, we are not only observers. We are participants. Together—television and you and I—we are involved in the choice of selecting the shape of our destiny as no other body of men ever was capable in the history of humanity. With reality on television, there is no such thing as passive involvement. What television tells us in our hearts about war, about politics, about race, has to be translated, has to change us, has to make us better or worse. Television has brought us to the precipice of an informed conscience. Television cannot now remove itself from helping us make decisions as though it were not here. Because, you see, it is. It is part of our lives, our cities, our ghettos, our landscape, our world and—to the extent that we assimilate into ourselves what it shows us and television assimilates us into showing us back to ourselves—it is us.

It is not enough to give birth to anything and then to let that which has been born seek its own solutions. Television has wrought changes in attitudes toward war, disassociation from traditional party politics, and commitments in justice and love to all men. Because these changes have come to us

through one medium, the relationship between war, politics and race is strikingly clear. They are one story, one movement in history. Television's involvement, as our involvement with it and it with us, must increase and grow. This participation must become more responsible. This participation must mature. This participation involves a fuller commitment to reality and to change. And I submit that it is Public Television where our participation and involvement to change and reality can take place as it can nowhere else.

There are, at this moment, some 160 non-commercial television stations in this country which the Carnegie Commission Report has given the over-all title of Public Television. Public Television is a loose confederation of community educational television stations and stations licensed under university, school board and state auspices. Its programming is achieved locally as well through broadcasts provided by National Educational Television (NET) and its autonomous division, the Public Broadcast Laboratory (PBL). Only occasionally do the Public Television outlets have the capability of interconnection, of networking, that is, of simultaneously joining the various stations on a coast-to-coast hookup for its broadcasts.

Despite the present networking limitations, Public Television, night after night, in season and out of season, has continued doing a remarkable job of informing the American people on precisely those subjects which most affect us. More has to be done, obviously, and more can be done—provided that the wheels which have been set in motion to make Public Television a strong, healthy and productive service are allowed to pick up momentum. There is a Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 under which money for new facilities and construction is authorized and under which a Corporation for Public Broadcasting is established. A fifteen-man board has been selected for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which will have its first meeting later this month.

Only through the offices of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, according to Congress' own definition in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, can all the activities that a strengthened Public Television this country needs be accomplished. It is intended that the Corporation will:

Facilitate the full development of Public Broadcasting.

Be the body to assist in the establishment and development of non-commercial television and radio stations.

Make funds available for production of programs of high quality for non-commercial broadcasting.

Obtain grants from various sources and make payments to local stations for programming and other costs of operations.

Arrange by grant or contract for interconnection facilities at the free or reduced rates which the communications common carriers are permitted by the Act to provide.

Engage in activities that will assure maximum freedom of the system and its stations.

Have final responsibility for recommending a permanent financing plan for Public Broadcasting.

There is one major problem in conjunction with the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, however. No governmental monies as yet have been appropriated for either the Corporation or for facilities. The \$9 million intended for the Corporation to begin its operations is being moved by the Congress into next year's fiscal budget—with no guarantee that the full sum will be forthcoming then. The \$10.5 million for facilities earmarked for the current fiscal year under the Act is being ignored and the \$12.5 million that the Act calls for in the next fiscal year is going to be requested. These sums of money are nowhere near the amounts that Public Broadcasting really needs to begin operating as it should. The Carnegie Commission Report,

upon which the legislation is based, said "the Corporation will require from Federal funds approximately \$40 million in its first year and \$60 million a year in the following years, allowing for a moderately rapid buildup."

At the time when the Carnegie Commission made public its report—in January, 1967—the Vietnam War, the political situation and this country's racial crises had not escalated into the complexities that need unravelling and explanation as they do today. The far-sightedness of the Carnegie Commission's fifteen distinguished members has not been allowed to flower into the full bloom that should by now have occurred. Political practicalities have dictated a slow, gradualistic approach to the most serious of our problems today, involving all of us together with Public Television in an understanding toward positive action in the solution of this nation's myriad and growing difficulties.

The \$10.5 million facilities money alone, which was to have been appropriated for fiscal 1968 and was properly expected by the public broadcasters and their audiences as a simple extension of the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962, are desperately needed by the Public Television and Radio stations of this country. Already, there are project requests in to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for funds three and one-half times the amount that was to have been but as yet has not been appropriated for fiscal 1968. The needed monies for Public Television and Radio station facilities are mounting at the rate of almost \$20 million per year while nothing is appropriated for them.

At least that \$10.5 million in facilities monies should still be appropriated for fiscal 1968. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting must inherit the strongest possible system of Public Broadcasting stations for it to service in the public interest.

There is no desire here to divorce myself from the multitudinous problems this nation faces. The Committee of which I am the servant exists, in point of fact, to foster a broadcasting system that will help this nation better to face, understand and solve these problems. Where federal funds are unavailable because of emergency budgetary considerations caused by the difficulties in which this country finds itself, it might be argued that there is sufficient reason for delay.

To answer that argument, there are several points in conjunction with the funding of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting that must be made with precision. A Public Broadcasting system of the breadth envisioned in the Congress' 1967 Act cannot get fully under way until Federal monies begin to make it possible. Such a Public Broadcasting system, at this point in our history, could do much to report and clarify the issues which threaten to tear this nation apart. The fact is that any delay in starting a strong, healthy and productive Public Television system on its way keeps our national communications from taking on a form that is absolutely essential to this nation's well-being.

The National Citizens Committee for Public Television exists to make the American people aware of the reality and the potential of Public Broadcasting. This does not mean only appealing to the converted; it means making new disciples of those countless millions who do not tune to Public Television.

Toward that end, the Citizens Committee seeks the support of national organizations and associations, through their leaders and individual members and through their publications, to spread the word about Public Television. We have an advisory council of national organizations, and I propose to you here today that the National Society for the Study of Communication would be most welcome as a member of our advisory council.

The word has to be made known through

the largest possible public relations-advertising campaign that can be mounted. The methods used to sell any product for which wide acceptance or support is sought are the methods that Public Television must employ to make its message known. Public Television has been referred to as minority television—a name Public Television wholeheartedly accepts but not for the usually-stated reason that large-scale audiences would not be interested. The quality offerings of the commercial networks—enjoying the best in promotion, advertising and exploitation techniques—have shown time and again the degree to which qualitative minority programming has reached quantitative majority audiences. The four-hour-long broadcast on Africa, the "CBS Playhouse" specials, the latest Senate Foreign Relations hearings with Dean Rusk, which outdrew its daytime competition, are only a few of the examples of the thirst that America and its audiences have which must be quenched.

Whenever anybody in Public Television lets his imagination soar, he talks about some mythical future time when Public Television is going to be competitive for audiences. Audiences must begin to know in far greater abundance than is the case at present that Public Television exists and they must begin to grasp more than they do at the moment that there is movement and excitement and entertainment and education and humanity and joy—all scheduled regularly—on Public Television that they cannot find scheduled regularly anywhere else. Only by making audiences tune in can the audiences that do exist for Public Television become habitues and supporters of Public Television.

Let us look at only a few of the outstanding examples of broadcasts that have been, are and will be carried on Public Television:

There is "NET Journal," the excellent series of broadcasts which this season included "What Harvest for the Reaper?" "Roots of Prejudice" and "North Vietnam."

There is the every-other-week "News in Perspective," the perceptive news analysis series with Lester Markel and top *New York Times* correspondents.

There is the fine "NET Playhouse" series with productions such as "Home," "Next Time I'll Sing To You" and Santha Rama Rau's adaptation to E. M. Forster's "A Passage to India."

There was the second annual NET coverage and probing analysis of the President's State of the Union Message.

There is "PBL," the Sunday evening experimental series.

Let me stop here for a moment to say what I have heard many others reiterate. "PBL's" report on Martin Luther King, the Sunday following his assassination on Thursday, told more about him, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the responsibility with which King and his people were forging their Poor Man's March on Washington, than anything else that was broadcast or printed before or since that sorrowful period. This was Public Television at its greatest. This is what it should strive always to be.

There is the outstanding programming produced and broadcast by local stations. We know it here on Channel 13 in New York. And you know it or ought to know it wherever you are from.

There are the "White House Red Carpet with Julia Child," the special series on "Men Who Teach," the three-hour-long report in May on the crises in our cities.

There is, in the long run, the Children's Television Workshop series, aimed primarily at the culturally deprived ghetto child.

Getting to the public about what is on Public Television is vital if we expect to gain audiences. If Public Television were to measure its audiences in the same way that others in broadcasting do, an "NET Journal" on a

commercial network to which the public is attuned to tuning, could bring Nielsen ratings of between 4 and 12, which could translate itself to 5.5 to 16.5 million people. In the same vein, "A Passage to India," on a commercial network with an outstanding cast that included Virginia McKenna, Cyril Cusack and Dame Sybil Thorndike, could bring a Nielsen rating on a commercial network even higher than 20, but a 20 rating could be translated into 27.5 million viewers. If these yardsticks are a true indication, an audience is there to be captured for what is on Public Television. That audience must be made aware of what is on Public Television.*

What Public Television is doing and what it has still to do can only be accomplished provided there is the wherewithal to make it all happen. This Sunday here in New York, Public Television station personnel of this country meet to discuss and act upon what they can further do in ghetto programming, a crucial area where Public Television has the time on its schedule to provide an unparalleled public service of unparalleled necessity.

The report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders in its section headed "The News Media and the Disorders" stated "by and large, news organizations have failed to communicate to both their black and white audiences a sense of the problems America faces and the sources of potential solutions." It further stated that the news media "report and write from the standpoint of a white man's world. The ills of the ghetto, the difficulties of life there, the Negro's burning sense of grievance, are seldom conveyed. Sights and indignities are part of the Negro's daily life, and many of them come from what he now calls 'the white press'—a press that repeatedly, if unconsciously, reflects the biases, the paternalism, the indifference of white America."

If turning over large-scale scheduling to provide answers to America's most demanding problem sounds revolutionary, so be it. We are in revolution, to television's conscience-molding credit, largely of television's making, and it is up to Public Television to make itself available to give meaning and direction to what is happening in America today. It is no longer enough to think of programming for a long hot summer, with the whites doing the programming. We live now in a long hot twelve-months-a-year, every year, year-in, year-out—and the challenge in conscience, justice and love has to be met.

There is need, yes, for massive infusions of money too long withheld and too long delayed, for whatever the reasons, to the poor of this country. There are people, from among the middle-class white majority, who still do not understand the need for such massive funds for the poor. There are poor who still accept their lot uncomplainingly who have rights that have been trampled or kept underfoot for too long who must be made to know that the change that must come is coming, and they must know and themselves shape the role they are to play in making it all happen.

Public Television can help bring together on a lasting basis the blacks and whites who joined hands and sang "We Shall Overcome" with quivering question marks in their voices only a little over a week ago. Public Television can be the vehicle that someday can bring blacks and whites to-

*These ratings conclusions are based on 55,000,000 television homes, with an average 2.5 persons-per-set. The A. C. Nielsen Company estimates that in prime time the average persons-per-set fluctuates for a variety of reasons from between 2.3 to 2.9. I have arbitrarily chosen the 2.5 persons-per-set figure for illustrative purposes.

gether with joined hands and hearts to sing "We Have Overcome," with their voices resounding with the proudest of explanation points. That vision would not have come this far, that vision would have been impossible if it were not for television.

We are living through the seasons of our discontent, the television seasons of our discontent. It is television that has made us arrive at the juncture in our history at which we find ourselves, as individuals and as a nation. It is television which has made us look at war in the faces of an alien people's crushed and wounded children and, in that alien country, our own people's maimed and dying youth. It is television which has taught us to recognize political sham when we see it. It is television which has brought us to this point in the struggle for equality for all men.

There is no turning back. There is no turning off the set that comes into our home and speaks the truth by showing it. There is no dimming of the issues that television raises.

Because Public Television has the time in its schedule—the space in its national pages, if you will—it offers this nation's citizens the opportunity to participate directly in democracy as nothing else in our history ever has. It alone among our communications media, be they broadcast or print, is capable at all times of reaching out to all our people and helping set aright the disorder and chaos reflected daily in spoken or written headlines. It alone has the time—and it must seek and seize the wisdom—to help us comprehend at this period of historic upheaval the changing way Americans look at war, politics and race.

Man and his society is in a constant state of change and it is Public Television—the future directions and dimensions of which are being determined now—that can lead us through the seasons of our discontent and bring us to a fulfillment of what we must do to effect a change in ourselves, as individuals and as a nation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have only a very brief comment or two to make on this legislation. I merely wish to call attention to two salient facts of a financial nature about this corporation.

First, on page 43 of the hearings on this legislation, H.R. 15986, the following comment is made by Mr. James Robertson, chairman of the executive board of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters. He said this in response to questioning:

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had provided for the corporation a projection which is found on page 53 of the committee's former report by fiscal years, starting with \$9 million in fiscal 1968, and running up to \$120 million in 1973, with the comments that the long-range corporation budget is not expected to exceed \$160 million by about 1980.

Now, I would underscore to you that we are asked today to start a program that by 1980 will cost this Nation \$160 million per annum. I for one am reluctant to do that in the face of the comment of Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin and others about our fiscal crisis.

I would like to make one other comment, if I may, and then I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

In testimony earlier during our hearings on this legislation, Mr. Joseph B.

Hughes, a member of the Board of Directors of the Public Broadcasting Corporation, pointed out that this year private contributions are expected to amount to \$2,125,000 of the proposed needed \$9 million figure.

I should like to suggest to this body that we challenge those who support this program in the private industry area to put their money where their enthusiasm is rather than expecting the taxpaying public to put its money into it. Let those enthusiastic industries supply the remaining \$6,875,000 to complete the needed \$9 million this first year. Then, perhaps next year we can take another look at the serious fiscal situation of our country and determine the relative need for public financing of public broadcasting at that time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me at this time. In the colloquy which was held between the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Illinois the fact was brought out that there was \$9 million authorized for fiscal year 1968.

I would like to ask the gentleman how much, if any, was appropriated for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. None of that money was appropriated, as I understand it, and none of it was expended, because the Corporation did not come into operation. No money was appropriated.

Mr. ICHORD. That was my opinion and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such additional time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate that we received telegrams from the National Association of Broadcasters, ABC, NBC, and the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., favoring this bill.

The comment which was made here a minute or two ago by the gentleman was not, I am sure, directed at the members of the Corporation. It is my opinion that the gentleman would agree that the 15 members which have been selected by the President of the United States are about the highest type of men and women to be found in the United States of America. I have confidence in them, and I am sure that every Member of this House of Representatives does.

All the bill proposes to do is to change the date from 1968 to 1969.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am happy that the private corporations—Westinghouse and the National Broadcasting Co. and others as well, are enthusiastic about the Congress appropriating the taxpayers' money for this program. But I would like to ask the gentleman if it would not be appropriate to expect that Westinghouse, the National Broadcasting Co., and those other giants of the communications industry who make a good deal of money in the private area of the com-

munications industry should not put in their money this first year in order to get this program off the ground, in order that we may see how it goes and, perhaps, then it would be desirable for us to consider whether Federal money might be added to the money that they put into this program privately?

CBS has already done this. I would feel a lot more kindly toward this matter if they express the fact that they were willing to put in some of their profits into the program rather than asking the Congress of the United States to appropriate the taxpayers' money with which to initiate this program.

Mr. STAGGERS. In reply to that statement which has been made by the gentleman from Ohio, CBS has already contributed \$1 million and I am sure that others will.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Has NBC contributed anything?

Mr. STAGGERS. Not to my knowledge. Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, has Westinghouse contributed anything?

Mr. STAGGERS. Not to my knowledge. However, I will say to the gentleman that last year this House passed a bill authorizing the appropriation of \$9 million to get the Corporation started. If we do not do that, we cannot expect any corporation in America to contribute one dime.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, last year the urgency for authorizing the \$9 million was stressed on the floor of the House. Yet the President of the United States did not name the Corporation Board members until just a few weeks ago when we were expected to consider this resolution to extend this time from 1968 to 1969. Apparently, the urgency to approve this legislation somehow got lost between that time and the time the Board was named.

Mr. STAGGERS. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that having gone over the hearing record of last year, I find nothing to the effect that the legislation had to be enacted immediately or by any certain time. I do not find one word wherein any sense of urgency was expressed when this matter was pending before the House and it was acted upon accordingly, and according to the normal course of events in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] explained the delays in organizing the Corporation very well. Each Member of this body should understand why the delay occurred. We gave our word on these funds last year and I think we have to keep it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further and if the Chairman will permit me one more question, I hope the gentleman will agree with me that apparently we are in partial agreement with Mr. Martin of the Federal Reserve Board to the effect that the fiscal situation of the country has deteriorated some since the passage of this legislation.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I

appreciate very much the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, last year I reported to my colleagues of the House that I am the owner of a one-fifth minority interest in a commercial television station in my home State and district. I am still the owner of such minority interest.

Irrespective of such ownership, I wish to go on public record as strongly favoring educational television—both public and private. The educational potential of this powerful medium of communication is immense and educational television should be promoted and advanced—in the proper way and at the proper time.

I have two deep concerns about the basic legislation which was passed last year by this House. First, that in spite of efforts made in H.R. 6736 to insulate the Corporation for Public Broadcasting from political involvement or control, the legislation does not sufficiently so insulate the Corporation. This involves an immense risk for the public in the area of future attempts at thought control in the political field and, until the insulation has been made much more certain, this remains an unsound situation.

Second, the whole question of permanent financing is left unresolved. Estimates of long-run costs are most sizable ranging as high as \$160 million annually; there is apparent agreement that these costs should not permanently be carried from the public treasury; and yet no alternative plan of financing has been proposed which is adequate and acceptable. When the National Treasury is in its present strained and unsound condition, it would be most unwise to saddle future budgets with an obligation to continue carrying from public funds this new and expensive program.

I wish I could support this bill today. But I do not feel that it represents the proper way at the proper time for the Federal Government to involve itself in this field, and I must therefore oppose it.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this—that the power that will be put into these stations by giving them Federal money seems to me exceedingly dangerous. I believe all of the Members have been told through their lives that when once the Government controls education then freedom is gone.

I would like the Members to consider this bill a little from that angle, and also from the point of view that we are presently head over heels in debt, so why can we not wait another year for this? Certainly we do not need this this year, right now. Let us wait and give it more consideration. It is not a matter of having to do this all at once, it may be we can do it next year if we are wise enough to protect our country from financial disaster, and from a whole lot of other kinds of disasters.

Mr. STAGGERS. I might say to the gentlewoman in reply to her suggestion that this be put off for another year—that I am very glad Christopher Colum-

bus did not say, "Let us put it off," and did not get the Queen's jewels to finance his venture, otherwise we might not be here today.

Mrs. BOLTON. Christopher Columbus was helped by a woman, and so I am just trying to help my country.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a bill that would bring this country's Corporation for Public Broadcasting out of gestation and give it life.

I want to express my vigorous support for this bill and to urge its swift enactment into law.

Established by the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting that year was granted authorization for a \$9 million appropriation in fiscal 1968. But the Corporation, its schedule snarled by a series of delays, was unable to make use of the authorization in fiscal 1968. The bill we are considering today—H.R. 15986—would transfer from fiscal 1968 to fiscal 1969 the authorization for \$9 million in appropriations.

A governmental appropriation for the Corporation, of course, is merely an expedient to give the organization enough financial strength to gain its feet. The Corporation, the Bureau of the Budget, the Treasury Department, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are now working together in an effort to establish a permanent financing plan—a plan that would make the Corporation wholly independent of political control or interference. The Corporation's very nature demands such independence. Political control of the Corporation's purse strings would hamper its work and taint its public image.

The \$9 million authorization bill before us today, however, must be passed if the Corporation is to carry out any work at all.

Created to promote and develop a new concept in educational and informational broadcasting, the Corporation promises to become a vital force in American life.

We in the Congress must pass H.R. 15986 if the Corporation is to begin fulfilling this promise.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the continuation of the Public Broadcasting Act by passage of H.R. 15986.

I fear we are continuing a new political device which, with Government support, will turn undefined education into a runaway brainwashing monster.

Events of recent weeks such as the King saturation on the television networks and the CBS "Hanoi" program should be the signal to thinking Americans of the dangers of a centralized communications system.

The obvious threat to our masses is the powerful one-sided persuasion, a tool to affect thought control by a few under the guise of education.

The admitted planners of public broadcasting are the Ford and Carnegie Foundations who indicate little in the interests of America—except to dodge taxes and influence political action.

We can shortly expect, by the use of Telstar devices, one intellectual professor to teach every child in America—yes,

even the world. This could be called an equal education exposure.

But what happens to the many other qualified and trained educators? Are they resolved to mere disciplinarians—to adjust the television sets and take up the tests? Who selects the courses, curriculum, and the teachers for public education?

The existing commercial networks have become highhanded and out of control in attempting to force the preferences of their few on the many. But to turn the entire network over to politicians can only nationalize the industry.

Private funds and private enterprise has brought the industry to its present development—whether we approve of it or not. I see nothing good to be gained by continuing the national public broadcasting blueprint.

I include the following as some indication of what we can expect—parental interference—from political broadcasting:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1968]

"TOWN MEETING" ON EDUCATION TO BE
TELEVIEWED

District school officials and members of the Board of Education will conduct an open-end "town meeting" on educational issues April 24 on WETA, the educational television station.

The program, which will be aired beginning at 8:30 p.m., will deal with four questions:

Are children learning what they need to learn?

What powers should parents have in running schools?

Should a neighborhood control its own school?

Should three-year-olds go to school?

A panel of "experts," to be announced later, will speak on the questions, and other comments will be given by officials and taken by phone from viewers.

Two additional such programs will be broadcast by the station in May, all co-sponsored by WETA and the District Board of Education.

[From the Network of Patriotic Letter Writers, Pasadena, Calif.]

SENSITIVITY TRAINING

Recently State Senator John G. Schmitz told me, in discussing a social phenomenon that has spread like cancer, not only throughout California, but to every State in the Union: "It appears to be aimed at destroying the independence, self-confidence and self-reliance of the individual—the foundations of both liberty and good government."

He was referring to that perversion of group therapy: "Group Criticism"—a method of social control through social pressure that is used by every communist regime in the exact form now spreading throughout our Nation. Only it is never called Group Criticism—but something dear to the hearts of guilt-ridden liberals. "Human Relations," perhaps, or "Operant Conditioning." Most often of all, however, you will hear it called "Sensitivity Training."

NOT ENTIRELY NEW

Now as many who read this will recognize, this process, usually under the name Sensitivity Training, has been around for several years, ever since social psychologist Kurt Lewin developed the idea in the early 1950's. Industries, businesses, groups of professional people such as doctors, lawyers, architects, have submitted to it on a voluntary, short-term basis where its destructive effects would not be widespread—although many who par-

ticipated still do not speak to each other to this day.

But today there is a new generation—and the situation, backed as will be shown, by communists and communist influences, is much worse.

Sessions of so-called Sensitivity or Group Criticism (its only correct name) have invaded California with a vengeance.

Dr. James Bugental, of Psychological Service Associates, Los Angeles, says, "California is a hotbed of such groups."

Sessions take place in private living rooms anywhere from San Diego to, of course, Berkeley. Or the "scene," as some devotees call it, may be a hall or lounge at UCLA's Conference Center at Lake Arrowhead; the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute at La Jolla; a conference of business executives at a "retreat" in Ojai Valley; or simply a meeting of students at San Diego State College.

The Esalen Institute at Big Sur is a favorite location for many avant-garde artists, writers and "liberal intellectuals."

But that is not all. The process has made a beachhead in State Civil Service, notably in the Departments of Mental Hygiene and Corrections—where it is used on the staff, not the inmates, on a mandatory basis.

But what is this Group Criticism—this "Sensitivity Training"?

Actually it hides behind nearly twenty names, depending on the mood of the "intellectuals" who push it and the type of "audience" they have picked for a target. For example, in the communist police states behind the 6000 mile stretch of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, it is known, without the need to disguise its true nature, as Self-Criticism.

MODERN ORIGIN

Group Criticism, defined as "Self-Criticism followed by Mutual Criticism, always in a group setting," originated at the time of the Twelfth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution in 1929. Included among the party slogans that year was: "Through Bolshevik self-criticism we will enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Called Sama Kritika, it was inspired by the Party advisers, the dreaded G.P.U., or communist secret police. Briefly the mechanics were as follows:

The entire population would be divided into small groups of "collectives" of ten to twenty persons each, which would meet regularly on a mandatory and permanent basis so that no member would have any real life outside the group. Each group would sit in a circle, members facing each other without any "protective" table or other furniture between; then each would take his turn criticizing himself, his faults and shortcomings, no matter how trivial. Each would be encouraged to be "frank" and tell exactly how he felt about the other members, who would then criticize him.

The object? To locate faultfinders and originators of trouble. To uncover any individualists, original thinkers, possible future agitators. The practice, of course, created a spirit of distrust and fear among the people, isolating each from every other. And it was further affirmed by the secret police, human nature being what it is, that most of so-called Self-Criticism would be aimed, not at the self, but at the other fellow.

The result? Police state control, arrests and disappearances, usually after a "frank" criticism session; and frozen fear and terror among those who remained.

TODAY IN CALIFORNIA

In California, as you read this, the exact process is taking place in the Departments of Corrections and Mental Hygiene, as I have mentioned. The sessions are mandatory and, instead of arrests and disappearances, the displeasure for individualism comes forth in poor employee performance ratings.

Just this last December George Robeson,

courageous columnist for the *Long Beach Press-Telegram*, discovered that a program of so-called Sensitivity Training or "T-Group Training," was in full swing in the nearby Los Altos YMCA. Several "retreats" had been held in the mountains at a "Y" camp. One 19 year old boy, after a five-day retreat, has suffered recurrent emotional distress, although his group session took place over a year ago.

Alarmed, Dr. Michael J. Singer, Long Beach psychiatrist, said: "There is danger of serious psychological damage rather than benefits from this type of group . . . meeting."

But the staff of the YMCA, none of whom is a qualified psychiatrist or group therapist, replied: "T-grouping will establish a climate of trust and openness which allows young people to experience acceptance, support, love and appreciation for their self-worth, as well as democratic process."

Democratic processes. Sound familiar? As, for instance, the "People's Democratic Discussion Groups" of Red China and North Viet Nam.

Left implicit in Robeson's two columns was the question: *Why group at all, if the children are normal?*

Dr. Carl Rogers, of the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, La Jolla, and one of the foremost exponents of grouping, has said that: "If therapy is good for people in trouble, then it is bound to be as good or even better for people who function well."

This astounding statement has an origin which we will take a close look at. But first it will be instructive to list the three main points of this pervasive form of Group Criticism that Dr. Rogers calls Sensitivity Training.

THREE MAIN POINTS

1. "The atmosphere helps participants to open up their behavior to examination by themselves as well as by others.
2. . . . the first step is to unfreeze the old values.
3. Gradually members unlearn the inappropriate reactions and find the courage (it's really called that!) to experiment with new responses.

While you wonder which totalitarian liberal will tell you what the "appropriate" response is, I can point out that the above forms a classical definition and analysis of Brainwashing, as both Major William E. Meyer and Edward Hunter have analyzed and defined that process.

Each also pointed out that, among American prisoners during the Korean War, the constant Group Criticism created havoc in group relations, making three out of every four men informers on their countrymen, preventing any escapes, since to escape takes teamwork and men who have torn each other apart before others in a group learn only to hate and distrust each other.

But let us examine the origin of Dr. Rogers' rationalization that what he chooses to euphemistically label "therapy" is better for the normal than for the sick.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

It is well known that when the United Nations brought the World Health Organization into existence in February 1948, it was convicted communist traitor Alger Hiss who gave it its initial impetus in the March 1948 issue of the magazine *International Conciliation*. Hiss, while neither he nor anyone else has ever been able to define mental health, did manage to define "health." In order to give the widest latitude to World Government planners to fit all mankind into a common mold, Hiss stated that: "Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being, and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity."

The plan was then enlarged and refined by the notorious communist sympathizer, Canadian psychiatrist G. Brock Chisholm,

assisted by Dr. Daniel Blain, who was Director of California's Department of Mental Hygiene until 1963. Together they reached two conclusions:

1. That the United States has an enormous mental health problem.
2. That this problem can be solved by the use of government clinics.

Chisholm followed this by the outright declaration that "Universal mental health means one world." And, for the treatment of the "sick world" in order to achieve this goal, Dr. Chisholm put near the top of his list what he chose to call "group therapy."

But it was Dr. Blain who, after helping formulate the *World Citizenship Credo*, told us exactly who the beneficiaries of that "therapy" would be. Said Dr. Blain, "Prevention of mental illness is the primary goal of the government clinic."

In other words, attention would be shifted from the *abnormal* to the *normal*! Which means that everyone supposedly is in need of Group Therapy, Criticism, or Sensitivity.

NATIONAL TRAINING LABORATORIES

As a result of the groundwork laid by Blain, Chisholm, and Hiss, the *National Education Association* has been pushing Group Criticism for the normal since 1955. For the NEA this is only natural, since it has been the stronghold of the John Deweyite, group-centered "progressive educationists" for many years. The actual missionary work and spreading of the "faith" is done by a division of the NEA, *The National Training Laboratories*, with headquarters at 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., with a branch laboratory at Bethel, Maine. It is the NTL, under Director Leland P. Bradford, Ph.D., that sponsors Sensitivity Training at the Western Training Laboratory, U.C. at Berkeley; at U.C.L.A.'s Neuropsychiatric Conference Center, Lake Arrowhead; at La Jolla, Big Sur, and even at Boston University—to name only a few.

The process is increasing rapidly in scope. State College at Long Beach has actually started on an accredited course in Sensitivity Training. And many California colleges and universities now have what are called "Synanon Games Clubs," (after the group process used at Synanon, the Narcotics Treatment Center at Santa Monica). It has become a student fad from Berkeley to Sonoma State, Cal-Western, San Diego State, and San Fernando Valley State, to USC's School of Law.

SOME ARE MANDATORY

Most are voluntary, to spread the faith until such time as it becomes mandatory, as it already is in the Departments of Corrections and Mental Hygiene, with the Parole Departments of Michigan, Utah and Oregon planning to start Sensitivity Training programs in the near future.

Already, with the accent on community relations and a new "image for our police, the Los Angeles Police Department has weakened under liberal pressures—and will start mandatory Sensitivity Training, under the name Group Dynamics, at its Police Academy this year!

Since the effect of continued Group Criticism is to destroy group loyalty, making enemies of all members of the groups, it need hardly be said that if a police department surrenders to grouping its men, *the Leftists do not need a Civilian Review Board!*

As one business executive at Douglas Aircraft said of Sensitivity Training: "If everybody is going to know everything about everybody else, the result could be a definite deterioration in personnel attitudes. *I deplore it!*"

Dr. Al Cannon, psychiatrist at UCLA, has given a frightening view of the future he himself would like to see. A Negro, he envisions integrated "marathon groups" lasting up to 30 hours, to "improve race relations." No sleep, no rest, until resistances are over-

come in sheer fatigue. The exact precise formula was used by communist brainwashers.

WHAT CAN YOU DO?

1. Expose and block Sensitivity Training wherever it rears its head. Be especially alert for it in YMCA's, youth groups, schools, summer camps, and in Civil Service.

2. Write your Assemblyman, Councilman or State Senator, letting them know of the situation and asking that they question those responsible as to their motivation and authority.

3. Learn to recognize the process, no matter what it involves. Self-Criticism followed by mutual criticism, always in a group setting; and that the criticism will be vicious, hurtful, aggressive, and serve no purpose but to isolate each member from every other, trusting in and loyal to no one, not even himself.

But first, learn the names that Group Criticism can hide behind. Here they are: *Sensitivity Training, T-Group Training, Group Dynamics, Auto-Criticism, Operant Conditioning, Human Relations, Synanon Games Clubs, Basic Encounter Group, Broad Sensitivity, Class in Group Counseling, Management Development, Leadership Class, Self-Honesty Session, Self-Examination, Interpersonal Competence, Interpersonal Relations, Self-Evaluation, Human Potential Workshop.*

There are others and there will be more. Until the day when the mask is dropped and there is no longer any need to hide.

We must not let that day ever arrive!

EDITOR:

No sooner did I get my article on "Sensitivity Training" off to you than the biggest Sensitivity program I've yet heard of is announced for the Garden Grove District in the Santa Ana Register, clipping enclosed.

Importance

1. It is the biggest.
2. It will involve 7,550 pupils in the 7th & 8th grades on a mandatory basis.
3. It will be funded by \$77,939.
4. \$32,190 of that amount will come from Federal funds!

And:

5. For the first time, the U.S. Office of Education is making a frank head on spousal of group criticism, alias "Sensitivity"!

Several years ago Dr. Max Rafferty fought bitterly with a Dr. Richardson over Group Dynamics for school children in Orange County. But now the dam is about to burst—and not just in Orange County!

Sincerely,

ED DIECKMANN, JR.

A WARNING TO ORANGE COUNTY PARENTS FROM STATE SENATOR JOHN G. SCHMITZ

The most familiar duty of an elected representative of the people is to express their will in the making and carrying out of laws. But an elected representative has a further duty. When, from his point of vantage at the seat of government, he learns of a grave danger to the people he represents, he can be the first to sound a warning.

For several months I have been receiving reports from well-informed and reliable sources about a practice called "sensitivity training" which has been used here in California in the state Department of Corrections, in certain large business corporations, and in YMCA groups of high school students. Sensitivity training has already been made mandatory on a continuing basis for many California parole officers and their office staff.

These reports aroused my deep concern from the beginning, because this "sensitivity training" employs almost exactly the same method that was used to brainwash American prisoners of war in Korea—organized "group criticism."

Group criticism compels the participant to bare his soul before 10 or 15 other persons

who are required to do likewise, under the direction of a group leader. The individual is pressed to seek out real or imagined shortcomings in his personality and in his thinking, to humble himself and give up his independence of mind and judgment, to make himself utterly dependent on the good opinion of the others in the group and the leader of the group.

In time this eats away the very foundations of individual resistance to indoctrination and outside control. Group criticism is used regularly and scientifically for this purpose in every communist country. In the North Korean prison camps it systematically broke down the self-confidence of American prisoners and their trust in one another as individuals and as Americans.

On March 27th a newspaper report revealed that a sensitivity training program financed in part by the U.S. Office of Education, has been proposed for the schools of Garden Grove. The group criticism sessions will include teachers, school counselors, and individual children whom they select and compel to attend. Over 7500 seventh-grade and eighth-grade boys and girls in Garden Grove schools are thus to be exposed to the same kind of psychological pressures which broke strong men in Korea and have driven seasoned parole agents in Los Angeles to the verge of nervous breakdown.

The news story stated that Garden Grove school officials expect "routine approval" of this plan.

I am confident that Orange County parents will not submit so tamely to so great a threat to their children. For if your child thinks for himself and takes pride in himself, if he respects sound moral values, if he dares to be right when the majority is wrong—then "sensitivity training" is like a gun aimed at his head.

This vicious program can be blocked if only enough Orange County people know what is happening, and tell their friends and neighbors. Many might write to our fine Orange County School Superintendent, Dr. Robert Peterson, and ask his help in the fight against it. Those who live in Garden Grove should write, phone or visit its school officials to demand that they never introduce "sensitivity training." To the best of my knowledge this is the first attempt to require group criticism for children at any public school in America. We must crush it under the weight of a united public opinion before it has become a rooted destroyer of the best in our children.

"With so much talk about 'group psychology' and 'peer group adjustment' and 'group recreation' and more recently 'group therapy,' we are beginning to wonder what's happened to the poor unfortunate individual.

"This country was founded and settled not by groups, but by individuals—some of them pretty rugged ones. We owe our greatness and our liberty to the fact that each man was important in himself—a unique and precious thing. It's up to the schools to keep it this way.

"That's why we take a pretty dim view of such things as 'group psychological testing' and 'group counseling' in some education today. Sure, it costs more to deal directly with the individual than to lump him in a mass and deal with him that way. Your doctor could treat your ailments more cheaply, too, no doubt, if he could diagnose and prescribe medicine for a whole crowd of you at one time. But who wants this kind of medicine?" (Dr. Max Rafferty, Superintendent of Public Instruction and Director of Education for the State of California.)

FACT SHEET: EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR THE PUBLIC BROADCASTING CORPORATION, H.R. 15986

BACKGROUND

Last year, the Congress enacted the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 which provided

for a nonprofit Federally-chartered Corporation for Public Broadcasting to improve the quality of noncommercial radio and television programs. \$9 million was authorized for fiscal year 1968.

PROPOSAL

The bill would postpone from fiscal year 1968 to fiscal year 1969 the authorization of \$9 million to support the Corporation.

JUSTIFICATION

Since the Corporation for Public Broadcasting was not incorporated until March 27, 1968, it is not likely that the Corporation would be able to use appropriated funds this fiscal year. However, the Corporation will need such funds in fiscal year 1969.

LONG-RANGE FINANCING

The President has directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to work with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Board of Directors of the Corporation as well as the appropriate congressional committees to formulate a long-range financing plan.

SENATE ACTION

On March 22, 1968, the Senate passed S. 3135, which is identical to H.R. 15986.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15986

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 396(k) of the Communications Act of 1934 are each amended by striking out "1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "1969".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARBSTEIN

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARBSTEIN: On the first page insert the following new section after line 5:

"Sec. 2. It is the sense of the Congress that in view of the privileges granted by the United States Government to commercial broadcasters of radio and television, such broadcasters should contribute substantially to the expenses of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting."

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, while watching some of the educational television in New York, at the end of a program, I noticed that the gentleman sponsoring the program said to the public generally, "Please help support this station. We have no funds for public television except what is sent to us by the public."

It seems a pity to me that stations that broadcast educational television should go hat in hand to the public to seek their aid and assistance in maintaining their broadcasting station.

I do not think it is asking too much to suggest that it is the sense of the Congress that the commercial broadcasting stations should assist in maintaining educational television. I am thus introducing an amendment embodying this position.

Last year I offered a similar amendment and I also suggested at that time that the Federal Communications Commission hold hearings to determine the

extent to which commercial broadcasting should assist in the support of educational television.

I was unsuccessful with my amendment last year so I am only offering half of it today. I leave to some other agency that is better qualified, to make the determination of exactly how much commercial broadcasters should contribute.

Nevertheless, it would seem to me entirely and singularly appropriate that something should be done along this line. Whether or not this amendment is adopted today, it will at least be evidence of the fact that there are some people in this House with their eyes on commercial broadcasters, to learn whether any effort is being made to assist educational television or if it is still necessary for the educational stations to come hat in hand to the public and beg for support—beg for alms, in order to maintain an educational television station.

With that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of this House for my amendment to H.R. 15986.

The amendment reads as follows:

That in view of the privileges granted by the United States Government to commercial broadcasters of radio and television, such broadcasters should contribute substantially to the expenses of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 15986 would authorize \$9 million for fiscal 1969 in program funds for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I support this bill because I believe these funds are essential to meet the short-term needs of the Corporation. However, like the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, H.R. 15986 contains no provision for long-term financing of this Corporation.

I think we all will agree that the question of who should contribute to the permanent financing of public television and radio is one of the major issues of our times. The answer will help spell out the scope and independence of educational broadcasting.

Mr. Chairman, on February 8, 1968, I introduced a resolution—House Joint Resolution 1079—which also embodied the above amendment. It was in the form of a simple statement of policy, as is this amendment today. It seems to me that because commercial broadcasting has been granted the privilege of using the public airwaves, they have an obligation to use some of their \$3 billion in annual revenues to support nonprofit educational broadcasting. I believe it is right for Congress to go on record now supporting this view.

Mr. Chairman, I have read with a great deal of interest the recent remarks of William D. Carey, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget, contained in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Communications and Power, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Mr. Carey, in testifying in support of H.R. 15986, outlined present administrative thinking on long-term financing, as he stated:

At the moment, it appears there are three techniques for providing Federal funds for public broadcasting. These are: (1) a tax on television and radio sets manufactured; (2) a tax on gross revenues of commercial broad-

casters; and (3) some special kind of "insulation" for general Federal revenues.

President Johnson, in his February message on education, stated that he was asking administration officials to work with the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and Congress in formulating a long-term financing plan.

I believe the Congress has a responsibility to go on record on this vital issue. We should play an important role in developing any financing plan. My amendment does not place a dollar figure on what commercial broadcasters should contribute, but instead, offers a statement of policy that in its work, the administration should be aware that it is the sense of Congress that commercial broadcasters should contribute substantially to any long-term financial plan for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Again, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York offered this same amendment last year and I stated then that I thought we ought to give the Corporation and the President time in order to make a study as to how the Corporation should be funded. Then the committee could take a look at what they proposed.

I assure the gentleman that all phases and all manners of funding will be gone into. I do not think it ought to be the sense of this Congress to do anything in this respect until hearings have been held.

Therefore, I am opposed to the amendment and I think it should be defeated.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Does the gentleman suggest that the attachment of this amendment to the bill would be harmful in any way either to the passage of the bill or to the funding of public television?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes; I do believe that it would be.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I certainly do not want to be responsible for the defeat of this bill—because I favor it.

However, I do believe that some effort should be made to see that help is given to these educational television organizations.

Mr. STAGGERS. All that I can say to the gentleman in answer to him is that he is prejudging the situation and I do not believe we want to do that. I say that a study should be made of it and not have an expression of the Congress to say that there is any one method or manner in which it should be done.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOLTON. As I understand our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] he is suggesting that it is very important that we subsidize these broadcasting people. That would be enforced giving on the part of the people of this country.

In my city we support educational television and we are outsiders, we are not Government people. We manage. Let us

go more slowly and let us not turn education over to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GALLAGHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15986) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the authorization of appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, pursuant to House Resolution 1133, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DEVINE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DEVINE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 15986 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 241, nays 133, answered "present" 1, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—241

Adair	Bingham	Cahill
Adams	Blanton	Carey
Addabbo	Biatnik	Carter
Albert	Boggs	Celler
Anderson, III.	Boland	Clark
Andrews,	Bolling	Cleveland
N. Dak.	Brasco	Cohelan
Annunzio	Brooks	Conable
Arends	Brotzman	Conte
Ashley	Brown, Calif.	Conyers
Aspinall	Brown, Mich.	Corbett
Barrett	Broyhill, Va.	Corman
Bates	Burke, Mass.	Cramer
Bell	Burton, Calif.	Culver
Berry	Burton, Utah	Cunningham
Bevill	Button	Daddario
Blester	Byrne, Pa.	Daniels

Davis, Ga.	King, Calif.	Reid, N.Y.
Delaney	Kirwan	Reifel
Denney	Kornegay	Reuss
Dingell	Kupferman	Rhodes, Ariz.
Donohue	Kyros	Rhodes, Pa.
Dow	Laird	Riegle
Dulski	Landrum	Rodino
Eckhardt	Leggett	Rogers, Colo.
Edmondson	Lloyd	Rogers, Fla.
Edwards, Calif.	Long, Md.	Ronan
Edwards, La.	McCarthy	Rooney, N.Y.
Ellberg	McCloskey	Rooney, Pa.
Esch	McCulloch	Rosenthal
Eshleman	McDade	Rostenkowski
Evans, Colo.	McDonald,	Roth
Everett	Mich.	Roush
Farbstein	McFall	Rumsfeld
Fascell	Macdonald,	Ruppe
Findley	Mass.	Ryan
Fino	MacGregor	St Germain
Flood	Machen	St. Onge
Foley	Madden	Sandman
Ford, Gerald R.	Mathias, Calif.	Scheuer
Fraser	Mathias, Md.	Schweiker
Friedel	Matsunaga	Schwengel
Fulton, Pa.	Meeds	Shipley
Fulton, Tenn.	Meskill	Sisk
Fuqua	Miller, Ohio	Skubitz
Gallagher	Minish	Slack
Garmatz	Mink	Smith, Calif.
Glaimo	Mize	Smith, Iowa
Gilbert	Monagan	Smith, N.Y.
Gonzalez	Montgomery	Springer
Gray	Moorhead	Stafford
Green, Oreg.	Morgan	Staggers
Griffin	Morris, N. Mex.	Stanton
Griffiths	Morse, Mass.	Steed
Grover	Morton	Steiger, Ariz.
Halleck	Mosher	Steiger, Wis.
Halpern	Moss	Stratton
Hamilton	Myers	Sullivan
Hanley	Natcher	Tenzer
Hanna	Nichols	Thompson, N.J.
Harrison	O'Hara, Ill.	Tiernan
Hathaway	O'Hara, Mich.	Tunney
Hays	O'Konski	Udall
Hébert	Olsen	Ullman
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Neill, Mass.	Van Deerlin
Heckler, Mass.	Ottinger	Vigorito
Helstoski	Patman	Watts
Hollifield	Patten	Whalen
Horton	Pelly	Widnall
Howard	Pepper	Williams, Pa.
Hungate	Perkins	Willis
Jarman	Pettis	Wilson, Bob
Joelson	Philbin	Wolf
Johnson, Pa.	Pike	Wright
Jones, Ala.	Pirnie	Wydler
Karsten	Podell	Wyman
Karth	Pollock	Yates
Kastenmeier	Price, Ill.	Young
Kazen	Pryor	Zablocki
Kee	Pucinski	Zion
Keith	Quie	
Kelly	Rees	

NAYS—133

Abbitt	Downing	Lukens
Abernethy	Duncan	McClory
Ashbrook	Dwyer	McClure
Baring	Edwards, Ala.	McEwen
Battin	Erlenborn	McMillan
Belcher	Fisher	Mahon
Bennett	Flynt	Marsh
Betts	Fountain	Martin
Blackburn	Gathings	May
Bolton	Goodell	Mayne
Bray	Goodling	Michel
Brinkley	Gross	Mills
Brock	Gude	Moore
Broomfield	Gurney	Neisen
Brown, Ohio	Haley	O'Neal, Ga.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hall	Passman
Buchanan	Hammer-	Poage
Burke, Fla.	schmidt	Poff
Burleson	Hardy	Pool
Bush	Harsha	Price, Tex.
Byrnes, Wis.	Harvey	Purcell
Cabell	Henderson	Quillen
Casey	Hicks	Rallsback
Cederberg	Hosmer	Randall
Chamberlain	Hull	Rarick
Clancy	Hunt	Reid, Ill.
Clawson, Del	Hutchinson	Rivers
Colmer	Ichord	Roberts
Cowger	Jonas	Robison
Curtis	Jones, Mo.	Saylor
Davis, Wis.	King, N.Y.	Schadeberg
de la Garza	Kleppe	Scherle
Dellenback	Kyl	Schneebell
Derwinski	Langen	Scott
Devine	Latta	Shriver
Dickinson	Lennon	Sikes
Dole	Lipscob	Smith, Okla.
Dorn	Long, La.	Stuckey

Talcott	Utt	Whitener
Taylor	Vander Jagt	Whitten
Teague, Calif.	Waggonner	Wiggins
Teague, Tex.	Wampler	Winn
Thompson, Ga.	Watkins	Wyllie
Thomson, Wis.	Watson	Zwach
Tuck	White	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Taft
NOT VOTING—58

Anderson, Tenn.	Gardner	Murphy, N.Y.
Andrews, Ala.	Gettys	Nedzi
Ashmore	Gibbons	Nix
Ayres	Green, Pa.	Pickle
Bow	Gubser	Reinecke
Brademas	Hagan	Resnick
Clausen,	Hansen, Idaho	Roudebush
Don H.	Hansen, Wash.	Roybal
Collier	Hawkins	Satterfield
Dawson	Herlong	Selden
Dent	Holland	Snyder
Diggs	Irwin	Stephens
Dowdy	Jacobs	Stubblefield
Evins, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.	Vanik
Fallon	Jones, N.C.	Waidle
Feighan	Kluczynski	Walker
Ford,	Kuykendall	Whalley
William D.	Mailliard	Wilson,
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Calif.	Charles H.
Galifianakis	Minshall	Wyatt
	Murphy, Ill.	

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:
On this vote
Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Dowdy against.
Mr. Vanik for, with Mr. Satterfield against.

Until further notice:
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Minshall.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Irwin with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Nix with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Jacobs.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Nedzi.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Walker.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Stubblefield.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Pickle.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Murphy of New York.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. MADDEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."
Mr. DOWNING changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."
Mr. GOODELL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."
Mr. HUNT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
The doors were opened.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the pro-

visions of House Resolution 1133, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 3135.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3135

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 396(k) of the Communications Act of 1934 are each amended by striking out "1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "1969".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 15986) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 16729

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight Friday night to file a report on H.R. 16729, the higher education amendments dealing with student assistance loans.

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

There was no objection.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR VIETNAM ERA VETERANS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 705, to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 705, with Mr. GALLAGHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the concurrent resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, House Concurrent Resolution 705 was reported unanimously by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It is a replacement for House Joint Resolution 1052, requested by the President of the United States in his official message on veterans—House Document No. 245—which was reported earlier by our committee but not scheduled for House action.

House Concurrent Resolution 705 is directed to one of the critical needs of our time—the providing of prompt and meaningful employment opportunities for the large numbers of veterans who are returning from the Armed Forces to civilian life.

The sacrifices being made by members of our Armed Forces in Vietnam and other duty posts encircling the world surely warrant them a place of honor in this Nation.

Words of eulogy, however, cannot replace prompt, tangible action when these men and women return to civilian life in this country. They must find that we have kept our trust with them, and that their homeland is still the land of opportunity.

The resolution now before this House reaffirms the traditional policy of the Congress to recognize the debt of gratitude the Nation owes its veterans.

It sets forth the sense of the Congress—

That every arm of the Government shall exert its best efforts to provide Federal employment for these returning veterans, giving preference to them in the selection of employees;

That all departments and agencies shall urge all private parties contracting with the Government to give the returning veterans priority in private enterprise employment as soon as they return to the labor market; and

That all other sectors of private industry and commerce carry out the same objectives and purposes, and consult, advise, and cooperate with the Government in furtherance of this policy.

The resolution, therefore, places the Congress on record in support of the granting of employment priorities to facilitate the transition and readjustment of Vietnam era veterans to private life. It is the understanding of the committee that this intention will be implemented by a program, coordinated by the Veterans' Administration, the U.S. Civil Service Commission, and the Department of Labor, to channel the returning veterans toward employers who will be most receptive and who can offer real employment opportunities. It is anticipated that this program, in both the Government and private enterprise, will materially aid the veterans in finding suitable employment.

The Vietnam era veterans' employment program contemplated by this concurrent resolution will be conducted primarily through existing facilities of the

Veterans' Administration, the U.S. Civil Service Commission, and the Department of Labor. Therefore, there should be no additional cost to the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that House Concurrent Resolution 705 expresses the desire and the deepest sentiments of all Americans that we welcome back returning veterans with more than words alone. I urge its prompt approval by the House.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my voice in the wholehearted support of the measure under consideration, House Concurrent Resolution 705.

This resolution, which is identical in purpose to one which I introduced on February 6, reflects reassuring action by the Congress to provide needed assistance to returning Vietnam era veterans.

This resolution states the resolve of the Congress that a policy will be followed by each Government agency and department to exert every effort, in accordance with existing law, to provide Federal employment opportunities for these returning servicemen.

It calls on Government agencies to seek the voluntary cooperation of Government contractors to extend employment priority to these veterans.

And, it expresses the sense of Congress that all other employers in private industry will be encouraged to carry out the objectives of the resolution by also providing employment opportunities to Vietnam era veterans.

It is fitting to extend our deepest appreciation for the sacrifices made by these men. And it is also fitting to extend, to the limits possible, the assistance of the Government toward resolving the problems which our Vietnam veterans face in the period of transition to civilian life.

No part of this resolution is compulsory on private industry, nor on those Government contractors who supply material, equipment, and services to the Government. This was made quite clear in the legislative history of the resolution.

However, I do believe that the Federal Government, in its employment practices, can do no less than exert a maximum effort to assist those returning Vietnam era veterans who seek Federal employment.

Mr. Chairman, the subject matter of this resolution has languished too long and I therefore urge the prompt approval of House Concurrent Resolution 705.

Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time, and there is no need to prolong our doing what is right and proper for our veterans, so we yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the objective of the resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 705, before us today, to express the sense of Congress that Federal agencies should provide employment opportunities to veterans of the Armed Forces who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere—and I emphasize the word "elsewhere"—is an important objective.

However, I should like to point out that there are several thousand members of the U.S. Armed Forces who will not be able to receive benefits under this resolution or under present employment practices of the Federal Government simply because of the fact that they have not obtained their U.S. citizenship, although they have served honorably in the Armed Forces and have made a contribution, often at the risk of their very lives, to the United States in time of war. Because of Public Law 90-147, which generally restricts civil service employment to U.S. citizens, they would be excluded.

On March 4, when the House had before it a bill to deal with early citizenship for those who were serving honorably, in the Armed Forces, I read into the RECORD a letter to me dated March 4, 1968, from the Civil Service Commission which pointed out that noncitizens may be appointed to civil service positions "only on a temporary basis and even then only when qualified citizens are not available." It also pointed out that under Executive Order No. 11397 "noncitizen veterans are not eligible for transitional appointments."

I think this is a matter which should be of deep concern to Members of the House. We have passed a bill (H.R. 15147) in this body which will provide early citizenship for those aliens serving in combatant areas during the Vietnam crisis. On the opening day of the 90th Congress I introduced H.R. 40 to permit lawfully admitted aliens serving honorably with the U.S. Armed Forces to apply for citizenship immediately—regardless of where they happen to serve.

I hope that the Senate will act and amend the House bill to include all veterans who have served in the Armed Forces. Until that is done, I want to point out the inequity for the veteran who has honorably served this Government and this Nation and who will not be able to benefit to the same extent as other veterans.

I believe this matter deserves the attention of the committee, and of the Civil Service Commission. I have discussed this with the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and I hope that it will be acted upon.

I urge that administratively and legislatively, if necessary, action be taken for the veterans who have served and who are not citizens, to give them the opportunity to be included in the benefits which the Veterans in Public Service Act and this resolution would provide.

Surely it is unjust for a young man who has served this Government in uniform for several years of his life to be denied the opportunity for civilian employment with it.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, a member of the committee [Mr. HANLEY].

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the distinguished chairman of our Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI], in bringing House Concurrent Resolution 705 before the House for consideration today.

The sacrifices made by members of the

Armed Forces in Vietnam and elsewhere throughout the world certainly place them in a position of honor before this Nation. Their willingness to support the cause of freedom will stand in history as a pillar of devotion to the rights of free men.

The concurrent resolution which has been called up by our committee chairman demands our immediate attention.

By acting today on this resolution, we will have availed ourselves of the opportunity to show that the Congress, in behalf of the people we represent, desires to provide these returning servicemen real and tangible help in securing meaningful and rewarding employment in our vast governmental, commercial, and industrial complex.

There is room for gainful employment for all of them—but time is of the essence in their quest for suitable positions. By passing this resolution we will have helped them materially in their search. They will be given due priority in filling Federal positions, in accordance with the veterans' preference laws. The way will also be prepared, by a firm statement of congressional intent, for them to receive all reasonable priority in employment by those who contract with the Government and other employers in the private sector.

Certainly, it is appropriate that we express the sense of Congress that private enterprise join with the Government in helping to place returning servicemen in gainful employment. Business and industry share with all America an awareness that their continued welfare—if not, indeed, their continued existence—has been protected by these men and women who have served with devotion in the U.S. Armed Forces.

When freedom is endangered anywhere in the world—and when free enterprise is challenged—all of us here at home are joined together to meet and defeat the challenge at its source.

Our Armed Forces are protecting our freedom and our way of life, as well as the rights of free men in Vietnam and elsewhere. We owe them a great debt, and can partly repay it by demonstrating appreciation in many ways.

Prompt enactment of House Concurrent Resolution 705 is one tangible way of showing our appreciation—by helping to speed their transition from the uniformed services back to their rightful places in civilian life.

It will help those who have helped us so much and so unselfishly.

I urge that the House approve House Concurrent Resolution 705.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, it is with a profound sense of gratitude for the great sacrifices being made by our servicemen during this war in Vietnam that I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 705.

To me, it seems that the very least America owes its recent veterans is to create an atmosphere conducive to their obtaining fruitful civilian employment when they leave the service.

It is not fair to take them away from the mainstream of their lives, interrupting their education, jobs, and families, send them off to a dirty, deadly struggle in the jungles, and then—when the

ordeal of fire is over—simply turn them loose and say, "So long, you are on your own now, go back to whatever you were doing before."

Mr. Chairman, in this era of intense competition for job opportunities, servicemen who have been away from it all for several years are at a heavy disadvantage when they return. We have all heard the repeated and widespread reports of Vietnam combat veterans coming home and hunting for months trying to find suitable employment—and then having to settle for something unsatisfactory just to be able to have an income.

This problem is taking on the proportions of a national disgrace. Our veterans are entitled to be treated as men to whom the Nation owes an obligation to restore the economic opportunities they lost when they answered the call to the service.

We cannot permit a situation to continue that imposes on our young men not only the burden of fighting—and for some, the scars of it—but also imposes upon them an economic disability. This is to add insult to injury. They have forfeited some of the best years of their lives to preserve their country, only to find themselves losing the benefit of that preservation.

The transition back to civilian life is difficult enough without economic handicaps. For all the merits of military service—and there are many—it unavoidably produces a dislocation and disruption of young lives in their most critical period of adjustment to adulthood, to earning a living, and to pursuing a selected field of endeavor. These veterans do not want charity; what they want is a chance, without delay, to lead normal peacetime lives, and pick up where they would be, had there been no war.

It is imperative that we give them that chance, and this resolution is a wonderful place to begin.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee which was unanimous in its recommendation of House Concurrent Resolution 705, I rise to urge the unanimity of the Congress in its approval.

One of the most serious problems of our servicemen returning home from combat duty in Vietnam is that of finding and obtaining suitable and rewarding employment in civilian life.

This resolution takes cognizance of the problems of the Vietnam veteran and offers tangible assistance in resolving them. It is fitting tribute to these men who have fought bravely and valiantly for our land of opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, the resolution before us, House Concurrent Resolution 705, is identical to the resolution which I sponsored, House Concurrent Resolution 725. In brief, it declares that as governmental policy each department and agency will exert every effort to provide Federal employment opportunities for these returning servicemen.

The resolution also urges the voluntary cooperation of Government contractors to allow a similar policy in employment practices, and encourages employers in all areas of private industry to do likewise.

Mr. Chairman, the import of this resolution is clearly that the firm hand of our Government is offered to returning Vietnam veterans in assistance and gratitude. The policy expressed in it reaffirms the traditional feeling which Congress holds for its returning servicemen of all conflicts, and I suggest we can do no less for those who served and sacrificed in Vietnam.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, House Concurrent Resolution 705 is intended to replace House Joint Resolution 1052, reported by the committee on March 6, 1968—House Report No. 1160, 90th Congress.

House Concurrent Resolution 705 is a declaration of the sense of Congress that employment preference will be given by both the Federal Government and private industry to veterans of the Vietnam era. The concurrent resolution, upon adoption by both bodies of the Congress, will become a declaration of the sense of Congress, but does not become positive law as would have the provisions of House Joint Resolution 1052, upon enactment by the Congress and approval by the President.

Since House Joint Resolution 1052 has not been scheduled for action by the House, the committee has reported the substitute resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 705, which in effect recommends the same employment preference program for Vietnam era veterans that would have been positively established by House Joint Resolution 1052 as a matter of law.

For the record, it is to be noted that certain members of both the majority and the minority originally sponsored House joint resolutions substantially identical to House Joint Resolution 1052, introduced by the committee chairman. However, during the committee's consideration of these joint resolutions all minority members then present voted to report a severely watered-down House concurrent resolution which would have been largely ineffectual and was not approved by the committee.

The majority of the committee supported House Joint Resolution 1052, from the logical standpoint that, if the Congress intends to take any action to help Vietnam era veterans find employment, it should act in the most positive and effective way possible—that is, by a joint resolution having the force and effect of law, rather than by a concurrent resolution that merely expresses the view that others should take action.

Since House Joint Resolution 1052 was not scheduled for House consideration, the majority members of the committee introduced House Concurrent Resolution 705 as a replacement, in order to provide an opportunity for a timely expression of the sense of the Congress that Government and private enterprise should join in a vigorous employment program for returning veterans.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support House Concurrent Resolution 705. The resolution states the sense of the Congress with regard to the employment opportunities which should be available to members of the Armed Forces when they return to civilian life. There is perhaps no right more impor-

tant than the right to a job which enables a person to support himself and his family in a dignified way. We have a deep obligation to assist our returning veterans in the full enjoyment of this right.

Thousands of veterans are returning to civilian life after fulfilling their obligations to their country. It is now the country's turn to fulfill its obligation to these veterans whose lives and careers were interrupted by duty in our Armed Forces. In the words of the resolution:

One of the most immediate and acute needs of members of the Armed Forces upon discharge from the service is to obtain early and suitable employment in positions which will enable them to be self-reliant, which will provide meaning, purpose, and fulfillment in their lives.

To accomplish its purpose the resolution states as the sense of Congress the duty of each agency and department of the Federal Government, first, to employ veterans of the Armed Forces to the maximum practical extent; second, to give preference, in accordance with law, to veterans in the selection of employees; and third, to take appropriate steps to secure, on a voluntary basis, priority in private employment for veterans.

With regard to the duties of private industry in the employment of veterans, the resolution states that private employers should consult, advise and cooperate with the Federal Government, as appropriate, in carrying out the purposes of the resolution.

Mr. Chairman, our experience has been that the veterans of our Armed Forces are one of the Nation's best assets. We have an obligation to the veterans as individuals and to the Nation as a whole to conserve this asset by putting it to the best possible use. Our dual obligation is expressed in the resolution now before this body. Our Nation survives today as a democracy because of the actions of our veterans, and we must expend our energies in providing a meaningful outlet for the talents of these men and women who are now returning from service in Vietnam and other world trouble spots. We must resolve to take all possible steps to assure that the Nation fully utilizes the valuable talents of these people who served their country so well.

As a nation proud of its fighting men let us give them the opportunity to serve as well in civilian life as they served in our Armed Forces. Our veterans are a precious resource. In fairness to them and to the Nation let us give them the opportunity to continue to contribute to our national goals.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to express that I fully support the intent and provision of House Concurrent Resolution 705 which we have under consideration today. I am sure that we will have the foresight today to meet the critical requirement that each veteran of the Armed Forces of the United States who has served his country during the Vietnam era obtain suitable employment upon his return to the country and discharge from the military. The final fulfillment of the resolve we will express today, however, I would remind those who read the record of this debate, will rest with the public and private exec-

utives who will be called upon to put this resolution into effect.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues at this time which is most appropriate, H.R. 1093, which I have introduced during this Congress. Briefly, this bill would clarify the reemployment rights of servicemen, particularly guardsmen and reservists, who are called upon to serve their country. My bill is intended to extend the present reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide that a serviceman may serve up to 5 years on active duty without losing his reemployment rights if his service is at the request of the Government. This bill passed in the House during the 89th Congress, but failed to come up for a vote in the Senate during that Congress.

I would commend H.R. 1093 to my colleagues at this time as another piece of legislation which could carry out the high intentions we have expressed today. I request your support and encouragement.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support House Concurrent Resolution 705, which expresses the sense of the Congress that every effort must be expended to provide employment opportunities to veterans returning from Vietnam.

Our Nation has too often taken her returning veterans for granted, although former service men and women from World War II and the Korean conflict were afforded very material advantages in the form of loans for education, homes, and businesses. These benefits presumably are now an inherent part of our philosophy that we have an obligation to assist our returning war veteran for his sacrifices in behalf of his countrymen.

But loans are by no means the complete answer, for they fail to resolve the problem of the veteran who has no immediate plans for a college or whose plans for the ownership of home or business lie somewhere in the future.

The pressing need for this large segment of returning veterans—many or most of whom are relatively young and often responsible for the support of a growing family—is the opportunity to compete in the job market. And, because their skills and experience may have become "rusty," most of them will be at a severe disadvantage unless there is some provision to insure fairness and equality of opportunity.

The Federal Government, in my judgment, must take the leadership in any such effort, and the resolution before us today appropriately expresses the ways in which the Government can exercise that leadership. At the same time, the Government cannot by itself open up all of the job opportunities and, thus, the cooperation of private industry is a very vital requisite to the success of the overall effort.

This is the basic cooperation between industry and government that brought our Nation to greatness, and I have every confidence that a continuation of this relationship will insure the success of the effort to provide employment for our

fighting men and women when they return from Vietnam.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 705

Whereas the members of the Armed Forces of the United States are and have been making great personal sacrifices to defend freedom and bring justice and peace to the world; and

Whereas the veterans of the Armed Forces who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere are deserving of the gratitude and respect of the Government and people of the United States and deserving of assistance from such Government and people in connection with the major problems of transition to civilian life; and

Whereas one of the most immediate and acute needs of members of the Armed Forces upon discharge from the service is to obtain early and suitable employment in positions which will enable them to be self-reliant, which will provide meaning, purpose, and fulfillment in their lives, and which will assist the United States in the solution of its pressing problems and in providing a better foundation for its continued growth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that each department and agency of the United States—

(1) shall endeavor, to the maximum practicable extent, to provide employment with the United States Government for veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere during the Vietnam era;

(2) shall give preference, in accordance with law, to such veterans in the selection of persons for employment with the Government; and

(3) shall follow such policy and take such action, through the process of procurement for the Government of material, supplies, services, and equipment from private industry and through other means, as may be appropriate to secure voluntarily from private industry for such veterans a priority in employment in positions in private industry as soon as possible following the reentry of such veterans into the labor market.

Sec. 2. It is further declared to be the sense of the Congress that employers in private industry should exert every effort to carry out the objects and purposes of this concurrent resolution with respect to employment of veterans in positions in private industry and should consult, advise, and cooperate with the United States Government to the extent appropriate to carry out such objects and purposes.

Sec. 3. The provisions of this concurrent resolution shall be held and considered to be in effect until the Congress by concurrent resolution, declares that the provisions of this concurrent resolution are no longer essential to the public interest.

Mr. DULSKI (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the concurrent resolution and that it be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GALLAGHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Concurrent Resolution 705, to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment, pursuant to House Resolution 1125, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1052) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE SUNDRY PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file sundry privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

DESIGNATING SECOND SATURDAY IN MAY OF EACH YEAR AS NATIONAL FIRE SERVICE RECOGNITION DAY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 908) designating the second Saturday in May of each year as National Fire Service Recognition Day, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 908

Whereas the fire service of our Nation performs many public services in addition to the suppression of fire, such as home inspections, prefire planning, inspections of industrial and commercial facilities, rescue and emergency services, and many others; and

Whereas public attention should be invited periodically to the varied and professional-type services rendered by the fire service of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second Sat-

urday in May of each year is designated as "National Fire Service Recognition Day". The President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with and it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer several amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendments as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 1 strike all "whereas" clauses.

On page 1, line 3, strike "each year", and insert "1968".

On page 2, line 1, strike "annually".

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Amend the title to read as follows: "Designating the second Saturday in May of 1968 as National Fire Service Recognition Day, and for other purposes."

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW DOCTRINE OF SOCIOLOGICAL APPEASEMENT CAN ONLY INVITE FURTHER DISORDER

Mr. FINO. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most shocking corollaries of the recent violence in our cities is the willingness of high-ranking officials—the Attorney General of the United States and the Vice Chairman of the President's Riot Commission—to give in to mob rule and order law officers to ignore the law. No wonder we have riots when the police are ordered to coddle their perpetrators. This new doctrine of sociological appeasement can only invite further disorder.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, we have seen rioters fed steak and chicken by police; we have seen dozens of looters carrying their loot past squad cars of police told

to ignore them; and we have seen the smoke of a hundred arsons floating over this very Capitol. How has this come to pass? Well, let me tell you. It has been brought about by politicians who have sought to excuse riots at every turn; by politicians who have rewarded every riot with new handouts. So long as rioting is rewarded and not crushed, it will continue. Pillagers cannot be appeased. No matter how much you give them, they want more.

Thirty years ago, British Prime Minister Chamberlain thought that Hitler's Nazi mob could be appeased with Czechoslovakia. History knows how wrong he was. Today, we have our own appeasers urban style—Attorney General Ramsey Clark and Mayor John Lindsay. "Peace in our time" is now called "cool streets" but the payoff is the same—handouts, concession, appeasement, and surrender to brute force and mob violence.

Giving in to these looters and rioters is not wisdom but cowardice. These people have put panic and fear in the hearts of law-abiding citizens of every color and creed.

Last week, 100 Negro and Puerto Rican businessmen attacked Mayor Lindsay for coddling the rioters, encouraging them with his appeasement, ignoring property rights, and downplaying the extent of riot damage in New York City. These men hit the nail right on the head. Lindsay's appeasement is a failure. Despite his handouts, airplane rides with black nationalists and honor welfare, property damage in the New York riots 2 weeks ago almost equaled 1964 totals. The mayor does not admit this because he tries to pretend that his appeasement policies are successful. Unfortunately, the people who pay for this surrender are the hard-working people, white and Negro alike. I think it is time to start protecting the people who work for a living, not those who burn for a loafing.

This is not a question of civil rights, but of criminal wrongs. The arsonists, rioters, and looters who disrespect our laws are merely using the civil rights movement as a vehicle to rain havoc on America. Arson, rioting, and looting are the law of the jungle, but not of a civilized nation. If these vandals are bent on violence and destruction, then they must be treated accordingly.

I believe that we must bring law and order to our cities before we can bring progress. We will not have law and order until we demonstrate—clearly and forcefully—that riots bring punishment and not rewards. This cannot be done with the attitude shown by Attorney General Clark and Mayor Lindsay. In the end, appeasement always invites more trouble than it avoids.

I urge the Attorney General and the local law-enforcement officials to enforce the law. If they cannot—or if they will not—then they ought to resign. This Nation is a nation of laws. Officials that will not enforce them ought to resign forthwith.

Riots must be met with the full and necessary force to convince all who participate in them that rioting is not a sport, but a serious violation of the law.

Arsonists, firebombers, and snipers observed in the act should be shot on sight. Looters should be arrested or physically incapacitated so as to prevent their activities. No tolerance—no appeasement—can be shown.

If the law-enforcement officials of this Nation do not enforce the law, they must be replaced. The time has come to crack down on the reign of terror in our cities.

A TEENY-WEENY BIT CRIMINAL

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, in the last few months we have seen our society erupt in lawlessness which holds the seed of national disaster. A society which is based on the rule of law has been faced with the threat of criminal anarchy. This threat has been met with a policy of permitting some illegality to buy off greater illegality. The consequences of this trend toward more and more permissive handling of crime by law enforcement authorities are gradually placing us in a state of serious danger.

I have viewed this drift with grave concern, and in an attempt to strengthen the forces of order and justice have introduced legislation to establish a Committee on Coordinated Crime Control which will coordinate the efforts of local, State, and Federal governments in combating crime by ascertaining what is being done on each level, and what might and should be done individually and collectively.

The wave of disorder which has swept our country in the wake of Dr. Martin Luther King's assassination has been a shock and a disgrace. A disturbing development of these events has been the above described theory of some authorities that a little destruction or lawlessness is to be condoned in order to avoid greater trouble. What is needed in the face of such lawlessness is not a public apology by mayors and other civic officials for inadequate performance by the law officers, but a firm and clear statement of intention to emphasize that the Federal Government intends to enforce the law where it has jurisdiction, as in Washington, and to use adequate force to protect the property and lives of innocent citizens with the development of adequate plans for coordination of local and Federal officials in the event of a recurrence of this critical situation.

After the riots in Washington, I wrote to the President urging him to spell out a Federal determination to curb these rising incidents of crime and anarchy. It is my firm conviction that only adequate force to contain such outbreaks will assure safety and security in our land. With this intention in mind, I include the text of my letter to the President:

APRIL 11, 1968.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to you in connection with the recent riots, looting

and fire-bombing in Washington because I feel that the possibility exists that these acts may be repeated and it seems clear to me that we cannot afford a repetition of the halting way in which the local government and Federal agencies acted in this long-expected emergency.

Looking back over the events of last week, it seems clear that the local police were not mobilized quickly enough, nor in adequate numbers to handle the emergency. It also appears that they were acting under orders to withhold action in the face of lawless acts. It is also a fact that Federal troops were not effectively brought into the situation until late Friday, April 5, although rioting, lawlessness and frightfully destructive activity had been out of control for almost 24 hours.

I want to protest strongly against the theory of the authorities that a little destruction or lawlessness is to be condoned in order to avoid greater trouble. It is said that the community should not kill looters because they are merely invading an interest in real or personal property. Obviously this facile generalization is subject to all sorts of qualifications, especially in view of destruction estimated at over 13 million dollars, but even if we were to accept it, there is no reason why we should not require that adequate punitive and protective action be taken in the face of threatened destruction of homes and places of business. I would concede that the local police should be given the first opportunity to put down lawlessness, but I would also emphasize that the Guard or Federal troops should be brought in promptly if it becomes obvious that local forces cannot cope with the emergency. A lapse of nearly 24 hours between the time when the danger became apparent and the actual take-over by the troops was far too long in view of the seriousness of the situation.

Although many cities throughout the country have the primary and sole responsibility for maintaining public order within their limits, Washington is a city where the Federal Government has a primary responsibility.

It seems to me important therefore that adequate plans should be made for a proper coordination between local and Federal officials in the event of a recurrence of a critical situation. More importantly, however, I believe that a firm and clear statement of intention should be made to emphasize that the Federal Government intends to enforce the law and to use adequate force to protect the property and lives of innocent citizens.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

A COMPLAINT DESK FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. BETTS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the massive growth of Federal spending in recent years, underscored by the cost of defense requirements in Vietnam, should be accompanied by greater concentration in Congress for prudent and efficient administration by the executive branch. Congress has a role not only to keep expenditures for any Federal activity in check but also to provide maximum provisions for good management of appropriated funds. In line with this dual responsibility, I have been looking into waste and inefficiency in the Executive

and the procedures currently available to identify problems and ferret out waste and inefficiency.

Congress has established an effective investigatory and auditing organization, the General Accounting Office, which finds millions of dollars of misspent funds each year. Committees of Congress exercise oversight and similarly uncover wasteful practices and their causes. Through these efforts and the work of the Government Operations Committees, Congress is alert to the necessity of keeping a close check on spending practices. What are the administrators of each department and agency doing to help Congress and the taxpayer by seeing that their personnel participate in similar economy programs?

PRESENT DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAMS

Recently, I wrote to each department to learn the internal procedures open to Federal employees or private contractors who wish to provide criticism or suggestions about its programs and policies. The question I asked was this:

Aside from personnel being recognized or given cash awards for savings ideas within the Government Employees' Incentive Awards program, what other administrative channels are open for individuals to present complaints as to the efficiency of the program, recommendations on policy or other improvements in a program or agency's operations?

Let me review some of the responses I received from this inquiry.

The Departments of Agriculture; Housing and Urban Development; State; Health, Education, and Welfare; Treasury; and Post Office, each indicated it was the sole prerogative of employees to bring complaints to the attention of their supervisors. From the Department of State, I received this reply:

In addition to the usual channel for employees to discuss with superiors complaints and recommendations with respect to efficiency of programs, policy matters or other improvements in the Department's operations, the Secretary has issued a request to the officers of the Department and Foreign Service for a continuing flow of ideas.

The Office of the Postmaster General was more emphatic in answering:

The suggestion program is the proper administrative channel for employees who have constructive ideas or solutions to problems. Complaints without solutions are not accepted through this program. There is no formal provision for any other administrative channel, but individuals sometimes express their views in writing either through official channels or directly to the responsible official.

The Departments of Transportation, Interior, Justice, Labor, and Commerce responded that there were other channels in which to file a complaint. Interior, Justice, and Commerce have negotiated labor agreements and the departmental grievance procedures. The Federal Aviation Administration in the Department of Transportation established a program in June 1966 called the unsatisfactory condition report. This report "provides mechanism whereby an employee may report situations which contribute to accidents or hazardous systems or systems components which exhibit chronic unsatisfactory charac-

teristics, unusable publications, charts, or drawings, and lack or inadequacy of supporting equipment."

The departmental management system of the Labor Department "serves as the principal administrative channel for policy and program recommendations. The participation of employees in the development of future program plans and changing present programs is encouraged."

In addition to the route offered by the incentive awards program for submitting complaints or recommendations concerning the efficiency of operations, employees have the opportunity to make proposals through regular line channels, and through cost reduction and value engineering programs which encourage personnel at all levels of the department to seek out ways to improve efficiency and economy.

The aforementioned comments by the respective executive departments convince me of the need to provide a more effective channel through which concerned Federal employees and other interested parties may pursue a complaint. After all, who better knows of the waste and inefficiency in the expenditure of funds than those responsible for carrying out departmental and congressional policy.

INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAM

The primary objective of the Government Employees' Incentive Awards Act enacted in 1954 is to provide a tangible means for encouraging employees to participate in improving Government operations. Awards amounting to \$40 million per year are given to deserving employees for innovative ideas, suggestions, inventions, and superior personal performance. Although a recent report by a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service points up some needed improvements in the awards program, it has resulted in many improvements in Government operations and administration. However, the program falls short of receiving and considering administrative reforms, reorganizations, transfers, new emphasis of criteria in programs, and unworkable legislative or administrative policies.

COMPLAINT DESK AT GAO

In view of the varied and in some instances inadequate channels for submission of criticism or suggestions for policy and program revisions, I believe steps should be taken to remedy this problem. If a single, independent recipient were designated to review and investigate such information, an open flow of data on policy and program administration would begin. The General Accounting Office with its expertise could undertake this additional responsibility. I have prepared a bill to be introduced today to accomplish this objective.

This legislation would give the Comptroller General authority to receive information and promptly investigate any statement, recommendation, or complaint submitted to him by any person including officers and employees of the Federal Government, concerning waste and inefficiency in the use of Government funds and property. This function should be the sole responsibility of a special office within the GAO. It might be termed the "complaint desk" at GAO.

Every request of any merit would be the subject either of a special investigation or referred to the appropriate audit division for consideration at the next periodic audit. Personnel grievances are excluded from the scope of complaints to be reviewed by the GAO. The identity of persons submitting information to the Comptroller General would be treated as confidential.

Within 90 days after the enactment of this legislation, the Comptroller General would be required to distribute to all Federal departments and agencies appropriate materials describing the procedures to be followed in submitting information to him. All Federal employees are to be made aware of the opportunity to submit information to this complaint desk. It is further provided in my bill that no Federal employee shall be denied, directly or indirectly the right to communicate with the Comptroller General.

A FEDERAL EMPLOYEE OMBUDSMAN

This complaint desk at GAO will serve as an ombudsman of sorts, a channel for complaints and suggestions on Government operations from Federal employees at all levels. The GAO already has the authority to investigate the type of reports which would be submitted by employees or any citizen who has information on inefficiency, waste, or mismanagement. The independence of the GAO, its familiarity with the accounting systems of each agency and case histories of management and Federal control problems makes the Comptroller General and his staff ideally suited for this assignment.

Advocates of an ombudsman for the Congress, District of Columbia, or various Federal agencies dealing extensively with the American public, highlight three major characteristics essential for successful citizen-complaint centers:

First. It should be a specially designed external body which, in addition to handling complaints, can spot trends in problem areas and even suggest remedial legislation where necessary.

Second. It must have the authority to investigate complaints, inspect agencies, obtain all information needed from Government officials and hold hearings if necessary.

Third. It should be a defender against maladministration, without authority to initiate court action or correct improper activities on its own motion, yet having the effect of centering congressional and public attention on improper or wasteful practices. I believe the GAO complaint desk fits well into the pattern of other types of ombudsman plans.

NEED FOR ACTION

Such a complaint desk as I have described would provide a seriously needed channel which can lead to considerable savings to the taxpayers. Total appropriations approved from fiscal year 1964 to 1967 increased by 42.3 percent resulting in expenditures in fiscal 1967 of over \$120 billion. The Comptroller General reports that in 1967 his auditors uncovered \$190 million in savings due from recommended improvements in spending and program administration. These savings were based on the audit reports of the GAO alone. If a strong communications

link were established between the GAO and Federal employees who function where the dollars are actually being spent, I think the saving in future years would greatly increase.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should give every citizen a chance to point out wherever tax dollars are misused or are getting less than full value. There are nearly 6 million personnel on the Federal payroll who do not have adequate opportunity to transmit their complaints and suggestions to an organization for investigation and recommended action. If we add the millions of State and local officials, personnel of companies and universities with Federal contracts, and those who receive our foreign assistance overseas, the likelihood of this complaint desk accruing major administrative and monetary savings increases materially. Let Congress and the Federal employees join in improving Government efficiency and economy.

TIME THAT LAWS OF OUR LAND BECOME THE LAWS OF CONDUCT FOR EVERYONE

Mr. MICHEL. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the Washington Daily News a picture of model "shanties" which have been designed to be used in the proposed march on Washington by civil rights protesters.

Leaders of the march have stated that they intend to erect numbers of these structures on the Capitol mall—despite the fact that Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall has pointed out that it is illegal to camp on park property without a permit. I am advised by the Interior Department that as of last week there is no record of a request for a permit from this group.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the administration to exercise whatever intestinal fortitude it may possess to make it clear to these people that the U.S. Government does not intend to allow any privileged class of lawbreakers to desecrate the mall that belongs to all the people of the United States.

I believe it is time to take a stand for law and order. No one questions the right of orderly petitioning of the Congress. No one can condone willful lawbreaking done in the name of civil rights or any other cause. If we are to maintain our position as the bastion of freedom, we must have a society in which obeying the law is expected and in which disobeying the law is punished.

In the light of the recent riots which demolished sections of the Nation's Capital, it is obvious that the insistence on a massive march is presumptive arrogance on the part of those responsible.

I call upon the administration to assure residents of the Nation's Capital that disruption of the affairs of Government during this wartime period will not

be tolerated. I call upon the administration to assure the American people that no special class of excused lawbreakers will be allowed to illegally set up camp on public property.

We have seen the results in riot and unreason of the "permissive society." Now it is time that the laws of our land become the laws of conduct for everyone. Licensed anarchy is inconsistent with the principles of our Republic.

A MILESTONE IN THE HISTORY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include the remarks of President Johnson upon the signing of the District of Columbia School Board bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I had the pleasure of taking part in the ceremony at which President Johnson signed into law legislation giving the District of Columbia an elected School Board. As the President said on the occasion:

Today, democracy comes a bit closer to reality in the Nation's Capital.

It was a great source of personal satisfaction to me to be present at the signing ceremony. In my capacity as a member of the District of Columbia Committee I worked for passage of this important bill. I concur with the President that—

Washington must become—in every sense—a model city. It must be a place where democracy is enshrined not only in monuments, but in the lives of its people.

Because the President's remarks are so timely, I insert them in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF THE REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING H.R. 13042—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOL BOARD BILL

Today, democracy comes a bit closer to reality in the nation's capital.

Today, we give the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to elect their own school board.

In the process, we will put nine good men and women out of work. They have done a splendid job. But—as they know better than anyone—selection by a federal court is no substitute for election by the people.

Education in this city has long been the direct concern of the people. Now it becomes their direct responsibility.

This has been a momentous year for the District of Columbia.

We have installed a Mayor and a council in City Hall. The new government is responding to the needs and the hopes of the people—in day-to-day operations, and in crisis as well.

With this legislation, we restore another basic right of popular government—the right of people to help shape the education of their children.

But this right will be hollow, unless it is given strength and substance by better education.

We want to make our capital city a showcase for the nation.

We want to make the schools in the District not just places where children are kept,

but where they can fully prepare for life and citizenship.

We want the schools to serve all the citizens of the community, young and old alike, all year around.

We want to make the schools in the nation's capital models for all America to follow.

The bill I sign today brings us part of the way.

Now we must sustain the momentum of progress. I ask the Congress to give the people of the District:

The \$155 million in the District budget to run better schools, to pay teachers higher salaries, and build more classrooms.

And the special \$10 million appropriation to begin a new program of model community schools.

Washington must become—in every sense—a model city. It must be a place where democracy is enshrined not only in monuments, but in the lives of its people.

The people must be given the right to elect their own representatives in Congress.

The people must be given the most basic right of all—Home Rule.

For almost four decades, as a resident of this first city, I have looked to the day when these rights would become reality.

Someday they will be. Of that I am certain. And I am glad today to take another step toward making them so.

HEALTH AND SAFETY IN THE COAL MINES

Mr. OLSEN. 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 Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, disease, injury, and death are not strangers to the coal miners of this Nation. Throughout the history of coal mining thousands of men have been killed or injured in the industry and other thousands have been disabled by the occupational diseases connected with the extraction of coal.

Since its founding in 1890, the United Mine Workers of America has championed programs to reduce and eliminate this needless human suffering. The union—often alone—has fought the battle for safety at the bargaining table, in the legislatures of the various States and in the Halls of Congress. At times it has had to fight a hostile judicial system and an equally hostile public opinion.

Today coal mining is a safer place than it has ever been. Accidental deaths for 1967 stood at 217 men, a high price indeed, but lower than any other year in history. Lost time nonfatal accidents were 10,160 in 1967, also a tragic price, but a decided improvement over the years past.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the Nation's coal miner lives longer today than the average American male. Figures published by the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund in their 20th anniversary report show that the median age of a coal miner at death in 1964 was 73 years, as compared to 69 years for the average American male. This was not always so. In 1947 the average age of a coal miner at death was 56, as compared to 66 years for the general male population.

This improvement just did not happen,

Mr. Speaker. The years that have been added to the life of a coal miner are years bought at a cost of dollars and effort. They are years made possible because of the work of the UMWA itself and because of the magnificent medical and pension program of the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund.

The record will show, Mr. Speaker, that \$902 million has been spent by the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund for hospital and medical care since its founding. The record will also show the thousands of men, women, and children who have received medical care because of this fund, care which was not available to many of them prior to the fund.

The record will also show that it has been the United Mine Workers of America which has focused public attention upon the dust disease so prevalent in the coal mines. It has been the UMWA which led the fight to make the various dust diseases compensable. Recently, Pennsylvania and Virginia have made pneumoconiosis a compensable disease, in large part because of the work of the UMWA.

Over the years the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund and the anthracite health and welfare fund have devoted their efforts to treating the victims of mine disease and to probing for causes and cures. Because of the efforts of these organizations coal mine diseases, including pneumoconiosis, have received much attention in the medical literature. Thus it is possible today to move ahead to a more effective preventive program, with the support of informed medical opinion.

Obviously, not enough has been done in the field of health or safety. The 217 men who died last year, the 10,160 who were injured, and the thousands of coal miners and ex-coal miners with dust diseases is ample evidence that much more remains to be done.

But, progress is never simple. The progress that will come in the future will occur in the same way that progress was made in the past—step by painful step.

Recently, the health and safety programs in the coal industry were highlighted by a nationally known author, first in a magazine article and subsequently in correspondence directed to Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH and to Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall. The main thrust of the writer's remarks were not directed so much at the causes and potential cures for coal mine diseases but to an attack upon the allegedly collusive way in which coal mine safety programs are administered. It is his apparent conviction that the joint efforts of the coal industry, the Bureau of Mines and the United Mine Workers of America are somehow retarding the safety program of that industry and causing the deaths of thousands of coal miners.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth, as anyone with any knowledge of the history of coal mine safety knows. To the contrary, the events and the record of the past decade is evidence that significant progress has been made and that further progress will be made.

Perhaps most distressing were the remarks alleging collusion between the UMWA and the coal industry and the alleged acceptance on the part of the

UMWA of the health of the industry over the health of the coal miner. These allegations are an obvious untruth and a disservice to a labor union which has championed industrial health and safety at a great cost over all of the years since its inception.

The work of the UMWA has been set forth in a letter by its President W. A. Boyle to Secretary of Interior Udall. I believe it to be an informative and well written document which should set at rest any doubts of either the intent or record of the United Mine Workers of America in the field of health and safety.

I believe it to be extremely important that this letter appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the public will be aware of the efforts of the coal miners' union to insure the safe operation of our Nation's coal mines and the long lives of its coal miners.

The letter follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1968.

HON. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On March 25, 1968, Ralph Nader directed a letter to you on health and safety practices in the coal mining industry. That letter contains allegations by him about the failure of the United Mine Workers of America to do its utmost to promote the health and safety of American coal miners. These allegations are not true.

We have been aware of Mr. Nader's recent interest in coal mine health and safety. Indeed, through various channels we attempted to contact him in order to acquaint him with the voluminous records of the UMWA in this field. For some reason he has chosen to ignore our union and the acclaimed knowledge and skill which it alone possesses on this subject.

The record of the UMWA on health and safety is well known and needs no defense. Our constitution sets forth as a major union objective: "To secure by legislative enactment, laws protecting the limbs, lives and health of our members." These words are not an idle promise. In fact, they represent the conscious dedication of the United Mine Workers of America to protect the lives and health of its membership.

It is well known to you that the UMWA played the major role in securing enactment of the first Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in 1941. The passage of that Act came only after many years of turmoil in our industry and after the loss of thousands of lives in the coal mines of this country. It was not until 1952 that the UMWA was successful in securing enforcement provisions under the Act.

Our union was still not content. As you know the 1952 Act excluded mines employing less than 15 men. Many of these smaller mines were virtual death traps. In order to protect the men in these mines, many of whom were not members of our union, the UMWA carried a vigorous and solitary fight which culminated in the 1966 amendments to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952, providing enforcement of federal safety standards in all coal mines regardless of size.

In fighting for adequate coal mine safety laws we have had to contend at times with the hostile forces of both government and the coal industry itself. The achievements we have made in the safety field were not easy to attain and the records of our union will demonstrate the time, money and manpower that was expended to secure them. We do not intend to rest on these gains. The 217 men who were killed in coal mines in 1967 is too high a price to pay for the production of coal. On the other hand, Mr. Secretary, it

is a far smaller price, for instance, than the 1,388 men who died in coal mine accidents in 1940, the year before the passage of the original Federal Coal Mine Safety Act.

Nader's inference that safety meetings between representatives of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, the coal industry and our union are collusive is ridiculous. As you well know safety directors representing the three parties of interest in coal mine safety meet regularly to exchange information. At times there is a divergence of opinion, but the Bureau of Mines has always maintained its freedom to act in a way believed by it to be in line with its authority and responsibility.

Progress is made step by painful step. The Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1940 as amended in 1952 and 1966 was basically designed to prevent coal mine disasters underground. To a great extent it has succeeded in doing so. We have had no major disasters since July 1966.

Today through the UMWA Safety Division we are working toward more effective dust control in coal mining; automatic fire protection on certain mining machinery (I might point out that prototypes of such equipment are already in use); the training of men in accident prevention. To date over 206,000 members of the UMWA have voluntarily taken such training. In addition, the UMWA is a charter member and is extremely active in the affairs of the National Safety Council. This organization, as you well know, is chartered by the federal government and is a leading force for health and safety in all aspects of American life.

The activities of the UMWA has not been limited to work in the safety area. Instead a great deal of time and effort has been devoted to the problem of diseases associated with the mining of coal.

Since the founding of our union we have been acutely aware that coal miners live with coal dust and far too many die from dust diseases of the lungs. We have struggled long and hard to eradicate this tragic suffering and shameful waste of human life. In the anthracite area, for example, a program financed in large part by the Anthracite Health and Welfare Fund has cared for thousands of coal miners with silicosis. Also, in conjunction with the Jefferson Medical College, this program is searching for ways to alleviate this dread disease.

Thousands of coal miners have been disabled by dust diseases and coal miners with dust laden lungs have suffered from a slowly progressive illness terminated by premature death. When the coal miner disabled by dust diseases resorts in desperation to the arduous, devious litigation necessary to obtain the compensation pittance he is blacklisted for continued employment.

During the last 20 years our efforts to resolve these problems have been fortified by the activities of the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund, which is the only uniform industrywide self-insured medical care program in the nation. From its inception, the Fund has been committed to a program of comprehensive medical care including preventive, diagnostic, therapeutic and rehabilitative services for all eligible beneficiaries. The Fund is the acknowledged national leader in its 20-year achievement of providing high quality medical care at a reasonable cost. Unfortunately, workmen's compensation medical benefits are so meagre that the Fund has paid the vast majority of the costs necessary to diagnose and treat coal miners afflicted with dust diseases.

Early in the Fund program it became apparent that the prevalence of these diseases and the related extent of inability to work were unknown in the United States. Public health authorities have conservatively estimated that 100,000 working and ex-coal miners in the anthracite and bituminous industries are afflicted, and of these more than 25,000 are unable to work because

of their condition. Coal workers' pneumoconiosis, the most common dust disease among coal miners, is probably the greatest single occupational disease disability problem in the United States at this time.

Medical care statistics reveal that all of those miners with dust disease are prone to repeated acute attacks of illness which necessitates much more medical care and hospitalization than for others not afflicted. Because of lack of medical knowledge, it is believed that many miners whose illness and disability are actually due to occupational dust diseases are incorrectly diagnosed and never treated for their true condition.

Workman's compensation is available in most states for silicosis but the only states with coverage for coal workers' pneumoconiosis are Alabama, Pennsylvania and Virginia.

As part of its long-range endeavor to provide beneficiaries with a high quality of medical care, the Fund embarked early on a program dedicated to developing professional understanding of chest diseases among coal miners. Over the years the Fund has:

1. Prepared, published and distributed summaries of available knowledge on coal workers' pneumoconiosis.
2. Arranged for the care and treatment of beneficiaries at teaching institutions concerned with the advancement of knowledge in this field.
3. Distributed widely to physicians current information as it is received from authoritative sources.
4. Stimulated and assisted practicing physicians and research scientists in recording and publishing their reports.
5. Provided drugs, oxygen, oxygen equipment and other therapeutic measures for hospital and ambulatory patients suffering from these diseases.
6. Assisted in the planning and execution of numerous conferences with physicians and other interested professional personnel.
7. Arranged for national and international authorities to meet with the physicians in coal mining areas to acquaint them with the latest research and findings in this field.
8. Encouraged and assisted the U.S. Public Health Service and the U.S. Bureau of Mines in their efforts to determine the prevalence of these diseases.
9. Assisted in the formulation of state and Federal disability policies relative to these disease entities.
10. Utilized clinical research developed in former Miner Memorial Hospitals to hasten the provision of adequate medical care of these diseases.
11. Encouraged and assisted Federal and state surveys and studies of dust diseases occurring among coal miners.
12. Introduced and encouraged utilization of the "International X-Ray Classification of Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis" for the diagnosis and treatment of this disease.
13. Fought the inequities imposed by certain workmen's compensation legislation which penalizes the worker who does not report a diagnosed dust disease to his employer.

In the absence of the Fund and the Union none of these achievements would have been possible. Working together with all other interested groups it is possible today to record an impressive development little known to those outside the coal industry. Despite this record, of which we are justly proud, much remains to be done.

All the dust diseases afflicting coal miners, including coal workers' pneumoconiosis, are preventable diseases which, with the application of adequate control measures, can be eliminated. Improving workmen's compensation legislation will encourage the application and improvement of known preventive measures. An expanded research effort will help to solve some fundamental problems such as the precise etiological role of coal

dust, the cause and correct assessment of the respiratory disability and efficiency of various therapeutic measures.

In conclusion, we are not prepared to accept a theory that simple, and easy answers are available to solve complex and intricate problems. We are ready now, as we have always been, to work with those who will promote the well being of the U.S. coal miner. But, conversely, we will oppose and reject those programs from supposed friends, or outright foes, whose activities mitigate against the attainment of a better life and a longer one for the coal miners of America. To do otherwise would be to forsake the principles upon which our union was founded and built. This we will never do.

Mr. Secretary, we shall be most happy to discuss with you questions which deal with the safety and well-being of our nation's coal miners.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. BOYLE.

THE FINANCIAL SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked at the recent statement of Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin. He is reported to have said last Friday that "We are in the midst of the worst financial crisis since 1931." He also stated, according to published reports, that the Nation faces either "uncontrollable inflation" or an "uncontrollable recession," because of an "intolerable balance-of-payments deficit side by side with a budget deficit." I hope that I am quoting Chairman Martin correctly, as he holds a key position in the monetary policy of the United States, and he chose to make these monumental allegations without benefit of prepared text. I requested a transcript of his remarks from the Federal Reserve, and was told that there had been none prepared.

Chairman Martin should be summoned to come before the proper committee of Congress immediately to elaborate on the reasons for his statement. That would give the Nation an opportunity to have a full discussion of the state of the economy. As it stands, Mr. Martin's comments were unsupportable by fact and irresponsible for a man in his position. If he cannot make a convincing case for his interpretation of the economic facts of life of the Nation, there is some question in my mind whether he should continue to hold the position he now occupies.

Mr. Martin made certain recommendations which included cutting the prospective fiscal budget by \$8 billion. He also recommended passage of the administration-backed, 10-percent tax surcharge. He is quoted as saying that "to a certain extent we have been living in a fool's paradise." He had issued an order on Thursday raising the Federal Reserve Board's discount rate to 5½ percent, which is the highest since the 6-percent rate posted by the New York Reserve bank for 3 months in 1929. This raising of the discount rate, of course, caused all the commercial banks in the country to lift their minimum lending rate from 6 to 6½ percent for prime loans. Other interest rates throughout our economy were

scaled up accordingly. When we realize that in round numbers our Federal debt is \$360 billion, our State and local government total debt is \$140 billion, and the interest-bearing debt in our private sector is roughly \$1.5 trillion, representing a total interest-bearing debt in the economy of about \$2 trillion, we can see that a slight increase in the interest rate on even a portion of this debt will lead to another heavy burden for the interest payers of America. We must realize that this will have a depressing effect upon the rapidly growing gross national product.

I believe in fiscal responsibility, and I believe that the President's request for a tax surcharge should be passed. I stand ready to vote for a tax bill which will cause moneys to be extracted from our affluent society to meet the necessary expenditures for national security, and our expenditures for meeting the domestic challenges which threaten the stability of our society. However, I cannot agree with Chairman Martin's tactics in pushing the panic button in the midst of the obvious economic prosperity which we are enjoying. To do this is like the man who shoots his race horse because it needs a new shoe—I would be in favor of replacing the shoe and saving the horse.

I have carefully researched the important factors relating to the stability and health of our economy, and I believe that the facts which I will make in this presentation will refute the dangerous allegations of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board that "We are in the midst of the worst financial crisis since 1931." I do not believe that we face an "uncontrollable inflation," or an "uncontrollable recession."

I believe that Mr. Martin's statement can, in fact, do far more to bring about a recession than can the present fiscal condition of our Nation. When the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board speaks on financial matters, his words carry a great weight. He is Chairman of a Reserve Board which operates as an overall regulator of lending policy for the majority of our major commercial banking institutions, and as such it can restrict or expand the operation of our economy, which depends heavily on the use of credit. This is why I am so concerned about his statement and why I have given this subject matter so much research, time, and attention.

I do believe that we are learning to operate the controls over taxes, debt expansion, and contraction of credit to the point where we no longer need have the peaks of uncontrollable boom accompanied by inflation and the valleys of production paralysis which brought about the great depressions and recessions in our past. These controls cannot be operated separately on a "hit or miss" basis. They must be coordinated in order to smooth out the booms and depressions into a gradually uptrending line of growth of our gross national product.

I am strongly of the opinion that the Federal Reserve Board's action has been based on a desperate move by Mr. Martin and others in high quarters to call attention to the fact that Congress has not passed a tax bill. If this be so, I

state that it is a dangerous action which can backfire. Mr. Martin has shouted "fire" in a crowded theater. He had better be able to show us the fire in terms more convincing than in his ad lib, off-the-cuff comments. Congress should pass a tax bill, but not for the reasons Mr. Martin advances. If it does not pass a tax bill, it will be because it does not like to be jack-handed by a man who believes he is above the Congress and outside the powers of the Executive. In fact, he has shown repeatedly that he considers his position to be fully a fourth branch of the Government.

The reenactment or reimposition of a portion or all, if necessary, of the taxes that we have annulled or forgiven since 1960 would, in my opinion, have a salutary effect by increasing the revenue of our Government at this time of unusually large expenditures. I believe that such action would be far more desirable because it would return from the affluent and uptrending economy a portion of the profits which are increasing as a result of our prosperity. This could be done without affecting the expansion of residential construction and industrial expansion to the point of paralysis.

I believe that expansion of our economy is absolutely necessary because of the increasing population in our country and its increasing need for consumer goods, increased housing, and industrial facilities.

Without a balance in the use of the modern controls which we now have to create a stable rate of growth, we will endanger the necessary growth which we must have in our society and we will run the risk of arresting the Nation's productive process to a serious degree. When the Chairman of the Federal Reserve applies one of these "brakes" in a foolish and irresponsible fashion, he may very well derail the whole train. The drastic increase in Federal Reserve discount rates will contract credit and will result in a sharp cessation of residential and industrial expansion. This will in turn have a depressing effect upon our gross national product, and will cause a limitation of profits and wages which are vital to expansion. The decrease in lending will have the effect upon our debt structure of stopping our Nation's growth. It will also probably have a regressive effect because it will increase the interest charges on all new debt-bearing certificates, and on the old ones as they become due or renewable.

I therefore state that the Federal Reserve Board's action is dangerous and undesirable. Unless the other control levers are used in our economy without undue delay, the Board's drastic action will do more to bring about an uncontrollable recession than would be caused by our present fiscal position. In order to discuss this matter in depth, I will go into some background detail and try to give an overall description of what I believe to be our present fiscal and economic situation.

CAN WE AFFORD GUNS AND BUTTER AT THIS TIME?

We are faced with two great national problems.

First, the continuing struggle against Communist pressure throughout the

world including the Communist aggression in Vietnam and the threat of further aggression throughout Southeast Asia.

Second, the war against social and economic inequality of opportunity throughout our own country.

A dangerous doctrine of negativism is being advanced and accepted by the 90th Congress.

We are constantly being told that the United States cannot meet the challenge abroad and at home, because of a lack of funds. We are told that we face a "fiscal crisis." We are told that we cannot have "guns and butter." We are told by dissenters that we cannot afford to fulfill our treaty commitments to the national effort in Vietnam. The dissenters blame the cost of the struggle in Vietnam for our failure to meet the problems at home.

We are also told by the "economy blocs," the compulsive "budget balancers," that we cannot make necessary expenditures for the elimination of poverty, crime, vocational incapability, disease, and educational deficiencies because of the military costs in Vietnam. The argument by this group is an expedient excuse for cloaking their ideological and political positions. In my opinion, many in this group would continue to oppose social reform whether the war in Vietnam continues or stops. I say this because traditionally they have defended the "status quo" and resisted change to meet the challenges of a changing society.

I reject the arguments of both groups. I state that this Nation can meet its vital needs and face its dangerous obligations as the leader of the free world. I state that we can afford the dual cost involved because of the tremendous capabilities and resources of our country and our people.

Having made these statements, which are so contrary to the prevailing attitude and position of those who believe otherwise, I feel it is incumbent upon me to give some basic supporting reasons.

The "past is prolog to the future." Our national response to challenges in the past, is indicative of our capacity to respond to today's challenges.

I have some very interesting statistics to place before you today. These statistics allow us to make a comparison between two 7-year periods in our history.

The first 7-year period was from 1941 to 1947 inclusive. This period I will designate as the World War II era. It encompassed the 4 years of World War II.

Our Nation with about 29 percent of our present gross national product capability faced annual deficits ranging from \$6.2 billion to \$57.4 billion during this era. The total cumulative deficit for the 7 years was \$210.4 billion.

Our total cumulative gross national product for the World War II era was \$1,266.2 billion. So we find that our total deficits amounted to 16.6 percent of our total gross national product for this era.

Now let us turn to the second 7-year period of 1961 to 1967 inclusive, which I will designate as the Vietnam era. For this era our gross national product was \$4,369.5 billion—about a 345-percent in-

crease over the GNP of \$1,266.2 billion for the World War II era.

Our national annual deficits have run from \$2.3 billion annually to \$9.9 billion. Our total cumulative deficits for the 7 years of the Vietnam era total \$40.3 billion. So we find that our total deficits in the Vietnam era amount to nine-tenths of 1 percent of the total gross national product for those years. The comparison is startling, but undeniable. It is obvious that deficits amounting to nine-tenths of 1 percent of our gross national product do not and have not contributed to a "fiscal crisis."

What was the magnitude of military expenditures in the two eras?

In the World War II era our military expenditures were \$308.9 billion. This was in the 7 years when our gross national product was \$1,266.2 billion.

In the Vietnam era our military expenditures were \$384.2 billion. During this 7-year period our total gross national product was \$4,369.5 billion. We see that our military expenditures have been \$75.3 billion greater than in the World War II era. But we drew those military expenditures from a gross national product $3\frac{1}{2}$ times larger.

What is the logical economic conclusion?

There was no "fiscal crisis" in the World War II era when the total deficits were 16.6 percent of the total gross national product.

How then could there be a "fiscal crisis" today when the total deficits are nine-tenths of 1 percent of the total gross national product? The answer is obvious. Any such claim is ridiculous.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have proven by undeniable facts and figures that there is no economic basis for the dangerous doctrine of negativism that unfortunately has been advanced by the fearful, the defenders of the "status quo," and the alarmists who use the comparatively small deficits of 1961 to 1967 inclusive as a reason for cutting all of our vital remedial domestic programs.

I further state that no economic basis exists for our failure to fulfill our international commitments of honor—to secure our Nation and other non-Communist nations from totalitarian aggression.

There may be some ideological positions against our policy abroad and our domestic social improvement programs at home, but I submit that no basis exists for the argument that we cannot financially afford "guns and butter."

GOLD CRISIS

I know that someone will rise and point to the "gold crisis" of recent time and the concurrent attack on the dollar.

My response to that argument is that the "gold crisis" was an accumulative situation based, at the best, on a psychological reflex of dollar owners abroad to the fetish of gold worship which still pervades many minds. At the worst, it was based on a direct attack of gold speculators, led, aided, and abetted by President de Gaulle's opposition to the United States and his envy of the position of prestige in terms of international acceptance of the dollar as the prime unit of exchange in world commerce.

The fact that the gold crisis has now receded—the fact that the price of gold on the free world market has now dropped from its speculative price of \$44 per ounce or higher to the lower price of \$38 an ounce April 4, 1968, is ample proof that our domestic deficit position is not and was not the real reason for the "gold crisis."

If the argument is made that our trouble arises from lack of confidence in dollar convertibility into gold at the request of foreign dollar holders, then let us look to the fallacy of the U.S. policy of placing ourselves in the untenable position of trying to guarantee the international balance-of-trade settlements in gold-backed dollars. We know that our supply of gold is inadequate to back foreign held dollars, of course every other nation's gold supply is inadequate to back up their units of currency.

The steps recently taken by the governors of the central banks of the gold pool countries in fact acknowledge the fallacy of our former position which guaranteed the convertibility of foreign-owned dollars into gold, on demand.

We are faced as you know with an accumulation of foreign-owned dollars in countries overseas of about \$30 billion. Why did this occur? They accumulated from many sources: Tourist money spent abroad—about \$2 billion annually; economic aid and military aid; American corporate investments abroad; and some imbalance in foreign trade and so forth.

The foreign dollar inventory in post-World War II era was relatively small in relation to their domestic needs. Once their own economies started producing most of their consumer goods, these countries found that they no longer had urgent need for our goods; and, consequently, their interest in the dollar shifted to its value based on gold convertibility.

I believe I have proven the fact that our Nation is industrially strong and economically sound, by citing the remarkable advance in our gross national product in the past 25 years. The GNP as we know encompasses the value of goods produced and includes the profits, wages, and interest earned.

No one can challenge the fact that our financial strength is at an all time high, when we assess it in terms of capital investment, in wealth producing facilities, accumulated savings in our bank, insurance and thrift institutions. Our brain pool and trained manpower pool is in first place in the world register of nations.

The year 1968 is a political campaign year. If the Republicans can scare the people into believing that the Democratic administration is fiscally irresponsible—that we are headed for the shoals of national financial bankruptcy—then I suppose they may achieve some political gain.

Some of the Democrats have fallen into the Republican propaganda trap. I plead with them to reject the Republican "fiscal crisis" fantasy. I state again, we have a job to do in defending the security of the United States against Communist aggression worldwide. We have a job to do here at home in meeting the social

and economic threats which challenge the stability of our economic structure and the unity of our people.

Many people believe that our debt and tax management could be improved.

I share that view. This is a very complicated problem area. There is a large area of controversy amongst our Nation's best known fiscal and financial experts as to how to handle our national debt and how, when, and where taxes should be levied. For the purpose of this presentation I will not enter this other area today.

I shall try to point out the sharp differences in our approach to the tax processes during the World War II era—1941 to 1947—and the Vietnam era—1961 to 1967.

Generally speaking the Congress levied a series of tax increases during the World War II era—1941 to 1947.

Generally speaking again, the Congress enacted a series of laws decreasing taxes during the Vietnam era—1961 to 1967.

I am appending at the close of my remarks a summary of the actions of Congress in these two 7 year periods of time.

Notwithstanding our levy of increased taxes in the World War II period, we accumulated \$210 billion in deficits. We resorted to borrowings to finance those huge deficits.

Notwithstanding our failure to increase taxes in the Vietnam period we accumulated a remarkably small deficit in the Vietnam period compared to the World War II period. This, too, we have financed by borrowing. Over a period of time we can retire the \$40.3 billion deficit by having the courage to levy a reasonable tax increase. We can meet 1968 and future deficits from taxes levied against a series of annual gross national products which promise to be larger and larger.

During the past 7 years, 1961–67, we have repealed substantial tax levies; therefore, a reinstatement of all or part of those tax levies would represent a small price for us to pay in order that we could meet our commitments abroad and here at home.

During the World War II era, as I have illustrated, we were making huge military expenditures and accumulating staggering deficits.

In order to prevent runaway inflation we were forced to institute direct and comprehensive controls on wages and prices. We also rationed scarce consumer goods.

During the Vietnam era, with an actual surplus of consumer goods, some inflation has occurred. From 1961 to 1965 consumer prices increased about 1½ percent per year. But during 1966 and 1967 consumer prices increased at an annual rate of 2.9 percent. This sharp rise in prices is due to increased military expenditures, wage increases, and higher interest rates.

To stop this upward inflationary trend the President has asked Congress to pass a tax surcharge of 10 percent; this tax would amount to about 1 penny out of each dollar of income. This is a small sacrifice in contrast to the rigid controls on wages, prices, and goods instituted during World War II.

SHOULD CONGRESS PASS A TAX BILL?

The question before the Congress for some time has been: Should Congress pass some type of a tax increase?

Should Congress restore at least for a limited time some of the tax revenue sources which we have canceled, abandoned, or forgiven during the past 7 years?

I voted for the tax increases during World War II when I was a new Member of Congress.

I voted for decreases in taxes during the past 7 years which embrace the Vietnam war period.

I stand ready to vote not only for the surcharge but also for the reinstatement of the tax sources which we have abandoned in the past 7 years. These taxes can be borne by a far more affluent economy than we have ever had before.

I believe this is the difficult but prudent course which we should take. It would restore confidence in the dollar to foreign dollar account holders, and would meet the needs of our country in funding foreign commitments and domestic needs.

I want to make it very plain, however, that my readiness to vote for recapture of tax sources does not stem from any belief that we are in a time of economic stringency nor from any acceptance of a condition of national "fiscal crisis." It stems from other reasons, and I will state them:

First. Our economy is the strongest in terms of fiscal soundness, capital investment, industrial productivity, technological advancement, maximum employment, and accumulated capital savings in the world. It is at the highest level in our own national history.

We can afford a tax increase if we want to balance the budget for national or international reasons. It would be a cheap price for us to pay, if it would convince the skeptics in other nations and the gold speculators that we can and will remove the causes of their fears in regard to the soundness of the dollar. It is to our advantage to protect the reputation of the soundness of the dollar against the slander of those who envy our real position of financial soundness.

Second. But there are other reasons for taxes far more important than erasing annual deficits.

The first reason is to remove any fears from the non-Communist nations that the United States will not pay the financial costs necessary to honor our commitments to strengthen world security.

The second reason which is equal, if not greater in importance, is to enable us to enlarge and develop domestic programs to correct the internal problems which weaken and divide us as a nation.

Taxes we can raise from our affluent society can furnish the money to purify our water and air and improve our environment. Even more important, taxes can educate all of our people to take a productive, wealth-producing place in our society. Taxes can remove the cancerous, crime-producing slums of our great cities. Taxes can help fund the tremendous public transportation facilities for people and goods, which 375 million people will need by the year 2000.

These taxes, if invested in strengthen-

ing the capability of our people and building facilities so badly needed by our exploding population, will not be a negative economic factor—they will not represent wasteful expenditure.

They can be an investment in America's future that will yield tenfold in material advancement and a hundredfold in the strength of our people, and in their dedication to the preservation of the structure of our society.

If we move with courage and vision, we can remove the causes of unrest and revolt which are now a cancerous growth in the hard-core slum areas of our great cities. We had our Watts—the damage to property and life struck this city like a bolt of lightning. The scars remain and the basic causes have not as yet been completely removed.

Other cities, Chicago, Syracuse, Detroit, Rochester, Memphis—each of these cities have had their travail of riots, arson, death, and destruction. How many more cities face similar experiences during the hot summers of tomorrow?

How many of those which have had their first travail are in danger of further agony?

Some people say to me, "Society cannot afford the cost of the preventive medicine."

I say that "Society cannot afford the cost of the illness."

I say further that "Society will pay the cost, whichever way we move."

If we drift, we will pay it in welfare costs, criminal costs, and property costs. We will pay the cost again and again in loss of human life and productive potential.

Society can pay the cost in another way.

We can educate the illiterate. We can train the unskilled. We can turn tax eaters into taxpayers.

We cannot force any man to accept the opportunity for self-improvement, but we can guarantee every man that he will have the chance to accept or reject opportunity.

The path which we have trod has been a long and arduous one. We have made great progress, but we have not arrived at the end of the path. Let no man believe that the path ahead is shorter or less fraught with difficulty. It now becomes the task of this generation to decide how we will walk the path into the future.

Will we accept the costs of constructive change? Or will we pay the costs of destructive deterioration of the structure of our society and lose the American dream?

The additional matter referred to earlier appears herewith.

THE 1942 REVENUE ACT

First, increase tax rates for larger corporations from 31 to 40 percent.

Second, the excess profit tax rate, which had ranged from 35 to 60 percent, was replaced by a flat rate of 90 percent.

Third, exemptions were lowered for both estate and tax and gift tax—rate unchanged.

Fourth, the Secretary of the Treasury was given the power to renegotiate war contracts to recapture excess profits.

THE TAX PAYMENT ACT OF 1943

This act ordinarily referred to as the Ruml plan achieved some forgiveness of

past taxes. It also started the principle of current payment of taxes by inaugurating the withholding principle.

The 1943 Revenue Act as finally passed over a presidential veto increased the excess profits tax from 90 to 95 percent. The excess profits tax exemption was raised from \$5,000 to \$10,000. On balance there were few meaningful changes.

The Revenue Act of 1944 abolished the victory tax. While normal taxes on personal income were reduced from a level of 6 to 3 percent, surtaxes were increased about 7 to 9 percent.

Although taxes were increased during the war years the financing of the huge war effort was accomplished mainly by selling Treasury bonds, thereby increasing the national debt. By the close of 1945 a total of \$156.9 billion of war bonds were sold, and of this amount, 62 percent were bought by nonbank investors.

Controls over prices, wages, manpower, raw materials, production, and other phases of the economy helped to control inflation in a scarce domestic goods economy. As the war ended the tax burdens were reduced, controls were removed, and the economy rapidly inflated.

Now let us look at the tax actions of Congress during the Vietnam era—1961 to 1967 inclusive. During this period of unparalleled increase in the gross national product from \$506.5 billion in 1961 to \$763.1 billion in 1967, we, the Congress, reduced taxes or initiated tax writeoff concessions time after time. Here are the important actions we took:

In 1961 an investment tax credit was passed which amounted to about 7 percent writeoff on capital investment. In 1963 there was a major personal and corporate income tax reduction.

The Revenue Act of 1964 reduced individual income taxes from a range of 20 to 91 percent down to a range of 14 to 70 percent. For corporations the combined normal and surtax rate was reduced from 52 to 48 percent. The 7-percent capital investment credit of 1962 was simplified and broadened. This and other measures yielded a total reduction of \$11.5 billion for the fiscal year 1964-65.

In 1965 Congress reduced some of the excise taxes.

In 1966 Congress passed the Tax Adjustment Act which increased taxes approximately \$1 billion in 1966 and \$4½ billion in 1967. Personal income tax withholding was increased from a flat 14 percent to 30 percent in graduated rates. Congress also suspended the investment credit and accelerated depreciation for many assets in 1966.

Generally speaking the Congress levied increased taxes during the World War II period—1941 to 1947—and we have reduced taxes during the Vietnam period—1961 to 1967.

I have appended some charts which portray an annual and cumulative basis the figures I have presented.

Chart (A): Cumulative deficits for 1941 to 1947 of \$210.4 billion amounted to 16.6 percent of the cumulative total gross national product for those 7 years of \$1,266.2 billion:

[Dollar amounts in billions]			
	Gross national product	Public debt, year end	Percent of GNP
1941	\$109.4	\$55.3	50.5
1942	139.2	77.0	55.3
1943	177.5	140.8	79.3
1944	201.9	202.6	100.4
1945	216.8	259.1	119.5
1946	201.6	269.9	133.9
1947	219.8	258.4	117.5
Total	1,266.2		

Chart (B): Cumulative deficits for 1961 to 1967 of \$40.3 billion amounted to nine-tenths of 1 percent of the cumulative total gross national product of \$4,369.5 billion for those 7 years:

[Dollar amounts in billions]			
	Gross national product	Public debt, year end	Percent of GNP
1961	\$506.5	\$289.2	57.1
1962	542.1	298.6	55.1
1963	573.4	306.5	53.4
1964	612.2	312.5	51.0
1965	653.5	317.9	48.7
1966	718.7	320.4	44.6
1967	763.1	326.7	42.8
Total	4,369.5		

ANNUAL DEFICITS FOR 2-7 YEAR PERIODS IN OUR HISTORY

1941 to 1947, inclusive	Amount	1961 to 1967, inclusive	Amount
1941	6.2	1961	3.9
1942	21.5	1962	6.4
1943	57.4	1963	6.3
1944	51.4	1964	8.2
1945	53.9	1965	3.4
1946	20.7	1966	2.3
1947	.8	1967	9.9
Net cumulative deficits.	210.4		40.3

ANNUAL DEFENSE EXPENDITURES (ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET)

[In billions of dollars]			
1941 to 1947, inclusive	Amount	1961 to 1967, inclusive	Amount
1941	6.1	1961	47.5
1942	24.0	1962	51.1
1943	63.2	1963	52.8
1944	76.8	1964	54.2
1945	81.3	1965	50.2
1946	43.2	1966	57.7
1947	14.4	1967	70.8
Cumulative expenditures.	308.9		384.2

The figures in these charts completely refute the claims of the people who continually state that the United States is in a "fiscal crisis."

I state that we are not in a "fiscal crisis" based on the economic facts as portrayed in these chart figures which are taken from the U.S. budgets of 1968 and 1969, and from figures supplied by the Library of Congress.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. First of all, may I say that the gentleman is making a very important contribution, in my opinion, to the great debate on the current fiscal situation of the Nation.

He is also making powerful argument regarding the strength of our Nation and its economy. I congratulate the gentleman on the work he has put into this effort and on the clarity of his explanation. I think he has made a valuable contribution.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman. As I proceed, I shall point out some other information which I think is very interesting. As I said, we have spent \$75.3 billion greater than in the World War II era for military expenditures, and we have drawn these additional expenditures from a gross national product 3½ times larger.

What is the logical economic conclusion? There was no fiscal crisis in the World War II era when the total deficits were 16.6 percent of the total gross national product. How then could there be a fiscal crisis when the total deficits are nine-tenths of 1 percent of the total gross national product? The answer is obvious. Any such claim is ridiculous.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

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

Mr. ALBERT. I think the forthrightness of the gentleman is further emphasized by the fact that in spite of his analysis, he recognizes the need for a tax increase at this time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As the gentleman knows, I have already said that in my speech, and I shall get to that point further in just a minute and comment on it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have proved by undeniable facts and figures that there is no economic basis for the dangerous doctrine of negativism that unfortunately has been advanced by the fearful, the defenders of the status quo, and the alarmists who use the comparatively small deficits of 1961 to 1967, inclusive, as a reason for cutting all of our vital remedial domestic programs.

I further state that no economic basis exists for our failure to fulfill our international commitments of honor to secure our Nation and other non-Communist nations from totalitarian aggression. There may be some ideological position against our policy abroad and our domestic improvement programs at home. But I submit there is no basis that exists for the argument that we cannot in this country financially afford guns and butter.

I said that my statement may be challenged. But I want the Members of this House who challenged the speech I am making today to come forward with some facts, as I have come forward with facts, showing the strength of our economy, because I happen to know at this time in our Nation's history our employment has gone up from 65 million people, in round numbers, in 1960, to 75 million people. Our unemployment has gone down from 5.9 percent to about 3, 6, or 7 percent. It is almost in half. We have fewer people unemployed percentage-wise to our population than we have ever had. And we have more people employed than we have ever had—75 million-plus—but in round numbers, 75 million.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. ALBERT. I believe the gentleman said that the percentage of the deficit to the gross national product averages something like 0.9 percent in recent years, nine-tenths of 1 percent, is that correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, the percent was the cumulative deficits of the 1941 period against the accumulated gross national products, and the accumulative deficits of \$40 billion against the \$4,365 billion accumulative gross national products. I am taking the total of the 7 years' gross national products and the total deficits of the 7 years and comparing them. In the latter instance, the 1961 to 1967 instance, it comes out to nine-tenths of 1 percent increase.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman does recognize the possibility of an increase in the deficit considerably in excess of \$20 billion in the next fiscal year and does argue for the enactment of a tax bill?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I realize that a tax increase is called for, but I want to call to the attention of the gentleman that although the estimate for 1968 is a deficit of around \$20 billion at the current projected rate of expenditures, the gross national product for 1968 is estimated to go from \$765 billion to above \$800 billion.

So there is another factor that has to be cranked in. The increase in the gross national product is going to be tremendous, as well as the increase in the deficit. If we could put the 8 years together in the 1941-48 period and in the 1961-68 period, inclusive, we would find that the figures percentagewise have very little change.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER POSTMASTER GENERAL LARRY O'BRIEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee, I have worked closely with Postmaster General O'Brien in the 2½ years he has held the position he is now leaving. He has been a great Postmaster General, and I do not use that description lightly.

The Post Office is an extremely difficult agency to manage. It is big in every sense of the word—big in the number of employees, big in budget, big in the scope of its responsibilities, and big in the area over which it operates.

As the manager of this agency, the Postmaster General works under some severe limitations. He has little or no control over his agency's budget, the fees it charges for its services, the salaries of its employees, the amount of money it invests in capital improvements, and a number of other things over which similar executives in private industry have almost complete control.

Of course, these limitations, these areas of no control, are the same in virtually all other Federal agencies. But I believe they impose greater problems in the postal service than in most other agencies because it is so closely related to an industrial operation in the private sector of the economy.

Despite the built-in difficulties, Larry O'Brien has done an excellent job managing the postal service. And he has imparted a sense of urgency about the need for improvements in postal technology and postal management. This, perhaps, is his greatest achievement.

You do not necessarily have to agree with Mr. O'Brien's proposal to convert the postal service into a Government corporation to recognize that in making it he stimulated thinking about the Post Office. As a result of his recommendation an outstanding Commission was appointed by the President to make an in-depth study of our mail delivery system.

Whatever the organizational structure the Kappel Commission recommends for the Post Office, I am sure it will have many excellent ideas for improving postal operations.

Under the leadership of Larry O'Brien the postal service has made great strides in improving its technological capabilities. Postmaster General O'Brien recommended and the Congress approved a bill creating the Bureau of Research and Engineering with an Assistant Postmaster General to head it.

The emphasis on research and engineering activities is part of a broad-ranging postal modernization program that has been the major theme of Larry O'Brien's tenure as Postmaster General. The modernization program includes the development and purchase of high-speed mail processing machines, the construction of badly needed new postal facilities, and the introduction of modern management policies and techniques.

Larry O'Brien has asked for considerably more money for capital expenditures than the Postmasters General who preceded him. And he has gotten most of what he requested. He got the money because he made a case for it—because he convinced the Congress and the public that we had to begin spending a great deal more money on capital improvements in the postal service or face the very real possibility of a breakdown in the system.

Some 2 months ago the postal service took an important step forward in developing a training program that really meets its needs. The Postal Service Institute opened. This is the Department's own school for training postmasters and supervisors in the postal arts and sciences.

The Department has long needed a bigger, and more comprehensive training program. Until now the Department of-

ferred little in the way of training instruction in such important areas as labor relations and financial management.

Mr. O'Brien is leaving the Department just as the expanded training program he fostered in getting underway. But there is no question in my mind that the Postal Service Institute will make a significant contribution to improved mail service and will prove to be one of the major accomplishments of Larry O'Brien's postal administration.

Larry O'Brien understood that the postal service is a vital element in our Nation's economy. He realized that close cooperation with the business community was not just desirable, but essential if the postal service is to meet its responsibilities to the Nation.

Today, the postal service has stronger, more productive contacts with the business community than at any time in its history. And I think it is noteworthy that this climate of cooperation and understanding was developed under a Democratic administration.

Last September the Post Office Department invited businessmen who make extensive use of the mails to come to Washington to discuss a wide variety of postal matters of mutual interest and concern. Some 1,800 businessmen from across the Nation attended this first National Postal Forum.

The businessmen were given an active part in the program. They were participants, not observers. There was a frank and very useful exchange of views among postal officials, businessmen, and Members of the Congress. The National Postal Forum was one of the most effective examples of meaningful communication between a Government agency and the business community I have ever witnessed.

The forum stimulated great interest among businessmen who rely heavily on the mails. The main point of contact between the Post Office and business mailers is the network of mail users councils that have been formed throughout the country. Membership in the mail users councils has doubled since last September.

It would require much more time than I wish to take to discuss all of Larry O'Brien's achievements as Postmaster General. But no review of his record would be complete without a mention of the airlift program.

All first-class mail going more than a few hours distance is now getting air transportation. In a nation as large and technologically advanced as ours this is as it should be. There is no reason why carrying the mail by plane should be considered a premium service in the space age.

At a time when expanding mail volume has put tremendous strain and pressure on the postal service, the Nation has been fortunate in having a man of Larry O'Brien's imagination, vigor, and ability as its Postmaster General. I commend him for his outstanding service to the Nation and wish him well for the future.

POSTAL PROGRESS, NOVEMBER 1965 TO APRIL 1968

Since assuming office in November 1965, Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien has taken numerous steps in his efforts to improve mail service and mod-

ernize postal operations. These actions include:

SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS

Restored 6-day window and parcel post service upon receipt of funds from Congress.

Authorized some 500,000 households to receive mail delivery at the door rather than the curblin service formerly provided.

Pledged significant improvement in mail service for New York City with construction of new Franklin Delano Roosevelt Postal Station, Murray Hill Station, and the central truck terminal and bulk mail processing plant, all in midtown Manhattan.

In 1967 alone, saved more than \$1.5 million in annual postal operating costs through the merger of small post offices with larger offices, increasing postal efficiency with no reduction in service.

Announced delivery, largely through use of airlift on a space available basis, of 75 percent of first-class mail deposited before 5 p.m. the following day and 90 percent within 2 days. In November 1967, the Department airlifted 17.7 million ton-miles of first-class mail. Airlift on a space available basis by January 1968 was approaching 100 percent for all first-class mail capable of being moved more rapidly by air.

MECHANIZATION AND MODERNIZATION

Announced accelerated mechanization and modernization program, at a cost of \$125 million in 1967 and 1968. In 1967, emphasis was placed on obtaining high-speed mail processing machines and replacing outmoded postal facilities and equipment. The Department's budget contained some \$300 million in modernization funds, including a 46-percent increase in expenditures for plant and equipment and 40-percent increase in funds for research and engineering.

Reorganized Office of Research and Engineering, with top-level scientific and managerial executives from private industry providing the leadership.

Ordered for installation in post offices at 75 cities a \$33.5 million electronic source data complex, largest in the world. The first major segment of the complex, initially serving Rochester, Syracuse, Albany, and Buffalo in New York State, began operating August 1, 1967, at Paramus, N.J.

Established 124 self-service postal units in 102 cities to provide round-the-clock mail service to about 12 million customers.

Established an Office of Planning to chart improvements and programs for future needs.

ZIP CODE

Inaugurated first high-speed optical ZIP-code reading machine at Detroit, Mich. Ordered 14 readers for installation in eight post offices. Four cities now have these optical scanners.

Expanded use of ZIP code in the destination address of all categories of domestic mail to more than 75 percent. Annual savings in postal operating costs attributable to ZIP code rose to \$53 million. Despite record volume and a fire that destroyed a key mail-handling facility in New York at the height of the Christmas rush in 1967, ZIP code paved

the way to a smooth Christmas mail-handling operation. The response by volume mailers to resort regulations advanced the use of ZIP code on second- and third-class mail to almost 100 percent. ZIP coding of first-class mail climbed to over 60 percent.

LABOR MANAGEMENT

Signed agreement with seven exclusively recognized national organizations, representing the seven postal crafts, to use mediation to settle bargaining impasses in future national agreements. After an unprecedented use of mediation to resolve impasses arising out of 3 months of collective bargaining in late 1967 and early 1968, signed with heads of postal unions having exclusive recognition over 620,000 workers a national agreement, to become effective March 19, 1968, and run for 2 years.

Created a special labor-management committee on safety, related to the letter carrier's craft—one of the first permanent committees of its type in the Federal Government.

RECRUITMENT

Announced a six-point, long-range recruiting program to fill postal positions and provide new talent, including 250 management interns over a 5-year period.

LEGISLATION

Congress authorized Bureau of Research and Engineering with an Assistant Postmaster General.

Requested and received legislation for independent authority to construct postal buildings.

Asked for and received from Congress restoration of parcel post delivery service 6 days a week on all routes at more than 4,100 post offices and on some routes at an additional 721 offices as well as restoration of some window services 6 days a week.

Asked Congress to remove size and weight restrictions on parcel post legislation passed unanimously and signed by President.

Announced end of postal savings, effective March 28, 1968.

Through a comprehensive upward adjustment of postal rates, effective January 7, 1968, will shift almost \$1 billion of the annual cost of running the postal service from the taxpayers to the users of the mails.

GENERAL

Through the first National Postal Forum, following a series of 15 regional forums in 1967, drew some 2,300 persons to Washington for 2 days of discussions on postal matters. The forums added to the continuing dialog between business mailers and postal officials carried on through the 355 mail users councils of the Nation, with a membership of over 40,000 at the end of March 1968.

Increased rates on money orders, insurance, registered and certified mail, and c.o.d. to narrow cost-revenue gap.

Inaugurated the Postal Service Institute, the Department's first school in its 192-year history. The Institute will teach a wide variety of courses from maintenance and mechanization to social problems affecting the Department. The Institute began operations in

January 1967 at its temporary headquarters in Bethesda, a four-story building with a total capacity of 250 resident students.

Proposed that the Post Office Department be removed from the President's Cabinet and converted into a nonprofit Government corporation, rendering essential public service. The Corporation would provide postal services authorized by the Congress, would be operated by a board of directors, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Congress, and managed by a professional executive appointed by the board. In addition, the proposed Corporation would be given a clear mandate on the percentage of cost coverage for postal services, so that further revisions in rates, if necessary, would be on a fixed formula basis.

A report on this proposal is expected in April 1968 from the Commission on Postal Organization, appointed by President Johnson and headed by Frederick R. Kappel, former chairman of the board of A.T. & T.

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

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has given the House a very fine summary of the administration of the Post Office Department during the tenure of Larry O'Brien. In doing so he has not only informed the House but he has aided future historians in their search and study of this period of American history by summarizing his own personal knowledge of the accomplishments of Larry O'Brien and of the Post Office Department during this period. No one is in a better position to know the history of the Department during Larry O'Brien's administration than my colleague from Oklahoma who heads the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Post Office Department.

Much of what the gentleman has said would have been lost or been so scattered in the archives of the Post Office Department that it would never have been possible for it to be accumulated into a single document had it not been for the fine discourse that the gentleman is making this afternoon.

Mr. STEED. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, recently a political cartoon in one of our newspapers portrayed Larry O'Brien reporting for duty to a Member of the other body, and that Member was saying to O'Brien, "Where have you been, O'Brien?"

The answer to that question is one of the proudest chapters in the U.S. postal service, a chapter that proved President Kennedy's dictum that "One man does make a difference."

When Larry O'Brien was sworn in as Postmaster General at the country post office in Hye, Tex., in November of 1965, time was running out on the Post Office Department. It was in a race with catastrophe and it was losing.

For example, in October 1965, the Chicago Post Office stopped functioning for 3 weeks as 10 million pieces of mail piled up. Nothing moved. It was as if a human heart had stopped beating.

Larry O'Brien rushed railway postal cars to Chicago and the patient revived, but it was a warning. The condition of the postal service was still serious.

The Post Office Department employs 700,000 persons—one out of four civilians on the Federal payroll—and delivers 80 billion pieces of mail a year through 33,000 outdated post offices. That is more mail delivered than the deliveries of all other postal services of the world combined.

This same postal service faced a 9-percent increase in volume the year O'Brien took over instead of the usual 3-percent increase. The 75 largest post offices through which 50 percent of the mail flowed, had been built prior to World War II when 10,000 trains a day delivered mail, and these post offices had been built near rail terminals for this reason.

During Larry O'Brien's service those train deliveries had shrunk 1,100 percent to 900 trains a day. The mail was being delivered by plane outside the city but the post offices were downtown near the rail terminals. They were huge impersonal structures but their floors could not hold modern machinery, so the mail was sorted by hand. Yet the mail volume had doubled. The answer to this problem had always been to hire more employees. But if that trend continued every man, woman, and child would be delivering the mail in the year 2000.

What is more, the morale of these employees was sinking fast. New postal employees started out on wages \$100 a month lower than the average city bus driver. Eighty-five percent of them would never receive a promotion no matter how long they stayed in the postal service. The skills they learned were unique so they could not get jobs in industry or in Government and they had to stay where they were.

This is where Larry O'Brien came in. He started by telling a stark truth: the Post Office would need a rebuilding program that would take a billion dollars a year for 5 years. To initiate a realization of this goal, he did four things immediately:

First. He began a \$100 million crash mechanization program, including a new computer center hooked up with our 75 largest post offices.

Second. He established the Bureau of Research and Engineering and recruited top scientists and engineers to staff it.

Third. He began the Postal Institute of Technology.

Fourth. He established an Office of Planning and Systems Analysis to pilot long-range programs for service improvements.

What is perhaps more important, he fought for and obtained one of the largest postal rate increases in the history of his office. At the same time, he supported one of the largest postal pay increases that Congress had ever passed.

The test of leadership in a democracy is the ability to bring public opinion to bear on our national problems. As a country, we had long ignored the Post Office, despite the fact its operations are crucial to the efficient functioning of business and government. Larry O'Brien felt it was now time to assign priority to the one agency every American has

taken for granted. In a politically unpopular move, but nonetheless a hard-headed pragmatic one, he urged the abolition of the Post Office and establishment of a postal corporation. A Presidential Commission was formed and a yearlong study made of every nook and cranny of the postal system. Regardless of the practicality of the recommendations of this commission, it will be a long time before we are able to forget the post office again.

Larry O'Brien was one of the greatest and most influential Cabinet members and Federal executives in our recent history. He has left his mark along with the automobile executives and the presidents of electric companies who have come to Washington, D.C. He was probably one of the most talented Postmasters General since Benjamin Franklin and, may I point out they were both politicians. I know that Larry O'Brien has a great career ahead of him in private industry. I hope he returns to the Federal Government some day. We will miss him, but the 700,000 employees of the postal service will miss him even more, and that is a far greater tribute than any Member of Congress can give. In short, that is "where O'Brien has been" and we the people of the United States are better for it.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel a great sense of personal regret over the resignation of Larry O'Brien as Postmaster General, not only because his resignation deprives the Post Office Department of his remarkable ability, but also because our country so desperately needs men of his caliber in public service.

Larry O'Brien has been an outstanding Postmaster General—the most impressive in the history of our country. As one of the oldest departments in Government, improvement and changes in the postal service and in the Department were sorely needed when he took office 6 years ago. Under his guidance, the postal service has been transformed from an antiquated operation into a delivery system that is keeping pace with our modern technology society. He was able to do this by upgrading every facet of the Post Office Department and by gaining public support for his innovative improvements.

As he returns to private life, he leaves behind him a distinguished Government career and the respect and admiration of those who have worked with him. I wish for Larry the best of all worlds and hope that some day he will again want to put his rare talents to use in public service.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial, the Washington Post accurately described Lawrence F. O'Brien as one of the truly outstanding public servants of our time. I join the Post in hoping that the outgoing Postmaster General may at some point in the future "again be harnessed in Government service," and under unanimous consent, I place the Post editorial in the RECORD:

EXIT MR. O'BRIEN

The Washington political arena is a vast stage on which players are constantly entering and exiting. Most of them bring some genuine talents to the boards, but for a variety of reasons few turn in memorable performances or make a lasting impression on those who sit in front of the footlights.

Surely Lawrence F. O'Brien, who resigned from the Postmaster Generalship, belongs in the small cluster of stars. He performed brilliantly as one of President John F. Kennedy's principal political tacticians and then went on to serve with equal loyalty and effectiveness in the Johnson Administration. The President, who is not an easy taskmaster, did not exaggerate when he said that: "I have never been served by a more competent, more efficient or more likable or effective employe than Larry O'Brien."

Postmaster Generals have not been noted for their interest, to say nothing of their diligence, in achieving greater efficiency in mail delivery. But Larry O'Brien was a most courageous exception to the rule. In April, 1967, he startled the country with a witty speech in which he proposed that the management of the Post Office be vested in an autonomous, nonprofit corporation. The trouble with the Post Office is that its management is powerless to determine postal rates, labor policies, modes of transportation or the introduction of labor-saving machinery. The Postmaster General's "area of no control," Mr. O'Brien quipped, "is almost unlimited."

A ten-man commission, headed by Mr. Frederick R. Kappel, is about to submit a report to the President on the reorganization of the postal service. If as seems likely, the O'Brien proposal for a nonprofit corporation is endorsed, Mr. W. Marvin Watson, the Postmaster General-elect, will assume office amid a shower of political sparks.

Apparently, Larry O'Brien will now employ his considerable talents in the Kennedy campaign. Some day we hope that they may again be harnessed in Government service.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor and privilege to be present at the departmental auditorium on Tuesday, as a great Postmaster General—Lawrence F. O'Brien—said farewell to Department personnel upon his departure from the President's Cabinet.

General O'Brien has accomplished an outstanding record of public service over the years, capped by his superb job as head of the Post Office Department.

He served two Presidents faithfully and capably as assistant at the White House, and then he moved forcefully and effectively when he took charge of the Nation's postal system.

General O'Brien did not solve all of the problems of the postal system during his tenure, but he made great progress even while the ever-increasing flow of mail keeps compounding a difficult situation. The postal system is better for his inspiring leadership.

I doubt that any Postmaster General ever has had better relations with Members of Congress and in particular with members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

With permission, I include with my remarks a summary of postal progress during the period of Mr. O'Brien's tenure as Postmaster General:

POSTAL PROGRESS—NOVEMBER 1965 TO APRIL 1968

Since assuming office in November, 1965, Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien has taken numerous steps in his efforts to improve mail service and modernize postal operations. These actions include:

SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS

Restored six-day window and parcel post service upon receipt of funds from Congress.

Authorized some 500,000 households to receive mail delivery at the door rather than the curbside service formerly provided.

Pledged significant improvement in mail service for New York City with construction of new Franklin Delano Roosevelt Postal Station, Murray Hill Station, and the central truck terminal and bulk mail processing plant, all in midtown Manhattan.

In 1967 alone, saved more than \$1.5 million in annual postal operating costs through the merger of small post offices with larger offices, increasing postal efficiency with no reduction in service.

Announced delivery, largely through use of airlift on a space available basis, of 75 per cent of first-class mail deposited before 5 P.M. the following day and 90 per cent within two days. In November, 1967, the Department airlifted 17.7 million ton miles of first-class mail. Airlift on a space available basis by January 1968 was approaching 100 per cent for all first class mail capable of being moved more rapidly by air.

MECHANIZATION AND MODERNIZATION

Announced accelerated mechanization and modernization program, at a cost of \$125 million in 1967 and 1968. In 1967, emphasis was placed on obtaining high-speed mail processing machines and replacing outmoded postal facilities and equipment. The Department's budget contained some \$300 million in modernization funds, including a 46 per cent increase in expenditures for plant and equipment and 40 per cent increase in funds for research and engineering.

Reorganized Office of Research and Engineering, with top level scientific and managerial executives from private industry providing the leadership.

Ordered for installation in post offices of 75 cities a \$33.5 million electronic source data complex, largest in the world. The first major segment of the complex, initially serving Rochester, Syracuse, Albany, and Buffalo in New York State, began operating August 1, 1967, at Paramus, N.J.

Established 124 Self-Service Postal Units in 102 cities to provide round-the-clock mail service to about 12 million customers.

Established an Office of Planning to chart improvements and programs for future needs.

ZIP CODE

Inaugurated first high-speed optical ZIP Code reading machine at Detroit, Michigan. Ordered 14 readers for installation in 8 post offices. Four cities now have these optical scanners.

Expanded use of ZIP Code in the destination address of all categories of domestic mail to more than 75 per cent. Annual savings in postal operating costs attributable to ZIP Code rose to \$53 million. Despite record volume and a fire that destroyed a key mail handling facility in New York at the height of the Christmas rush in 1967, ZIP Code paved the way to a smooth Christmas mail handling operation. The response by volume mailers to presort regulations advanced the use of ZIP Code on second- and third-class mail to almost 100 per cent. ZIP Coding of first-class mail climbed to over 60 per cent.

LABOR MANAGEMENT

Signed agreement with 7 exclusively-recognized national organizations, representing the 7 postal crafts, to use mediation to settle bargaining impasses in future national agreements. After an unprecedented use of mediation to resolve impasses arising out of three months of collective bargaining in late 1967 and early 1968, signed with heads of postal unions having exclusive recognition over 620,000 workers a National Agreement, to become effective March 19, 1968 and run for two years.

Created a special labor-management committee on safety, related to the letter carriers' craft—one of the first permanent committees of its type in the Federal Government.

RECRUITMENT

Announced a six-point, long-range recruiting program to fill postal positions and pro-

vide new talent, including 250 management interns over a five year period.

LEGISLATION

Congress authorized Bureau of Research and Engineering with an Assistant Postmaster General.

Requested and received legislation for independent authority to construct postal buildings.

Asked for and received from Congress restoration of parcel post delivery service six days a week on all routes at more than 4100 post offices and on some routes at an additional 721 offices as well as restoration of some window services six days a week.

Asked Congress to remove size and weight restrictions on parcel post; legislation passed unanimously and signed by President.

Announced end of postal savings, effective March 28, 1966.

Through a comprehensive upward adjustment of postal rates, effective January 7, 1968, will shift almost \$1 billion of the annual cost of running the postal service from the taxpayers to the users of the mails.

GENERAL

Through the first National Postal Forum, following a series of 15 Regional Forums in 1967, drew some 2,300 persons to Washington for two days of discussions on postal matters. The forums added to the continuing dialogue between business mailers and postal officials carried on through the 355 Mail Users Councils of the nations, with a membership of over 40,000 at the end of March, 1968.

Increased rates on money orders, insurance, registered and certified mail and C.O.D. to narrow cost-revenue gap.

Inaugurated the Postal Service Institute, the Department's first school in its 192-year history. The Institute will teach a wide variety of courses from maintenance and mechanization to social problems affecting the Department. The Institute began operations in January 1967 at its temporary headquarters in Bethesda, a four-story building with a total capacity of 250 resident students.

Proposed that the Post Office Department be removed from the President's Cabinet and converted into a nonprofit government corporation, rendering essential public service. The corporation would provide postal services authorized by the Congress, would be operated by a board of directors, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Congress, and managed by a professional executive appointed by the board. In addition, the proposed corporation would be given a clear mandate on the percentage of cost coverage for postal services, so that further revisions in rates, if necessary, would be on a fixed formula basis.

A report on this proposal is expected in April 1968 from the Commission on Postal Organization, appointed by President Johnson and headed by Frederick R. Kappel, former Chairman of the Board of A.T. & T.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article on a sometimes-overlooked aspect of Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien's tenure in office—his excellent relationship with the business community—appeared recently in the Newark, N.J., Evening News. The article describes Postmaster General O'Brien's very commendable efforts to operate the postal service in a more businesslike manner.

The article follows:

MAKE GOOD IN POST OFFICE

(By John Cunniff)

NEW YORK.—One political asset that Lawrence F. O'Brien can offer Sen. Robert F. Kennedy that he couldn't offer John F. Kennedy eight years earlier is a long and gen-

erally warm relationship with the national business community.

There is little question that business trust and support is desired and needed by presidential candidates. On this basis alone O'Brien is a valuable man to a political candidate, especially to one whose rapport with business could be improved.

As postmaster general, O'Brien impressed many businessmen with his quick grasp of the department's problems and his approach to them. A year or so after taking the job, Fortune magazine reported:

"As the postmaster general, he is demonstrating not only unusual energy but also a flair for modern management practices."

PUSHED AUTOMATION

He instituted a crash automation program, created an Office of Planning and elevated the Office of Research and Engineering into a prestigious role that attracted highly qualified engineers from private enterprise.

There is little question that the postmaster general genuinely sought businesslike methods. Seventeen months after his appointment, which must have been a personal triumph, he advocated doing away with his own job as outmoded.

"If we ran our telephone system in this way, the carrier pigeon business would still have a great future, and I would sell my shares of AT&T—if I had any."

Statements such as these brought worth to the hearts of businessmen who had felt Washington, by its nature, was incapable of understanding businessmen or appreciating their thoughts and inspirations.

O'Brien concluded that in the Post Office "there are so many existing and formidable barriers to efficient management that the ultimate solution to the problems of the postal service lies in taking the department out of its present context entirely."

He suggested that the Post Office be partially set free from congressional and executive interference by turning it into a nonprofit corporation operated by a board of directors and headed by a professional executive.

Under this system the department would determine its costs and raise or lower rates according to a formula rather than congressional whim.

It would pay its employees competitive wages. It would develop work incentives. It would seek college graduates and it would set up a postal academy to train executives in modern methods.

NEW MACHINES

It would gear its construction program to needs; financing would be via private capital. More emphasis would be placed on research and development. Modern machinery would relieve workers of the most tedious jobs.

Could businessmen be given any stronger demonstration of respect for the ways of business? O'Brien's statements and plans really were testimonials to the business way of doing things, and critical businessmen couldn't help but be impressed.

No wonder then that the business community responded to President Johnson's appeal for a commission to study the proposals, to make "the most searching and exhaustive review ever undertaken of the structure and organization of the Post Office Department."

HEADED BY KAPPEL

Frederick R. Kappel, former chairman of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., was named chairman, and among others were these prominent business figures:

George Baker, Harvard Business School dean; Fred Borch, General Electric president; Ralph Lazarus, Federated Department Stores president; J. Irwin Miller, Cummins Engine Co. chairman; W. Beverly Murphy, Campbell Soup Co. president, and Rudolph Peterson, president of the Bank of America.

This commission is expected to make its report soon. Although there is no evidence it

will simply blueprint O'Brien's proposals, the recommendations very likely will be an endorsement of the broad outlines.

Regardless of the report's contents, the fact that it was undertaken by such prominent businessmen certainly enhances O'Brien's reputation, and perhaps his influence also, in the business community.

It will be interesting to watch the effects of this added dimension.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join my colleagues in praising Larry O'Brien, one of the most esteemed and highly respected public servants I have had the privilege of knowing.

Larry O'Brien has been one of the finest Cabinet officers I have known during my congressional career. He has combined the skills of an able administrator with sound political judgment and an overriding loyalty to his Nation and his President. A man of his word, whose integrity and honesty are beyond reproach, Larry O'Brien exemplifies the sterling qualities of the model practitioner in the political profession. His excellent record of success is in direct proportion to his high personal qualities as a political man.

Larry O'Brien has, in my judgment, done more to advance the reputation of professional politician than any single individual I know. His expertise and skill are renowned; but above these abilities is his enduring capacity to function as a gentleman in any situation.

A man for all times may be the best way to describe Larry O'Brien. His impact on the American political scene extends beyond the bounds of his own personality. The salutary effects of his influence are felt in many quarters in many ways—all for the better.

I treasure my friendship with Larry O'Brien, and I look forward to continuing our warm relationship.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to join our esteemed colleagues in paying tribute to retiring Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien.

As only a few of his predecessors have, Larry O'Brien has left his stamp on the Post Office Department. Since the autumn of 1965 when he took over the job of Postmaster General from John Gronouski, now U.S. Ambassador to Poland, this outstanding American has sighted new goals for the Nation's postal service.

Perhaps his most farsighted effort has been an attempt to change the Post Office Department from a Cabinet-level agency to a quasi-official corporation. He has believed that the efficiency and effectiveness of our mail delivery system could be enhanced thereby.

It is characteristic of the high quality of public service rendered by Larry O'Brien that he should back an idea which, if carried out, would abolish his own position.

In many other ways as well Larry O'Brien deserves the admiration and commendations of us all. Although the ZIP code had been developed earlier, it was under Postmaster General O'Brien that it was fully implemented.

It was also during his tenure that the large majority of first-class mail moving between major population centers began

to be carried by air. This innovation has helped to speed communications over the Nation.

After almost a decade of serving wisely and well in two administrations, and under two Presidents, Larry O'Brien is leaving his Government to devote his energies and know-how to the political arena. Undoubtedly he will enjoy the political activity for which he is justly so famous.

I am hopeful that his endeavors in the private sector will be crowned with success. I am certain, too, that another day will come when Larry O'Brien will again turn his talents to the art of government administration.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help feeling a deep sense of personal loss as well as loss to the Nation over the news of Larry O'Brien's resignation as Postmaster General. His achievements are as significant as they are impressive, for he brought the Department a new spirit, a "new look," a higher morale than postal employees have enjoyed in many a year, and some of the most important strides forward in modernization of the Post Office Department in its entire history.

The thought-provoking ideas for postal management which Mr. O'Brien fostered, the dynamism which he encouraged, and the loyalty and dedication which he gave to this immensely complex and complicated job have enriched both the Department and this Nation. America needs and deserves his kind of leadership, and though I understand Mr. O'Brien's reasons for leaving the Federal Government, I am sorry to see America lose so distinguished and able a public servant.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to offer Larry O'Brien my sincere thanks for all the splendid, generous cooperation I received from him personally and from his staff on matters of importance to my constituents, and I certainly wish him all the very best of everything in his future plans in the earnest hope that we will continue our contacts and our friendship, which has been one of the highlights of my 22 years in Congress.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Larry O'Brien's resignation as Postmaster General closes out a brilliant chapter in the annals of the public service.

Larry O'Brien was named Postmaster General after working on the personal staff of two great Presidents. The historic legislative accomplishments of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations are due in considerable measure to his ability and amiability.

Very few men who were ever nominated to be Postmaster General were better known or better liked on Capitol Hill than Larry O'Brien. And no Postmaster General has done more to make our postal service the modern, efficient mail delivery system the American people want and have every right to expect.

In the past 2½ years he has proven to be one of the most imaginative and progressive Postmasters General in the long history of the postal service.

Tremendous strides have been made in closing the postal technology gap and

bringing the benefit of the Nation's great scientific and engineering talent to our mail delivery system.

All first-class mail going more than a short distance is now being delivered by air, as it should be in a nation as advanced and as large as ours.

Larry O'Brien leaves the Government with the thanks and best wishes of a grateful nation.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank one of the greatest Postmasters General for the outstanding job he has done as a public servant.

I first had the pleasure of seeing Larry O'Brien in action in 1960, when he was national director of the Kennedy-Johnson campaign and I was chairman of the Minnesota Citizens for Kennedy. At that time I knew that he, with his many talents, was destined for a position of responsibility in our national government. Hence I was not surprised when Larry O'Brien was appointed special assistant to the President for congressional relations. Thanks to Larry O'Brien relations between Congress and the White House were the best they had been in years. President Kennedy said:

I have never been served by a more competent, more efficient, or more likable or more effective employee than Larry O'Brien.

August of 1965 found our friend Larry in a different address, but he was just as helpful and cooperative as ever. He put that Post Office Department of ours into the best shape it has been in in years. He pushed the techniques of modern management, the use of automated equipment, the Post Office Institute, and the sending by air of all first-class mail going more than a short distance, to mention a few of the highlights.

Larry O'Brien has done much for his country and has been a true and able friend to us here in Congress. We all owe him a debt of gratitude and we hope that he will continue to serve his country in the years to come.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, Lawrence F. O'Brien has served his country as Postmaster General with effectiveness and efficiency, and he has established a record as head of his Department which will be difficult to surpass.

During his term of service there has been a great forward movement in the Post Office. There has been greater productivity through better utilization of employees. There has been modernization, mechanization, stepped-up research programs, expansion of data-processing systems, and construction of facilities.

All this has been done in the face of an ever-increasing volume of mail, and it has been done with a consistent effort to keep the cost to the American taxpayer down.

As ranking Republican member of the House Appropriations' Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee, I have had an opportunity to see the tremendous job he has done in this difficult position. Larry O'Brien has been the innovator of many new ideas, and he has given the employees of the Department the necessary motivation to get the job done.

In a recent letter to me, Larry recalled our work together during which time

many difficult and politically sensitive subjects have been considered.

He wrote:

During all of my many contacts with you and the Committee, I have never detected the slightest partisan element that might have diverted attention from what you considered to be in the best interests of the Post Office Department and the American people.

Throughout all of our years of work together Larry O'Brien has consistently proven that the best interests of his Department have been uppermost in his own mind, and I am deeply grateful to him for the recognition he has accorded me.

His clear, concise, and bold approach to the problems of the Department have given a new dimension to the Post Office, and this Department is doing a better job today than it has ever done before in its history.

Larry O'Brien has been a valued friend of mine for many years, and our personal and working relationship has been a close and a fruitful one. He deserves the congratulations of the House of Representatives for accepting the challenge of the Post Office, and for the vigorous steps he has taken from his very first day in office.

I firmly believe that if there was ever a man in this country who has had the ability to resolve the vexing problems confronting his Department—and any problems he may face in the future—that man is Larry O'Brien.

His record of service here in Washington is an illustrious one, and one of which he and all his family can be justly proud.

All of his years have been characterized by loyal and dedicated public service.

I am certain that I do not stand alone—either among the members of my committee or among my colleagues in the House—in offering Larry O'Brien our best wishes on a job well done.

The whole Nation owes him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute this afternoon to Larry O'Brien, whom I have been privileged to know not only as a Presidential adviser and a Cabinet officer, but above all as a friend.

In his 2½ years as Postmaster General, he has earned the appreciation of the entire country for his outstanding and unprecedented service.

When the announcement was made of his appointment, the response around the country was immediate and favorable. Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, who had worked with him in the legislative arena for the previous 5 years, applauded the appointment.

That unanimous wave of approval was a tribute to his organizational talents and his personal popularity, and his record in that position has confirmed that initial reaction of the Congress and the Nation.

Larry O'Brien's unusual managerial ability and executive talent were put to their strongest test, against the vast complex known as the U.S. Post Office Department. He has met that challenge, and in doing so has brought the Post

Office into the age of modern science and technology, the age of the computer.

Rejecting the "brush fire" approach of tackling each problem as it arises, he created an Office of Planning to anticipate the future postal service of the country on a long-range basis.

In addition, he reorganized and upgraded the Department's research, development, and engineering activities, and ordered a massive program to accelerate mechanization and modernization of the postal system.

Perhaps ultimately his most significant contribution will prove to be his courageous and imaginative proposal to remove the Post Office Department from the Cabinet and convert it to a public nonprofit corporation.

There is no more fitting tribute to his service, or no better acknowledgment of the respect and affection which we all hold for Larry O'Brien, than an editorial which appeared in today's Federal Times, the newspaper of his own employees.

I include excerpts from it at this point in the RECORD:

O'BRIEN RESIGNATION

The departure of Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien is a major loss both to the Post Office Department and to the nation. He is a man of vision and imagination—two qualities found all too rarely in government leaders.

Perhaps his greatest achievements as postmaster general will be measured in the manner in which he encouraged national interest and involvement in postal problems.

Through the National Postal Forum he solicited the advice and aid of business and industry leaders in meeting the national postal service needs. The event was so successful that it is being repeated. Through the Equal Employment Opportunity Conference he studied the problems of minority group members and worked to improve conditions.

He was active in labor-management programs and had a good working knowledge of the feelings and needs of the postal worker.

He never missed a national convention and it always was possible for union and management officials to get to him to discuss mutual problems.

Through his briefings to industry he got the business community to help improve mail service. He met with unusual success in encouraging pre-sorting and the use of ZIP codes.

Not all postal problems have been solved. It is going to take continued imagination and willingness to try new methods.

We wish Mr. O'Brien luck in his new ventures. We join the nation in thanking him for his past service.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD with reference to Larry O'Brien.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE REPORT ON "THE UNITED STATES AND EASTERN EUROPE"

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and

include the Republican coordinating committee task force report on "The United States and Eastern Europe."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Republican coordinating committee has adopted a report on "The United States and Eastern Europe" prepared by its task force on the conduct of foreign relations. Included among the members of the task force are our colleagues, Representatives JOHN ANDERSON, FRANCES B. BOLTON, PAUL FINDLEY, and PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the report:

THE UNITED STATES AND EASTERN EUROPE INTRODUCTION

Eastern Europe¹ is one of the most complex areas in the world. Its half-million square miles of territory are inhabited by some 130 million people who speak a variety of tongues, and embrace different cultural traditions and religious faiths.

The region has a tragic history. For centuries it has been a thoroughfare of conquest and the object of partition and subjugation. World War II brutally affected the countenance of Eastern Europe. The land was laid waste, millions of people were slaughtered and the region fell prey, in turn, to the invading armies of Nazi Germany and Communist Russia. Finally in 1945, at Yalta, a Democratic President tacitly agreed to Soviet domination of Eastern Europe.²

The new Communist empire, however, soon showed signs of strain. Three years after the war, Yugoslavia defied Moscow's authority. The next year Mao's Communists triumphed in China, creating for the Soviets an ally in some respects but clearly a rival in others. After Stalin's death the situation underwent other alterations. Moscow's control and authority were shaken throughout the Communist movement by the disorders in Eastern Germany in 1953; by Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin; by the revolt in Poland and the armed rebellion in Hungary in 1956; by the Soviet attempt to patch up relations with Yugoslavia, which appeared to give Russian sanction to Tito's "independent" course; and finally by the developing Sino-Soviet conflict.

All of these events unfroze a static situation. An atmosphere in which change might take place was created, and change which altered the unity of the Communist Bloc did

¹For the purposes of this paper "Eastern Europe" includes parts of East Central Europe—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania, and East Germany. The last two are special cases, and although it is obvious that a solution to the German question is a central issue in European policy considerations, the recommendations which follow are not intended to apply to Albania or the Soviet Zone of Germany.

²In testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 30, 1967, the noted historian and diplomat, George Kennan, commented on Russian expansion into Eastern and Central Europe: "We were slow to realize the dangers of this development, but once it had occurred, and it had occurred partly with our blessing, we had, I think, little choice but to accept it. The alternative was to pile another great war onto the one we had just finished fighting. I do not think anyone in the world wanted to see that happen. I regarded the sovietization of Eastern and Central Europe as part of the price that we paid for the ability to defeat Hitler in this war."

occur. Yet, change has not come quickly nor has it been all-embracing. Cautious experimentation by Eastern European governments has been conditioned by the dynamics of the Communist world and by the overpowering proximity of the Soviet Union.

All Communist governments in Eastern Europe came to power as a result of the Soviet military presence, and none has ever dared hold a free election. All Eastern European troops are fully integrated with and controlled by the Soviets under terms of the Warsaw Pact. Russian troop units are close at hand and the bitter lessons of Hungary are not lost on the population of Eastern Europe. Some countries have chafed against their appointed economic roles in COMECON (the Soviet response to the Western European Common Market which is used to perpetuate trading agreements favorable to the USSR), and have expressed interest in expanding trade with the West. Yet all Eastern European governments are increasing their total trade with the USSR, and after Soviet requirements are satisfied, there is little left with which to finance trade with the West. Diplomatically some governments have taken individual initiatives abroad, but all still vote according to the Soviet party line in the United Nations. To date, on all major questions since becoming the first Communist President of the General Assembly, Rumania's Foreign Minister Manescu has supported Soviet positions.

Moreover, change in Eastern Europe is characterized by advance and retrogression. Innovations are never made across a broad front all at once. For example, most of the gains in personal liberties arising from the Polish revolt in 1956 have now been lost, and recent student protests have so far only increased the regime's oppression. Although Rumania has shown signs of national independence in its foreign economic and diplomatic policies, the harshness of its internal police restrictions exceed all other Eastern European countries with the possible exception of East Germany. Developments in Czechoslovakia bear close watching, but whatever gains are made should be judged against the exceedingly long tenure which hard-line Stalinist elements have so far enjoyed in that country.

While favoring increased across-the-board communications, and while well aware of changes which have taken place, Republicans question whether these changes are profound and significant enough to justify the Democrats' current ardor for a detente with the Communists. To some extent, liberalization has become a means for altering the image Western peoples have of Communism, and thus for softening the Western Alliance. This is not an argument against trying to exploit opportunities created by liberalization, but it is an argument for viewing liberalization with due detachment and for probing with maximum perception the realities of change.

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration should realize that such opportunities as exist for the United States in Eastern Europe are not of a transient nature—they need not be seized at once or be forever lost. A deft sense of timing is an indispensable element in the successful conduct of foreign affairs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *The United States should never abandon as its basic goal the right to self-determination for the peoples of Eastern Europe.*

America's devotion to freedom and independence has been known to Eastern Europeans from the very beginning of our history as a nation when Polish patriots Kosciuszko and Pulaski came here to fight in our War of Independence. Our country, in turn, became the focal point for the independence movements of Poland's Paderewski, Hungary's Kossuth and Czechoslovakia's Masaryk. It was the U.S. Government which insisted upon the restoration of Poland after World

War I. The historic 1918 agreement that Czechs and Slovaks would unite to form a new nation was signed, not in Prague, but in Pittsburgh. Moreover, the millions of American citizens of Eastern European descent, who have so enriched our culture and national life, are living proof of the fact that "The American Dream" was known, not only to the elite, but also to the people of Eastern Europe.

We must continue to assure those people who are now forced to live in the dark shadow of Russian tyranny that America remains true to her great traditions. We should reiterate to these people our great concern that free elections have not been held since the Communists seized power. We should also keep clearly in mind that our sole purpose in dealing with the current Communist regimes is to encourage and promote their evolution. Without dropping their military guard the Soviets are now opportunistic, where once doctrinaire, in their approach to Western Europe. The obvious intention is to exploit differences among the NATO Allies. Our Government would do well to adopt a similar attitude toward restive Warsaw Pact members.

We must be imaginative and selective in our approach, for diversities among Eastern European countries make clear that no single or simple policy will succeed.

2. *The United States should seek to develop a coordinated Western policy toward Eastern Europe.*

The extent to which Western policy in Europe has become the victim of its own success is tragic. The fact that Communist policy has evolved toward a more indirect, long-term style of advancing its interests is mainly due to the Western Alliance's strategic superiority, high rate of economic growth and firmness in resisting military pressures. The current lack of cohesion among NATO Allies and the low priority attached to Europe by Democratic Administrations paradoxically promote the destruction of the very instrument which forced the Communists to change their strategy.

Moreover, the changes in Eastern Europe are, at least in part and perhaps principally, the result of Western containment. If NATO had not barred the way, the Soviets would have expanded westward, and victorious Communism need not have made any domestic concessions. The controlled industry of Western Europe would have been available to supply consumer goods for Eastern European demand.

The Democratic Administration's proclivity for trying to "build bridges" over the heads of our European Allies has encouraged by example the other NATO nations to undertake their own bilateral negotiations with the East. This practice has undermined European confidence in U.S. sincerity and leadership, and unwittingly served the fundamental Communist goal of disrupting the North Atlantic partnership.

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has failed to exploit for common good the obvious advantages of closer geographic, cultural and historic ties which Western Europe has in dealing with Eastern Europe. An underlying principle of our foreign policy since World War II has been to foster the development of a united Europe. Eastern Europe should, if possible, be part of such a united Europe. Since the last invasion by Asian conquerors many centuries ago, the basic orientation of those European countries now under Communist domination has been toward the West, not toward the East. Encouragement of all-European economic and political schemes would seem to provide the best, even though limited, chance for freeing Eastern Europe from economic serfdom and political fealty to the Soviet Union.

The United States is the first strong military power in modern history which has abandoned the old political tactic of "divide and rule" and has consciously attempted to build up another major power (Western Europe). This policy is wise and must be

continued. Thus, there is little rationale for the United States to become concerned if Western Europe takes the lead in developing relations with Eastern Europe. In fact, we might do much better to coordinate our policies with those of Western Europe, rather than being so persistent about trying to be foremost in all things at all times.

3. *The United States should not grant political concessions to the Communist regimes of Eastern Europe without a quid pro quo.*

During the Eisenhower Administration, the United States never conceded any advantage to the Communists. Initiatives taken by Democratic Administrations seem to indicate that this is no longer considered a worthy principle by which to guide our actions. A single example demonstrates the differences in approach. Following the Hungarian revolution, the Republican Administration expressed its indignation by maintaining only a charge d'affaires in Budapest and by supporting the United Nations' moral quarantine of the Soviet-imposed Hungarian regime. Now the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has decided to upgrade our mission in Budapest to Embassy level and has appointed the first American ambassador since the original Communist take-over after World War II. Moreover, the Democrats have acquiesced to the shelving of the long-standing United Nations' resolution to condemn Hungary for refusing to admit a UN investigating team. It may be argued that those events in Hungary which so outraged the world took place a long time ago, but the man the Soviets placed in power after the 1956 revolution still leads the government, and the United States still finds it necessary to grant Cardinal Mindszenty asylum in Budapest. And what did the United States receive in return for the political concessions which the Democrats granted Hungary? Nothing.

It has become fashionable in the West to talk about the liberal reforms in Eastern Europe and even to speculate about "the end of the Cold War." While no one would deny that changes have taken place, change is hardly sweeping through Communist capitals. Accordingly, the U.S. Government should pursue and disseminate the truth about conditions in Eastern Europe. We should keep in mind that justified criticism, even ridicule of police state methods, can be a stimulant for change in countries which are attempting reform and seeking acceptance in the world.

4. *The United States should make enlightened self-interest the foundation stone of its economic and trade policy toward Eastern Europe.*

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration's lack of clarity in explaining many of its policies has clouded the East-West trade issue as well. In July 1965, for example, the Department of State *Bulletin* quoted the Deputy Assistant Secretary for European Affairs as follows:

"... a rapid expansion of trade is not in the offing (because Eastern Europe lacks the means to pay for desired goods and has little to export of interest to Western buyers). Second, the expanding and mutually beneficial economic contacts will not be of overriding significance in altering the basic political relationships between the East and the West or in inducing changes in the political structure of the Communist states themselves."

Nine months later the same publication carried the text of the Administration's East-West Trade Relations Act, and ever since it has been full of statements on how important and far-reaching the effects of the Act are likely to be.

The Administration's credibility problem is further complicated by its tendency to talk of trade relations with the East in unrealistic terms. The "bridge building" theme of the Administration ascribes inflated polit-

ical values to a question which is more correctly viewed as economic by other nations of the world, particularly our NATO Allies. Former Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy has criticized the assumption that trade will promote or guarantee peace by pointing out that, "In no area were trading relations closer than in Europe, among Germany, the U.K. and France. Yet this did not prevent both world wars, nor did similar close trade relations between Japan and China keep the peace in Asia."

Republicans believe the Administration should clearly define the basic principles involved in East-West trade. At a minimum this would seem to require: a better definition of, and stricter controls over, the strategic goods list; credit limitations on trade in non-strategic goods so that trade does not in fact become "aid";³ and some firm distinctions about peace-time and war-time trade policies with Communist states, whether the wars are declared or undeclared. Having clearly established our trading strategy, the United States should seek a comprehensive agreement with those of our Allies who are great traders (NATO members and Japan) on the terms of trade to be offered to the East.

The United States should always be prepared to exploit the fact that Communist nations have real need for expanded East-West trade.⁴ Eastern Europe, in particular, should feel great urgency to expand its trade with the West, because most of its trade is currently conducted under most unfavorable terms with the Soviet Union. The oppressive nature of Soviet trading policies was dramatically demonstrated in 1965 by the suicide of the East German Planning Commission Chairman, Erich Apel, right after he was forced to sign a new five-year trade accord with the USSR.

5. *Tourism and cultural exchanges between the peoples of the United States and the peoples of Eastern Europe should be expanded if possible.*

The Republican Party reconfirms its belief that the cultural exchange program begun by President Eisenhower plays a very beneficial role in increasing mutual understanding and respect between the people of Eastern Europe and the United States. While aware that Eastern European governments still carefully screen those going abroad, with the result that all travelers are not necessarily bona fide visitors, we should nevertheless encourage people living under Communism to see what life is like in the West.

We must also inspire those other than the kept Communist intellectuals to assert their creativeness, because such creativeness is bound to deviate from established totalitar-

³ The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has also been fuzzy on deciding when trade actually amounts to aid. It has declared that trade with Rhodesia constitutes aid to an unrepresentative and authoritarian regime and so is to be prohibited. Yet no similar criteria about popular support for Communist regimes is applied when the Administration urges greater trade with Eastern Europe. Nor does the fact that Eastern European governments have little gold or hard currency and so must trade on credits from international institutions for which the United States provides most of the backing, seem to be taken into account by the Democratic Administration.

⁴ For example, the Democrats might have attempted to extract some sort of concession from the USSR in 1963 when it badly needed wheat from the U.S., partly in order to fulfill Soviet wheat sale contracts abroad. Had we failed to obtain concessions, we might better have offered our wheat directly to Russia's foreign customers, thus exposing the weakness of Communist agricultural practices.

ian norms. Far from being successful in creating the "New Soviet Man," which was the ideal of Communism in the 1930's, the Communist regimes in Eastern Europe have failed even to indoctrinate and motivate their young people ideologically. Thus, they are Communism's greatest weakness, and we must encourage the development of this intellectual "fifth column." On the other hand, although the culture and people of Eastern Europe have greatly enriched American life, our knowledge and understanding of Eastern Europe remain inadequate. We hope that universities and private groups or foundations will increase their research and publication in this field without official government inspiration.

With a growing number of Americans interested in visiting the Eastern European countries of their origin, the United States should seek to afford its citizens better protection against interference and possible harm by Communist officials. The abduction of Mr. Vladimir Kazan-Komarek from an international aircraft by Czech secret police and the mysterious death of Mr. Charles Jordan in Prague are recent examples which prove the Communists are not above intimidating and terrorizing our citizens. Now that the governments of Eastern Europe appear to be interested in improving relations with the United States, American officials should also pursue vigorously the outstanding financial and other legal claims which U.S. citizens have against the current Communist regimes. Moreover, the U.S. Government should officially deplore the growing anti-Semitism in Europe and throughout the Communist Bloc.

CONCLUSIONS

While we should encourage evolution of the Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, we must guard against becoming victims of our own wishful thinking on the opportunities this beneficial process creates. Changes which have so far taken place are primarily designed to achieve some degree of national independence from the domination of the Soviet Union. Personal freedom, which is quite different from national freedom, is still abridged by police controls internally, and we can still probably count on the Communists siding with each other if seriously challenged by the outside world.

The recommendations presented above assume that the American government and the American people will have the good sense and patience to support the people of Eastern Europe during an evolutionary process which will inevitably last a long time. Change in the Communist world is bound to proceed slowly for at least two reasons.

First, the repressive police state system inhibits innovators and sets strict limits on the growth of social and physical mobility. Both of these are critical factors in stimulating social change.

Second, there is a tendency in the West to consider the Communist states, particularly the USSR, "developed" countries because they have built up a strong, modern power base. The Communists try to foster this impression for propaganda purposes—to intimidate their enemies and to impress the underdeveloped world. However, in fact, they are only "semi-developed," because the government has applied modern technology only to those sectors of society which will enhance its power and control. As a result, society as a whole has not experienced the full impact of modern technology. Hence, the prerequisites for total change are lacking and modifications in the power structure are bound to come slowly.

Therefore, given the long-range problem we face and the limited leverage we have to apply, the impatience demonstrated by the Democratic Administration in abruptly trying to modify our Eastern European policy is ill-advised at this time. There is a natural American tendency to want to accomplish things quickly—to have a smash hit or a

rags-to-riches success story. Republicans feel obliged, however, to be extremely critical of the inconsistency involved in forcibly trying to prevent the expansion of Communism in Asia, while urgently seeking to "build bridges" into the Communist camp in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, a recent Gallup Poll has revealed that—

Crime and lawlessness are viewed by the public as the top domestic problem facing the Nation for the first time since the beginning of scientific polling in the mid-thirties.

Although there has recently been a decrease in crime in proportion to the population, the actual incidence of crime is on the increase.

With this increase of the total number of crimes, there is, obviously, a corresponding increase in the number of crime victims. And with the prospects for more crime and violence in the coming "long hot summer," a greater number of our citizens can realistically expect to be the victims of violent crimes.

Our Nation has a monumental task before it to make every effort to prevent crime and to effectively deal with the criminal element in our society. We have made and we are making great strides toward making our streets and homes safe from such lawlessness and crime, and we must make even greater efforts in this direction.

That, however, does not complete our responsibility relative to an act of violence. The innocent victim of a crime is too often left alone to suffer the burden and cost of an attack against his person. Such burdens could mount to undue crippling proportions for the average citizen.

An editorial in the New York Times, January 18, 1966, began:

Since the maintenance of law and order is a basic responsibility of the State, it follows logically that the innocent victim of violent crimes are entitled to compensation from the State.

Arthur J. Goldberg, while a Justice in the Supreme Court, endorsed the above proposition in a speech to the New York University School of Law, February 11, 1964, saying:

Many countries throughout the world, recognizing that crime is a community problem, have designed systems for government compensation of victims of crime. Serious consideration of this approach is long overdue here. The victim of a robbery or an assault has been denied the "protection" of the laws in a very real sense, and society should assume some responsibility for making him whole.

J. Edgar Hoover has said:

We are faced today with one of the most disturbing trends that I have witnessed in my years of law enforcement—an overzeal-

ous pity for the criminal and an equivalent disregard for his victim.

A British Government white paper that probed that country's rising crimes of violence declared:

The assumption that the claims of the victim are sufficiently satisfied if the offender is punished by society becomes less persuasive as society in its dealings with offenders increasingly emphasizes the reformative aspects of punishment. Indeed, in the public mind the interests of the offender may not infrequently seem to be placed before those of his victim.

This report in 1964 led to the enactment of Criminal Injuries Compensation Acts in Britain and New Zealand.

In this country, the States of California and New York have taken the lead in providing compensation to the victims of violent crimes in their States. Such a bill is now pending in Maryland. Others have been proposed in Oregon, Michigan, New Jersey, Illinois, and Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act which I also introduced in the 89th Congress. This act would provide the needed coverage for those victims of crime in the "special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States" as defined in section 7 of title 18 of the United States Code or within the District of Columbia. The increase in actual crimes and the prospects for riots and violence in the coming summer make this legislation more pressing in its need than ever before.

This legislation deserves our immediate attention, and I hope that Members of Congress will give serious attention to this proposal in the interest of meeting our responsibility to our fellow citizens who have the unhappy experience of falling innocent victim to such crimes of violence.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the analysis of the Gallup Poll focusing on the issue of crime and lawlessness. It follows:

THE GALLUP POLL: CRIME TOPS DOMESTIC ISSUE LIST

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., February 27.—Crime and lawlessness are viewed by the public as the top domestic problem facing the Nation for the first time since the beginning of scientific polling in the mid-thirties.

Next to Vietnam, this is the issue that almost certainly will have a powerful influence on the vote in November.

Three persons in every ten (31 percent) admit being afraid of going out alone at night in their neighborhood. Among women and residents of the largest cities the figure jumps to about four in ten.

Gallup Poll interviewers asked this question:

"What do you think is the most important problem facing this country today?"

The Vietnam war is cited most often (by 53 per cent of respondents) but in terms of domestic or national problems, the remainder of the responses divide as follows:

1. Crime and lawlessness (including riots, looting, juvenile delinquency)
2. Civil rights
3. High cost of living
4. Poverty
5. General unrest in nation

This question was asked next:

"What is the most important problem facing this community today?"

Crime and lawlessness are mentioned nearly twice as often as any other local problem.

The order is as follows:

1. Crime and lawlessness
2. Education: crowded schools, poor quality of education
3. Transportation, parking, traffic
4. High taxes
5. Unemployment

HARVEY BROOME, WILDERNESS SOCIETY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, several weeks have passed since the death of a great wilderness leader, a great conservation leader, the president of the Wilderness Society, Harvey Broome. When those who have made their mark upon our civic conscience leave our earthly ken, it is difficult to reconcile our feelings. Because it is those who have the spirit, the wisdom, and the charity of their wholesome beliefs who make the world inch along a little better, who give us hope for a better life.

Harvey Broome, born and raised in Knoxville, Tenn.—gentle, tough, scholarly, and earthy—was primed in the wilderness. A lawyer by profession, his great love was for the out of doors, and in particular the primitive out of doors. He wanted wildness for the sustenance of his own spirit, but he wanted it for others, too. He labored for the national wilderness preservation system, and in this he was fellow to Bob Marshall, Olaus Murie, Howard Zahniser—all great leaders for the saving of wilderness for our time, for all time. They have passed on, but their legacy falls to new leaders as their spirit lives on.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from an article about Harvey Broome which will appear in the winter 1967-68 number of "The Living Wilderness," the quarterly magazine of the Wilderness Society. This gives further details about Mr. Broome, his works, and his death:

HARVEY BROOME, JULY 15, 1902-MARCH 8, 1968

Harvey Broome, President of The Wilderness Society, and one of its founders, died at this home in Knoxville, Tennessee on March 8, 1968 of a heart attack. At the time, he was engaged in sawing a hollow log into segments to build a wren's house. His activity, despite three months of recuperation from an initial incident diagnosed as a coronary insufficiency, was typical. Above all else, apart from wilderness hiking, climbing, conservation activities, the practice of law, and a finely honed interest in judiciary practices, he loved the feel of wood. His camp chores and home relaxation inevitably turned to the splitting of logs, which he did with pride in his skill, with the quiet exultation of exercise and woodsmanship.

Harvey was indeed a woodsman and would perhaps want best to be remembered for his affinity with the outdoors. From the days of his early youth he grew to know the Great Smoky Mountains with great intimacy; he roamed them with a perceptive mind and free spirit, frequently accompanied by his wife,

Anne. He loved the misting rain, the weather-mark of the Smokies.

Harvey's gifts to The Wilderness Society, as its President, Council member, and executive committee chairman, were extraordinarily unlimited. He held himself available to the staff, without exercise of self-conscious authority, for consultation at all times. His advice and leadership were expressed in thoughtful terms. Steeped in knowledge about the wilderness of the Smokies, Harvey had traveled, by horse, foot, and canoe, this country's wildernesses from coast to coast. His correspondence and statements on the questions affecting these and other unspoiled areas, and on the influences and results of ill-considered practices upon land, water, and air, were succinct, provocative, and perceptive of the situations. With the late Howard Zahniser he contributed in high measure to the educational process which led to the establishment of the National Wilderness Preservation System. His persistence helped in averting the imminent threat of a second transmountain road across the wilderness of the Smokies.

Harvey has been described as a person of gentle manners and cultivated mind, but those who had cause could feel his steel and toughness. A man of tolerance and quiet patience, with the judiciousness of his law school training and personal predilection of justice, he would succumb for a fleeting moment to emphatic irritation and authoritative decision, but the tempest would be over almost as soon as it appeared.

Upon notice of Harvey's death, letters and telegrams were sent from far and wide—from Cabinet officers, from the Governor of Tennessee, members of Congress, heads of public natural resources agencies, citizen organizations, and individuals.

Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr., of Tennessee, paying tribute on the floor of the Senate, said of Harvey Broome that "His love of nature was the hallmark of his life, and it was so deep and so abiding that it won him national prominence. . . . America has lost a great citizen with the passing of Harvey Broome."

The Washington Post, in an editorial comment on his death, said that "Conservationists and naturalists all over the country owe him a debt of gratitude for his work as president of the National Wilderness Society. . . . he found relaxation and renewal of the inner spirit in the beauty of a forest, the gleam of a glacier, the song of a bird and the quiet whisper of the teeming wilderness. These are the values he helped to preserve for America."

Carson Brewer, writing in the Knoxville News-Sentinel, said "Though Harvey Broome's profession was law, he was far more widely known for his love of the wild outdoors and his efforts to preserve it. He had tramped through nearly every wilderness area in America, from Washington's Olympic Peninsula to the Great Smokies."

Harvey Broome was one of the nine men who completed the entire hike of 189 miles with his friend, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, from Cumberland, Maryland to Washington, D.C., in 1954, along the towpath of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. The purpose of the hike was to draw public attention to the natural and esthetic values which would be destroyed by the proposed construction of a roadway over this Federal property. Harvey's last climb was of Mt. Katahdin in Maine, five months before his death.

Harvey Broome, one of the eight organizers of The Wilderness Society in 1935, was a member of its governing Council from the beginning, became Vice President of the Society in 1948, and was President from 1957. He became a Trustee of the Robert Marshall Wilderness Fund in 1948. In 1959 he was appointed a member of the Advisory Council of the Outdoor Recreation Resources

Review Commission which was instrumental in stimulating the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the Land and Water Conservation Fund. He was President of the Smoky Mountains Hiking Club in 1932, a director of the Great Smoky Mountains Conservation Association from 1932 to 1935, and President of the East Tennessee Historical Society from 1945 to 1947. He was a member of the Board of Directors of the Student Conservation Association.

Harvey was a writer of considerable skill and insight. He contributed four chapters to *The French Broad-Holston Country, A History of Knox County*. His *Mountain Notebooks* and other writings appeared in *THE LIVING WILDERNESS* magazine, *National Parks* magazine, *Nature* magazine, and elsewhere. At the time of his death, arrangements were under way for the publication of his book, tentatively called *Out Under the Skies of the Great Smoky Mountains*. He kept a series of journals, described by his friend, Benton MacKaye, the founder of the Appalachian Trail, as "a marked contribution to nature findings—of fact underfoot and of thought overhead. He will live in his works, gathering momentum as their need unfolds."

A special gathering was held by close relatives and colleagues from The Wilderness Society at the Broome home on March 16, for remembrance. At the conclusion of reminiscences shared, Anne Broome read selections from Harvey's Journals. One of the selections, from an April 23, 1950 entry, read:

One has a different feeling in the Ramsay-Buck Fork country . . . There are no roads and no broad trails to serve one. There is the potent feeling of being on one's own. . . . What played havoc with the old trail was the blowdowns. Sometimes we scrambled across them in a direct lunge . . . sometimes we did not pick up the trail again for minutes at a time, in the labyrinth beyond. In such surroundings the primeval experience was powerful and undiluted.

At the Chapman Prong we picked up the half mile of majestic trail leading down the main stream to the confluence with Ramsay. In the deepness of twilight, we noted an elusive fragrance, and I was reminded of the fragrance which Thoreau noted several times over the course of years and which was to him so sweet and captivating that he was almost afraid to trace it to its source. He never did. We, however, followed ours to an oasis of phacelia which flanked the trail like snow—acres of it. And the heavy, tense, strenuous day came slowly, evenly, peacefully to an end, like the subsiding notes of a great symphony.

The group changed footwear, and drove to the Great Smoky Mountains. In a gentle rain, his friends climbed his favorite Greenbrier Trail. Anne remarked, "It is a day of superior quality. Harvey loved the rain." The rain gathered in intensity. As the group paused above a saddle in the trail, heads bowed against the weather, Ernest Griffith asked permission to add a thought to the expressions of the morning. He said:

"This is a day, first of all, of triumph. We celebrate a great life with its far-reaching accomplishments. Harvey's life was a life of triumph.

"In the second place, this is a day of gratitude. All of us here are grateful for the friendship he gave us, for the dedication of his life to this cause of the wilderness for the free. It is finally a day of dedication. We who remain must dedicate ourselves to this cause for which he gladly and greatly lived. We must resolve never to falter as he never faltered, and to take inspiration from his life to fight all the harder for the future of the wilderness . . . His spirit knows no boundaries and will be with us in the years ahead."

Harvey Broome was born July 15, 1902 in Knoxville, Tennessee, where he lived most of his life. He received his A.B. from the Univer-

sity of Tennessee in 1923, and his LL.B. from Harvard Law School in 1926. He entered into private law practice in that year, leaving it in 1930 to become law clerk to Judge Xen Hicks of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. In 1949 he returned to private practice, joining the Knoxville law firm of Kramer, Dye, McNabb and Greenwood, in the Oak Ridge office of the firm. He was general counsel for Management Services, Inc. at Oak Ridge.

He left private law practice once more, this time to become law clerk to Federal Judge Robert L. Taylor, in 1958. He explained his decision in a letter to a fellow-lawyer and member of The Wilderness Society's Council, thus: "I have been disturbed this past year at the relentless demands upon my time from the law practice, with a consequent inability to do the things I should be doing for The Wilderness Society. When the opportunity offered to return to my old interest—the judiciary—with the hope of more free time and much more control of my time, I decided to make the break."

In addition to The Wilderness Society, Broome was a member of the Alaska Conservation Association, Committee for the Preservation of Tule Elk, Defenders of Wildlife, Izaak Walton League of America, Montana Wilderness Association, Nature Conservancy, Sierra Club, Smoky Mountains Hiking Club, and an honorary member of the Tennessee Outdoor Writers Association.

Broome was the second son of George William Broome, born in Ludlow, Shropshire, England, who came to America with his parents in 1872, because of the controversy in England over free public schools. His mother's family was of early revolutionary stock.

Harvey Broome and Anna Waller Pursel were married in 1937 in the home of their mutual friend, Benton MacKaye, in Shirley Center, Massachusetts. The Broome home is at 5115 Mountain Crest Drive, on a ridge on the outskirts of Knoxville. Surviving relatives are William S. Broome, a brother, of Knoxville; Mrs. Robert M. Howes, a sister, of Cadiz, Kentucky; William S. Broome, Jr., a nephew, of Knoxville; Jonathan Broome Howes, a nephew, of Washington, D.C.; and Mrs. Nancy Broome Howes Robinson, a niece, of Atlanta, Georgia.

Anne Broome has designated The Wilderness Society, 729-15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005, for memorial gifts.

METROPOLITAN TRIAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, according to an article in the *Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat* of April 3 which I should like to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, Federal officials are considering restrictions on passenger cars to relieve congestion in metropolitan areas.

The idea is meritorious, but it is unnecessary for the Federal Government to seek means to force America's cities to accept the plan. If it were tried successfully in Washington, I am confident that other highly-populated communities would follow suit voluntarily without the compulsion of bureaucratic directive.

Washington has been in need of such an experiment since planning experts first sought to bulldoze into oblivion many park areas and revered landmarks

in deference to the continuing invasion of motor vehicles. If, in fact, the trial transportation proves satisfactory here, the Government might conceivably be able to dispense with construction of the costly subway program which, I assume, is now in the design state.

The traffic restrictions should be initiated on a sector-by-sector basis in the Washington area, thus giving the local bus company and suburban communities reasonable time to provide adequate public transit facilities and fringe parking lots. If the model traffic program works and precludes the growing need for more streets and parking lots, it is likely to receive nationwide acceptance without the threat of cutbacks in local highways, slum clearance, and other projects that normally receive Federal financial assistance.

I recommend that it be tried as soon as possible.

The article follows:

TRAFFIC THREATENING TO CHOKE REMAINING LIFE IN "SICK CITIES"

(By Jack Miller)

WASHINGTON.—Federal officials are saying privately they believe the nation's largest cities soon will have to place harsh restrictions on when and where people can drive.

Some officials suggest that entire sections of central cities will have to be placed off limits to motor vehicles. The reason: traffic congestion is threatening to choke the remaining life out of the already sick cities.

Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd put it this way in an interview:

"There isn't enough money in the United States (to build a street and highway system) to allow everybody to go everywhere they want to at any time of the day" in and around the big urban areas.

"POLITICALLY DANGEROUS"

Secretary Robert C. Weaver of the Department of Housing and Urban Development—HUD—points out, however, that to question the freedom of every American to drive anywhere he wants "is politically dangerous, since each car owner—and they are legion—has already decided the answer."

But many officials questioned in a series of interviews said they believe the issue will have to be faced. And soon.

For despite new efforts by government and industry, they say, the gloomy prognosis is this: urban traffic congestion will get even worse for at least the next several years.

TRYING TO REVERSE TREND

The government, which helped bring the country to its present heavy reliance on automobiles through the federal aid highway program, now is trying to reverse the trend. It has been pouring money into existing transit systems to improve and modernize them. And it has begun cranking up a research program to find new ways of moving people and goods around urban areas.

The aim is to develop and revive public transportation—mainly buses and trains—as a greater alternative to travel by car.

SUGGESTED CHANGES

Boyd, whose agency is the first ever to be given over-all responsibility for the transportation needs of the country, has suggested a number of changes the cities might make to relieve the horrors of congestion. One is that each city or urban area regulate that parking rates be set to go up rather than down for each additional hour.

Boyd stresses that his department has no intention of dictating solutions. For the next few years, he says, "We'll be trying to find out what kind of a system of transportation people want."

But much of the hope for relieving urban

congestion has come to rest with alternatives to the motorcar. Of those that are known, the most discussed is rail rapid transit: subway, elevated or ground level.

RAIL TRANSIT SAID OVERSOLD

Department of Transportation officials maintain that rail transit has been oversold, however. They point out that only about 15 of the nation's largest cities have the population density to make such a fixed-route system feasible.

But officials of HUD, which administers a new program of aid for urban mass transit, argue that more and better rail systems will go far to alleviate congestion where it is worst—in the largest cities.

Whatever the solutions, federal officials believe development of new and better means of transportation is critical to revival of the decaying cities. And they are deeply aware that they are in a race with the continuing flood of people to urban areas.

LOOK TO BUSES

Most promising of the here-and-now ideas is making better use of the ordinary bus. Researchers are trying to find ways of making the bus quieter, smoother, more attractive and more comfortable.

The biggest problem, officials say, is getting people to leave their cars for a bus.

In the one controlled new bus experiment to date, commuters in Peoria, Ill., took well to the idea. But they had to be lured aboard the buses with such superservice as front-door pickup, hot coffee served by attractive hostesses, monthly passes (\$6 to \$10) home billing, guaranteed seating, paid taxicab service in case of a bus breakdown.

The potential for traffic relief is tremendous. Buses traveling at 35 to 40 miles per hour could carry 25,000-30,000 people an hour in one lane, compared to 3,000 people in cars in the lane.

To develop new systems and revitalize old ones, HUD has spent a third of a billion dollars in the last three years.

So far, the federal effort has failed to halt the decline in urban transit passengers, from 19 billion in 1945 to less than 7 billion in 1966, even though the urban population has been soaring.

For the throbbing center of the problem—downtown—federal officials have their eyes on such systems as conveyor belts, minitrains and minibuses, monorails, overhead sidewalks and even moving sidewalks.

THE "PUEBLO"

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that information has diminished on the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, is it any wonder that some parents of the captive crewmen are beginning to wonder if the ship has been forgotten by the U.S. Government in the almost 3 months that have intervened since it was pirated by the North Korean Reds?

With so much attention focused upon Vietnam and disorders in the U.S. cities, North Korea might be given to believe that this Nation's interest in the *Pueblo* has been subordinated. Since Communists traditionally take advantage of whatever situation is made available to them, there is danger that North Korea would assume that now is a strategic

time to proceed with threats to deal harshly with the interned American servicemen.

There is additional danger that failure of the U.S. Government to free the prisoners has boosted North Korea's confidence in its ability to carry out the hostile action that has been indicated.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend that North Korea be put on notice that any mistreatment of personnel from the *Pueblo* will bring full and destructive retaliation. It should be unmistakably clear that any untoward act against a single American will result in merciless reprisal. My own inclination would be to inform the Communist command that Choson, its capital city, will be subjected to immediate and complete destruction if the least harm comes to those serving under the flag of our Nation.

We must go on record without delay in a commitment that abuse of our servicemen will be answered, not with discussions between diplomats nor with a half-war in which immunity is guaranteed to selected enemy sanctuaries, but with the full might of the Nation's military force.

One of the most realistic editorials on the *Pueblo* incident appeared in the *Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat* on March 28. I include it in the RECORD at this point:

THE "PUEBLO"

More than three months after it was captured by North Korean gunboats, the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and its crew remain in enemy hands.

So far as the American public knows, the fate of the ship and its crew remains as uncertain as it was in the hectic hours that followed immediately their capture by the Communist vessels.

A lot of people thought, back in January, that the United States ought to act relatively swiftly to gain the return of the *Pueblo* and the 83 men aboard. Many other people, of course, expressed the opinion that the United States should proceed exceedingly slow so as not to arouse anyone.

Those who favored a more-or-less decisive approach to getting the *Pueblo* back reasoned that the longer the ship and its crew were in Communist hands the greater the propaganda victory to be achieved by the Reds. They believed also that the humiliation to the United States in general and the U.S. Navy in particular would heighten if time were allowed to drag on. A matter of preservation of pride, as it were.

Some of the more cautious individuals were of the feeling that our national pride was not so important. Others indicated that the United States should apologize to North Korea. Go begging, as it were.

The Johnson administration decided to act somewhere between the two most apparent courses of action. Instead of being demanding and instead of being submissive, it was decided to press for release of the crew and the ship through diplomatic channels.

Well, since that day in January when the *Pueblo* fell to the gunboats, a lot of tides have risen and fallen at the harbor of Wonsan—where the *Pueblo* was towed by her captors.

And each day that has passed has deepened the propaganda loss that the United States has suffered to communism, and each day provides the Communists with added faith in the belief that this nation has become weakened.

This is not only an editorial opinion from landlocked Johnstown. It is backed by the American Security Council, which publishes reports on national and international developments which it believes affect the nation's security, and a number of foreign spokesmen.

According to a recent council report, the *Pueblo* incident "demonstrated our military weakness, Washington's seeming inability to cope with a crisis requiring immediate and effective response, and our government's utterly naive and pitiful assumption of Communist reasonableness."

The report notes that the day after the *Pueblo's* capture a leading Asian diplomat said:

"A nation as great and powerful as the United States, with worldwide responsibility for leading the resistance to Communist aggression and tyranny, may be able to afford the loss of a small naval craft and its crew. But it absolutely cannot afford to 'lose face.'"

A high-ranking British Commonwealth air officer who had served with American forces in the Korean War commented:

"The coolest thing you could have done was to issue an ultimatum that unless the *Pueblo*, and its crew, was released within X hours, the port of Wonsan . . . would be put out of commission."

Instead of something definite, though, a questionable diplomatic course was chosen, a course the Security Council report described as "highly polite and civilized about the whole nasty show."

A nasty show it is. Also a hazy one. Just as hazy as it was three months ago—unless Washington knows a lot more than it is telling the general public.

And so far as pride and saving face are concerned, it is not simply a case of American pride and American face. For, as the Asian diplomat said, the United States is the world's leader of the defense against militant communism. If we suffer a loss of face, the free world's defenses against communism are weakened.

For as the free world's image of resolve against Communist aggression is sapped, the Red desire for world conquest becomes stronger.

And for that reason—as well as for the welfare of the captured crewmen—the United States should do something concrete to recover the *Pueblo*. Soon.

PUBLIC OPINION POLL

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, for each of the past 6 years, I have conducted annual public opinion polls in the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina to obtain the views of my constituents on important issues facing the country and the Congress. This year, I extended my poll so that it would include the 16 counties which comprise the present Ninth Congressional District and the new 10th district which will become effective next January.

These surveys have been very useful, indeed, in helping me to assess public sentiment on matters of importance for the Nation. They have also helped establish lines of communication between the people and their representative in Washington. The poll this year was no exception to this process.

As of April 24, a total of 12,137 questionnaires had been returned to me. The present tabulation is based upon these expressions of opinion.

In this poll, there is no question of the strong feelings and serious concern with

which those participating in the poll regard our national problems. There is a striking consensus on most of the issues listed in the questionnaire which has not existed in similar surveys in past years.

With these categorical "yes" and "no" responses on the various questions have come thousands of comments in which North Carolinians have explained why they feel as they do. There is no way to present these remarks in statistical terms. Nevertheless, I shall try to discuss the main currents forthcoming from the poll along with the results of the poll itself.

By all odds, the war in Vietnam remains the most pressing problem facing the country today. Of those responding to the question, 74.9 percent do not support the President's conduct of the war. The direction of these sentiments are clear from the very large number of comments I have received. On another question, 71 percent expressed the belief that the United States should continue the bombing of North Vietnam. The prevailing view in the poll is critical of policies which have failed to use sufficient military power to bring this conflict to a successful conclusion. There is concern that a continued war of attrition will result in more serious losses and further large expenditures without justifiable purpose. During the course of the poll, test samples were taken of views received before and after the President's announcement of the bombing limitations and of contacts with North Vietnam about peace talks. These samples showed no appreciable difference in the views being expressed in the poll.

Strong opposition to increased trade with the Communist bloc was registered with considerable numbers of comments indicating that U.S. trade with nations supporting the North Vietnamese is

contributing to American casualties and the continuation of the war. Most of the responses in this vein drew a line calling for policies of increasing trade with the Communist bloc while the war in Vietnam continues morally indefensible.

Also related to war policies were responses to a question pertaining to the so-called credibility gap. A total of 86.6 percent of those responding declared their feeling that the American people are not receiving sufficient information about Federal policies and activities. Misleading and conflicting statements about the war as well as continuing optimistic official assessments have caused concern about the candor of Government spokesmen.

On the issue of trade policy, a growing worry about increasing textile imports was apparent in the poll. A total of 79.7 percent of the people participating favored congressional action to limit textile imports. In the absence of positive action, many of those commenting on this question believe that the American textile industry will be seriously affected during the next few years.

Constitutional changes abolishing the electoral college to permit the election of Presidents and Vice Presidents by direct popular vote was strongly favored. Similarly, 79.9 percent of those expressing their views favored abolition of political patronage in the selection of postmasters and rural mail carriers. Also rejected by an overwhelming 91.5 percent was the proposal that Federal funds should be used to finance election campaigns for presidential and senatorial candidates.

Aside from the Vietnam war, great work was apparent in the poll about the financial problems of the country. Deficit spending, inflation, increasing social welfare costs, and taxes received large numbers of comments insisting

upon financial reforms. Chief among these were demands for significant and long-term reductions in Federal spending. There was a widespread belief that Federal spending creates economic circumstances harmful to those in greatest need. Inflation, it was charged, has become a serious issue for the elderly, the poor, and the disabled person who must live on limited fixed incomes.

Almost 85 percent of those in the poll opposed increases in Federal income taxes while questions relating to Government spending in general fared badly. Increasing funds for the antipoverty program was opposed by 86.3 percent. Increased Federal spending to rebuild cities drew support for only 11.1 percent. Continuation and increasing the highway beautification program received the support of 27.7 percent. Among the most decisive responses in the poll came in the 89.7 percent opposition expressed to the Federal Government guaranteeing an annual income to every family.

At the time the questionnaire was prepared, no civil rights legislation was pending before the House of Representatives. However, the Federal "open housing" legislation enacted by the Senate drew several thousand special comments in the poll. Most of those discussing the issue expressed themselves strongly in opposition to what they regarded as a denial of Constitutional guarantees to dispose of private property without Federal interference.

Along with these comments were demands for vigorous steps to prevent outbreaks of civil disorders and riots. Calls were made for law enforcement and for more active cooperation among all levels of government to assure protection for life and property in civil disorders as well as punishment of arsonists and looters.

The detailed results of the poll are as follows:

	Yes	No	Undecided		Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you support the President's conduct of the war in Vietnam?	16.9	74.9	8.2	12. Are you in favor of the Federal Government guaranteeing an annual income to every family?	6.1	89.7	3.3
2. Should the United States continue the bombing of North Vietnam?	71.0	16.8	12.1	13. Do you support increased new Federal spending to rebuild cities?	11.1	82.0	6.9
3. Do you favor expanding trade with Communist countries?	14.3	78.6	7.1	14. Do you favor Federal action to change the dates of national holidays so that they will fall on Mondays each year?	24.0	70.0	5.9
4. Do you feel that the American people are receiving sufficient information about Federal policies and activities?	9.1	86.6	4.1	15. Do you favor legislation to continue and increase funds for the Federal highway beautification program?	27.7	64.6	7.7
5. Do you favor an increase of Federal income taxes?	10.8	84.8	4.4	16. Are you in favor of Federal authorization of pay-TV to operate in addition to the present system of free television programs?	15.0	74.9	10.1
6. Do you favor abolition of political patronage in selection of postmasters and rural mail carriers?	79.9	14.7	5.4	17. Would you favor Federal legislation providing criminal penalties for persons traveling to Cuba, North Vietnam, and other countries in violation of existing travel restrictions for American citizens?	79.1	15.3	5.6
7. Should the Constitution be amended to abolish the electoral college so that Presidents and Vice Presidents would be elected by direct popular vote?	79.0	13.6	7.3	18. Do you believe Federal funds should be used to finance election campaigns for presidential and senatorial candidates?	5.3	91.5	3.2
8. Should funds for the antipoverty program be increased?	8.4	83.6	5.3				
9. Do you favor congressional action to limit imports of textile products from foreign countries?	79.7	13.0	7.3				
10. Do you support tax incentives for private companies which will conduct job training programs for unemployed persons?	51.4	40.0	8.6				
11. Would you support a Federal law requiring the disclosure of annual interest rates on credit purchases?	79.0	12.8	8.2				

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER'S TIME-LY WARNING OF A SERIOUS THREAT TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, this morning Gov. Nelson Rockefeller testified before the House Committee on Pub-

lic Works which is holding several days of hearings on the serious question of water pollution control. His statement to the committee was timely and thought provoking, and I would like to share it with my colleagues by placing it in the RECORD.

Although the Governor raised a number of interesting points concerning certain provisions in H.R. 15907, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1968, I would like to comment on one in particular, because it raised the whole question of Federal-State relationship. Under the provisions of this bill, as it now reads,

interest from the bonds issued by local and State agencies to finance the construction of sewage treatment plants would be taxable; I repeat, taxable.

Such a step is, if my memory serves, without precedent, and in the words of Governor Rockefeller, this "is really an initial attempt to erode the traditional immunity from Federal taxation of the obligation of the States or their subdivisions."

With the tax-exempt bonds, communities and States are able to obtain funds at very low interest rates. Without this exemption, these rates would probably sky-

rocket. Governor Rockefeller went on to say:

To deny this exemption would seriously curtail the potential for Federal-state-local cooperation and would go far toward denying to the states and their localities the flexibility needed to meet the problems which confront them today . . .

At a time when the Nation requires the maximum possible cooperation among governments at all levels, and the maximum possible contribution by the private sector of the economy, curtailing the fiscal effectiveness of states and municipalities is an unwise course.

The committee should seriously consider the Governor's argument before adopting such a new and potentially dangerous precedent seriously jeopardizing the partnership which must exist between Federal, State, and local governments.

Mr. Speaker, for those Members who did not have the opportunity to hear the Governor speak this morning, I commend his testimony to them, as follows:

TESTIMONY BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER
BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC
WORKS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HAR-
BORS, APRIL 24, 1968, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am very grateful to Congressman Blatnik and the members of the House Public Works Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors for this opportunity to testify on H.R. 15907, the proposed "Water Quality Improvement Act of 1968."

This Subcommittee and the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution have been greatly responsible for the increased national awareness of the need to take prompt and comprehensive action to combat water pollution.

A year ago, when I appeared before this Subcommittee, I pointed out that the recommended appropriation for fiscal '68 was only 55 per cent of the authorization, and, in my opinion, woefully inadequate.

At that time I also recognized, however, the difficult fiscal situation faced by the Federal Government.

I observed that consideration might therefore be given to new mechanisms which would make it possible for the Federal Government to finance its share of constructing sewage treatment plants at a more rapid rate.

H.R. 15907 provides for such a mechanism. The bill provides that the Federal Government, in addition to continuing the basic grant program, can contract with state and local agencies for the Federal share of construction costs and pay over a period to the public bodies principal and interest payments amounting to the Federal share of the bonds sold by public agencies to finance sewage plant construction.

The bill also provides for a Federal guarantee of bonds covering the state or local share of the treatment facility.

In view of demands on Federal revenues at this time, a debt service approach is a creative way for the Federal Government to more quickly meet its commitment to clean waters before pollution overwhelms us.

The potential value of this legislation, however, is eroded by unnecessary and unwise provisions. These provisions could severely penalize a state such as New York, which has underway a program to solve the problem as quickly as possible.

I would like to focus on four major provisions:

1. The requirement that, under debt service contracts, the interest on the state and municipal bonds be subject to Federal taxation.

2. The requirement that there be "user charges" for a project to be eligible for the Federal debt service program.

3. The limitation under the debt service program of ten per cent per state.

4. The elimination of the pre-financing provision so that it would not apply to either the existing program or the new debt service mechanism.

1. TAXABLE STATUS OF STATE AND LOCAL BONDS
Under the proposed new debt service contract program, interest from the bonds issued by local or state agencies to finance the construction of sewage treatment plants would be taxable.

This is neither necessary nor desirable.

One of the arguments apparently advanced in favor of taxing municipal sewer facility bonds seems to relate to the present municipal bond market. Additional tax-exempt bonds, according to this argument, would worsen market conditions and further increase interest rates.

Problems which may exist in connection with the total municipal bond market, however, are much more closely related to the general state of the economy than to the question of the tax exemption for such bonds.

In this connection, I would like to submit for the record data from the United States Securities and Exchange Commission and the United States Department of Commerce on proceeds from new securities and average yields since 1960.

The data indicate that the volume of taxable bonds sold has increased at a more rapid rate than the sales of tax-exempt bonds, and that the interest on tax-exempt bonds has not increased as rapidly as the interest rate on corporate taxable bonds.

Thus, it would appear that eliminating the present tax exemption for clearly public purpose bonds—such as those for pollution abatement purposes—is not really reaching the basic factors affecting municipal bond market conditions.

Furthermore, the marketability of municipal bonds could be jeopardized if the tax exemption were removed.

Smaller communities in particular might well be seriously affected, as well as the bonds of such agencies as the New York Pure Waters Authority, created at my recommendation in 1967 to assist municipalities finance and construct sewage systems and treatment facilities.

Federal legislation removing the option for tax exempt bonds would threaten progress of the entire water pollution abatement program.

A second reason for this proposed elimination of tax exemption seems to stem from the contention that the amount of Federal tax revenue derived from the interest earned on taxable municipal bonds would be greater than the cost of the proposed subsidy to meet the difference between the interest rate for a tax-exempt and a taxable bond.

Yet, the possible advantage of a relatively minor improvement in Federal revenues is far outweighed by the far-reaching ramifications of this proposal to eliminate the tax exemption. Such action would seriously curtail the ability of state and local governments to meet their problems.

If this should occur, there might well be increased demands on the Federal Government to provide funds to meet problems which State and local governments are now working to solve, and thus negate the improvement in Federal revenues.

Most importantly, taxation of bonds for a clearly public purpose such as water treatment facility construction would impair the long-standing precedent of tax immunity which state and local bonds have traditionally enjoyed.

Since the apparent two reasons for this drastic change in public policy seem to have little merit, I am deeply concerned that the main reason for inclusion of this provision in a bill to further meet pollution abatement needs is really an initial attempt to erode the traditional immunity from Federal tax-

ation of the obligations of the states or their subdivisions.

A number of bills before Congress and a proposed Treasury Regulation would deny an income tax exemption to the interest on industrial development bonds.

I am aware that there have been abuses arising from the indiscriminate use of industrial development bonds. I support appropriate action to prevent these abuses.

I am strongly opposed, however, to any blanket denial of this exemption that could be applied indiscriminately to obligations that deeply affect the public interest.

To deny this exemption would seriously curtail the potential for Federal-state-local cooperation and would go far toward denying to the states and their localities the flexibility needed to meet the problems which confront them today.

For example, should such action be taken, and be upheld by the courts, it is quite likely that a major program established this year in New York for dealing with the agonizing problems of the core city areas could be jeopardized.

I refer to the creation of the Urban Development Corporation and the Urban Development and Research Corporation. Both contemplate using obligations which would assist the private sector of the economy to accomplish a vital public purpose—locating and expanding in core areas.

These proposals at the Federal level are also a threat to the continued tax exemption of obligations issued by states and their political subdivisions to provide other facilities which deeply affect the public interest.

I realize that neither of these problems is the direct concern of this Committee, but the proposed bill before you does raise the question of denying an interest exemption on bonds of the states or their political subdivisions—a question which has ramifications far beyond those of financing sewage treatment facilities.

The proposed denial of a tax exemption in H.R. 15907 would be for an obligation which has a clear and undeniable public purpose—the construction of sewage treatment facilities to eliminate water pollution. No less clear and undeniable, however, is our pressing and overdue obligation to eradicate—once and for all—the problems and city core areas.

At a time when the Nation requires the maximum possible cooperation among governments at all levels, and the maximum possible contribution by the private sector of the economy, curtailing the fiscal effectiveness of states and municipalities is an unwise course.

The purpose of the Federal water pollution control program is to eliminate pollution. I agree that new steps may be needed at this time to permit the Federal Government to meet its share of the cost more quickly.

A Federal program designed to achieve a specific functional purpose should not be used, however, as a vehicle to eliminate or test the possibility of eliminating the tax exemption for municipal and state bonds—a drastic change in public policy.

2. USER CHARGES

Under the proposed legislation, a municipality issuing bonds under a debt service contract must establish user charges sufficient to amortize construction costs, provide for operation and maintenance, and build a reserve for expansion and replacement.

While I am not opposed to the principle of user charges, this provision concerns me for several reasons.

It is inappropriate for the Federal Government to mandate the specific way in which a local government should meet its commitment to pay for and operate a sewage treatment plant.

User charges may not always be the most equitable or wisest way to support such projects. In some cases a combination of a

user charge, assessments, and the property tax is most equitable and efficient.

Local governments need flexibility in fiscal matters more than at any other time in history. I believe it unwise for Congress to restrict the financial flexibility of local government in this way.

There is also a serious question whether the full cost of operating and replacing sewage treatment plants as well as their initial construction, as called for in the user charge proposal, should be borne directly and entirely by just the municipality concerned, regardless of the revenue source.

Those who may benefit most from treatment facilities are not necessarily in the immediate community but are perhaps downstream, even in another state.

The proposed bill seems to provide that the user charge also be sufficient to cover replacement and expansion needs of the plant. While the bill is not clear on this point, the concept must be treated carefully.

New York law, for example, prohibits the use of reserve funds for expansion when the original system is paid for by benefit assessment.

This theory is sound—those paying for present benefits should not also have to pay for the benefits of future generations.

User charges sufficient to cover amortization, operation and replacement would be substantial. They could be a major deterrent to a community seeking to enter into a contract with the Federal Government, even though the community had other fiscal resources adequate to meet its commitments.

The bill provides that the Secretary may waive the requirement for user charges "if such charges would not serve to improve the financial capability and efficiency of the waste treatment system." This provision is not clear.

Even with clarification, however, it seems to me that basic concepts are being seriously jeopardized.

The user charge provisions as a whole should be eliminated and replaced by a general provision requiring the Secretary to obtain necessary assurance that the locality will meet its financial commitments.

3. TEN PERCENT MAXIMUM DEBT SERVICE CONTRACTS PER STATE

H.R. 15907 provides that contracts in any one state in any one year shall not exceed 10 per cent of the total amount available for contracts in that fiscal year.

I am opposed to any ceiling which is arbitrary and not related to needs. Ceilings often tend to discriminate against those states in which needs are greatest.

While the bill does provide that any contract funds not obligated within a particular year shall be available in the next fiscal year without regard to the 10 per cent state limitation, this could delay the start of approved projects.

The 10 per cent limitation also raises a very practical question in the case of large sewage treatment plants.

In New York City, one project alone is estimated to cost \$220 million. Under the 10 per cent limitation, New York could receive in fiscal 1969 a contract allotment of \$47.5 million.

Under the grant program, New York could receive approximately \$17 million. Thus, the total available to the State would be \$64.5 million, but the Federal share of this one plant is \$121 million.

The 10 per cent per state ceiling should be removed. If there are to be limitations, however, they should be related to need and speed.

4. PREFINANCING

In 1965 and again in 1966, I called for Federal encouragement of state and local action by authorizing Federal reimbursement from future allocations if states and localities prefinance the Federal share of the cost of constructing municipal sewage treatment plants.

H.R. 15907, however, eliminates this pro-

vision. It would not provide for reimbursement for projects initiated after July 1, 1968.

When Congress approved the pre-financing provision in 1966, it recognized that states and localities should not be penalized for demonstrating initiative. The proposed legislation would penalize the State of New York for adopting a Pure Waters program to quickly eliminate water pollution.

New York anticipates approval of \$534 million worth of projects during the coming Federal fiscal year. We expect these projects to be eligible for the full 55 per cent Federal share established by law.

A 55 per cent share of New York State's \$534 million program for Federal fiscal 1969 would be \$294 million—42 per cent of the total nationwide authorization of \$700 million. Obviously, New York State could not realistically expect to receive 42 per cent of the total authorization.

In fiscal 1970, however, when the Federal authorization goes to \$1 billion, New York State's construction program will decrease to \$375 million.

In 1971, with a Federal authorization of \$1.250 billion, New York's program needs are estimated to be \$325 million. In 1972, the last phase of New York's six-year program, needs will further decrease to approximately \$140 million.

In other words, because the State of New York has acted to meet its needs now, its construction requirements are peaking in Federal fiscal 1969, well before the nationwide peak provided for by the authorizations enacted by Congress.

Retention of the reimbursement provision will advance the national goal of abating pollution as quickly as possible and at the lowest possible cost.

Construction costs are rising rapidly. It is prudent fiscal management to meet the needs as quickly as possible.

It is consistent with Congressional intent to have the Federal Government share in the cost of constructing approved sewage treatment works.

It is essential that a pre-financing provision be included in this pending legislation. Such a provision should apply to all projects approved by the Secretary of the Interior as eligible for Federal assistance, whether or not such assistance is available at the time of approval.

These then are four major objections to H.R. 15907. It is absolutely essential that they be corrected if the effort to eliminate water pollution is to progress as rapidly as possible.

Efforts of states such as New York would be seriously jeopardized by provisions in this proposed bill.

NEW YORK STATE'S PURE WATERS PROGRAM

The State of New York is achieving dramatic steps toward its goal of cleaning up all waters by 1972. The people's overwhelming 4 to 1 mandate approving the Pure Waters Bond Issue in 1965 is being vigorously implemented.

As of April 1, we have in process 273 local sewage treatment works projects with a total cost of over \$1 billion.

An important reason for this rapid progress is that since 1962 New York has had a program of 100 per cent State aid for locally initiated comprehensive sewage planning studies on an area-wide basis.

In addition, the State is providing one-third of the cost of operating and maintaining sewage treatment plants.

To spur industry to construct treatment facilities, we grant real property tax exemptions and a one-year depreciation write-off.

We have streamlined our enforcement machinery—98 per cent of all pollution is under abatement schedules. Either through voluntary agreements or legally enforceable orders, construction timetables establish dates for operation of required treatment works by our deadline in 1972.

We have established model standards of

water quality. The Secretary of the Interior has approved standards for each of our river basins. In fact, New York was among the first states to have its standards approved.

We are installing a State-wide network of automated water-quality monitors to give a record of the water quality four times every hour.

When pollution exceeds the standard, immediate action can be taken. Two pilot monitors have been in operation for over a year. On March 30, contracts were let for installation of ten additional monitors.

We have established the New York State Pure Waters Authority to assist municipalities in establishing sewage treatment and solid waste disposal facilities. It can help finance, mobilize scarce technical skills, and effectuate area-wide service systems.

And finally, we are engaged in a program of water pollution control research amounting to more than \$500,000 annually.

In short, New York is carrying out the most active, comprehensive water pollution control program in the Nation.

Such initiative and effort and that of other states must be stimulated, not threatened or undermined.

Unwise changes in Federal policy could threaten the momentum and capability of state and local governments, in cooperation with the Federal Government, to carry out an effective program to end water pollution.

ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1915, approximately 2 million Armenians living in Turkey were put to death either by outright massacres or by the depredations visited upon them as they were driven from their homes to the deserts of Syria.

This act of genocide essentially eliminated all the Armenians in Turkey who had been living on their ancestral lands in their ancient homeland. The world took note of these happenings when they occurred but because a world war was occupying the energies of the enlightened nations, retribution for the Armenians was postponed until after the war.

Our own President Woodrow Wilson drew the boundaries of a renaissance independent Armenia at the behest of the Allied Powers. However, when the new country thus created, suffering the pangs of rebirth amidst famine and bankruptcy, was attacked from the west by Turkey and the east by Russia, the world looked the other way. Soon the Armenian massacres were forgotten. Hitler, when admonished by his aides, that killing the Jews would bring the wrath of the world upon Germany, replied, "Who remembers the Armenian genocide?"

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 1151, introduced by my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], calling for the designation of April 24 as Armenian Martyrs' Day by Presidential proclamation each year be favorably reported to the House by the distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee.

April 24 is the day chosen by the Ar-

menian Nation to commemorate the start of their trek to Golgotha in the dark year of 1915.

OIL IMPORTS AND OUR DOLLAR DRAIN

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the President of the United States, in a special statement, declared:

I want to discuss with the American people a subject of vital concern to the economic health and well-being of this Nation and the free world.

It is our international balance-of-payments position.

The strength of our dollar depends on the strength of that position.

The soundness of the free world monetary system, which rests largely on the dollar, also depends on the strength of that position.

To the average citizen, the balance of payments, and the strength of the dollar and of the international monetary system, are meaningless phrases. They seem to have little relevance to our daily lives. Yet their consequences touch us all—consumer and captain of industry, worker, farmer, and financier.

Since then, Congress and the executive department have been pursuing many avenues in an attempt to find answers to this most vexing question—How to cure this chronic payments' deficit. As the President pointed out, when the outflow of dollars from these shores is greater than our earnings and credits from foreign nations, a deficit results in our international accounts. For 17 out of the last 18 years, we have had such deficits. The result—the strength of the U.S. dollar is in dire circumstances abroad as well as here at home. The time for more talk, more vacillation, more waiting has come and gone. The time for immediate action is now, unless we wish to invite total chaos in our monetary system.

EXCESSIVE OIL IMPORTS CAUSE DOLLAR DRAIN

Mr. Speaker, there is one area where immediate and effective action could be taken which would add greatly to the efforts to solve our balance-of-payments deficit. I refer to the excessive amount of oil imports which continues to grow and grow. This Nation has an established program to limit petroleum imports. The mandatory oil import program has been functioning since March 1959. Yet, even with the program which has done much to hold down imports, petroleum imports are this Nation's largest trade deficit commodity.

Our deficit in petroleum trade is a very large factor in the overall deficit in the U.S. international balance of payments. The total U.S. balance-of-payments deficit averaged \$2.83 billion per year during the 5-year period 1960 to 1964, inclusive. The deficit in petroleum trade amounted to \$1.27 billion yearly, equivalent to 45 percent of the total deficit in our balance of payments. In 1965, and again in 1966, the petroleum trade deficit was even greater than the total deficit in the U.S. balance of payments.

The facts show that in 1965 the total U.S. deficit in international payments amounted to \$1.335 billion. The deficit in petroleum trade was \$1.634 billion.

This growing trade deficit attributable to increasing petroleum imports and declining petroleum exports further aggravates two distinct national problems: First, it contributes further to our imbalance in international trade; and second, increasing imports of crude petroleum and its products are having an ever-growing adverse influence on this Nation's 10-year decline in the search for and development of new petroleum reserves.

DOMESTIC INDUSTRY SUFFERING

During the past 10 years, the drilling of exploratory wells for new sources of supply has decreased by 35 percent. As a direct result of this serious decline, the Nation's crude-oil-reserve position is suffering.

The recently announced additions to oil reserves show that the crude oil life index dropped from 11 years at the end of 1966 to 10.3 years at the end of 1967. Including 1967, yearend crude reserves have declined in 4 of the past 8 years.

ACTION NEEDED NOW

Mr. Speaker, as I stated in the beginning, these matters need attention now. The President has the authority to act and to act decisively to cut oil imports. A substantial reduction in the level of oil imports would not only help solve our balance-of-payments problem, but as equally important it would reverse the adverse trends in drilling for oil and thus contribute to the strengthening of our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the President will act to bring this about.

AN OUTSTANDING KANSAS LADY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, amidst an era commonly characterized by a philosophy of "Let the other fellow do it," it is refreshing to know men and women with a "can do" attitude.

One such person is Mrs. Olive White Garvey, of Wichita, Kans., a gracious lady, who seeks no headlines or applause for her devotion to others and her meaningful contributions to her community and State. Her industry and generosity are an inspiration to all of us who are acquainted with her.

Marie MacDonald, women's staff writer for the Wichita Eagle-Beacon, has well summarized Mrs. Garvey's spirit and accomplishments in a recent article. I submit the article for inclusion in the RECORD:

HER VIEW OF WICHITA FITTING

(By Marie MacDonald)

From the 10th floor she looks out over the city . . .

From her private office in the Garvey Building she looks north across the rooftops to the Colorado Derby Bldg. and the County Courthouse; across the river to the west and

southwest she sees jets streaking across the sky to and from the Municipal Airport.

From her apartment in Parklane Towers, she walks out on a balcony at dusk to see the lights of the shopping centers and factories.

It is fitting that Olive White Garvey should be able to look out over the area that once was prairie . . . for in all directions there are buildings, oil wells, grain elevators and wheat fields that are a part of the legacy from her husband, Ray H. Garvey.

But she sees other things too . . . the beauty of the plains, the glory of the sunset . . . the fullness of the moon.

"I have no desire to live any place except in Wichita," Mrs. Garvey points out. "We have the best weather . . . the best food . . . the best people."

"We (Ray and I) used to have a summer home in Evergreen, Colo. It was lovely there but I didn't like the sameness of it . . . nothing but evergreen trees and no place to look but up.

"In Kansas you have variety . . . the color of the plains . . . I like to travel and see new places, but I'm always glad to get home. I'm most comfortable here."

Mrs. Garvey, who is chairman of the new Chamber of Commerce committee on community livability, says that one of the first accomplishments of that group will be to prepare a mailing piece that will inform the public of what Wichita has to offer.

"I think people are going to be very surprised to know what is available here in Wichita. Most people don't realize how much we have to offer in Kansas."

Much has been written about this quiet, well-mannered woman. She has served on almost every important civic and philanthropic board as well as boards and committees in cultural and educational categories. She has received numerous citations and honors.

"Far more than I deserve," she will tell you.

Much has been said about her business acumen. She took over the reins of the Garvey holdings after her husband was killed in an automobile accident in 1959. She is president of Garvey Enterprises.

Asked if her husband approved of working women she replies, "Well, he never talked about it. But he felt that I should understand the business. In fact, I had to make out my own income tax, which I didn't appreciate . . . at the time."

While her time is her own, Mrs. Garvey usually puts in from five to six hours a day in the office. Much more time is spent in board meetings and at the meetings of numerous committees on which she still serves.

At a recent state convention of the Kansas Press Women's Association, Mrs. Garvey was honored as a KFPW Patron member. In her acceptance speech she spoke wistfully of her own writing aspirations.

"I've always scribbled. I think I wrote my first story at the age of 7. I'm very much interested in the theater and I think . . . if, I could . . . I would specialize in this field.

"But I'm like the woman in my favorite cartoon . . . just when I think I'm going to have the time I get put on another committee . . . I think that sums me up pretty well," she says.

Many people marvel at her ability to get things done. She believes it is because she concentrates on the "work at hand."

"I try to take care of one thing at a time. It's when people get involved in too many things at once that they get confused. I'm always clearing the decks for the next order of business."

One way in which she manages is to keep her home in such condition that it can be well cared for with a minimum of time.

"That is one reason I moved from my home (the Garveys lived for many years in a spacious Eastborough home) to Parklane Towers . . . my home there is easy to keep clean."

While she doesn't dislike cooking, Mrs. Garvey admits she eats out most of the time.

Although her husband was a collector (he had a magnificent collection of cameo pins and rings) his wife only collects small things of no intrinsic value, "something that won't take much space, to remind me of places I've been."

She has been many places in her travels—to South and Central America; Scandinavia; three times to Western Europe, twice to Spain, Portugal, Italy and the Orient.

She travels on the spur of the moment, usually with a group and never alone.

Her writing ability comes in handy on her trips . . . also her enjoyment in sharing good things with others. She keeps a detailed account of her travels and puts them into interesting travel-letters to be shared with her family, friends, and "the office" back home.

"The most interesting thing to me about traveling is the people I meet. They are what I remember," she says. Perhaps her interest in others is the key to her youthful appearance.

She looks much younger than her 70-some years. Her calm, unruffled manner is completely lacking in the mannerisms usually associated with a person that age.

She wears beautifully-cut classic suits and dresses, short enough to be in style and long enough to be ladylike. Although she once favored soft blues, she now admits she likes the more vibrant colors.

She avoids discussing her personal life, but in talking about today's youth she speaks a bit nostalgically about the days when she and her sister "picked violets in the woods" and when her children were growing up in the small community of Colby, Kans.

"You know one of the things I feel has been lost to children is the opportunity to grow up surrounded by the things of nature . . . trees . . . woods . . . animals. Maybe that is why so many young people love stuffed animals."

She laments the fact that most mothers have to serve as chauffeurs for their children. "It's just not safe for children to walk any more . . . the traffic . . . and other dangers."

The role of women in the world concerns her a bit. "I think women are just as smart as men . . . they have equal ability . . . but in a different way. When a woman becomes too dominant in the home she deprives the man of leadership and I don't think this is to the best interest of the family . . . or the woman."

Mrs. Garvey had fulfilled her role as wife and mother before entering the business world.

She was born in Arkansas City and moved with her family to Topeka at the age of nine. In 1910 she entered Washburn University.

It was there she met Ray Garvey, a young law student who fell so in love with her pretty smile that he made provision in his will for the Olive White Garvey Scholarships to be awarded to Washburn University girls in their junior year (the year Ray and Olive became engaged) with the prettiest smiles.

They were married in 1916 and moved to Colby, Kan., where he was elected county attorney. Their children, Ruth (Mrs. H. Bernard Fink), Olivia (Mrs. George A. Lincoln), Willard and James were born there.

During those years of marriage she did most of her housework, sewed and took an active interest in the Colby Civic Improvement Club. After the family moved to Wichita her family and civic responsibilities grew.

At the time of her husband's death they were only seven years away from their 50th anniversary.

Now he is gone and, of the children, only Willard Garvey still resides in Wichita. Al-

though she has 21 grandchildren and two great-grandchildren, many of those, too, are scattered.

Although she doesn't dwell on her widowhood, one senses her deep feeling of loss. On her desk is a picture of her late husband, one of many to be seen in the office and in her home. And on the shelves of her office cabinet are stacks of clippings, papers and a large note book filled with typed pages. These are part of the material being compiled into a book.

Although she could afford a nationally known writer with whom to collaborate on this important work, Mrs. Garvey turned to a local writer.

After all it takes a Kansan to write the story of the man responsible for the Garvey Building, Parklane Towers and so many other things that are a part of her life . . . her husband, Ray H. Garvey.

TIME TO ACT AGAINST FDA STALLING

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on July 27, 1967, I introduced H.R. 11837, a bill to curb the Food and Drug Administration's power to regulate food supplements, including vitamins. This legislation has bipartisan support as evidenced by the fact that 64 Members of the House of Representatives from 25 States have either cosponsored or introduced identical bills because they feel strongly that the views of their constituents are important enough to take action to curb FDA's power in this particular area.

The move springs from an FDA food supplement order, published in the Federal Register on June 18, 1966, to which users of food supplements throughout the Nation strongly object. This proposed regulation would have required a label which read:

Vitamins and minerals are supplied in abundant amounts by the foods we eat. The Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council recommends that dietary needs be satisfied by foods. Except for persons with special medical needs, there is no scientific basis for recommending routine use of dietary supplements.

This proposed directive is greatly in variance with the most recent surveys of the Department of Agriculture which indicate that 40 percent of our boys and 60 percent of our girls have a very poor diet, one which will not permit maximum health, strength, and full energy. The Government report indicates that the American diet, nothing to brag of 10 years ago, has worsened by 15 to 20 percent since that time. The Department of Agriculture books, among other reputable books, inform us that if all of the amino acids are not present it is not possible for the body to use the one or two which are present. Vitamin shortages are very common.

Despite the strong congressional concern, as shown by the 64 bills before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce, there is no departmental report forthcoming from the Department of Health,

Education, and Labor although it was requested on August 1, 1967, by the committee's chairman, Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS. On three occasions I wrote to the Assistant Secretary for Legislation of HEW who replied twice with evasive answers about when the report would be submitted to the committee. He did not respond to my March 12 letter and following is the letter I wrote to him on April 23, 1968:

Mr. RALPH K. HUITT,
Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUITT: This is my fourth letter to the Department about a report on my bill, H.R. 11837, requested by Chairman Harley O. Staggers, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, on August 1, 1967.

In response to my letters of October 17, 1967 and January 4, 1968, you first told me that this bill "involves substantial staff work" and "the many demands made upon the time of our very limited legislation staff in this office and in the Office of the General Counsel" were in part attributable to the delay in furnishing the report. However, in your January 10th letter you said you expected to have the report ready soon for clearance within the Executive Branch.

I wrote to you again on March 12th because the report was not forthcoming. You have not replied unless you consider the call at my office by your Special Assistant, Mr. Jerome T. Murphy, was sufficient response to my inquiry. In explaining the delay in the report, Mr. Murphy did not give the reasons set forth in your letters but said that no report would be forthcoming from the Department until the Food and Drug Administration holds public hearings on food supplement regulations. These hearings will start on May 21st. How long do you predict they will continue? Is it true that, despite the introduction of 64 bills by Members of Congress who want to curb the power of the FDA in the area of food supplements and vitamins, the Department is withholding the requested report on H.R. 11837 until completion of the FDA public hearings?

I shall appreciate an immediate, written response to my questions.

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

At this point, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the following column by James J. Kilpatrick which appeared in the April 18, 1968, issue of the Evening Star:

DR. GODDARD'S WAR AN EFFRONTERY

Dr. James L. Goddard, commissioner of food and drugs, is back in the saddle again. He has announced a new assault upon an old target: vitamin supplements. He wants to impose his own judgment (and the judgment of his resident experts) upon a free society. Out of his way! Hearings begin on May 21.

This long-delayed war upon vitamins will be Superdoc's second major campaign of the year. Back in January, he began assailing the "efficacy" of certain old-line products. He pronounced a whole group of drugs, known as the bioflavonoids, to be ineffective for man in any condition. Whereupon he set in motion the legal machinery to get them off the market.

In making his declaration as to the bioflavonoids, Dr. Goddard chose to ignore the testimony of reputable physicians, writing in reputable medical journals, that these citrus derivatives are indeed effective for some men in some conditions. Consensus is the magic words, these days, and the consensus of Superdoc's advisory committee was that these particular drugs were no damn good. He pro-

poses to give their opinion the force and effect of law.

He would exercise the same olympian power in the pending case. Dr. Goddard proposes to require the manufacturer of dietary supplements to print the following two-sentence statement upon every label:

"Vitamins and minerals are supplied in abundant amounts by commonly available foods. Except for persons with special medical needs, there is no scientific basis for recommending routine use of dietary supplements."

Consider, if you please, the sheer effrontery of this remarkable rescript. The Food and Drug Administration does not contend that the familiar vitamin and mineral supplements, the one-a-day tablets, are in any way dangerous for human consumption. You could eat these things a bag at a time, like popcorn, and suffer nothing more severe than a mild disorder south of the navel.

No, indeed. The element of danger is no part of the picture. Once again, it is a matter of Dr. Goddard's undertaking to assert, by edict, what he regards as good for mankind—or in this case, what he regards as a waste of money. Thus he proposes his schoolmarmy notice, which, considering the limitations of a label on a bottle, is more than a notice; it is more like a long essay or a short book.

The first of the two sentences is doubtless a statement of truth, but it is one of those provisional, general truths with no particular meaning. Yes, vitamins are supplied in abundant amounts by commonly available foods; but supply is one thing and consumption quite another. To say that milk, liver, orange juice and leafy vegetables are commonly available is not to say much to persons unable regularly to avail themselves of these items in sufficient amounts.

The second of the two sentences is one of those wiggling ambiguities beloved of loophole lawyers and timid teachers. "Except for persons with special medical needs." Does this include the teen-ager who regularly skips breakfast and makes his lunch on candy bar and Coke? Or does this embrace only persons whose metabolic deficiencies are capable of specific diagnosis?

The larger trouble with the second sentence is that evidence is beginning to accumulate that the statement simply is not true. A study by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, for example, indicates that large elements of the American population are in fact receiving less iron, calcium, ascorbic acid and Vitamin A than the National Research Council believes is desirable. Committee studies by the American Medical Association and the American Academy of Pediatrics tend to support this view.

From the standpoint of political principle, however, it makes no difference whether Dr. Goddard is dealing in the hemi-demi-semi truth, or whether some "scientific basis" supports the proposed statement. In the absence of a demonstrable, clear and present danger to the public health, a federal agency has no business ordering people around or imposing dubious opinions by bureaucratic decree.

Is it a waste of money for a man to take a vitamin tablet every morning? Dr. Goddard says it is. But suppose a man or woman feels better, or thinks he feels better, because of this daily routine: Why should he be officially discouraged by a sort of mandatory letter to the editor printed on the label of a jar?

If Superdoc wants voluntarily to propound his own theories and throw his own cold water, well and good. But when he exercises his power to impose needless and nitpicking compulsions upon the makers of honest and harmless products, he abuses his office.

Coercive edicts are supplied in abundant amounts through commonly enforced regulations. Except for situations of special urgency, there is no rational basis for taking more of the people's liberty away.

FIGHT FOR EQUITABLE ADJUSTMENTS IN CUTBACK OF HIGHWAY FUNDS MEETS WITH SOME SUCCESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have had numerous questions from Members of Congress and interested parties involved in the highway program concerning the announcement today by the Department of Transportation that some adjustments were going to be made in the obligational limitations to States that suffered severe cutbacks as a result of the \$600 million cutback and the \$1,200 million freeze on unobligated allocations as ordered by the Secretary in January.

Numerous conferences have been held by myself and others in an effort to provide some relief for States such as Florida which suffered a 55-percent cutback and for clarification of the effects of the latest action, which makes adjustments in these allocations. I incorporate in the RECORD hereafter the news release, together with the table by States, showing the new figures.

The States will have an option to either choose the new figure or the figure resulting from the January announcement. Obviously, those States that get more money under the January formula will probably use it and those that get more under the new formula will use the new one.

Florida, as an example, would have gotten \$62,417,000 under the January formula, based upon 1967 spending, and will now receive \$88,933,000 under the new optional apportionment formula.

This apparently has been accomplished by accepting the floating fund theory which I advanced shortly after the announced cutback and when it was indicated in the January statement that adjustments might be made at a later date. My proposal at that time was that the States that were severely and inequitably affected by the cutback as a result of using the spending in 1967 formula would be given adjustments based upon their allocations for calendar year 1968 rather than 1967 expenditures and that funds to accomplish this could be made available out of unused allocations or those allocations which it is contemplated throughout the balance of the year will not be obligated. That estimated amount, which is a floating fund would be used to make adjustments in States like Florida. This is the theory on which the new optional formula was made and using this theory results, in effect, in making available \$221 million more to the most adversely affected States and brings this year's obligational limitations more in line with fiscal year 1969 apportionments but still under the cutback ceiling of \$4,115,000,000. After years of experience, the Department of Transportation can easily estimate what the States will not actually put under obligation out of their ap-

portionments and this figure approximates the \$221 million. Therefore, it is available as a result of being a floating fund for making these adjustments announced in the following press release. I also include a table of the new obligational limitations and a copy of the wire sent to the respective States explaining this action.

I shall continue my efforts to get the \$600 million cutback restored at the earliest possible date so that all funds cut or frozen can be made available to the States.

The press release and table follow:

[From the Department of Transportation News, Apr. 24, 1968]

Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd today announced a revision of the Federal-aid highway fund obligation schedule. The new formula employs an alternative schedule which would permit approximately one-half of the states to increase their obligational levels for calendar year 1968.

Boyd said the new schedule was worked out to correct inequities which threatened to penalize states where highway construction levels were relatively low in 1967.

Under the previous schedule, announced in January, Federal-aid highway obligational levels during calendar 1968 were frozen to approximately five per cent below 1967 levels.

Tying the five per cent cutback to last year's levels, Boyd said, created problems for several states. These states had hoped to catch up in the current year and would not have that opportunity under our first schedule, he said. The new schedule will allow increases in obligational levels in these states.

He emphasized that total Federal-aid obligational authority for this calendar year remains limited at \$4.115 billion, the ceiling imposed by the five percent January cutback.

Under the new formula, states can obligate to the highest amount, under either the new or old schedule. It is anticipated that many states will not use their total obligational apportionment, thus making it possible to absorb individual state increases within the \$4.115 billion ceiling.

COMPARISON OF \$4,115,000,000 OBLIGATION LIMITATION PER IM 30-2-68 WITH DISTRIBUTION OF \$4,115,000,000 BASED ON 1969 APPORTIONMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Calendar year 1968 obligation limitation	
	Per IM 30-2-68 (\$4,115,000)	Based on fiscal year 1969 apportionment (\$4,115,000)
Alabama.....	75,544	85,874
Alaska.....	34,261	34,493
Arizona.....	60,576	60,293
Arkansas.....	37,141	36,586
California.....	359,258	364,271
Colorado.....	74,335	51,703
Connecticut.....	58,449	76,482
Delaware.....	7,034	9,431
Florida.....	62,417	88,933
Georgia.....	66,245	65,483
Hawaii.....	32,737	31,613
Idaho.....	33,686	26,691
Illinois.....	212,907	219,814
Indiana.....	107,584	89,692
Iowa.....	50,837	56,562
Kansas.....	49,954	40,900
Kentucky.....	102,498	80,911
Louisiana.....	96,894	94,817
Maine.....	16,405	20,020
Maryland.....	37,282	62,080
Massachusetts.....	122,411	83,908
Michigan.....	126,656	124,355
Minnesota.....	103,358	94,976
Mississippi.....	49,519	47,907
Missouri.....	110,247	100,617
Montana.....	45,506	45,071
Nebraska.....	27,969	31,069
Nevada.....	19,848	27,626
New Hampshire.....	21,707	19,259
New Jersey.....	107,606	101,112
New Mexico.....	40,234	49,384

COMPARISON OF \$4,115,000,000 OBLIGATION LIMITATION PER 1M 30-2-68 WITH DISTRIBUTION OF \$4,115,000,000 BASED ON 1969 APPORTIONMENT—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

State	Calendar year 1968 obligation limitation	
	Per 1M 30-2-68 (\$4,115,000)	Based on fiscal year 1969 apportionment (\$4,115,000)
New York.....	245,611	213,005
North Carolina.....	54,861	49,511
North Dakota.....	24,116	24,003
Ohio.....	206,594	231,313
Oklahoma.....	48,680	49,487
Oregon.....	63,238	68,333
Pennsylvania.....	193,847	191,566
Rhode Island.....	21,844	22,353
South Carolina.....	28,392	31,433
South Dakota.....	39,815	38,738
Tennessee.....	88,456	87,014
Texas.....	202,899	211,604
Utah.....	53,863	56,779
Vermont.....	34,575	26,363
Virginia.....	112,751	116,288
Washington.....	103,803	91,325
West Virginia.....	71,470	82,245
Wisconsin.....	53,107	46,195
Wyoming.....	33,566	39,298
District of Columbia.....	15,878	47,430
Puerto Rico.....	3,393	5,658
Total.....	4,051,874	4,051,874

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1968, the Department of Transportation announced that Federal aid highway obligation levels during calendar year 1968 would be held approximately 5 percent below 1967 levels in order to combat general inflationary tendencies in the economy. The individual States have been operating under this limitation.

After being informed of obligations incurred during the first quarter of this year, the Department has prepared an alternative procedure for fund limitations. This alternative procedure is based on the amount which each State would have received had the original distribution been based on the normal apportionment formula. Those States which will receive larger amounts under the alternative procedure, as compared with the January formula, will be permitted to obligate against the higher level.

A table follows:

	Calendar year 1968 limitation (\$4,115)		Apportionment basis	
	Amount (\$4,115)	Difference	Amount (\$4,115)	Difference
Alabama.....	76	86	34	+10
Alaska.....	34	34	60	-1
Arizona.....	61	60	37	+5
Arkansas.....	37	37	52	-22
California.....	359	364	76	+18
Colorado.....	74	52	9	+2
Connecticut.....	58	76	89	+27
Delaware.....	7	9	65	-1
Florida.....	62	89	32	-1
Georgia.....	66	65	27	-7
Hawaii.....	33	32	220	+7
Idaho.....	34	32	90	-18
Illinois.....	213	220	51	+6
Indiana.....	108	90	50	-9
Iowa.....	51	57	81	-21
Kansas.....	50	41	95	-2
Kentucky.....	102	81	20	+4
Louisiana.....	97	95	62	+25
Maine.....	16	20	84	-38
Maryland.....	37	62	124	-3
Massachusetts.....	122	84	95	-8
Michigan.....	127	124	48	-2
Minnesota.....	103	95	101	-9
Mississippi.....	50	48	45	-----
Missouri.....	110	101	28	+3
Montana.....	45	45	20	+8
Nebraska.....	28	31	19	-3
Nevada.....	20	25	108	-7
New Hampshire.....	22	19	40	+9
New Jersey.....	108	101	246	-33
New Mexico.....	40	49		
New York.....	246	213		

	Calendar year 1968 limitation (\$4,115)		Apportionment basis	
	Amount (\$4,115)	Difference	Amount (\$4,115)	Difference
North Carolina.....	55	50	24	-----
North Dakota.....	24	24	231	+24
Ohio.....	207	49	49	-----
Oklahoma.....	49	68	68	+5
Oregon.....	63	68	192	-2
Pennsylvania.....	194	192	22	-----
Rhode Island.....	22	22	31	+3
South Carolina.....	28	31	40	-1
South Dakota.....	40	39	88	-1
Tennessee.....	88	87	203	+9
Texas.....	203	212	54	+3
Utah.....	54	57	35	-9
Vermont.....	35	26	113	+3
Virginia.....	113	116	104	-13
Washington.....	104	91	71	+11
West Virginia.....	71	82	53	-7
Wisconsin.....	53	46	34	+5
Wyoming.....	34	39	16	+31
District of Columbia.....	16	47	3	+3
Puerto Rico.....	3	6		

RIOTERS CHARGED UNDER U.S. LAWS SHOULD NOT BE RELEASED DURING PERIOD OF DANGER, AND BAIL REFORM ACT SHOULD BE AMENDED TO GIVE COURT DISCRETION TO SO FIND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the purpose of the Bail Reform Act of 1966 that persons should not be needlessly detained when detention serves neither the ends of justice nor the public interest. I disagree that releasing an accused who is a danger to his community serves either the ends of justice or the public interest. Therefore, I am introducing an amendment to the Bail Reform Act of 1966 which will allow the judicial officer who sets conditions of release to take into consideration danger to the community which might result from the accused's release. This does not mean that any time it is determined there is danger to the community by the release of an accused that he must be held without bond, although this amendment will allow such preventive detention, along with the right which the act already gives to appeal such detention. What it will do is allow that danger to the community to be considered in determining whether or not the accused shall be released, and if he is to be released, under what conditions.

I raised this question when the Bail Reform Act of 1966 was before the House. The ACLU raised this question publicly during the Washington riots this year. Congress should settle the issue before the ACLU institutes court action to take away all discretion in the court.

At this time of strife and crisis in our cities, it is unthinkable to me that an act of Congress would provide that looters and arsonists, just because they have so many ties to their community that presence at their trials are reasonably assured, should be allowed to go back on the streets and contribute more flames to an already inflamed situation. The ends of justice are not served in this way, and we have not promoted the public

safety and welfare by so allowing this to happen.

The eighth amendment of the U.S. Constitution merely states that "Excessive bail shall not be required." It was an act of Congress, the Judiciary Act of 1789, that provided that:

Upon all arrests in criminal cases, bail shall be admitted, except where the punishment may be death.

Therefore, it is not the Constitution which prohibits preventive detention, but it is an act of Congress. Thus, this amendment which I am introducing today is in no way a violation of the Constitution of the United States, but is an exercise of the legislative powers granted to us in that very same Constitution.

It is true that in *Stack v. Boyle*, 342 U.S. 1 (1951), the U.S. Supreme Court held that bail set before trial with a figure higher than reasonably calculated to assure the presence of a defendant at his trial is excessive in the sense of the eighth amendment. However, that case was concerned with the possibility of defendants fleeing the jurisdiction and not with protecting the public safety and welfare. Furthermore, in *Carlson v. Landon*, 342 U.S. 524 (1952), the power of the Attorney General to hold in custody without bail aliens who are members of the Communist Party pending determination as to deportability was held not unconstitutional—section 23 Internal Security Act of 1950, 8 U.S.C., 1252 (a), 64 Stat. 1011 (1950).

There is no reason at all that the hands of society and the hands of judicial officers should be tied by a bad provision in an otherwise good bill. My amendment will make the Bail Reform Act more workable, more realistic, and more in tune with the needs of our society.

CONGRESSMAN CRAMER WARNS REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1968 NEEDS CAREFUL EXAMINATION IF HUD IS INCLINED TO TRY TO RUN THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1968, the President submitted to the Congress, the Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968. Briefly stated, the reorganization plan would transfer to the Secretary of Transportation certain functions of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development relating to urban mass transportation.

I believe that it is generally agreed that transfer of urban mass transportation functions to the Department of Transportation is desirable. On the surface, Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968 does nothing more than to transfer certain functions from HUD to DOT. If this were the only effect of the reorganization plan, I would be strongly in favor of it. Information has come to my attention, however, which indicates that a much more sweeping realignment of functions

is contemplated than is evident upon a reading of the reorganization plan.

The information which has been furnished to me indicates that, under the proposed reorganization, the Department of Housing and Urban Development will:

Take control of the highway planning functions in urban areas now exercised by the Department of Transportation;

Control the administration of section 134, title 23, United States Code, which now requires the Secretary of Transportation to determine whether highway projects in urban areas of more than 50,000 population are based on continuing comprehensive transportation planning processes;

Have substantial control over the expenditure of highway research and planning funds made available to the State highway departments out of the highway trust fund under section 307, title 23, United States Code;

Have approval authority which amounts to a veto power over highway projects within urban areas.

The conclusions stated above are based upon a "Summary of HUD and DOT Positions on Major Reorganization Plan Issues," dated February 19, 1968, and prepared by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Transportation. This summary not only spells out in some detail the powers and functions concerning highway construction to be exercised by HUD, but expressly states in several places that certain of these powers and functions will not be referred to in the Reorganization Plan No. 2, but will be provided for in a memorandum of understanding between the two Departments. This summary shows, among other things, the following:

Under the heading "Planning Base for Urban Mass Transportation Assistance," the summary states:

The Federal responsibility for assisting and guiding areawide comprehensive planning (including comprehensive transportation planning) by local communities resides in HUD.

Under the same heading, the summary states:

Where a local agency having responsibility for comprehensive planning for the area is qualified, as determined by HUD, to carry out transportation system planning, that agency or one responsible to it, shall carry out the transportation system planning.

It seems to me that assigning responsibility for comprehensive transportation planning to the Department of Housing and Urban Development is entirely inconsistent with the stated reasons for creating a Department of Transportation which, as conceived by the Congress, would bear the Federal responsibility for all transportation systems in all parts of the Nation. In addition to this, it is amazing to me that it appears to be agreed that HUD, rather than DOT, will determine whether a local agency is qualified to carry out transportation system planning.

Under the heading, "Planning Base for Highway Assistance," the summary provides that:

HUD will certify to DOT as to the adequacy of the continuing transportation planning

process in urban areas of more than 50,000, pursuant to section 134, title 23, United States Code. (The HUD certification will provide a basis for a DOT finding as to adequacy of the planning process and a finding that projects are based on such a process.)

The effect of this is to transfer from the Department of Transportation to the Department of Housing and Urban Development this important function. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968 does not even hint at such a transfer. In fact, the summary expressly states that:

The HUD responsibility for certification will not be assigned to HUD in the Plan, but will be provided for in a Memorandum of Understanding.

Under the heading, "Project Approvals—Consistency With Planning—Urban Mass Transportation," the summary states that DOT will assume responsibility for determining whether urban mass transportation projects are needed for or essential to carrying out a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system, but will not make this determination without securing the recommendations of HUD. The HUD involvement in this determination is to be treated as a formal step in the process of project approval.

Under the heading, "Project Approvals, Highway, Consistency With Planning," the summary states that HUD will assume, with respect to highway projects having significant impact on the planning and development of urban areas, the same role as with respect to mass transportation project approval. In other words, HUD is to be given what amounts to a veto authorization over proposed highway projects. Again, it is disturbing to note that the summary states that:

There will be no reference in the [Reorganization] Plan to HUD involvement in review of highway projects for consistency with comprehensive planning.

Details of review of these projects will be provided for in a memorandum of understanding.

Under the heading, "Highway Planning Assistance Programs for Metropolitan Areas," the summary provides that:

DOT will utilize HUD in the review of annual work programs developed by State highway agencies under section 307(c) of title 23, insofar as these programs have an impact on comprehensive planning (including comprehensive urban transportation planning) in metropolitan areas.

It is also stated that DOT and HUD would jointly develop criteria for urban transportation system planning, and evidently these jointly developed criteria would apply to the 1½ percent highway planning funds made available under section 307(c) of title 23, United States Code.

Again, this summary states with respect to these planning funds:

There will be no reference in the [Reorganization] Plan to HUD's responsibilities in the exercise of this function.

As I indicated at the outset, I am in favor of transfer of urban mass transportation functions to the Department of Transportation. I believe it is extremely dangerous, however, to dilute the authority of the new Department of Transportation by vesting in the Department of Housing and Urban Development sub-

stantial powers and authority over highway planning and construction in urban areas.

It may be that there are logical, convincing reasons why this authority and power should be vested in HUD. I can think of no reason, however, why the administration should see fit to transfer this authority without spelling out the details in the reorganization plan submitted to the Congress. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968 purports to be a simple transfer of urban mass transportation functions to the Department of Transportation. In reality, it appears that under the plan, if approved by Congress, there will be a complete realignment of functions and power relating to the highway program as well as mass transportation within urban areas.

I would urge that the Congress not approve Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968 unless and until all of the proposed transfers of functions are clearly spelled out in the plan, or documented in some manner and the Congress given an opportunity to consider all of the implications of such transfers.

OKLAHOMA REFUGE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to designate the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge in Oklahoma as a wilderness area.

This lovely spot in Comanche County, near Lawton, already is within the national wildlife refuge system, but this legislation would further guarantee its preservation as a place where all may go, unhampered by commercialism and private promotion, to enjoy and study the plant and animal life that find refuge there.

It is an area of rugged granitic mountains and gently sloping cliffs. Its virtual isolation offers excellent opportunities for scientific study and related educational activities.

The refuge initially comprised 5,000 acres known as the Charons Gardens unit. On the basis of recommendations made at the public hearing held on this unit, and studies conducted thereafter, the wilderness proposal has been enlarged to include an additional 3,900-acre North Mountain unit which is about 2 miles from the original unit.

At a time when the natural beauty of our Nation is being usurped by high-speed automobiles, smokestacks, the hustle and bustle of industrial and commercial life, it is imperative that we preserve for generations to come some of the areas which are still untouched.

INTERIOR SECRETARY UDALL HAS EXCEEDED HIS AUTHORITY IN ADMINISTERING THE WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on the 8th of February, Interior Secretary Stewart Udall issued a far-ranging proclamation which had the effect of arbitrarily amending the Water Quality Act of 1965.

Mr. Udall's additions to the act require that the States incorporate into their water quality standards applicable to interstate waters either an effluent standard—such as an absolute requirement of secondary treatment or its equivalent—and a requirement that waters whose existing quality is better than the established standards be maintained at their existing high quality.

This edict by the Secretary had the effect of turning around 180 degrees the intent of Congress in the 3-year-old law; the intent being that the quality of the water receiving discharge would be the criterion for quality rather than the effluent itself.

That this action by Mr. Udall is of profound significance to my State of Wyoming can be attested to by letters from Wyoming Gov. Stanley K. Hathaway and State Engineer Floyd Bishop.

Governor Hathaway's letter to Secretary Udall, dated March 21, 1968, states:

We have concluded that your proposed addition to our water quality standards is not acceptable. Such a provision would unfairly and unreasonably restrict and inhibit the future development of our State. Wyoming's water quality standards as submitted to you on June 26, 1967 with the modifications agreed upon in conference with representatives of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration on November 16, 1967 appear to provide for a continuation of high quality water in our streams, while at the same time allowing for a reasonable degree of future development and use of our water resources. To do less for Wyoming in either of these areas of consideration would constitute a disservice to our State.

I also wrote Secretary Udall under date of February 29, pointing out that:

Wyoming has had an exemplary record of water purity control. Perhaps more than any other Western State Wyoming is dependent upon the availability of water resources for economic development. This is the reason why my State generally takes a dim view of efforts by Washington to place the Federal seal upon the waters which are so vital to the building of industry and the expansion of communities. I believe the changes made in the Water Quality Act of 1965 amount to treatment for treatment's sake, and that it is extremely unfair to require Wyoming to treat return flows when these return flows would be completely suitable without treatment for all contemplated purposes.

Neither my letter to Secretary Udall nor Governor Hathaway's letter have been answered, and the nondegradation issue is resting where it has been since Secretary Udall's edict of February 8.

Last Friday, a copy of a remarkable memorandum was made available to me. The memorandum was prepared by the well-known and highly respected Washington law firm of Covington & Burling.

It dealt with the water degradation issue, asserting:

The Secretary has no authority, under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by the Water Quality Act of 1965, to insist that a State include in its water quality standards applicable to interstate waters, either an effluent standard—such as an absolute requirement of secondary treatment or its equivalent—or a requirement that waters whose existing quality is better than the established standards will be maintained at their existing high quality.

In eloquent and effective language the law firm took issue with Mr. Udall's ruling of nearly 3 months ago, contending that the content and legislative history of the Water Quality Standards Act deny Mr. Udall the power he has taken onto himself.

This issue is of utmost importance to Wyoming. It is an established fact that the authority that controls the quality of water controls as well as the uses of water and the industrial development of our Western States. This development is becoming increasingly dependent upon a decreasing supply of pure water.

If kept in force, Secretary Udall's additions to the 1965 Water Quality Act would force industry to treat discharge into rivers regardless of its effect or lack of effect, on the quality of the water. It would prohibit any lowering of water quality in rivers that might already far surpass the quality standards set down by Congress in the 3-year-old law. These regulations are still in effect despite scores of protests from Congressmen and State officials.

I think it important to note that Congress specifically rejected the administration version of the Water Quality Act which sought authority to require that States incorporate effluent standards. Congress changed the thrust of the water purity question by requiring that water quality standards prescribe the quality of the waters into which effluent is discharged, rather than the quality of the effluent itself. By purely administrative action Secretary Udall has turned this important point around.

Wyoming has taken excellent care of its rivers. Operating under our authority as a State, we have taken better care of our rivers than has the Federal Government.

I call attention to the North Platte River, which was cleaned up some 10 years ago by State action, as an example of what Wyoming was doing before Washington got into the water pollution picture.

To make a complete record with respect to the question of water quality and antidegradation I will include, following my remarks in the RECORD, Secretary Udall's news release of February 8, Governor Hathaway's letter to Secretary Udall, to which I have alluded, the Covington & Burling memorandum and supporting material, and an article by Mr. Robert Gannon which appeared in the April 1966 issue of True magazine and which illustrates how Wyoming did indeed clean up the North Platte River, entitled, appropriately, "A Sick River Is Returned to Nature." The material referred to follows:

[News release, U.S. Department of the Interior, Feb. 8, 1968]

WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION ISSUE RESOLVED

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall today issued the following statement in connection with the review and approval of water quality standards for interstate and coastal waters:

During the past several weeks, I have given intensive study to what has become known as "the degradation issue" in connection with the water quality standards as submitted by the States under the Water Quality Act of 1965.

I have resolved this basic policy issue in a way that I believe is fair and equitable to all concerned and, at the same time, entirely consistent with the policy and objective of the Water Quality Act, which is to protect and enhance the quality and productivity of the Nation's waters.

I have concluded that in order to be consistent with the basic policy and objective of the Water Quality Act a provision in all State standards substantially in accordance with the following is required:

Waters whose existing quality is better than the established standards as of the date on which such standards become effective will be maintained at their existing high quality. These and other waters of a State will not be lowered in quality unless and until it has been affirmatively demonstrated to the State water pollution control agency and the Department of the Interior that such change is justifiable as a result of necessary economic or social development and will not interfere with or become injurious to any assigned uses made of, or presently possible in, such waters. This will require that any industrial, public or private project or development which would constitute a new source of pollution or an increased source of pollution to high quality waters will be required, as part of the initial project design, to provide the highest and best degree of waste treatment available under existing technology, and, since these are also Federal standards, these waste treatment requirements will be developed cooperatively.

Because of the importance of this issue to the future quality of America's waters and to the Nation's further social and economic development, the decision that I have made warrants some elaboration.

On the one hand, it is imperative that there be no compromise with the Declaration of Policy as now set forth in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. This declaration states: "The purpose of this Act is to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution."

On the other hand, it is also imperative that the water quality standards provision of the Act be administered in a way that will neither seek nor serve to stifle further economic development in areas where interstate waters are of high quality.

I am convinced that the resolution of this issue as set forth above achieves the dual purpose of carrying out the letter and spirit of the Act without interfering unduly with further economic development.

A key factor in the resolution of the degradation issue is the substantial upgrading of water quality that will be achieved as secondary treatment of municipal wastes and the equivalent for industrial wastes becomes the common practice, as it will within a few years under the water quality standards program.

This, in itself, will allow for considerable additional economic development and still maintain many streams at a quality well above present levels. In fact, I fully expect that most questions arising under the new policy will be resolved by the States.

Obviously, there will be some close questions for the States and perhaps for my Department in implementing the new policy, but I am confident that these can be resolved to everyone's ultimate satisfaction.

Accordingly I have decided that no standards will be approved from here on that do not contain a satisfactory anti-degradation provision. And we are in the process of reviewing, from the standpoint of the new policy, the standards that were approved before the degradation issue came to my attention. If any of the approved standards do not contain a satisfactory anti-degradation provision, we will ask the States to revise their standards accordingly. I have every confidence that we can count on their cooperation.

I do not intend to be capricious or arbitrary, now or in the future, in asking for changes in standards that I have approved. At the same time, it was clearly recognized by the Congress that revisions might be needed from time to time, and procedures were written into the law for that purpose.

No standards should be viewed as having been set in concrete once they are approved. Both technology and circumstances will change, and some flexibility in the administration of the program is obviously necessary.

Both with respect to the degradation issue and all other questions involved in the administration of the water quality standards program, we are operating on the policy that it is better to be safe than sorry. By that I mean that if we err on any question we want to err on the side of safety. We want to make sure that there is a margin of safety for all agreed-upon uses in determining the specific water quality criteria that are necessary to or contribute to those uses.

STATE OF WYOMING,

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,

Cheyenne, Wyo., March 21, 1968.

Subject: Press Release dated February 8, 1968, concerning Water Quality Standards.

HON. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your press release dated February 8, 1968, entitled "Water Quality Degradation Issue Resolved" has recently come to my attention. I am deeply concerned about the effect on the future development of Wyoming which would result from a strict interpretation of the provision which you have suggested for inclusion in all state water quality standards.

Wyoming is a young and developing state. Our future growth and development will involve utilization of water resources for many purposes, and some of these uses will necessarily result in a degree of deterioration of water quality. Almost every type of water use is accompanied by some deterioration of water quality.

As I understand the provision which you are recommending for inclusion in all state water quality standards, there would be no water quality deterioration allowed below the level of quality which presently exists in any interstate stream. This, in effect, replaces the water quality standards which have been adopted. The requirement to maintain our present high levels of water quality places a lid on development and future utilization of our water resources. We are in an entirely different situation in Wyoming than the Eastern states, where most of the potential development has already taken place, and where water quality has degraded to the point where the only way they can go is up. In the East it is possible to improve the water quality by upgrading the treatment facilities of the worst polluters. In Wyoming, pollution is presently minimal, with limited opportunities to upgrade the quality of return flows. Hence we have limited opportunity to improve existing water quality. In

many Wyoming streams the present water quality is so high that the addition of certain nutrients is actually beneficial to fish growth, and is not detrimental to other uses.

As long as new uses of water do not interfere with other uses, existing or potential, we can see no valid reason for requiring a higher degree of treatment of return flows than can be justified by reasonable analysis, just in order to maintain an arbitrary level of water quality such as your proposed requirement would involve.

We have made an honest effort in the formulation of our state water quality standards to provide for a continuation of high quality water in our streams, while at the same time allowing some flexibility for future development and use of our water resources. A great deal of time and effort has gone into the formulation of these standards, with participation by many local, state and federal agencies, private citizens, recreational, industrial and agricultural representatives and other interested parties. To substitute for these standards an arbitrary requirement of "maintaining the existing high quality," such as you are suggesting, would be an insult to all of those who worked so diligently in the formulation of our standards.

Specifically, we object to the following statements in your recommended provisions for inclusion in all state water quality standards:

1. "Waters whose existing quality is better than the established standards as of the date on which such standards become effective will be maintained at their existing high quality."

This would immediately apply to all interstate waters in Wyoming, as we have high quality waters and standards were set slightly below existing quality to allow for progress and development of these waters.

2. "These and other waters of a state will not be lowered in quality unless and until it has been affirmatively demonstrated to the state water pollution control agency and the Department of the Interior that such change is justifiable as a result of necessary economic or social development and will not interfere with or become injurious to any assigned uses made of, or presently possible in, such waters."

Under this requirement, all future developments in Wyoming that would involve a discharge, be they municipal, industrial or agricultural, would require approval of the Department of the Interior. I can foresee long delays and difficulty in such a procedure. It would appear that the decisions on progress and development in the State of Wyoming would by this requirement be placed in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior.

3. "This will require that any individual, public or private project or development which would constitute a new source of pollution or an increased source of pollution to high quality waters will be required, as part of the initial project design, to provide the highest and best degree of waste treatment available under existing technology, and, since these are also federal standards, these waste treatment requirements will be developed cooperatively."

This statement bases the degree of treatment strictly on technology, and disregards practical and economic feasibility. Such an approach involves a higher degree of treatment than can be justified in many of our situations in Wyoming.

In summary we have concluded that your proposed addition to our water quality standards is not acceptable. Such a provision would unfairly and unreasonably restrict and inhibit the future development of our state. Wyoming's water quality standards as submitted to you on June 26, 1967, with the modifications agreed upon in conference with representatives of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration on Novem-

ber 16, 1967, appear to provide for a continuation of high quality water in our streams while at the same time allowing for a reasonable degree of future development and use of our water resources. To do less for Wyoming in either of these areas of consideration would constitute a dis-service to our state.

I would hope that you will be able to approve our water quality standards in the near future. Please let me know if you have any questions concerning the matters set forth herein.

Sincerely,

STAN HATHAWAY.

COVINGTON & BURLING,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1968.

Mr. JAMES G. WATT,
Secretary, Natural Resources Committee,
Chamber of Commerce of the United
States of America, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WATT: You have requested our opinion whether the Secretary of Interior is authorized to determine that State water quality standards are not consistent with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act on the ground that they fall to include (1) an effluent standard relating to the quality of matter permitted to be discharged into interstate waters, or (2) a uniform standard of "nondegradation" as published by the Secretary.

In our view the answer to both parts of this question is No. The Secretary has no authority under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by the Water Quality Act of 1965, to insist that a State include in its water quality standards applicable to interstate waters either an effluent standard—such as an absolute requirement of secondary treatment or its equivalent—or a requirement that waters whose existing quality is better than the established standards will be maintained at their existing high quality.

The express policy of Congress in enacting and amending the Federal Water Pollution Control Act was "to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution," and under the Act it is the initial right and responsibility of each State to adopt, after public hearings, water quality standards applicable to interstate waters within or on its borders. If the Secretary of the Interior determines that a State has adopted water quality criteria and an enforcement plan that are consistent with the Act, such State criteria and plan thereafter become the water quality standards applicable to the interstate waters within the State.

If the Secretary were to disapprove a State's water quality standards for their failure to include either an effluent standard or a nondegradation requirement, and then to promulgate standards applicable to the interstate waters of that State which included these requirements, the State would be entitled to a public hearing before an independent Hearing Board. In our view the Hearing Board would be obliged, as a matter of law, to recommend the elimination of these requirements from the standards promulgated by the Secretary, and the Secretary would be obliged to promulgate revised standards of water quality in accordance with the Hearing Board's recommendation.

This letter sets forth in summary form the basis for these conclusions, which are further elaborated with citation to the legislative history and other relevant authorities, in the accompanying memorandum.

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS MUST RELATE TO THE QUALITY OF THE RECEIVING STREAM

Both the language and the legislative history of the 1965 amendments to the Act make it clear that Congress intended that water quality standards prescribe the quality of the waters into which effluent is discharged, rather than the quality of the effluent itself,

and that such standards must relate to the use and value of the receiving body of water.

Section 10(c) (1) provides for the adoption of "water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof within such state"—clearly a reference to the quality of the receiving waters. Water quality standards must meet the requirements of section 10(c) (3), which provides that in establishing such standards States, the Secretary, and Hearing Boards must take into consideration the use and value of interstate waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial and other legitimate uses. This emphasis on the use and value of the receiving waters is fundamental to Congress' insistence upon local standards that relate directly to the quality of these waters.

The sole means for Federal enforcement of water quality standards is set forth in section 10(c) (5), which provides that the "discharge of matter into such interstate waters or portions thereof, (which reduces the quality of such waters) below the water quality standards established under this subsection . . . is subject to abatement . . . (Emphasis added.) No violation occurs until it can be shown that the quality of the stream has been reduced below the level prescribed in the standard for that stream.

The fact that the Water Quality Act requires that water quality standards apply to the stream rather than to the effluent is the result of the deliberate decision by Congress to reject the approach taken in the initial Administration proposal, which would have authorized both stream standards and controls reading directly on the effluent. On the basis of testimony at the first hearings on the bill, the Senate Committee removed the provision for effluent standards, and it never reappeared through enactment.

Thus, both the statutory language reading explicitly in terms of stream standards, and the Congressional refusal to provide for effluent controls, make it clear that the Secretary of the Interior has no authority to insist on the inclusion of an effluent criteria in State water quality standards as a necessary condition for their approval under the Act. More particularly, the insistence by the Secretary that States include within their water quality criteria a uniform requirement of secondary treatment or its equivalent, without regard to whether such treatment is necessary to achieve compliance with the applicable stream standards, is beyond the Secretary's statutory authority.

In many instances municipalities and companies may have to install secondary treatment or its equivalent if they are to prevent the discharge of matter which reduces the quality of interstate streams below the applicable water quality standards. Failure to install secondary treatment in those instances would result in a violation of both Federal and State law.

But an across-the-board requirement of secondary treatment or its equivalent without regard to the water quality standards applicable to the interstate waters in question is contrary to the Congressional intent and the statutory language. If, after the adoption of water quality standards based on particular uses and values of an interstate stream, a municipality or a company finds that it need not install secondary treatment in order to prevent the discharge of matter that would reduce the quality of the stream below such standards, then there is no basis for requiring such treatment or for taking Federal enforcement action for failure to install it.

THE LACK OF A STATUTORY BASIS FOR A NON-DEGRADATION STANDARD

A somewhat different question is raised by the attempt of the Secretary to insist that every State water quality standard include a provision to require that waters whose existing quality is better than established standards as of the date on which such standards become effective will be maintained at their

existing high quality. The Secretary has stated that the lowering of the quality of such waters would be permitted only upon a determination by the State water pollution control agency and the Department of Interior that such change is justifiable as a result of necessary economic or social development and will not interfere with or become injurious to any assigned uses made of, or presently possible in, such waters. Any new or increased source of pollution to high quality waters would be required to provide "the highest and best degree of waste treatment available under existing technology."

Such a "nondegradation" standard cannot be justified under the provisions of the Act. First, in adopting water quality standards, State authorities must consider, on the evidence presented at public hearings, whether the quality of a particular stream should be improved in order to permit uses not now possible, whether the standards should reflect the existing level of water quality because it satisfactorily accounts for desired uses and values of the stream, or whether standards should be set at levels below the existing quality level in order to accommodate uses and values of importance to the citizens of the State and consistent with purposes of the Act. A nondegradation standard would in effect override any stream standard in this last category, for it would purport to require a water quality level above that specified in the standard. There is no basis in the Act for the Secretary summarily to disregard the decision of the State authorities, and to impose a general requirement unrelated to the hearing evidence.

State standards must of course meet the general requirements of section 10(c) (3) "to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of this Act." Presumably the nondegradation standard is thought to be justified as a means to "enhance the quality of water," but such a narrow reading of this one provision ignores the statutory purpose "to enhance the quality and value of our water resources," and in effect nullifies the requirement that the Secretary and the State take into consideration the "use and value for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses." If the hearing record establishes that maximum value and use of a stream can be achieved by water quality standards somewhat below existing levels, then the Secretary cannot arbitrarily refuse to give effect to such standards.

A second difficulty with a general nondegradation standard is that it purports to impose an unenforceable requirement. A Federal action for failure to observe water quality standards can be maintained only upon a showing that discharged matter reduced the quality of the receiving stream below the standards adopted for that stream. No action would lie under the Act for the discharge of matter that merely reduced the stream quality below earlier quality levels, if the stream continued to meet the requirements of the standards themselves.

A third objection to the Secretary's nondegradation standard is that it seeks to displace the initial responsibility of the State to establish water quality standards and to prevent and control water pollution. Under the nondegradation standard, permission to lower the quality of "high quality" waters would be granted only upon a showing of justification made to the State and the Secretary. But the Act carefully prescribes the role of the Secretary in the establishment and enforcement of water quality standards, limiting his authority to the approval of State standards, the promulgation of standards if State standards are not consistent with the Act, and the initiation of court enforcement proceedings. He has no statutory authority to require prior Federal approval of discharges into a stream or of treatment facilities.

Finally, the requirement that new or increased pollution of "high quality waters" can be permitted only if the installation will have the highest and best degree of waste treatment available under existing technology is an attempt to write effluent standards into the Act, and to impose a degree of treatment that is inconsistent with the enforcement tests of "practicability" and "physical and economic feasibility." A treatment method that is technically available may well be impracticable and totally unfeasible economically. Under any circumstances, a violation of the Act must be predicated on discharge that reduces the quality of the receiving waters below the stream standard, and not on failure to install any particular type or degree of treatment facility.

For these reasons, we conclude that the Secretary has no authority to require that States adopt either effluent or nondegradation standards as a condition of receiving approval of water quality standards under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD DUNKELBERGER.

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS UNDER THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

(Memorandum of April 4, 1968, prepared by Ed Dunkelberger of the Covington & Burling law firm, as a backup to their April 4 letter to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States)

INTRODUCTION

This memorandum focuses upon the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to require a State to include specific provisions in its water quality standards as a condition of his approval of those standards under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by the Water Quality Act of 1965. This and related questions are considered in the light of the legislative history of the 1965 amendments and other relevant authorities.

Section I traces in summary form the legislative developments of 1963-65 which culminated in the passage of the Water Quality Act by the 89th Congress. Section II provides a description of the water quality standards provisions of the Federal Act as amended in 1965. State-Federal relationships (including procedures for issuing Federal water quality standards) the role of the statutory Hearing Board, and limitations on Federal enforcement authority are considered.

The Secretary's authority to insist on effluent criteria in water quality standards is considered in Section III, with emphasis on both the statutory provisions and their legislative history. It is concluded that in the light of the clear Congressional rejection of authority to set such standards coupled with the expressed legislative intent of avoiding arbitrary National standards, insistence on any effluent standard by the Secretary has no legal basis. The Secretary's requirement of mandatory secondary treatment in particular is found to be both outside the Secretary's statutory authority and in direct conflict with the Water Quality Act's legislative history.

Section IV outlines the basis for the conclusion that the Secretary has no statutory authority to demand that a so-called nondegradation requirement be included in State water quality standards, or to require Federal approval of waste treatment methods or facilities.

Section V examines the statutory requirements for revision of standards once they are approved and adopted, and Section VI outlines State alternatives when a requirement imposed by the Secretary is deemed arbitrary or without statutory basis. The function of the Hearing Board and the extent of judicial review available during the standard-setting and enforcement processes are considered.

I. THE WATER QUALITY ACT: 1963-1965

The drive for Federal water quality standards legislation, which culminated in the Water Quality Act of 1965, 79 Stat. 903-10 (1965), began two years earlier with Senator Muskie's introduction of S. 649, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 466-466k (1964), in the first session of the 88th Congress. Prior to the adoption of the 1965 amendments the FWPC Act authorized Federal court action for the abatement of pollution of interstate waters only under limited circumstances, on an ad hoc basis, and after extensive and time-consuming procedural steps designed to provide every opportunity for voluntary compliance and State enforcement action.

At that time the Secretary could initiate enforcement action upon the request of State officials—or on his own authority in the case of interstate pollution—when he possessed information indicating that any pollution of interstate or navigable waters endangered health or welfare. Detailed conference and hearing board procedures were required as initial steps in the enforcement process. If the conference or hearing board machinery proved inadequate to resolve the problem, the Secretary was authorized to bring suit on behalf of the United States to abate such pollution, except that where the cause and effect were both within a single State, a written approval from the governor was a prerequisite to court action. The court was given jurisdiction to enter such judgment and enforcement orders as the public interest and the equities of the case might require, in the light of the practicability and physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of the pollution.

Dissatisfied with this cumbersome, after-the-fact enforcement procedure, Senator Muskie and other proponents of strong Federal water pollution legislation began in 1963 to urge the enactment of a bill that would authorize the adoption of Federal water quality standards. The bill's stated purposes was "to establish a positive national water pollution policy of keeping waters as clean as possible as opposed to the negative policy of attempting to use the full capacity of such waters for waste assimilation." (Emphasis added.) To implement this purpose, the original bill provided for the promulgation of Federal water quality standards applicable to the quality of the receiving water and to the quality of the effluent as well.¹

Senate hearings on S. 649 were held in June 1963. *Hearings on S. 649, S. 737, S. 1118 and S. 1183 Before a Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Comm. on Public Works, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1963)*. Following these hearings and prior to reporting the Muskie bill, the Senate Com-

mittee made significant revisions. In particular, the stated purpose of the bill was amended to read:

"(a) The purpose of this act is to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution."

The vague phrase, "as clean as possible" was eliminated by the Committee and, significantly, it failed to reappear in any later drafts of the water quality legislation.

Of at least equal significance, the water quality standards provision was revised to eliminate authority for the adoption of effluent controls and to provide for Federal standards only in the event that the States failed to develop standards found to be consistent with the Act. On October 16, 1963, the Senate accepted the bill in its amended version, with its new emphasis on the initial responsibility of the States to adopt standards applicable solely to the quality of the receiving interstate waters.

House hearings were held in December 1963 and February 1964, spanning a total of twelve days. Testimony before the House Committee dealt primarily with the extent of Federal encroachment in the standard-setting procedure and the proposed reorganization of the Federal administrative machinery for water pollution control. *Hearings on S. 649, H.R. 3166, H.R. 4571, and H.R. 6844 Before the House Comm. on Public Works, 88th Cong., 1st and 2d Sess. (1963-64)*.

The Public Works Committee did not report the bill until September 1964. See H.R. Rep. No. 1885, 88th Cong., 2d Sess. (1964). Although the House accepted the Senate's revision of the Act's stated purpose, it rejected the mandatory water quality standards provision. As the House Report states: "[T]he committee has modified the provision of section 5 of the bill as passed by the Senate to provide that the Secretary, instead of promulgating standards, may recommend standards . . ." for adoption by the States. *Id.* at 6. Final House action was not forthcoming during the 88th Congress, and S. 649 died with adjournment.

Senator Muskie renewed his fight in the 89th Congress. The new Muskie bill, S. 4, retained the purpose and water quality standards provisions of the Senate's amended version of S. 649 in the prior Congress. Because of the lengthy hearings held on S. 649, Senate hearings on S. 4 were limited to a single day of testimony. And with only minor amendments, the Senate Public Works Committee reported S. 4 on January 27, 1965.

Following rejection of an amendment by Senator Tower, which would have given the Secretary the authority to issue recommended—rather than mandatory—water quality standards, the Senate passed the Water Quality Act of 1965 (S. 4) on January 28, 1965.

Three days of House hearings were held in February 1965. See *Hearings on H.R. 3988 and S. 4 Before the House Comm. on Public Works, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965)*. Again the House Committee rewrote the bill prior to reporting it. Although the stated purpose of the bill did not change, the water quality standards provision in the Senate-passed version was eliminated. In its place, a severely limited standard-setting procedure, tied to the authorization of Federal funds, was inserted. See H.R. Rep. No. 215, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. 3 (1965).

The House version of S. 4 was debated and passed by the House on April 28, 1965. III Cong. Rec. 8652-90 (1965). Senate disagreement with the House amendments sent the bill to conference. As it emerged from the Conference Committee on September 17, 1965 (See H.R. Rep. No. 1022, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. (1965)), the Water Quality Act of 1965 contained a water quality standards provision more like the Senate version of S. 4 than its House counterpart. The compromise standards provision provided for the adoption of Federal standards only in the

event that the State standards were found by the Secretary not to be consistent with the Act. Following final Congressional approval on September 21, 1965, the Water Quality Act was signed into law by the President on October 2, 1965.

II. THE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS PROVISIONS OF THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

The water quality standards provisions of the Water Quality Act of 1965 were enacted as section 10(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Initially, the governor or the State water pollution control agency must file a letter of intent indicating that the State will hold public hearings and thereafter adopt water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters within the State, as well as a plan for the implementation and enforcement of the criteria.

The State's water quality criteria and implementation plan, adopted after public hearings, are submitted to the Secretary, who must determine whether such State criteria and plan are consistent with section 10(c)(3) of the Federal Act. That section provides that the standards adopted under the Act must "protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of this Act," and that in establishing such standards, the use and value of the stream in question for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial and other legitimate uses must be considered.

If the Secretary approves the State criteria and plan, they become the water quality standards applicable to the interstate waters in question under both State and Federal law.

If the Secretary fails to approve the State standards as submitted (or if the State does not follow the established submission procedure), the Secretary may notify all interested parties and convene a conference of representatives of appropriate Federal departments and agencies, interstate agencies, States, municipalities and industries involved. Having complied with the conference procedure, the Secretary may prepare regulations setting forth the standards of water quality to be applicable to the interstate waters in question. The State is then given a six-month period within which to adopt water quality standards consistent with section 10(c)(3), or to petition for a public hearing. If the State neither revises its standards nor requests a hearing before the six-month period has elapsed, the Secretary must promulgate the standards for the waters in question.

At any time prior to thirty days after the Secretary has promulgated his standards, the governor of an affected State may petition the Secretary for a hearing, and the Secretary must call a public hearing to be held in or near one of the places where the water quality standards will take effect. The hearing is before a Hearing Board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State affected by the standards must be given an opportunity to select one member of the Board, and the Department of Commerce and other affected Federal agencies are given an opportunity to select one Board member each. Not less than a majority of the Board must be made up of persons outside the Interior Department. Notice of the hearing must be published in the Federal Register and given to the State water pollution control agencies concerned at least thirty days prior to the day of the hearing.

Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing, the Board will make findings and approve or modify the standards promulgated by the Secretary. If the Hearing Board approves the standards as submitted, they will take effect upon receipt by the Secretary of the Hearing Board's recommendations. If the Hearing Board recommends a modification in the standards, the Secretary must promulgate revised regulations setting forth

¹ Section 4 provided:

"In order to aid in preventing, controlling and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters in or adjacent to any State or States which will or is likely to endanger the health or welfare of any persons, and to protect industries dependent on clean water such as the commercial shellfish and fishing industries, the Secretary shall, after reasonable notice and public hearing and in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and with other affected Federal, State and local interests, issue regulations setting forth (a) standards of quality to be applicable to such interstate or navigable waters, and (b) the type, volume or strength of matter permitted to be discharged directly into interstate or navigable waters or reaching such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters. Such standards of quality and of matter discharged shall be based on present and future uses of interstate or navigable waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial and other legitimate uses."

water quality standards in accordance with the Board's recommendation. These revised standards will then become effective upon promulgation by the Secretary.

Where the Secretary seeks to amend or revise existing standards, the full procedural requirements of section 10(c) apply, except that the Secretary may initiate revisions through the conference procedure in section 10(c)(2) without giving the State an opportunity to revise its standards on its own. As a practical matter, the Secretary will probably give States an opportunity to act first and to adopt recommended revisions after a public hearing. Under any circumstances, the Hearing Board procedure will be fully advisable to States if they question revisions promulgated by the Secretary.

Federal enforcement under the Act is limited to those situations where the discharge of matter has caused a reduction of the water quality of a stream to a level below the stream standards (§ 10(c)(5)), or where there is pollution of waters which is endangering public health or welfare (10(g)). In the latter case, section 10(d), (e), (f) and (g) provides an extended conference and hearing procedure that must be followed before an enforcement suit may be brought, but in the case of an alleged violation of a stream standard, no conference or hearing prior to judicial determination is contemplated under the Act.

Water quality standards violations cognizable under section 10(c)(5) are subject to abatement in accordance with the provisions of 10(g)(1) and (2) of the Act. However, at least 180 days prior to the initiation of an abatement action, the Secretary must notify the violators and other interested parties of the standards' violations. Section 10(g)(1) provides that where water pollution originating in one State endangers the health or welfare of persons in a second State, the Secretary may request the Attorney General to bring suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement. Where pollution and harm are confined to a single State, section 10(g)(2) provides for Federal abatement action only if the written consent of the State governor is obtained by the Secretary.

This provision in 10(c)(5) that violations of water quality standards are subject to abatement in accordance with 10(g)(1) or (2) raises a question that apparently was not considered during the course of Congressional enactment. Section 10(g) provides for abatement of pollution only if it "is endangering the health or welfare of persons." Section 10(c), however, contemplates judicial action to abate pollution based on violations of the water quality standards themselves. It is not clear whether Congress intended that even in an action for violation of a standard it must be shown that the pollution is endangering health or welfare. Conceivably the courts might hold that a violation of the water quality standards is equivalent to an endangerment of health or welfare. The Act makes it clear, however, that protection of the public health or welfare is just one of several bases for adoption of water quality standards, and it may well prove difficult to establish that violation of a standard endangers health or welfare in every case.

In any suit brought on behalf of the United States under the provisions of section 10(c), the court must receive in evidence the transcript of the proceedings (if any were held) of the conference and Hearing Board convened during the standard-setting process, the recommendations made by the conference and Hearing Board (if any), and the recommendations and standards promulgated by the Secretary. In reviewing the standards, the court must give consideration "to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of complying with such standards," and the court may enter such judgment and issue

such order enforcing such judgment as the public interest and the equities of the case may require. Thus, the court is given a broad jurisdictional grant to determine whether the standards, as established, are consistent with section 10(c)(3) and whether compliance with such standards is a reasonable requirement under the circumstances of the case.

III. THE ABSENCE OF STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR NATIONAL EFFLUENT STANDARDS

A review of the statutory provisions and the legislative history of the Act clearly discloses the Congressional policy of maintaining the primary State responsibility for the promulgation of water quality standards applicable to the receiving stream. This is apparent both from the elimination of any statutory authority for Nationwide effluent control and from the provisions of the Act aimed at preventing adoption of arbitrary National standards.

A. The statutory scheme envisions standards adapted to local conditions

It is clear that arbitrary National standards are not contemplated under the Act. Section 1 states:

"(b) . . . it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and interstate agencies and to municipalities in connection with the prevention and control of water pollution . . .

"(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the states with respect to the waters (including boundary waters) of such states."

Furthermore, section 10(c)(1) itself makes it clear that Congress desired the States, in the first instance, to establish the water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters. And in adopting the criteria, section 10(c)(3) directs State authorities to consider the actual use and value of specific waters, thus indicating the direct relationship between standards and individual stream "uses" and "values."

A reading of the legislative history of the 1965 Act brings sharply into focus the fact that Congress did not contemplate the setting of arbitrary, uniform National standards of water quality. Rather, it clearly rejected such a concept. Indeed, during the three-year period in which hearings were held, Administration spokesmen continually rejected any notion of setting uniform National standards.

Testifying before the Senate Public Works Subcommittee in 1963, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Celebrezze took the position that flexibility in setting standards was essential, both procedurally and substantively. He noted that, as then written, the bill provided for the mandatory setting of water quality standards by the Secretary, but that the Department preferred such authority to be granted on a permissive basis instead. "We believe we can protect health and welfare more effectively and economically on a case-by-case basis than by involving the Government in an attempt to establish standards for all interstate and navigable waters at once." *Hearings on S. 649, S. 737, S. 1118 and S. 1183 Before a Special Subcommittee on Air & Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works, 88th Cong., 1st Sess. 460 (1963).*

In a similar vein was the Secretary's answer to the following question by Senator Miller:

"Do you foresee or do you think we ought to have flexibility so that varying standards can be provided in regions, for example? Is

there some kind of guideline that Congress should establish within which limits an administrative agency should work?"

The Secretary replied:

"I believe you have to have a degree of flexibility because standards will vary. You will need extremely high standards, for example, in shellfish areas.

"The standards that you would apply, for example, to a small community on top of a mountain, on a stream running through would probably be different than the standards that you would apply in areas where 8 million people are jammed together.

"You have to have a degree of flexibility. You have to take all those factors into consideration.

"We have some standards now. We have standards on shellfish, for example.

"But I don't think that you can set standards for the total United States. You have to draw standards in the highly industrialized areas of this country which would be different than standards, as I say, in the lobster beds, shellfish beds, trout streams, or affecting the fishing industry—you would have to have different standards.

"So you have to maintain a degree of flexibility." *Id.* at 470.

The rejection of arbitrary National standards was again made clear during the House consideration of S. 649, as passed by the Senate. During the hearings, Congressman Cramer (R.-Fla.) had occasion to question Assistant Secretary Quigley on this very point:

Congressman Cramer: "Setting standards before the fact is presently the function of the States and this proposal is to give the Federal government the power to take over present State authority."

Secretary Quigley: "Not at all. S. 649 specifically provides that the Secretary is not supposed to exercise his authority under this section if the States already have adequate standards. So, if the States elected to go the standards route and did a proper job, the Secretary of HEW would never have to do a thing under the section."

Congressman Cramer: "The Secretary decides whether the States have adequate standards and whether he should exercise that power."

Secretary Quigley: "Right. But this will not be done arbitrarily. He will not issue a fiat and that is it, because again in S. 649 it is specifically provided that if the standards are set and they are not complied with and this leads to an enforcement case, not only do you have all the routine in the enforcement procedure for resolving the question, ultimately, if you have to go to court, S. 649, directs the court, the judge, to second-guess the Secretary as to whether the standards he set are correct."

Congressman Cramer: "So the Secretary will set the standards nationwide."

Secretary Quigley: "That is not true, Mr. Cramer. That is not the case; that is not provided in S. 649. There is nothing that says he will set the standards nationwide."

Congressman Cramer: "He will set standards applicable on a national basis."

Secretary Quigley: "No."

Congressman Cramer: "Either by regional application or otherwise."

Secretary Quigley: "He will set standards, but not nationwide."

Congressman Cramer: "On a regional basis?"

Secretary Quigley: "On a regional basis, a river basis, or on a section of a river basis." *Hearings on S. 649, H.R. 3166, H.R. 4571 and H.R. 6844 Before the House Committee on Public Works, 80th Cong., 1st and 2d Sess. 271-72 (1963-64).*

The House Committee also heard testimony from an Interior Department representative. Eugene D. Eaton, a Resources Program Specialist in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, engaged in a general discussion of

the standard-setting problem during which he noted:

"Theoretically water quality standards might be set so that there would not be any discharge of any amount whatsoever of the offending substances. Desirable as this might be from the point of view of water purity, it is hardly a realistic approach in our highly urbanized and industrialized society.

"To be practical, in many cases, it may be necessary to formulate the standards in relation to the factors just mentioned—that is, such things as the rate and volume of flow and the chemical and physical characteristics of the receiving waters. In practice this could mean that often offending materials might have to be rigorously withheld during periods of low river flow, and perhaps they would be impounded or otherwise handled until river stages are high enough to provide safe dilution, or this could mean the allocation of discharge of offending material between subsurface and surface streams." *Id.* at 718.

Thus, it may be seen that, even at this early stage in the development of Federal water quality legislation, the Interior Department apparently realized that the only practical approach to water quality standards was one based on the relation of standards to local stream conditions and uses rather than National effluent controls. And in the House Report on S. 649, the Committee notes that the House changes in S. 649 were made to "assure the States, the various water pollution control organizations and private industry that the Federal Government does not desire to have an arbitrary establishment of such standards." H.R. Rep. No. 1885, 80th Cong., 2d Sess. (1964).

During the Senate consideration of S. 4 in 1965, Senator Muskie turned his attention to the question of arbitrary Federal standards:

"I might point out that tyranny exists only where there is no appeal. I would think that if I were the Secretary of HEW, and I were considering implementing the standards section, which would be a new kind of authority, I would look at that section giving the courts power to review that very carefully before I established any arbitrary standards.

"When the Congress says to the Secretary that his standard has to be practicable, and he knows that that will be the test that will be ultimately applied, and he knows there are industries with financial resources to press this in the courts, some of which are represented here today, he knows that he has to meet that test, he cannot be arbitrary, and that he has to be practical." *Hearings on S. 4 Before a Special Subcommittee on Air & Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. 85 (1965).*

Summing up the effect of the water quality standards provision in S. 4, the Senate Committee notes in its report (see S. Rep. No. 10, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. 10 (1965)):

"The authority given the Secretary is not arbitrary. He is constrained from arbitrary action by the public hearing and consultation requirements of the standard section and by the knowledge that, if he promulgates standards, compliance with such standards must ultimately meet the test of 'practicability' in the courts, as provided in section 5(d) of the bill, should violation of such standards trigger an enforcement action. It is clear, also, that the enforcement conference and the hearing board must, in the light of the authority given the court, consider the 'practicability' of the compliance with the standards."

In the same vein was Senator Boggs' comment during the Senate debates:

"The members of the Committee and the staff have worked diligently in preparing language to make it abundantly clear that the States, interstate agencies, and industries will be fully protected from any arbitrary action by a Secretary of Health, Educa-

tion and Welfare regarding established standards." 111 Cong. Rec. 1506 (1965).

Assistant Secretary Quigley made a final attempt to clarify the Administration's position in regard to uniform National standards and arbitrary action by the Secretary in his testimony before the House Public Works Committee:

"We do not intend to set any national standards. This point was made on the record last year; it was made in the other body. Let me make it again. There is no intent, no purpose in the standard section, as I understand it, to set national standards." *Hearings on H.R. 3988 and S. 4 Before the House Comm. on Public Works, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. 59 (1965).*

During the debate on S. 4, many Congressmen expressed the view that the primary responsibility for establishing water quality standards remained with the States and that uniform National standards arbitrarily set by the Secretary were not contemplated. See 111 Cong. Rec. 8635 (1965) (remarks of Congressman Brown, R.-Ohio), 8657 (remarks of Congressman Cramer, R.-Fla.), 8661 (remarks of Congressman Randall, D.-Mo.), 8665 (remarks of Congressman Harsha, R.-Ohio), and 8669 (remarks of Congressman Cleveland, R.-N.H.).

Testimony by FWPCA Commissioner Quigley during the 1967 hearings on water pollution is also of interest, although post-enactment discussion before a Congressional Committee cannot, of course, be considered to be a part of the legislative history. The following colloquy took place between Commissioner Quigley and Congressman Harsha (R.-Ohio):

Congressman Harsha: "... [n]ow, during the past year or so your office has issued several sets of guidelines and criteria and standards and so forth to be used in developing water quality criteria and in reviewing the States' standards. Is it your intention that the review of State standards be so demanding upon the States in order to have their standards accepted that they must establish the very same criteria that you wish to establish as Federal standards for water pollution control?"

Commissioner Quigley: "The answer is 'No,' but I think I will let Dr. Hirsch, who is responsible for it, comment in detail."

Dr. Hirsch: "Generally, the guidelines that we issue have been of a broad nature rather than being very specific.

"The areas, I think, that we have been most specific with in working with the States have been areas of technical, scientific fact rather than policy.

"In other words, if a body of water is desired for a certain type of fishery, we might be specific in working with the State to indicate what level of oxygen or what temperature level would be necessary to support that fishery. That is a matter of scientific information and not a matter of policy decision.

"In the policy areas, however, our guidelines, we think, have been rather general." *Hearings on Water Pollution Before the House Comm. on Public Works, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 107-08 (1967).*

Later in the colloquy, another interesting exchange took place:

Congressman Harsha: "I just have one other question, Mr. Quigley, or any member of your staff. It is my impression that Congress defines 'pollution' not as a discharge per se, but rather as a quality which impairs water use.

"Now, am I accurate in that assumption?" Commissioner Quigley: "I would certainly accept that, without checking the act. That is certainly my working definition of it."

Congressman Harsha: "All right. Now, does the Federal Water Control Administration believe that the discharge must be eliminated before clean water can be obtained?"

Commissioner Quigley: "As a theoretical

question, I do not think the answer to that could ever be yes. I think as a practical matter, in many instances, this is the only way you are going to eliminate the pollution. But I could recognize a situation where because of the flow, high quality of it, and lack of other discharges, that you would not have to." *Id.* at 110-11.

Thus, it may be seen that throughout Congressional consideration of the legislation and as recently as a year ago, the Federal authorities directly concerned with enforcement of the standards provision of the Water Quality Act were speaking in terms of broad general guidelines, as opposed to arbitrary Federal standards. This view was widely and consistently reflected in Congress and in the language of the Act.

B. The rejection of Federal effluent control authority

The original version of S. 649, as introduced, provided for both effluent and stream quality controls.² As Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Celebrezze noted in a letter to Chairman McNamara of the Senate Committee on Public Works:

"This subsection (section 9(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended by section 4 of the Muskie bill) would direct the Secretary to issue regulations setting forth standards of quality and the type, volume or strength of matter permitted to be discharged in interstate or navigable waters." *Hearings on S. 649, S. 737, S. 1118 and S. 1183 Before a Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Comm. on Public Works, 88th Cong., 1st Sess. 6 (1963).*

Similarly, Secretary Udall noted that:

"This new subsection requires the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to issue regulations . . . setting forth (1) standards of quality applicable to interstate and navigable waters, and (2) the type, volume, or strength of matter permitted to be discharged directly into interstate or navigable waters or reaching such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters." *Id.* at 9.

A number of witnesses strongly objected to Federal authority to set effluent standards, as an intrusion into an area traditionally reserved for the States. Sam Thompson, testifying on behalf of the Council of State Governments, noted that:

"The portions of S. 649 which would give the Federal Government power to set binding effluent standards, is the most crucial part of this legislation." *Id.* at 298.

Mr. Thompson further noted that:

"If the Federal Government is to have the power to set effluent standards, there will be nothing which State pollution control agencies can do which the Federal Government cannot also do." *Id.*

In a similar vein, Dr. Natale Colosi, Chairman of the Interstate Sanitation Commission, testified that:

"S. 649 is of great concern to the Interstate Sanitation Commission, primarily because the bill proposes to give a Federal agency power to set effluent standards.

"If some agency of the Federal Government is now to have authority to set an effluent standard, great confusion will ensue.

"Under existing Federal law, Congress has declared the responsibilities and rights of the States in pollution control shall be primary. Where single States acting alone may not be in a position to cope adequately with the problems of an area, the act directs the encouragement of interstate compacts for pollution control. We trust that the sponsors and supporters of S. 649 continue to seek the buttressing and encouragement of State and interstate efforts. The bill leaves these provisions of present law intact. However, the

² See the text of the standards provision at this stage, as quoted in the footnote on page 10472.

effluent standard provision would vitiate this declared policy of Congress." *Id.* at 581-82.

When the Senate Committee reported S. 649, the provision granting authority to set effluent standards was noticeably absent. The standards provision reported out by the Committee contemplated the setting of water quality standards for the receiving waters alone.

During the two remaining years prior to passage, the water quality legislation was the subject of extensive hearings and Congressional debate. However, with the exception of a passing reference, the effluent standards provision failed to occupy the attention of Congress and never reappeared in the legislation. Its rejection is summed up by John E. Kinney, a sanitary engineering consultant, who testified on S. 4 before the House Committee:

"The original Senate bill a year ago had a provision to establish water quality and waste discharge. The committee was under the impression that standards on discharges had to be provided before standards on stream quality could be established. When they learned it unnecessary—you can set standards on a stream which has no discharges to it—the committee ruled out standards on discharges." *Hearings on H.R. 3988 and S. 4 Before the House Comm. on Public Works, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. 323 (1965).*

C. The secondary treatment requirement—a national effluent standard

In the face of the clear rejection of effluent control by Congress and the consistent Congressional and Administration declarations that arbitrary National standards were not to be set under the Act, the Department of the Interior has established guidelines for water quality standards for interstate waters which represent an attempt to achieve National effluent controls by administrative fiat. See *Hearings on Water Pollution Before House Comm. on Public Works, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 86-88 (1967)*. The following "Policy Guidelines" are included:

"3. Water quality criteria should be applied to the stream or other receiving water or portions thereof. . . . In the absence of appropriate numerical values or biological parameters, criteria should consist of verbal descriptions in sufficient detail as to show clearly the quality of water intended (e.g., 'substantially free from oil')."

"8. No standard will be approved which allows any waste amenable to treatment or control to be discharged into any interstate water without treatment or control regardless of the water quality criteria and water use or uses adopted. Further, no standard will be approved which does not require all wastes, prior to discharge into any interstate water, to receive the best practicable treatment or control unless it can be demonstrated that a lesser degree of treatment or control will provide for water quality and enhancement commensurate with proposed present and future water uses." (Emphasis added.)

It seems apparent that the Interior Department first agreed in Guideline 3 to follow the Congressional command of setting stream standards, and then decided in Guideline 8 to attempt to impose effluent standards as well. On the basis of Guideline 8, the Department has attempted to impose a uniform requirement of secondary treatment or the equivalent on all State water quality standards. See Statement of Secretary of Interior Udall Before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. 3 (March 27, 1968). Such a requirement has no basis in either the statute itself or the Act's extensive legislative history.

Secretary Udall in his 1968 Senate testimony (see *Hearings on Water Pollution Before the Subcomm. on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Comm. on Public Works,*

90th Cong., 2d Sess. (March 27, 1968)) indicated that Federal authorities have had the general objective of mandatory secondary treatment for five years and that such a requirement is being imposed on all States. If this was in fact the case, it is surprising that this view was not expressed to Congress by Administration officials, and that no attempt was made to reinstate authority for such an effluent control in the bill. Such a requirement violates both the letter and the spirit of the Federal Act in at least three particulars.

First, it is clear that the Secretary has attempted to establish a rigid National standard in direct conflict with the express legislative intent and greatly at variance with statements of Administration witnesses during the course of the hearings on the Water Quality Act. If any single theme can be drawn from the legislative history of the Water Quality Act, it is that arbitrary, rigid National standards were not acceptable to Congress.

Secondly, the requirement of secondary treatment, whether viewed as a "kind of treatment" or as a "degree of waste removal" (as Secretary Udall has suggested in his recent testimony), can exist only as a control on the quality of the discharge, rather than the quality of the receiving water. It is thus an effluent standard of the type rejected by Congress at an early stage in the history of the water quality legislation. As such, it is clearly beyond the Secretary's authority under the Act.

Finally, since the Secretary's approval can be conditioned only on State compliance with the requirements of section 10(c)(3), any attempt to impose greater requirements on the States is a usurpation of their primary authority in the field of water pollution control.

IV. THE ABSENCE OF STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR A NONDEGRADATION STANDARD

Recently, the Secretary has sought to impose an additional uniform requirement as a condition on the approval of State water quality standards. Three Federal Guidelines are relevant—numbers 1 and 5, as well as the aforementioned Guideline 8:

"1. Water quality standards should be designed to 'enhance the quality of water.' If it is impossible to provide for prompt improvement in water quality at the time initial standards are set, the standards should be designed to prevent any increase in pollution. In no case will standards providing for less than existing water quality be acceptable.

"5. Water quality criteria should be accompanied by a description of present water quality and uses, together with uses expected in the future and the water quality required to make those uses possible. The water quality standards proposed by a State should provide for:

(a) Potential and future water uses as well as the present intended use and uses;

(b) The upgrading and enhancement of water quality and the use or uses of streams or portions thereof that are presently affected by pollution;

(c) The maintenance and protection of quality and use or uses of water now of a high quality or of a quality suitable for present and potential future uses." *Hearings on Water Pollution Before the House Comm. on Public Works, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 87 (1967)*. (Emphasis added.)

The Interior Department has used these guidelines as the basis for the "nondegradation" standard, which it seeks to superimpose upon all State water quality criteria. On February 8, 1968, Secretary Udall announced that, in the future, every State will be required to adopt a nondegradation provision substantially in accordance with the following language:

"Waters whose existing quality is better than the established standards as of the

date on which such standards become effective will be maintained at their existing high quality. These and other waters of a State will not be lowered in quality unless and until it has been affirmatively demonstrated to the State water pollution control agency and the Department of the Interior that such change is justifiable as a result of necessary economic or social development and will not interfere with or become injurious to any assigned uses made of, or presently possible in, such waters. This will require that any industrial, public or private project or development which would constitute a new source of pollution or an increased source of pollution to high quality waters will be required, as part of the initial project design, to provide the highest and best degree of waste treatment available under existing technology, and, since these are also Federal standards, these waste treatment requirements will be developed cooperatively." Press Release, Office of the Secretary, United States Department of the Interior, Feb. 8, 1968.

In his 1968 Senate testimony, Secretary Udall indicated that in his opinion imposition of a nondegradation standard comes within the intent of the 1965 Act. And Senator Muskie stated that he and the Secretary had agreed on this principle before the "Guidelines" were put together. See *Hearings Before a Subcomm. on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Comm. on Public Works, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. (March 27, 1968)* (testimony of Secretary of Interior Udall). But if Secretary Udall and Senator Muskie had agreed upon this interpretation of the Act prior to establishing the guidelines, they failed to take a critical look at the Act itself.

Section 10(c)(3) directs the Secretary, the Hearing Board, or the appropriate State authority to take into consideration the use and value of a given body of water when establishing the water quality standards. Such uses include public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial and other legitimate uses.

This clear statutory direction is further reinforced by the Act's legislative history. The Senate Committee made clear the direct relationship between standards and uses in 1963 and reaffirmed its position two years later:

"The Committee intends that water quality standards should be applied on the basis of the water quality requirements of present and future uses of the stream or sections of the stream, after due consideration of all the factors and variables involved. S. Rep. No. 556, 88th Cong., 1st Sess. 9 (1963); S. Rep. No. 10, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. 10 (1965).

See also "Additional Views in Support of S. 4," a statement by the Republican membership of the House Public Works Committee:

"Standards of water quality are concededly badly needed, but should be established by the State and local agencies, which are most familiar with all aspects of the matter in a given locality, including the economic impact of establishing and enforcing stringent standards of water quality. Authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to promulgate and enforce such standards to the exclusion of the States would obviously discourage the States and local agencies from developing their own plans and standards for water quality and purity. And it would place in the hands of a single Federal official the power to establish zoning measures over—to control the use of—land within watershed areas in all parts of the United States. Such power over local affairs has never been vested in a Federal official, and we are opposed to doing it now." H.R. Rep. No. 215, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. 10 (1965).

The nondegradation standard is clearly the sort of arbitrary National standard that is inconsistent with the statutory scheme of

State adopted stream standards based on stream value and use. This inconsistency is apparent from the language of Secretary Udall's press release of February 8, 1968. He states, "I have concluded that in order to be consistent with the basic policy and objective of the Water Quality Act, a provision in all State standards substantially in accordance with the following is required. . . ." What follows is the nondegradation requirement. Additionally, the Secretary notes, "Accordingly, I have decided that no standards will be approved from here on that do not contain a satisfactory antidegradation provision." Plainly the Secretary has issued an inflexible, arbitrary order requiring the superimposition of a uniform National standard over all State water quality criteria. Such a requirement is inconsistent with the Secretary's recent claim before the Senate Committee:

"Through all the standards setting process runs the important consideration of reasonableness. We do not seek clean water for its own sake, but for man's benefit. On balance, our clean water efforts must therefore be reasonable." Statement of Secretary Udall Before the Subcomm. on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Comm. on Public Works, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 5 (March 27, 1968).

And clearly, the flat nondegradation requirement goes beyond even Senator Muskie's pre-passage view of the need, where practicable, to maintain the present quality of high quality waters:

"Let me say this, in addition: You see, the present law states that the Secretary should act for the Federal Government whenever there is pollution which endangers the health and welfare of any persons."

"Now with respect to streams now contaminated we are talking ex post facto situations. Under S. 4 our objective would be to improve water quality to the point where the health and welfare of persons are more broadly and effectively served."

"With respect to uncontaminated streams, our objective is to preserve insofar as we can the current quality of those streams in the light of all use requirements that can be anticipated legitimately in the public interest." *Hearings on S. 4 Before a Special Subcomm. on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Comm. on Public Works*, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. 82 (1965). (Emphasis supplied.)

It is apparent that Senator Muskie did not envision a uniform nondegradation requirement unrelated to stream uses based on local needs. Rather, his statement reflects a more practical approach of maintaining present water quality in the light of all legitimate use requirements.

Furthermore, the nondegradation standard would be unenforceable under section 10(c) (5) of the Federal Act. That section provides for the abatement of any discharge which reduces water quality below levels established in accordance with section 10(c). No provision exists for abating any discharge which reduces present water quality unless such discharge also reduces the water quality below the use and value related standard set in accordance with section 10(c) (3).

Of equal significance is the fact that the nondegradation requirement serves to eliminate the primary authority of the States in the field of water pollution control. This too is clearly contrary to the intent of the Federal Act, which directs the States to assume the primary position in regard to standard-setting, pollution control, and pollution abatement:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution. . . ." Federal Water Pollution Control Act § 1(b).

"Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, State and interstate action to abate pollution of interstate or navigable waters shall be encouraged and shall not, except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to court

order under subsection (h), be displaced by Federal enforcement action." Federal Water Pollution Control Act § 10(b).

Finally, the Secretary's nondegradation requirement would in effect displace State primacy in establishing water quality standards and in preventing and controlling pollution contrary to the clear command of section 10(c) (1). Permission to lower the quality of "high quality" waters would require a determination of justification by both the State involved and the Secretary. But under the Act the Secretary lacks the authority to require Federal preclearance of treatment facilities or of particular discharges into a stream. Further, the additional requirement that new or increased pollution of "high quality" waters be permitted only if the new installation provides "the highest and best degree of waste treatment available under existing technology" is an attempt to impose effluent standards without statutory basis and to require a degree of treatment that is inconsistent with the enforcement criteria of "practicability" and "physical and economic feasibility." In any event, failure to install a particular type or degree of treatment facility is not a violation of the Act unless such failure also results in a reduction of stream quality below established levels.

V. REVISION OF APPROVED STANDARDS

Although an FWPCA release (March 18, 1968) indicates that 28 States' standards have received "approval," and Secretary Udall has indicated that his Department hopes to "approve" all State standards by June 1968 (see *Hearings Before a Subcomm. on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Comm. on Public Works*, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. (March 27, 1968) (testimony of Secretary Udall)), he has also stated:

"We intend to go back to the States whose standards were approved last summer, based on the new policy and on the experience which we have gained to date, and, where changes are needed in the standards, we will request them."

"We have not yet formally asked the ten States whose standards were approved last summer to adopt the anti-degradation language, except the State of Idaho. I have publicly indicated that this will be expected." Statement of Secretary of Interior Udall Before Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Comm. on Public Works, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. 9 (March 27, 1968).

In this context, the statutory procedures for revision of approved standards become particularly relevant. Once approved under section 10(c) (1), State water quality standards become the applicable Federal standards under the Federal Act. As such, they may be revised only in accordance with established procedures. In particular, section 6(b) of the Model State Act ("Suggested State Water Pollution Control Act, Revised") issued by the Department of the Interior, states:

"Prior to establishing, amending, or repealing standards of water quality the Board shall, after due notice, conduct public hearings thereon. Notice of public hearing shall specify the waters for which standards are sought to be adopted, amended or repealed and the time, date and place of such hearing."

Thus, any attempt to adopt a revised standard on the State level without a full public hearing would result in standards which are invalid under the "Model Act" and would be unenforceable in any State having a similar statutory requirement.

In addition, section 10(c) (1) of the Federal Act requires the States to hold public hearings prior to adoption of water quality criteria. It is logical that section 10(c) (1) also be read to require public hearings prior to the revision of existing water quality standards. Such was the intent of the Senate Committee:

Accordingly, the bill provides authority for the Secretary to establish standards of water

quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof. The standards are to be formulated in accordance with accepted administrative procedures calling for notice and public hearing and consultation with affected Federal, State, interstate and local interests and are to be such as to protect public health or welfare and to enhance the quality and value of interstate waters. Standards would also be subject to revision either by the Secretary on his own or when petitioned to do so by the Governor of any affected State. The same procedure for hearing and consultation will be followed in revisions as when standards were being formulated." S. Rep. No. 10, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. 9 (1965).

In any event, sections 10(c) (2) and (4) establish detailed requirements for the revision of existing standards. Section 10(c) (2) states that when the Secretary desires to revise an existing standard, he must call a conference in the same manner as that required for the original adoption of Federal standards. Furthermore, the Secretary must comply with the full Hearing Board procedures of section 10(c) (4) before any revised standard can be adopted over State opposition.

Thus, when the Secretary requests that a State adopt any provision that is not included within its water quality standards as previously approved, such as a nondegradation standard, the procedural requirements of section 10(c) must be observed, as well as those existing under appropriate State law. Any revised standards imposed without regard to these procedural requirements would be invalid and unenforceable.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OF THE SECRETARY'S REGULATIONS

When a State either refuses to adopt the minimum water quality standards deemed essential by the Secretary or refuses to revise existing standards to meet new minimum levels imposed by the Secretary, the administrative review process of sections 10(c) (2) and (4) becomes applicable, and affected States have a right to a hearing before a Hearing Board, as set forth in section II of this Memorandum. The legislative history of the 1965 Act makes it clear that the scope of the Board's inquiry in reviewing a proposed standard will be broad. As the Senate Committee notes in its Report (see S. Rep. No. 10, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. 10 (1965)):

"The authority given the Secretary is not arbitrary. He is constrained from arbitrary action by the public hearing and consultation requirements of the standards section and by the knowledge that, if he promulgates standards, compliance with such standard must ultimately meet the test of 'practicability' in the courts, as provided in section 5(d) of the bill, should violation of such standards trigger an enforcement action. It is clear, also, that the enforcement conference and the hearing board must, in the light of the authority given the court, consider the 'practicability' of compliance with the standards." (Emphasis supplied.)

The Hearing Board review process was further commented on by Congressman Blatnik, the House sponsor of the water quality legislation:

"This Hearing Board . . . can then do either one of two things: Approve the standards and recommend approval at the same time to the Secretary, whereupon he may promulgate them and enforce them. Or the board may modify the proposed standards. These modifications are reported back with a recommendation to the Secretary of HEW. He shall conform and comply with these recommendations of the hearing board and promulgate these standards. We have a process for establishing standards which will be a joint operation at which not only the Federal Government and its agencies, other than the Secretary of HEW shall be represented, but the States affected shall be represented, private industries shall be represented, and the general public shall be rep-

resented. In fact, all members affected by the standards are represented on the board, and the recommendations of the board shall govern the final decision of HEW." 111 Cong. Rec. 24588 (1965). (Emphasis supplied.)

Judicial review of Federal water quality standards is provided in an enforcement action under section 10(c) (5) (see section II of this Memorandum). The Act is silent about the availability of judicial review of the Hearing Board's decision prior to a charge of violation,³ and it is doubtful that such review may be obtained by States under the general statutory authority for review of administrative action, which does not apply to action by "agencies composed of representatives of the parties or of representatives of organizations of the parties to the disputes determined by them. . . ." 5 U.S.C. §§ 701, 702, 704 (Supp. II 1965-67). See *Pennsylvania-Reading Seashore Lines*, 245 F. 2d 579 (3d Cir. 1957) and *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen v. Chicago Burlington & O.R.R.*, 225 F. Supp. 11 (D.D.C.), *aff'd*, 331 F. 2d 1020 (D.C. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 377 U.S. 918 (1964). This accords with Senator Muskie's understanding of the statutory review machinery.⁴

Thus, a State would apparently have no right to obtain judicial review of a Hearing Board's decision either approving or recommending modification of standards promulgated by the Secretary. Review under section 10(c) (5) is available only in the course of an enforcement action for abatement of pollution, and the State would presumably not be a party to the litigation. But if the State objected to standards as approved or modified following a Hearing Board decision, and if such standards were sought to be enforced by the Secretary under section 10(c) (5), the court might be expected to permit the State to intervene as a defendant in the enforcement action and thereby to challenge the legal or factual basis for the standard in question.

[From True magazine, April 1966]

A SICK RIVER IS RETURNED TO NATURE
(By Robert Gannon)

In a broad path winding through the center of Cleveland, Ohio, the Cuyahoga River flows north to Lake Erie. It's a torpid swath of gray sludge pockmarked by pools of iridescence and contains slowly churning masses of oily goo.

New York State's beautiful Hudson River is a fetid dumping ground for 217 major sources of waste. The filth has decimated the fish population and wiped out all the shellfish.

Atlanta's once dogwood-lined Chattahoochee River is now bordered by surrealistic saplings anchored in filth-strewn mud reeking of decay. The river is the main source of water for Atlanta yet, at the city's intake, the once crystalline water now is the color of coffee with cream.

Across the land rivers once sweet and un-sullied now are so polluted they're good for little more than carrying away the human and industrial wastes that made them that way. "Except in dry spells, the water is pure. But it wasn't ever so. In 1948, a re-

³ Prior to Senate passage of S. 4, Senator Cooper offered an amendment which would have added additional procedural safeguards, including judicial review, at the standard-setting stage. The amendment was rejected by the Senate Committee and a more limited version was thereafter rejected by the Senate. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 2, pp. 1524-1531.

⁴ "As I understand, the Administrative Procedure Act provides only for administrative review of the regulations. Judicial review is provided when enforcement action is undertaken but in the establishment of rules and regulations only administrative review is provided." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 2, p. 1530 (remarks of Senator Muskie).

port of the U.S. Public Health Service about the 150-mile section from Casper to the state line said: "This stretch of the North Platte River is so grossly polluted that it is doubtful if recovery can ever be obtained."

Larry Peterson, District Fisheries Manager of the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission, thinks back and says, "What I remember most about the river in those days was the smell. In the spring of the year when the water was released from the dams for irrigation, it picked up the human sewage and refinery wastes that had accumulated over the winter and carried them downstream. That slug of stuff eliminated not only all the fish along the way, but the bottom food as well. You could smell it for three, four miles away. Just drive along the highway and when you hit that odor you'd know you were close to the river."

Today a fisherman can plop himself down on a five-gallon oil can, flick his line over a broken slat in the wooden Mystery Bridge three miles south of Casper and, a couple hours later, have a string of 18-inch cutthroats. In Wyoming, the river has come back to life.

The North Platte, in fact, is the only large river in the U.S. ever to be cleaned up after having been polluted in a variety of ways. The very few other rivers that have been de-polluted suffered from only one or two major problems. Pennsylvania's Schuylkill River, for example, polluted by coal dust, cleared up when the mines were sealed; Louisiana's Ouachita River, salty from oil drilling, freshened when the state clamped down on offenders; New York's Rondout Creek purified itself after local citizens complained so much that health authorities closed down a polluting paper mill. Each is a success story. But each river had only one problem. Yet the history of the North Platte cleanup proves that even a "grossly polluted" river can be made pure again.

The problems of the North Platte, like those of Cleveland's Cuyahoga, Atlanta's Chattahoochee and virtually all other polluted waters, were three: irresponsible industry, myopic municipalities and an apathetic public. The large plants on its shore were built a half century ago, almost before the word "conservation" was invented. The small plants came later. But by then the river was so foul anyway that a little more putrescence wouldn't hurt.

Towns along the way weren't interested in setting up expensive sewage disposal plants. Everyone else was using the river as a cess-pool; why shouldn't they? Casper alone was bequeathing to its neighbors downstream an offering of nearly four million gallons of raw sewage a day.

Along with the industries and the towns, there was a third complication, common in western states: "peak power discharge." To run a hydroelectric plant efficiently, you let the water roar through the turbines for four hours in the morning, four hours in the evening, and turn the river off the rest of the time. In Wyoming, the North Platte is broken by six dams and six power plants. "What happened when they let the water gush out of the last big dam above Casper," explained one state official, "was a sight to behold. A bank of water would come sweeping down the practically empty stream bed, kicking up oil sludge deposits in front of it, and flush the whole stinking mess downriver. It'd kill even the carp and suckers that had ventured in from the side streams. Then the Bureau (of Reclamation, which builds the dams and regulates water use) would turn the water off and let the foul stuff sit there and percolate until the next cycle."

The fouling of the North Platte had grown slowly over the years, with hardly a complaint raised. The people knew it was polluted but they figured nothing could be done about it.

Then, in 1948, Congress passed the first

federal water pollution law. It was a rapid, toothless bill, but in two ways important: First, it provided for the first basic cataloging of all major U.S. waters and, second, it focused attention on these waterways: for the first time people realized they could get mad at pollution and not simply accept it.

One man who got mad was the late editor of the weekly *Douglas Budget*, Keith Rider. And according to those later involved, he was the catalyst for the whole North Platte cleanup. "He kept needling us," says a spokesman for the Wyoming Department of Health. "This guy Rider would just sit there downstream and turn out these editorials and the Casper paper, the Cheyenne paper and the rest of them in the state would pick them up."

The trigger was a Rider editorial that ran May 20, 1954:

"The North Platte . . . is now nothing more than a second rate irrigation ditch and sewage disposal stream. Last Friday the first storage water of the season was released from the dams above Casper. By the time that head of water reached here, it had a black oily head on it which appeared to be a foot deep. . . . Following in the wake of the foul, oily mass of water, the river banks were strewn with dead fish of all kinds from Casper to the Guernsey dam."

The editorial was picked up by the AP wire and printed throughout the state. E. O. Williams, State Sanitary Engineer, said he was "very pleased" that Rider had reopened the problem. "There has been . . . too much foot dragging," he added. The State Fish Warden called for "stringent stream pollution laws." The mayor of Casper, a city of 35,000 without any sewage treatment at all, said he was thinking really hard about some sort of system. And every candidate eyeing the upcoming November election, including Wyoming's present Senator Milward L. Simpson, who was then running for governor, snatched the pollution ball and ran.

In May, 1955, on the first anniversary of the editorial, the excitement of the election having long cooled (Simpson won), another editorial appeared, in the *Douglas* paper, titled "It Still Stinks." "Here we go again," wrote Rider, as he lambasted everyone, pointing out that except for a dandy meeting almost nothing had been done in the full intervening year. Again the piece was widely reprinted.

"That's the editorial that got the governor really going on the problem," recalls one of Simpson's associates. "He printed up copies and sent them around to everyone remotely interested. The governor said he was tired of being needled like this."

Governor Simpson may not have known it at the time, but he had already thrown the master switch. Early in 1955, he hired a man named Arthur E. Williamson, then 40, as the top pollution man in the State Department of Public Health. Williamson's official title is Director of the Division of Environmental Sanitation. He is a slim, sun-scorched man who speaks with a drawl and, for the past 10 years, he has devoted the bulk of his considerable energy to cleaning up the North Platte.

Art Williamson was raised in the Midwest (Kansas) and educated in the East (an M.S. in Sanitary Engineering from New York University). But he belongs in and to the West. He drives a Ford pickup truck, wears cowboy shirts and black boots, and his hat looks like a prop left over from *Wagon Train*. For dress-up occasions he strings a bolo tie around his open collar.

When the governor appointed him, he said, "I don't care how you do it—how many arms you have to twist or heads to crack—just clean up the damn river. I'll back you to the fullest."

Williamson himself refers to the whole North Platte campaign as one big poker game. "We had to bluff our way most of the

time. I still don't know if our laws had teeth or not. But the governor and the pollution council and I all said we had real good laws, and we were going to enforce 'em. Now maybe if we had gone to court we could have forced industry to comply. Maybe. But I'll bet we couldn't have touched the municipalities. The towns *thought* we could, though—and that's all that mattered."

Shortly after he appointed Williamson, the governor named new members to the Pollution Control Advisory Council, a group composed of state agency people (Commissioner of Agriculture, Commissioner of Game & Fish, State Engineer, and Director of the Public Health Department) and laymen representing industry, municipalities and agriculture. One council appointment was especially interesting: Dr. C. C. Buchler of the American Oil Co. refinery, "I appointed Doc Buchler for a couple of reasons." Simpson said later, "The main one was that he was very intelligent, a famous engineer, and a good chemist. And the second reason, or maybe it was the first, was that I wanted him there so he'd show the way to the other oil companies."

By the end of 1955 Williamson and the commission had worked out a rough formula for pollution abatement. On January 24, 1956, at a meeting in Wheatland, he presented timetables to representatives of both communities and industry. Says Williamson: "I told the people that the first thing I want is an engineering report. Tell me what can be done with your sewage, what it's going to cost you, how you can finance it and by when. Well, the industries seemed to be expecting this, so at the meeting they only grumbled a little. But all the mayors tried to procrastinate. They said they didn't have the money."

"But we had an ace: Our Game and Fish Commission stepped into the breach with a \$50,000 fund for grants to the cities to get together engineering reports. There went their excuses. This is the only state I know of where the game and fish people were serious enough about their fish to set up this kind of fund." Twenty-five towns used the fund in 1956 alone.

While the communities were reluctantly forming plans, Williamson and the committee turned their energy to industry, focusing their persuasive talents on the four oil companies spotted around Casper. Each day, someone figured, the plants were dumping enough waste into the river to fill a 14-story building the size of a tennis court. "Oh, it was bad, all right," admits slow-talking, chain-smoking Joseph W. Yant, Chief Engineer of American Oil's Casper plant. "But consider the enormity of our problems." These were big enough, figured company planners to cost a million bucks or more to get rid of the three classes of gunk being dumped into the river:

1. Huge amounts of phenol (carbolic acid) and sulfides, along with a small quantity of silt and other chemicals formed during refining.

2. Calcium and magnesium salts pulled from river water used for cooling. If it isn't removed from the hard Wyoming water, thick crusts form on equipment.

3. Oil seepage. The refinery has been in operation for half a century and, as is usual with these plants, the storage tanks leak. Oil seeps into the ground, then into the river.

Along with two other oil companies (Socony Mobil and Texaco), American decided to cooperate. The fourth, Continental, tarried for the rest of the year, then in December, 1956, solved the problem by going out of business. "It was an old refinery debating whether to keep going anyway," Williamson explains. "When we put the heat on them it was the thing that convinced them to close."

In the meantime, American was examining possible solutions. One it almost bought: shoot the waste through pipes up a mountain and let it run back into the river, oxidizing

along the way. The company finally decided to solve things by cleaning up nothing—but by returning nothing to the river.

Four miles north of the plant, surrounded by rolling hills, a strongly alkaline pond called Old Soda Lake sat landlocked in the center of a huge basin. The company bought the slough and 2,200 acres around it and enclosed the whole thing in eight miles of fence. They built a pump house at the plant, ran a 23 thousand foot pipe to the pond and, in June, 1957, hooked it all together. From the end of the pipe poured everything: phenols, dissolved calcium and magnesium salts, suspended oil, even sewage from the employees' washrooms.

Not long after the company had spent \$1.5 million building the new Old Soda Lake (and the other two oil companies had installed similar setups), fish began slowly to return to sections of the river downstream. But the oil firms' trouble wasn't quite ended; people downriver complained that the fish tasted like petroleum. American discovered that the soil around the plant was so saturated with oil that some was still oozing into the river.

A little more pressure and the company came up with the solution: two wells eight feet in diameter with pumps constantly sucking up whatever drains in, mostly oil. Today, it seems to be working. At least nobody complains of oily fish any more. "A few months ago we stopped a fellow fishing from our railroad bridge, right in front of the plant," Yant said recently. "He had 64 trout—something impossible only a little while ago."

"Now you may wonder why American and the other oil companies paid any attention to anybody," says Williamson. In the first place, he explains, Doctor Buchler, manager of American's plant, as chairman of the pollution council, was placed in the odd public position of having to force his own company to comply. And in that position his leverage with others was considerable. "He never had a bit of sympathy for other industries," relates Williamson. "They'd come in and say, 'This is going to cost us to beat hell,' and he'd answer, 'I know what it's costing: I spent a million and a half bucks on it.'"

In the second place, so much publicity had been given the work of the committee and the condition of the stream that the companies were expecting pressure. And privately they believed they were in the wrong. "Our head office had been receiving complaints from elsewhere, too," says oilman Yant, "so the biggest hurdle was convincing the people with the purse strings that what we wanted to do, form a lake, was the cheapest practical solution."

Then, too, in cities the size of those along the North Platte, the people responsible for pollution are well known. If water pollution becomes something to be *against*, social pressures can be enormous. And the governor was backing Williamson and the antipollution fight to the hilt.

With the massive quantities of oil refinery waste being eliminated, smaller polluters became more obvious. The city of Casper, for example, which had never bothered with even elementary sewage treatment, suddenly found itself a principal offender. Williamson tells how it was: "Whenever another area built up, Casper would run a four foot sewer pipe down to the river and attach the houses to it. That was it. You could stand at the outlet and see the excrement flush right into the river."

In local politics, no matter what the section of the country, building water purification plants usually is easy. People must drink. Sewage treatment plants, however, are more difficult because it appears that they benefit only those downstream. Politically, you don't do anything about pollution, you just *talk* about it. But now, a good many people were demanding action. They wanted a clean river and they wanted a plant built.

The local paper, primed by an outdoor col-

umnist named Chuck Morrison, began to grind out a barrage of pro-plant editorials. Then with each utility bill, the city inserted little leaflets proclaiming that "Water is the Life Blood of a Progressive Community—Vote For on Sewer Bond!"

On May 14, 1957, the \$1,150,000 sewer bond passed overwhelmingly. Because the North Platte was classified a river with interstate pollution, the U.S. Health Department added another \$250,000.

With Casper well on the way to clean up, one by one the towns downriver began to come around; Douglas, Torrington, Guernsey, Glenrock, for example, is a smiling little community of 1,500, 22 miles east of Casper. "We're a pretty progressive town," says George McConnaughey, ex-mayor and owner of the Corner Market. "Art Williamson came down here and we had a meeting in the town hall and then we all went out and accomplished it. This is a small town with big people," he exclaims, straight-faced. The settling ponds, pumping station and sewage lines cost \$37,700, of which the U.S. Public Health Service paid a third. That did the job.

Meanwhile, Williamson was talking with representatives of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, because no matter how clean the river became, if peak power requirements dally cut off flow, fish could hardly survive. "About this time we got hold of an advanced study of the Bureau reporting on how they were going to operate this river," Williamson recalls. "From what I saw, I didn't like it. They were still figuring on this surge."

On May 12, 1957, Williamson, the Water Pollution Control Council, all interested state agencies and everyone else who wanted to be there held a mass meeting with the Bureau. "We really pulled in a tremendous number of people from down along the river," says Williamson. "We had a lot of power in that meeting."

As a result, a subcommittee was formed to study the problem. Soon afterwards it came up with a solution. The plan called for a small dam below the giant Alcova power plant with a reservoir to absorb the discharge pulses in its 181-acre lake, then let the water flow out at a constant rate.

The Bureau acquiesced. But two years dragged by before dam construction began, another two years, until 1961, before it started operating. Yet there was no real opposition the plan. Williamson says, "It just took someone to get the idea, push it and keep at 'em."

As the water began to clear, free from refinery and city sewage pollution, Williamson increased his pressure on the little industries: meat packing plants, mines and small manufacturers. "He kept retracing his steps," says Senator Simpson. "Just as soon as the industries would recover from one blow, he'd go back and give them something else."

"They climbed all over me because of a little red iron ore that never got down to the river anyway," complains Les Wahl, superintendent of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Corp. mine at Sunrise, some 125 miles downriver from Casper. "I think one of our disgruntled employees told somebody we were killing the river fish."

The 65-year-old mine produces hematite, red iron oxide, that tends to dye water bright red, whether or not it harms the fish. To counteract leakage in the Sunrise mine, pumps suck out 200 gallons of water a minute, dump into a ravine that leads six miles to the North Platte. Last summer Williamson drove up the winding road to the plant. "What looked like red paint was discharging down the dry draw. It had flowed three miles or so from the plant. Another three miles and it would have been in the river. I says, 'Boy this gotta be stopped quick.' I talked to 'em and asked the fish and game boys to go in and follow it up, and now it's fixed."

"I don't want the stuff running into the

river anyway," says Wahl. "It's worth dollars and cents to me. The pollution people had nothing to do with our building these dikes." At any rate, a series of little dams are up now and the silt flow has stopped.

On the outskirts of Casper, the Rocky Mountain Packing Company squats alongside Interstate Highway 25. Inside, workers in white smocks butcher buffalo. "When I first saw the operation," recalls Williamson, "they were letting the waste run through a very small septic tank, then out across the ground. It eventually got into the river so you had a bloody, black-looking mess. It certainly wasn't a major pollution source, but it was a stinking one."

Williamson urged, threatened and cajoled and, finally, the plant bought an old gravel pit with 20 or 30 feet of water in it. They began to dump waste there. Williamson told them: "I'll go along with that, but I think you're going to have some problems because that water's too deep. It's cold. You're just going to be pickling the stuff here. It's going to start smelling some day."

A few years later it did. There was a suit instituted by the plant's neighbors, but Rudy Stanko doesn't care to talk about it. Rudy Stanko is a large, red faced man who now runs the company. "We settled," he says. "Then we figured we had better do something. So now we boil everything down; we dry it and sell it for fertilizer."

All along the North Platte everything was going smoothly. The cities were cooperating, the peak power demand no longer was a problem, the industries were, with a little pressure here and there, cleaning up their outflows. Everything was rolling.

With one exception: Holly Sugar Corporation, just outside Torrington. "It wasn't that we didn't want to cooperate," says Ira D. Croghan, plant superintendent, a short, balding man with freckles. "It's just that our equipment happened to break down at the same time the state people took river samples."

Holly is a typical example of sugar beet processing plants, factories which are still polluting such rivers as the Arkansas, Montana's Big Horn, Idaho's Bear and the Mississippi. During their peak season, mid-October through December, the 40-year-old company processes 3,000 tons of sugar beets a day. There's lots of stuff to get rid of: lime, used to purify the sugar; Steffens waste, a high alkaline substance left over from the making of molasses; flume water, used to transport and wash the beets; beet tails and chips; and waste from the plant's washrooms. Until the Williamson campaign, everything went into the river except employee waste. That went through a septic tank estimated by health officials to be 50 percent effective.

Tests by the U.S. Public Health Service showed that total organic matter being discharged into the stream was equal to a city of 370,000 and potential disease-producing bacteria increased a thousandfold as the river passed the plant's outlet. No fish lived below the plant, and only a few hearty bottom organisms, like sludge worms and midge larvae, survived that deluge of contaminants.

The first real complaints began around 1950, when hunters claimed that because of pollution the ducks weren't settling. The hunters probably were wrong. "Those ducks were in there in the first place because of the beet pulp," Williamson says with a big grin. "They loved it. They'd come in by the thousands and stay as long as the river was full of pulp. So the more we cleaned it the fewer ducks would be there and the louder the hunters would scream."

Anyway, the hunters went hollering to the Public Health Service and soon Williamson came charging into the Holly offices. "Cooperate? Sure we cooperated," says plant superintendent Croghan. "They put the screws to us. They badgered us and threatened us with injunctions. That state com-

mittee and the fish and game people and Williamson—they never were satisfied with anything we did." That's probably because the first steps the company took, expensive as they were, didn't seem to help much.

First, Holly dug a giant pit the size of four football fields side by side. That was for the lime and it worked fine. But the river remained polluted. Then in 1956 the company bought a 55-acre pasture nearby, bulldozed a dike around it and dumped in the Steffens waste.

Still no fish. In 1961, the U.S. Public Health Service concluded that "... it is evident that pollution of the North Platte River by the Holly Sugar Company constitutes pollution of interstate waters..." So the federal government stepped in with fanfare hearings.

Beet chips and tails, it was decided at the hearings, must go. This waste was being swept away in Holly's flume water, which carried the beets through the plant. A screen was installed. Not much effect on the river.

The problem now seemed to be what is called pulp drainings. These "squeezeings" from pulp were allowed to run into the river. Reluctantly, the company installed piping to pump the drainings out to the Steffens waste pond and, just to be safe, diverted the sewer drains from the employees' washroom out there, too.

That almost did it. At least, the fish lived most of the year—until the sugar beet season began again. Then they disappeared up the tributaries. The only thing left at Holly was the flume water. Enough dirt stuck to the beets so that when the flume water entered the stream, the silt coated the bottom, killing off food for the fish. "Now it looked like a perfectly simple thing to set up a fine screen there, put a truck underneath it and haul out whatever you collect," recalls Williamson. "We suggested this to them. But about this time Holly was beginning to feel we were riding them a little too hard and they began to see that precedents were being set. So the sugar interests went to the legislature with some real high-powered lobbyists trying to put a law through exempting that particular kind of operation from any pollution law. Well, we beat them. It was a battle, but we beat them."

Holly finally installed the screens and found that during the height of the season nearly 150 tons of dirt a day collected to be hauled off. Today, fish live in the river even during the sugar beet season.

For its full length in Wyoming the North Platte has returned to life. Occasionally there are problems: Irrigation water run-back causes turbidity; a company springs a leak in a tank containing toxic chemicals; the Bureau of Reclamation washes out a reservoir and the silt kills bottom life; an empty barrel of insecticide rolls into the river and wipes out fish for 10 miles. But these things are rare. The people of Wyoming are enjoying their river. Bottom land has risen in value from about \$210 an acre 10 years ago to around \$1,500 now.

Now that the citizens are happy, some companies that spent a lot of money on pollution control are finding that in the long run they may come out ahead. Rudy Stanko, for example, now processes his packinghouse waste and sells it as fertilizer. He happily hauls in an extra \$1,000 a month. Les Wahl is watching his iron mine outflow settle behind those dikes. He expects that when the tanks fill, he'll scoop them out and process the iron oxide for a nice profit. And even Ira Croghan finds that sugar waste disposal isn't as bad as he once thought. Holly maintains a herd of 1,500 cattle on dried beet pulp.

The biggest surprise came to American Oil engineers. They expected an odiferous, lifeless mass to form from pumped wastes up in the Casper hills. What they got was a wildlife refuge. Discharge from the plant, a sickly green, almost black substance, first

floods into a small "settling" pond, then overflows into the lake. The pond reeks of spent chemicals and is lifeless except for a strange, intensely green species of alga so thick that the water is opaque.

But the lake into which it overflows, now fully grown and stabilized (intake equals evaporation) at 500 acres, is clear, with small aquatic insects zipping through it. Around the edges reeds and cattails grow and cottonwood and willow trees, now 20 feet high, thrive. The water tastes slightly brackish, but is highly palatable to animals. Fifty antelope live in the fenced off acreage, drinking the water and grazing on the new grass. According to one local ornithologist, during migration season the lake is the best place in the state to spot ducks and geese.

Meanwhile, back in Cleveland, in Atlanta, along New York's Hudson and Maine's Androscoggin, things are still awful. The problems in the East are vastly more complex than in Wyoming. But there is a new Federal Water Quality Act that has a lot of major industries running scared. A top steel official claims it will cost the steel companies \$260 million a year to comply. A paper man estimates the paper industry will have to spend a billion dollars in the next 10 years. Corporation bigwigs complain, but in the long run they'll probably have to get up the money. The states, too, are beginning to act. New York voters have recently authorized the financing of a giant sewage program and others are likely to fall in line.

"The public is now largely aware of the problem," says Assistant U.S. Surgeon General Gordon F. McCallum, "and is beginning to be willing to do something about it. The environment is starting to close in on us and the problems are pinching. They can be solved, though; we can have clean water and it's not going to bankrupt us to do it. The total solution depends on only two things: brainpower and willpower."

"And someone strong to show the way," adds Senator Simpson. "Someone like Art Williamson. There is no question in my mind that a dedicated governor with good men under him can clean up any river in America. Every industry and every municipality knows that clean up is coming. The main thing needed is someone with a strong voice to tell them when."

OUR NATION MUST SEARCH FOR A REASSESSED SOUL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, at the instance of our good and able mutual friend, Capt. George Maines, I incorporate in the body of the RECORD an outstanding column by the Honorable John S. Knight, publisher of the Miami Herald and Knight newspapers, in his regular weekly column entitled "The Publisher's Notebook," on the vital subject, "Our Nation Must Search for a Reassessed Soul."

Mr. Knight, always an able and stimulating writer, has in this article, I think, sensed the mood of our time and calls for soul searching among our citizenry to meet extraordinary challenges of this critical era. Coming from one of the ablest editors of our country, I think my colleagues and my fellow citizens will profit much by thoughtful reading of this stimulating column by Mr. Knight.

The column follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Apr. 14, 1968]
OUR NATION MUST SEARCH FOR A REASSESSED SOUL

In June of 1967, the now martyred Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. announced that he would conduct a coordinated civil rights campaign in Cleveland.

For the first time, he was to have been joined in this endeavor by Floyd McKissick, head of the Congress of Racial Equality; Whitney Young Jr., director of the Urban League and Roy Wilkins, director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Of these leaders, Floyd McKissick was linked with the radicals of the civil rights movement while Whitney Young and Roy Wilkins were and still are the moderates. Dr. King occupied a position between the extremists and the moderates depending upon his mood of the day.

At the suggestion of Carl Stokes, later to be elected Cleveland's mayor, several editors of The Akron Beacon Journal and I were to meet with Dr. King for a discussion of his aims and objectives in the Cleveland mission.

MEETING CALLED OFF

We had intended to ask whether, as a reasonable man, Dr. King could bring the fiery McKissick and the temperate Negro leadership into agreement on constructive policies.

And would their community examination include the shortcomings of Cleveland Negro leaders? Could Dr. King and the committee make a truly objective diagnosis of Cleveland's racial ills? And would its members then attempt to persuade and convince those who were retarding progress to change their ways, rather than to dictate terms and make themselves the objects of derision and hate?

Unfortunately, the meeting was suddenly called off. The suspicion was that Carl Stokes, who needed a summer of relative calm if his political fortunes were to be advanced, had persuaded Dr. King to postpone his project and make only occasional appearances in the Forest City.

If this was the strategy, it worked well. Cleveland did enjoy a quiet summer and Carl Stokes was elected mayor by the slenderest of margins.

Most political observers conceded that had there been a Cleveland riot in the summer of 1967, the victory would have gone to Stokes' opponent, Republican Seth Taft.

Carl Stokes is making a fine mayor and Cleveland has been remarkably free of the civil disturbances which have later afflicted Detroit, Newark and a score of other communities both large and small.

RACE NO BARRIER

The experience of Cleveland proves that race is no barrier to qualified Negroes seeking public office; that the majority of the white community prefers to judge a candidate for what he is and not by the color of his skin.

As Whitney Young Jr. said at the time: "The election results reaffirm the assertion of my organization that it is possible to make gains by working within the framework of the political system and through normal channels.

"The election," continued Mr. Young, "refutes those among the extremists who have said this is impossible. The results became possible through a coalition of intelligent, enlightened white voters and Negro citizens which represents the majority of Americans."

Which leads one to question whether Dr. King, victim of a cowardly assassin in Memphis, did in the last few years of his life really exert restraint upon civil strife or in fact unwittingly promote it.

STIRRED EMOTIONS

Martin Luther King was indeed an apostle of nonviolence in the cause to which he made so many magnificent contributions. His powerful and resonant oratory stirred the

emotions even as it presented the logic and justice of his crusade.

And yet, even the appearance of Dr. King as a leader of a civil rights march often signalled the beginning of destructive and unlawful acts.

Either his followers did not fully comprehend Dr. King's nonviolent philosophy or the provocateurs of mob action were using his image and the dream of the promised land as self-justification of their rioting and pillaging.

As long ago as 1955, Dr. King addressed these words to his flock: "If you will protest courageously, and yet with dignity and Christian love, when the history books are written in future generations, the historians will pause and say, 'there lived a great people—a black people—who injected new meaning and dignity into the veins of civilization.' This is our challenge and overwhelming responsibility."

This is the Dr. Martin Luther King whom I choose to remember rather than the Dr. King who shunted aside lawful injunctive processes as inferior to a higher moral law.

HIS VIEW CHALLENGED

In recent years, Dr. King's 1964 view that "nonviolence is both the most practically sound and morally excellent way to grapple with the age-old problem of racial injustice" has been challenged by the advocates of anarchy.

Within the week, CORE's Floyd McKissick has called Dr. King "the last prince of nonviolence." McKissick added ominously, "nonviolence is a dead philosophy and it was not the black people who killed it."

The radical Stokely Carmichael has proclaimed: "When white America killed Dr. King, she declared war on us. . . We have to retaliate for the deaths of our leaders. The executions of those deaths are going to be in the streets."

Other flouters of the law, both white and Negro, are urging American citizens to arm themselves with guns. Thousands upon thousands now possess new lethal weapons.

Many young Negroes have lost confidence in moderate leadership. In Memphis, one march leader explained that "these kids have been becoming more and more impatient with the ministers." Another said the youths "didn't come to march—they were outside our control."

True, there are level-headed leaders such as NAACP's Roy Wilkins, who contends that "millions of Negroes in this country are opposed to violence" and who rejects the shrill cries of the militants that they are taking over the Negro community.

But can they, or will they ultimately prevail? Or is America facing a civil war between the races?

WHAT'S NEEDED MOST

Needed most as we mourn the death of Martin Luther King is, as Editor Don Shoemaker of the Miami Herald has stated so aptly, "a time for national reassessment."

Mr. Shoemaker has said that the social values of yesterday appear to have lost all meaning, that a nation which wars with one hand and indulges itself with the other is a nation in search of its soul.

That a nation which lets crime increase geometrically and tempts the criminal by coddling him is a nation wandering soullessly.

That a nation which slackens its moral standards so immoderately that the libertine becomes a national hero is a nation without spiritual principle.

Editor Shoemaker believes that today is a good day to begin plodding the road back to decency, to order, to moral values, to greatness.

I can add nothing more to this other than to find in Dr. Martin Luther King's assassination a double tragedy:

The passing of a great, spiritually moti-

vated humanitarian without peer in pursuit of a noble endeavor and,

The demeaning of Dr. King's dream that we can all "sit down at the table of brotherhood" by radical and irresponsible elements of his race who would seize and pervert the cause for which he had labored so long.

Hopefully in the reassessment of values mentioned by Mr. Shoemaker, there will be found in the civil rights, business and political areas those willing to join hands and march forward in the quest for justice, morality and reinvigoration of our national character.

This will require greater effort than passage of open housing legislation and infinitely more wisdom than the lip service given Negroes by the pandering politicians.

For without such unity of purpose, the forebodings of the doleful and the disenchanting may be all too prophetic.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SNYDER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. COLLIER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the week of April 22, on account of medical treatment for kidney stone removal.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for April 25, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. MACHEN), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

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. STEED, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN, for 1 hour on Tuesday, April 30, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. BRINKLEY), for 30 minutes, on April 30; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

Mr. DORN in two instances.

Mr. PHILBIN in five instances.

Mr. BRINKLEY.

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

Mr. FINO.

Mr. REINECKE.

Mr. CURTIS in two instances.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHERLE in three instances.

Mrs. BOLTON.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. UTT in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. GROVER.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. TALCOTT.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. McDADE.

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

Mr. RODINO.
Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.
Mr. HOWARD in two instances.
Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.
Mr. MCCARTHY in 10 instances.
Mr. PATMAN.
Mr. ECKHARDT in two instances.
Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.
Mr. STEED.
Mr. DANIELS.
Mr. BARING.
Mr. WHITENER.
Mr. FEIGHAN.
Mr. GATHINGS.
Mr. RARICK in four instances.
Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances.
Mr. EILBERG.
Mr. MOSS in two instances.
Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.
Mr. ST GERMAIN.
Mr. WHITE in two instances.
Mr. DULSKI in two instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. BROOKS.
Mr. ROYBAL in five instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of California.
Mr. FARBSTEIN in four instances.
Mr. BOLAND.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 25, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

No. 1776. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the National Adjutant, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., transmitting reports and proceedings, and a copy of the audit of the receipts and expenditures of Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., following the national gathering in Indianapolis, Ind., September 11-15, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-105 (H. Doc. No. 297), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 14672. A bill to amend the act of February 14, 1931, relating to the acceptance of gifts for the benefit of Indians; with amendment (Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15348. A bill to amend section 703(b) of title 10, United States Code, to make permanent the authority to grant a special 30-day period of leave for members of the uniformed services who voluntarily extend their tours of duty in hostile fire areas

(Rept. No. 1301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 10897. A bill to amend section 404(d) of title 37, United States Code, by increasing the maximum rates of per diem allowance and reimbursement authorized, under certain circumstances, to meet the actual expenses of travel (Rept. No. 1302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 1093. A bill to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2629. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, with respect to the remission or cancellation of indebtedness of enlisted members of the Armed Forces and the National Guard of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2632. A bill to permit National Guard officers to act as inspecting officers under section 710(f) of title 32, United States Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 1305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11466. A bill to remove the restrictions on the grades of the director and assistant directors of the Marine Corps Band (Rept. No. 1306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13050. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize an increase in the numbers of officers of the Navy designated for engineering duty, aeronautical engineering duty, and special duty (Rept. No. 1307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13593. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase the number of congressional alternates authorized to be nominated for each vacancy at the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies; with amendment (Rept. No. 1308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 14739. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to authorize additional medical and dental care and other related benefits for reservists and members of the National Guard, under certain conditions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15865. A bill to amend section 1072 (2) of title 10, United States Code, to include a foster child within the definition of "dependent" (Rept. No. 1310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15863. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the name of the Army Medical Service to the Army Medical Department (Rept. No. 1311). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3300. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8578. A bill to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARDY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 10573. A bill to provide authority to increase the effectiveness of the Truth in Negotiations Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARDY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15789. A bill to amend section 2306 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize certain contracts for services and related supplies to extend beyond 1 year (Rept. No. 1315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 1136. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 15688, a bill to extend the executive reorganization provisions of title 5, United States Code, for an additional 4 years (Rept. No. 1316). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 1137. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 16703, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BETTS:
H.R. 16754. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BLANTON:
H.R. 16755. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that interest on certain industrial development bonds is not to be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California:
H.R. 16756. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:
H.R. 16757. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the Federal Government to deny employment in defense facilities to certain individuals, to protect classified information released to U.S. industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BUTTON:
H.R. 16758. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:
H.R. 16759. A bill to incorporate Retired Enlisted Association, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVERETT:
H.R. 16760. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 so as to reduce from 6 months to 5 months the period for which daylight saving time shall be in effect; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GUDE:
H.R. 16761. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to apply an acceptable credit risk standard for loans to small business concerns in certain high-risk areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HORTON:
H.R. 16762. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to provide for a more effective and economical utilization of the Nation's vocational training resources through arrangements with private voca-

tional training institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16763. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 16764. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to make certain aliens admitted to the United States for permanent residence eligible to be radio station operators; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 16765. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide for a national program to improve the availability of necessary insurance protection for residential and business properties against fire, crime, and other perils, through the cooperative efforts of the Federal and State Governments and the private property insurance industry, to authorize Federal reinsurance with appropriate loss sharing by the States against insurance losses resulting from riots and other civil commotion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 16766. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 16767. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to conduct research and development programs to increase knowledge of tornadoes, squall lines, and other severe local storms, to develop methods for detecting storms for prediction and advance warning, and to provide for the establishment of a National Severe Storms Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 16768. 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. CONTE:

H.R. 16769. A bill to amend section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage landlords to meet minimal housing standards by disallowing the depreciation deduction to a landlord who has been convicted of violating a housing code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. DENT, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. BRADEMAs, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. AYRES, Mr. QUITE, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. BELL, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. ESCH, and Mr. ESHELMAN):

H.R. 16770. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend the authorization of grants to States for rehabilitation services, to broaden the scope of goods and services available under that act for the handicapped, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUSEN (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. RODINO, Mr. MINISH, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DANIELS, and Mr. PATTEN):

H.R. 16771. A bill to designate certain lands in the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, Morris County, N.J., as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 16772. A bill to permit the melting of

coin of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16773. A bill to permit American citizens to hold gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 16774. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself and Mr. REUSS):

H.R. 16775. A bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 16776. A bill to revise the system of congressional nominations for appointments to the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H.R. 16777. A bill to designate certain lands in the Island Bay, Cedar Keys, and Passage Key National Wildlife Refuges in Florida, and the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge in Oklahoma as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 1238. Joint resolution to authorize the temporary funding of the emergency credit revolving fund; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 1239. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to the recommended identification of its historical economic system involving responsible individual enterprise of freemen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.J. Res. 1240. Joint resolution authorizing the provision of funds for U.S. support of the international biological program; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.J. Res. 1241. Joint resolution to authorize the temporary funding of the emergency credit revolving fund; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H. Con. Res. 766. Concurrent resolution to require France to pay its World War I debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUDE:

H. Con. Res. 767. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Social Welfare; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 768. Concurrent resolution urging the President to convey to the Government of France the sense of the Congress with respect to the responsibility of France in connection with the repudiation of its international obligations undertaken in furtherance of the North Atlantic Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself, Mr. FINO, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. RODINO, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. CAREY, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. KUPFERMAN, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. TENZER, and Mr. MURPHY of New York):

H. Res. 1135. A Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States enter into an agreement with the Government of Israel for the sale of military planes, commonly known as Phantom jet fighters necessary for Israel's defense to an amount which shall be adequate to provide Israel with a deterrent

force capable of preventing future Arab aggression by offsetting sophisticated weapons received by the Arab States, and on order for future delivery, and to replace losses suffered by Israel in the 1967 conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 16778. A bill for the relief of Natalina Miceli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 16779. A bill for the relief of Andrea Letizia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16780. A bill for the relief of Dr. Roland Ang Lim, Mrs. Dominga A. V. Lim, and Roland Lim, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 16781. A bill for the relief of Kyu Byung Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 16782. A bill for the relief of Mark P. Hagood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 16783. A bill for the relief of Cheung Lal Chow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 16784. A bill for the relief of Miss Nilda C. Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16785. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ashraf El-Bayoumi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 16786. A bill for the relief of Bokary Bangoura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 16787. A bill for the relief of Giam-piero Federico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16788. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Gugliara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16789. A bill for the relief of Giulio Mannino and Alicia Mannino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16790. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Esteves Fernandes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16791. A bill for the relief of Arminda Alves DaSilva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 16792. A bill for the relief of Hwa Bum Song; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 16793. A bill for the relief of Constantin Demetre Caralis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 16794. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Juana Goni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 16795. A bill for the relief of the Estate of Mary D. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 16796. A bill for the relief of Byung Wu Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 16797. A bill for the relief of Maria da Conceicao Silva Lourenco Salvador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 16798. A bill for the relief of Avelino T. Sales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 16799. A bill for the relief of Frangiskos Voulgaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Wednesday, April 24, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, since we know not what a day may bring forth, but only that the hour for serving Thee is always present, may we wake to the instant claims of Thy holy will; not waiting for tomorrow, but yielding today.

Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet may go; and the humblest work will shine, and the roughest places be made plain. Lift us above unrighteous anger and mistrust to faith, and hope, and charity.

Hasten, we beseech Thee, through us, the day of an ampler life for all, when every man shall dwell in safety among his neighbors, free from gnawing want, free from torturing fears.

"We pledge our hopes, our faith, our lives,
That freedom shall not die:
We pray Thy guidance, strength, and grace:
Almighty God on high."

For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 23, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I understand that objection will be made to the next request, but in view of the fact that the request was made, I am going to ask it, anyway.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, by request, I shall have to object to the request of the acting majority leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of three unobjected to bills which have been on the Calendar since April 10, 1968. They are Calendar Nos. 1073, 1074, and 1075.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PURCHASE OF U.S. OBLIGATIONS

The bill (H.R. 15344) to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1091), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

H.R. 15344 would extend for 2 additional years the authority of the Federal Reserve Board to purchase public debt obligations directly from the Treasury up to a limit of \$5 billion outstanding at any one time. This authority, which would otherwise expire on June 30, 1968, was first granted in its present form in 1942 for a temporary period. It has been renewed by the Congress on 13 separate occasions since that time. While the direct purchase authority has been used sparingly over the years, it has proven to be essential to efficient financial management.

Continuation of the direct purchase authority is necessary for three reasons:

One, the direct purchase authority permits the Treasury to maintain lower cash balances since any temporary or seasonal shortage could be accommodated through direct borrowing from the Federal Reserve System. By maintaining a lower level of cash balances, the interest expenses on the national debt are correspondingly reduced;

Two, the direct purchase authority permits the Treasury an alternative source of borrowing when conditions in the money markets are temporarily unfavorable. The Treasury is able to postpone for a short time market borrowing when such borrowing could be extremely disruptive;

Third, the direct purchase authority is a big element in our financial planning for a national defense emergency. In these circumstances, the Government could need an immediate and ready source of cash at a time when our financial markets were seriously disrupted. It is for this reason that an authority as large as \$5 billion is required although such a large amount has never been used.

THE PRACTICE OF PSYCHOLOGY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1864) to define and regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Practice of Psychology Act".

SEC. 2. The practice of psychology in the District of Columbia is hereby declared to affect the public health, safety, and welfare, and to be subject to regulation and control in the public interest to protect the public from the unauthorized and unqualified practice of psychology, and from unprofessional conduct by persons licensed to practice psychology.

SEC. 3. As used in this Act:

(A) "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of the District of Columbia or his authorized agent or agents.

(B) "Person" includes an association, partnership, or corporation, as well as natural persons.

(C) "Accredited college or university" means any college or university which, in the Commissioner's determination, offers either an acceptable full-time resident graduate program of study in psychology leading to the doctoral degree, or a comparable program. In making his determination concerning domestic educational institutions, the Commissioner shall accredit those institutions included in the listings of approved

academic institutions public by the United States Office of Education; in determining what foreign educational institutions shall be accredited the Commissioner may take into account the published lists of accrediting agencies and of professional associations.

(D) "The practice of psychology" is the rendering of or offering to render to the public for a fee, monetary or otherwise, any service involving the application of established methods and principles of the science and profession of psychology, except as provided in sections 5 and 20 of this Act. These principles and methods are concerned with understanding, predicting, and changing behavior, and they include, but are not restricted to, the use of counseling and psychotherapy with groups or individuals having adjustment problems in the areas of work, family, school, and personal relationships; measuring, testing, and assessing aptitudes, skills, public opinion, attitudes, emotions, personality, and intelligence; teaching or lecturing in psychology and doing research on problems relating to human behavior.

(E) Nothing in subsection (D) shall be construed as permitting either the administration or prescription of drugs or any infringement upon the practice of medicine as defined by the Healing Arts Practice Act of the District of Columbia, approved February 27, 1929 (45 Stat. 1326), as amended.

Sec. 4. The psychologist who engages in practice is expected to assist his client in obtaining professional help for all relevant aspects of the client's problem that fall outside of the boundaries of the psychologist's own competence; for example, provision should be made for the diagnosis and treatment of relevant medical problems by an appropriate, qualified medical practitioner.

Sec. 5. It shall be unlawful for any person to practice or to offer to practice psychology, or to represent himself to be a psychologist, unless he shall first obtain a license or certificate pursuant to this Act, except as hereinafter provided.

(A) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the activities of and use of the title "psychologist" by a person in the employ of any governmental agency, academic institution, charitable agency, research laboratory, or business corporation: *Provided*, That the services performed by such an employee are a part of his office or position and are provided only within the confines of the organization or are offered to like organizations. Persons providing services to the public through governmental organizations, such as clinics, who are compensated by their employer rather than their clients are also exempted under the Act. Persons coming under the exemptions established by this subsection may offer lecture services to the public for a fee but may not offer other psychological services to the public for a fee without having obtained a license.

(B) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the activities of a student intern, or resident in psychology, pursuing a course of study or research with an accredited college, university, or training center: *Provided*, That such activities are supervised as part of his course of study, and he is designated by such title as "psychology intern," "psychology trainee," or other title clearly indicating trainee status.

(C) Nothing in this Act shall prevent the employment by a person furnishing psychological services for remuneration, of an individual not licensed as a psychologist under the provisions of this Act to assist in the performance of psychological and other services, if such individual works under the supervision of a licensed psychologist who assumes full responsibility for his acts, and if such individual is not in any manner held out to the public as a psychologist.

Sec. 6. (A) The Commissioner shall be responsible for reviewing the applications of persons seeking licensure or certification for

the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia, for the granting and renewal of such licenses and certificates, for the preparation and administration of oral and written examinations, and for other matters related to the purposes of this Act.

(B) The Commissioner may appoint a Board of Psychologist Examiners. Each member shall be a citizen of the United States, licensed under the provisions of this Act, who shall either be a resident of the District of Columbia or have worked in the District of Columbia for at least two years preceding appointment to the Board. The initial appointees shall be psychologists eligible for licensure under provisions of this Act.

(C) The Commissioner shall maintain: (1) a record of licenses and certificates granted and refused and of licenses and certificates revoked or suspended which record shall be available to the public; and (2) a complete record of all hearings conducted pursuant to section 15(B) in connection with the denial, suspension, or revocation of a license. A transcript of an entry in a record of hearing, properly certified, shall be prima facie evidence of the facts therein stated.

Sec. 7. The Commissioner shall grant a license to practice psychology to each applicant who submits satisfactory proof that—

(A) he is of good moral character;

(B) he holds either (1) a doctoral degree in psychology from an accredited college or university and has completed two years of postgraduate experience acceptable to the Commissioner, such two years not to include terms of internship, or (2) a doctoral degree in a field related to psychology from an accredited college or university, plus two years of postgraduate experience: *Provided*, That his experience and training are considered by the Commissioner to be comparable to the requirements set forth in (B)(1) of this subsection;

(C) he has passed an examination, written or oral or both, the scope and form of which shall be determined by the Commissioner: *Provided*, That at any given examination session all examinations shall be uniform; and

(D) his application has been accompanied by the necessary fees.

Sec. 8. Within one year from and after the effective date of this Act, a license shall be issued without examination to any applicant who is of good moral character, who either maintains a residence or office, or participates in psychological activities, as determined by the Commissioner, within the District of Columbia, who has submitted an application for license accompanied by the required fee, and who holds—

(A) a doctoral degree in psychology from an accredited college or university or other doctoral degree acceptable to the Commissioner, and has completed at least one year of postgraduate experience not including terms of internship; or

(B) a master's degree in psychology from an accredited college or university, and has engaged in psychological practice acceptable to the Commissioner for five years after the attainment of his highest degree.

Sec. 9. The Commissioner may, in his discretion, grant a license without examination, on payment of the required fee, to any person who at the time of application is licensed or certified under the laws of a State or territory of the United States, or of a foreign country or province whose standards, in the opinion of the Commissioner, were substantially equivalent at the date of such certification or licensure, to the requirements of this Act.

Sec. 10. A psychologist who is not licensed under the provisions of this Act, but (1) who is licensed or certified under the laws of a State or territory of the United States or of a foreign country or province whose standards in the opinion of the Commissioner were substantially equivalent, at the

date of his certification or licensure, to the requirements of this Act, or (2) who meets the requirements of subsections (A) and (B) of section 7 and resides in a State or territory of the United States, or in a foreign country or province which does not grant licenses or certificates to psychologists, may be employed or invited by a person who is a resident of or maintains a place of work in the District of Columbia to offer professional services in said District for a total of not more than sixty days in any calendar year without holding a license issued under this Act. Upon arrival in the District of Columbia, such a psychologist shall report to the Commissioner with respect to the nature and duration of his professional activities in the District as well as the name of the person who has requested him to render services.

A psychologist claiming exemption under the provisions of this section who offers professional services in the District of Columbia for more than twenty days in any calendar year shall file with the Commissioner evidence of his right to such exemption. Upon proof of that right, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner, the Commissioner shall enter the name of the applicant in a register kept for that purpose and shall issue to the applicant a certificate in evidence of such registration.

Sec. 11. The Commissioner may, in his discretion, waive all or part of the examination required under section 7(C) of this Act when the applicant has (1) achieved a position of eminence in the practice of psychology and has demonstrated, over a number of years, competence in areas covered by the examination, or (2) has been certified by a national examining board: *Provided*, That the examination given by the national examining board was as effective for the testing of professional competence as that required in the District of Columbia.

Sec. 12. The District of Columbia Council is authorized to make regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act, and, after public hearings, to fix, increase, or decrease fees to be charged for services performed by the District government pursuant to the provisions of this Act, in such amounts as may, in the judgment of the Council, be reasonably necessary to defray the approximate cost of administering this Act.

Sec. 13. Every person licensed or certified to practice psychology who desires to continue the practice of psychology shall annually pay the required fee for which there will be issued a renewal of licensure or certificate. The Commissioner shall provide a written reminder of the renewal date to every person licensed or registered under this Act, which reminder shall be mailed at least one month in advance. A license or certificate not properly renewed as herein provided shall lapse. The Commissioner shall have the right to reinstate a lapsed license or certificate upon payment of the renewal fee plus a penalty fee. A psychologist who wishes to place his license upon an inactive status may do so by submitting notice thereof to the Commissioner. Such a psychologist may reactivate his license by payment of the renewal fee herein required unless his license has been inactive for a period exceeding five years, in which case he will be required to furnish the Commissioner evidence of his competence to continue or resume the practice of psychology.

Sec. 14. The Commissioner may refuse, revoke, or suspend licensure or certification if the person applying or the person licensed or certified be:

(A) convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude;

(B) found to be using any drug or any alcoholic beverage to an extent or in a manner dangerous to himself, any other person, or the public, or to an extent that such use impairs his ability to perform the work of a psychologist with safety to the public;

(C) convicted of a violation of any pro-

vision of this Act or of the regulations or rules promulgated pursuant thereto;

(D) determined to be a mental incompetent by a court with proper jurisdiction; or
(E) found guilty of the unethical practice of psychology in violation of standards to be established by the Commissioner.

SEC. 15. (A) Proceedings leading toward the suspension or revocation of a license or certificate shall be begun by petition, setting forth good cause therefor, filed with the Commissioner and served on the respondent.

The Commissioner may determine whether a license or certificate shall be suspended or revoked, and if it is to be suspended the duration of such suspension and the conditions under which such suspension shall terminate. Revocation of a license shall not preclude the issuance after the passage of at least five years of a new license or registration to the offender, provided such person can show that he has complied with the provisions of this Act.

(B) Before the revoking, suspending, or refusing to issue a license or certificate for any cause under the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner shall give the person whose right to practice psychology is challenged an opportunity to be heard in person or by attorney, and to produce witnesses on his behalf. After such hearing, should the Commissioner decide to refuse, revoke, or suspend licensure or certification, he shall set forth in writing his reasons for so doing, and shall include detailed findings of fact.

(C) Any person who feels aggrieved by a decision of the Commissioner under subsection (B) of this section may, within thirty days after receiving notice thereof, seek review of said decision in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. Such review shall be subject to appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(D) In hearings conducted pursuant to subsection (B) of this section, the attendance and testimony of witnesses may be compelled by subpoena. Any person refusing to respond to such a subpoena shall be guilty of contempt of court and may be punished as other persons guilty of contempt of court are punished.

SEC. 16. Any person who shall practice psychology, as defined in this Act, without having a valid, unexpired, unrevoked, and unsuspended license or certificate of registration issued under this Act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$500 or confined in jail for not more than six months, or both.

SEC. 17. The unlawful practice of psychology as defined in this Act may be enjoined by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia on petition by the Commissioner, upon a finding that the person sought to be enjoined is guilty of a violation of the provisions of this Act. In any such proceeding it shall not be necessary to show that any person is individually injured by the actions complained of. If the respondent is found guilty of the unlawful practice of psychology, the court shall enjoin him from so practicing unless and until he has been duly licensed. The remedy by injunction hereby given is in addition to criminal prosecution and punishment based thereon, and not in lieu thereof.

SEC. 18. It shall be the duty of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enforce the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 19. In legal proceedings, no psychologist shall disclose any information he has acquired from a person consulting him in his professional capacity without the consent of such person, except only (1) in actions, civil or criminal in which a psychologist is suing or being sued by a former client or his legal representative, such as an action against a psychologist for malpractice, (2) upon an issue as to the validity of a document, such

as a will of a client, (3) in cases where the defendant to a criminal action has raised the defense of mental incapacity.

SEC. 20. (A) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as restricting the use of tools, tests, instruments, or techniques usually denominated "psychological," provided that the user does not represent himself or itself in a manner prohibited by this Act.

(B) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent qualified members of other professions from doing work of a psychological nature consistent with their training and with the code of ethics of their respective professions: *Provided*, That they do not hold themselves out to the public by any title or description incorporating the words "psychological," "psychologist," or "psychology," unless licensed under this Act, and except as provided in section 5(D) of this Act.

SEC. 21. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary to pay the expenses of administering and carrying out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 22. If any section of this Act, or any part thereof, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of any section or part thereof.

SEC. 23. This Act shall become effective ninety days after the date of its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1092), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the protection of the public from the unqualified practice of psychology and from unprofessional conduct of persons practicing psychology in the District of Columbia by requiring all persons who offer psychological services to the public for a fee to obtain a license from the District of Columbia government.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

At the present time, psychologists may practice psychology in the District of Columbia without license or regulation. Your committee has been advised that there have been incidents in which the lives and well-being of residents in the Nation's Capital have been adversely affected by fraudulent persons representing themselves as psychologists. This is happening at a time when the profession of psychology is clearly expanding and is more and more in demand by citizens of this city and elsewhere in the country. Therefore, your committee believes that the bill incorporates the appropriate and necessary steps which must be taken promptly to regulate the quality of psychological services by regulating the practice of psychology as existing law already requires the regulation of other professions within the city.

HEARING

The Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety held a hearing on S. 1864 on August 28, 1967. The bill received the support of the District of Columbia government, the District of Columbia Psychological Association, and the American Psychological Association.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The first section of the bill cites the act as the "Practice of Psychology Act."

Section 2 declares the practice of psychology to affect the public health, safety,

and welfare, and to be subject to regulation and control in the public interest.

Section 3 defines terms used in the bill and provides that "the practice of psychology," as defined in the bill, shall not be construed as permitting the administration or prescription of drugs or any infringement upon the practice of medicine as defined by the Healing Arts Practice Act of the District of Columbia, as amended.

Section 4 states that psychologists are expected to assist their clients in obtaining professional help for aspects of the client's problems that fall outside the area of the psychologists' own competence; for example, that provision should be made for the diagnosis and treatment of relevant medical problems by an appropriate, qualified medical practitioner.

Section 5 requires the licensing of persons who practice psychology for a fee; exempting psychologists employed by Government agencies, academic institutions, charitable agencies, research laboratories, and business corporations. Also exempted are psychology interns and residents, and persons employed by licensed psychologists as defined in the bill.

Section 6 provides that the Commissioner shall be responsible for the issuance and renewal of licenses, authorizes him to provide for the preparation and administration of oral and written examinations, to appoint a Board of Psychologist Examiners to examine applicants for licenses, and requires the maintenance of public records respecting the granting, refusal, suspension, and revocation of licenses.

Section 7 sets forth the requirements for obtaining a license: Good moral character; doctoral degree in psychology or a related field; plus 2 years of postgraduate experience other than internship; and satisfactory performance in an examination.

Section 8 provides for licensing within 1 year without examination of psychologists who either maintain a residence or office, or participate in psychological activities in the District and who have a doctoral degree and 1 year of postgraduate experience or a master's degree in psychology and five years of practice acceptable to the Commissioner.

Section 9 authorizes the Commissioner to grant a license without examination to any person who has received a license from a State or foreign country whose standards are substantially equivalent to those of the District of Columbia.

Section 10 provides that qualified psychologists from outside the District of Columbia may offer professional services in the District for not more than 60 days a year without obtaining a license on request of a person who resides or works in the District. A psychologist claiming this exemption and who offers his professional service within the District for more than 20 days in any calendar year must file with the Commissioner evidence of his right thereto, have his name entered in a register kept by the Commissioner for that purpose, and be issued a certificate evidencing such registration.

Section 11 empowers the Commissioner to waive the licensure examination when the applicant has achieved a position of eminence as a practicing psychologist or has been certified by a national examining board, whose examination was as effective for testing professional competence as that required in the District of Columbia.

Section 12 authorizes the District of Columbia Council to make regulations to carry out the purposes of the act and to fix fees at levels to defray the expense of administering the act.

Section 13 provides for the annual payment of the required fee for renewal of licenses or certificates issued under the act

and contains provisions respecting the reinstatement of lapsed licenses.

Section 14 authorizes the Commissioner to refuse, revoke, or suspend licensure or certification if the applicant, licensee, or certificate holder be (a) convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, (b) found to use drugs or alcoholic beverages so as to endanger himself or others or so as to impair his ability to safely perform psychological services, (c) convicted of violating the act or any regulation thereunder, (d) adjudicated mentally incompetent, and (e) found guilty of unethical practice of psychology in violation of standards set by the Commissioner.

Section 15 sets forth the procedures to be followed by the Commissioner in suspending or revoking a license or certificate. Before a license is revoked, suspended, or refused to be issued by the Commissioner for any cause, the person whose right to practice psychology is challenged shall be entitled to a hearing and to produce witnesses on his behalf. Decisions of the Commissioner refusing, revoking, or suspending licensure or certification must be in writing and must include detailed finding of fact. Any person feeling aggrieved by a decision of the Commissioner may seek a review of the Commissioner's decision in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, which court's decision shall be subject to appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals District of Columbia.

Section 16 provides that any persons practicing psychology without a license or registration certificate shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction be fined not more than \$500 or confined in jail for not more than 6 months, or both.

Section 17 permits injunction actions in the U.S. district court to prevent persons found guilty of violating the act from continuing to practice psychology.

Section 18 directs the Commissioner to enforce the provisions of the act.

Section 19 provides that in legal proceedings, no psychologist shall disclose any information he has acquired from a person consulting him in his professional capacity without the consent of such person, except (1) in actions, civil or criminal, in which a psychologist is suing or being sued by a former client or his legal representative, such as an action against a psychologist for malpractice, (2) upon an issue as to the validity of a document, such as a will of a client, and (3) in cases where the defendant in a criminal action has raised the defense of mental incapacity.

Section 20 provides that so long as a user does not represent himself or itself in a manner prohibited by the act, nothing in the act shall be construed as restricting the use of tools, tests, instruments, or techniques usually denominated "psychological," and that the act shall not be construed to prevent qualified members of other professions from doing work of a psychological nature consistent with their training and the codes of ethics of their professions, so long as they do not hold themselves out to the public as psychologists unless licensed or certified in accordance with the act.

Section 21 authorizes appropriations necessary to pay the expenses of administering and carrying out the purposes of the act.

Section 22 provides a standard severability clause.

Section 23 provides that the act shall be effective 90 days following its enactment.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

Your committee struck out the term "physical" on page 3, line 18, and inserted in lieu thereof "medical." The purpose of the amendment is to emphasize the nonmedical character of the psychology profession and make clear the committee's intent that a person with organic disease complications to behavioral problems should be referred by the psychologist to a medical doctor. The

amendment was requested by the District of Columbia government.

Your committee deleted section 5, subsection (D), establishing different licensing requirements for social psychologists than for other psychologists. This action was taken because the committee sees no justification for treating social psychologists differently from other psychologists in the matter of licensing.

Your committee deleted the language in section 6(B) requiring the Commissioner to name members of the Board of Psychology Examiners from a list submitted by the District of Columbia Psychology Association. The committee believes that the Commissioner should be permitted to name any qualified psychologist to the Board and not be restricted to any list of names submitted by the above-mentioned professional association.

Your committee deleted the language in section 12 permitting the Commissioner to give a certificate of registration to an association, partnership, or corporation. The committee sees no justification for permitting the group practice of psychology when only one member of the group has a license issued in his individual name since the practice of psychology should, as with other disciplines, be licensed on a personal basis. There is ample provision elsewhere in the bill permitting a psychologist to have a trainee or other unlicensed person assist him providing the psychologist is entirely responsible for the actions of such a person working under the licensed psychologist.

In lieu of the language which has been deleted from section 12, the committee amendment authorizes the District of Columbia Council to make regulations to carry out the purposes of the act, and, after public hearings, fix fees to be charged for services performed by the District government pursuant to the provisions of the act.

Section 21 has been deleted by the committee, as no longer applicable in view of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967.

REPAIR OF FIXED EQUIPMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2017) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in District-owned buildings for periods not to exceed 3 years which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "the" strike out "Commissioners of the District of Columbia are" and insert "Commissioner of the District of Columbia is"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 2017

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized to enter into contracts for periods not exceeding three years for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in buildings owned by the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to. The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1093), explaining the purpose of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 2017, which is requested by the District of Columbia government, is to authorize the District to enter into contracts with private concerns for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in District-owned buildings for periods up to 3 years. Under existing authority, these contracts must be executed annually. S. 2017 is substantially similar to Public Law 89-276, approved October 20, 1965, conferring authority on the Administrator of General Services to enter into 3-year contracts for the maintenance of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

Under existing law, the District must execute annually contracts for fixed-equipment systems such as heating, refrigeration, ventilating, air conditioning, electrical, vertical transportation, plumbing, fire protection, watchman, fuel, and pneumatic tube systems. The District government has found it more economical and efficient to provide for servicing of this type of equipment under contracts with private firms specializing in such services rather than training skilled technicians and purchasing and storing innumerable spare parts and supplies.

The present 1-year contract limitation precludes the District from obtaining maximum potential benefits and savings. Some contractors engaged on a 1-year basis have not fully carried out their obligation for equipment maintenance and repair. As a result, latent deficiencies have appeared, after a new contractor has been on the job, making it difficult, if not impossible, to prove responsibility for the deficiencies. Consequently, the District government has had to bear the cost of remedying such deficiencies.

A contractor with a 1-year maintenance contract is not encouraged to do more than will keep the equipment operating for that year, since he does not know whether he will be successful in subsequent bidding. Contractors who have had a 1-year contract sometimes refrain from bidding on such work for a subsequent year because they know, from knowledge gained under a prior contract, that abnormal maintenance will probably be required during the ensuing year. Further, a contractor probably would be less likely to neglect needed maintenance during the early years of a long-term contract, since deficiencies could more easily be traced to him and the more extensive maintenance of subsequent years would be his responsibility. Savings through reduction in preparation of plans and specifications and costly advertising would be realized with multiyear contracts.

Contractors would also benefit from multi-year contracts, since they would be able to make larger volume purchases of supplies, spare parts, and equipment. Personnel of the contractor would become better acquainted with the characteristics of the particular equipment being serviced, and the detailed nature of the conditions and circumstances under which the equipment must be operated. This would result in reduced management problems and expense and provide better service to the using agency. A 3-year contract would encourage better planning by the contractor so that current maintenance would be accomplished with the prospect of less effort and expense being required in subsequent years.

HEARING

S. 2017 was the subject of a public hearing by the Subcommittee on the Judiciary on March 8, 1968. Representatives of the District government testified in favor of this legislation. No opposition was expressed to the enactment of the bill.

CONCLUSION

Your committee is of the opinion that longer contracts should result in greater

economy, safety, and efficiency in the maintenance and operation of buildings and equipment owned by the District government.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in District-owned buildings for periods not to exceed 3 years.

RELATIVE STRENGTH

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in recent years there has been consistent effort to downgrade the opinion of the military about military matters, and at the same time upgrade the opinion of others about military matters.

This is one of the reasons for the continuing lack of military success in the Vietnam theater. To that we should add the impact this war is having on our economy, and its negative influence on our political relationship with all other countries. But that is another story.

The most dangerous aspect of recent policy, however, would seem to be that, as a result of the decisions made with respect to where our time, effort, and money should be allocated to maintain the Nation's military posture, it is now an open question as to whether the United States today is, or is not, the strongest military nation in the world.

Some of our most knowledgeable civilian experts on military matters believe that as a result of these decisions as to priorities, the Soviet Union is already stronger militarily than the United States.

These beliefs are not pleasant to contemplate, but the American people have as much right to know about that side of the coin of informed opinion as they have to receive the opinion of those who continue to assure them that the war in Vietnam is going well, and that the military and political position of this country in the world is in as favorable shape today as it has been in the past.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WORLDWIDE COMMUNIST SCHISM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, recently, officials of the Soviet Union charged that Communist Chinese officials detained a Russian tanker carrying supplies to North Vietnam and that Chinese soldiers broke down doors and used force against the captain and crew of the Soviet ship. The captain of the ship accused the Chinese of having arrested him and his second mate and of phys-

cally assaulting and beating 11 members of his crew. The Soviet Government protested strongly against the unlawful detention on March 27 in Port Whampoa of the Soviet tanker *Komsomolets* carrying a cargo to North Vietnam and against the mistreatment of its crew. Soviet officials stated the Chinese actions were "of a premeditated, provocative nature and a rude violation of international law." Chinese authorities in return charged the Russians with behaving "just like United States imperialists" and stated:

This has clearly exposed the criminal aims of the Soviet leader clique in joining the United States to oppose China.

This was the third serious incident this year of official Soviet protests against the detention of Russian ships and mistreatment of Russian sailors in Chinese ports. Also, earlier this year Soviet leaders charged the Chinese with sabotaging discussions between the two nations on improving shipping conditions along rivers forming borders between the two countries. These incidents are further indication of the bitter enmity that now exists between the two great Communist powers, the Soviet Union and China.

A profound schism exists between the Soviet Union and China, and there has been fighting and bloodshed along their common 6,500 mile border. This belligerency has increased in recent months. Soviet troops were recently stationed in Outer Mongolia, as part of a general Soviet military buildup along the disputed Chinese border to provide protection for that supposed Russian ally against supposedly friendly Communist China. As regarding the most recent incident concerning the detention of a Soviet ship, Chinese Communist leaders have continually denounced and accused the Kremlin leadership of "ganging up" with the United States against China and of "collaborating with U.S. imperialism."

In the Soviet Union last October the 50th anniversary of the revolution was celebrated in a magnificent manner in Moscow. Of 14 Communist countries invited to send their leading governmental officials to this celebration, five nations failed, or refused, to send any delegates whatever. Communist China did not even deign to reply to the invitation. Communist Albania rejected it in scornful language. Then, Kremlin leaders were disturbed because both the North Vietnam and North Korean governments sent minor functionaries to represent them instead of top officials in their governments.

While the military and economic power of the Soviet Union is at an all-time high, the influence of Kremlin leaders on Communist governments throughout the world is at an all-time low. They recently called a meeting of world Communist parties in Hungary proposing to eject China from the Communist movement. Five Communist governments—China, Albania, North Vietnam, North Korea, and Cuba—sent no representatives whatever. Yugoslavia was not invited. The Japanese Commu-

nist Party, one of the largest in the free world, refused the invitation.

The Communist world is clearly in a state of disunity. Recently, top ranking members of the Cuban Communist party were arrested and placed on trial for being too pro-Russian. The Communist party in Czechoslovakia is undergoing an internal political convulsion, which has drastically reduced the power of the pro-Russian element in favor of a younger generation of Communists who openly appeal to nationalism and independence from Russia. Czechoslovakia has become a nationalist Communist nation. It is not a Soviet satellite. Rumania is becoming increasingly more independent, and its delegates walked out of the Budapest conclave. Of the Eastern European Communist countries, only East Germany, still occupied by a substantial armed force of Russian soldiers and airmen, remains a Soviet satellite.

The Budapest Communist meeting was a fiasco. It again revealed the bitter dissension and split between the world's two great Communist powers—the Soviet Union and China.

Nevertheless, rightwing extremists in the United States continue to rant of a monolithic worldwide Communist conspiracy. There is no such thing in truth and in fact. Unfortunately, their hysterical ravings reminiscent of the Joe McCarthy witch-hunting era still influence our foreign policy and work to the detriment of the Nation. Members of that rightwing extremist group of self-appointed vigilantes who term themselves anti-Communists, but who are termed "Birch-saps" by intelligent Americans, represent the last remnant of the witch hunters of the Joe McCarthy era. This reminds one of that couplet, "As I was going up the stair I met a man who wasn't there. He wasn't there again today. I wish, I wish he'd go away."

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the District of Columbia Committee be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVENTION ON THE RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT OF ARBITRAL AWARDS—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive E, 90th Congress, second session, the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and that the convention, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to accession, I transmit herewith the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, adopted at New York on June 10, 1958.

The provisions of the convention are explained in the report of the Secretary of State and in an accompanying memorandum transmitted herewith. The convention will facilitate the recognition and enforcement by foreign courts of arbitral awards granted in the United States as well as similar action by our courts with respect to foreign arbitral awards.

Thirty-three countries are parties to this convention including such nations with which the United States has major trading relations as France, Germany, India, Japan, the Netherlands, and the Philippines. We have been informed that the United Kingdom is taking steps to accede to the convention. Experience under the convention has established that it contributes in many ways to the promotion of international trade and investment. For example, it provides greater flexibility for the arranging of business transactions abroad; it simplifies the enforcement of foreign arbitral awards; it gives more binding effect to awards and standardizes enforcement procedures; and it strengthens the concept of safeguarding private rights in foreign transactions.

Changes in title 9 (arbitration) of the United States Code will be required before the United States becomes a party to the convention. The United States instrument of accession to the convention will be executed only after the necessary legislation is enacted.

There is substantial support for United States accession to this convention among members of the business community concerned with international trade. Both the American Bar Association and the American Arbitration Association support accession. I recommend that the Senate give its advice and consent to accession subject to two declarations for which provision is made in the convention. In the first, the United States would declare that it will apply the convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State. In the second, the United States would declare that it will apply the convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the Federal law of the United States.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 24, 1968.

Enclosures:

1. Report of the Secretary of State.
2. Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards.

PEACE NEGOTIATIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to state my views on

the present controversy raging in the press as to a meeting place for peace negotiations in the Vietnam war.

The President of the United States has made statements to the effect that the United States is willing to go anywhere and meet anywhere in order to talk about peace.

There has been some misunderstanding as to the precise meaning of what the President had in mind about that kind of discussion.

The understanding, from his point of view and that of the Nation, as I understand it, is that our representative would be willing to meet anywhere, go to Hanoi, or even go to Ho Chi Minh's bedroom, if need be, to talk about the fact that we should try to get together and arrange a peace conference and resolve the differences between the two countries.

When we undertake to sit down and formally arrive at a peace treaty, however, there are problems which cannot be arrived at in Ho Chi Minh's bedroom, or in Hanoi. For one thing, to meet with a foreign country to make a treaty of peace, we have to meet where our friends and allies who have an interest in the outcome will be permitted to be present, or to be in the vicinity where they can be consulted and advised, and where they can give their views. Circumstances must be such that our friends will understand us and we will understand them; that they will understand they will not be abandoned, that their interests will most certainly be considered, that whatever agreement is arrived at will be one into which they will feel they have been adequately consulted; we have not and we will not undertake to trespass upon or sacrifice any of the rights of friendly or allied nations without those nations knowing exactly what the terms of an agreement are likely to be. In honor we could not.

There are some countries around the world where some of our friends are not permitted to be present. That is particularly true of some of the Communist countries behind the Iron Curtain. It would create problems with us in meeting some of those countries to have formal negotiation of a peace treaty in countries where we are not confident of adequate police protection being afforded our negotiators. We would need to be in the position of being fairly sure that our negotiators and our friends who are in the vicinity to confer with us would not be subject to having their conference rooms bugged, or their telephones tapped, that we could communicate with one another, and that they could also communicate with their home governments, in order for a proper conference to be held.

Thus, my understanding is that both the suggestions from Hanoi and from the President have made reference to the fact that we want to meet at any suitable or reasonable meeting place. There are a number of places which have been considered which would not be appropriate for a peace conference, for a number of reasons, where everything would be under the control of the adversary, or else our friends or our adversary would object because places might be in areas

that would be friendly or sympathetic to the views of the United States or the allies of the United States.

There have been suggestions as to a number of different places and areas. I have no doubt that if there is any desire or willingness to negotiate, the two sides will find neutral ground acceptable to both.

This Nation has made some suggestions. The powers in North Vietnam have also made some. We have said to them, "If you do not find this place adequate, what we suggest is that you suggest a place you think would be agreeable or more desirable in which to hold a conference."

If the powers in Hanoi are interested in peace, I have no doubt in my mind that this can be resolved, if they will make a few suggestions as to meeting places where they would either be neutral or where our side of the conference table would be under the control of people friendly to this Government and the other side of the conference table would be under the control of people friendly to that government.

Mr. President, I recall a precedent that might serve some useful purpose.

Once, when the Committees on Appropriations of both House and Senate could not agree on a major appropriation bill, they could not agree on where they were going to meet. The position was that one time the House conferees would come over to the Senate and the next time the Senate conferees would go over to the House. The House Members decided that that was no longer satisfactory and insisted that we should always confer on the House side of the Capitol Building.

The controversy raged for more than a month and it looked as though the Government might have to come to an end because it could not pass any essential appropriations to continue the functions of the Government merely because of the pride of the House Members in the House and the pride of the Senators in the Senate.

Eventually, the matter was resolved. Fortunately, a new wing had just been built in the Capitol, under the entrance, including a room equidistant from the House Chamber and the Senate Chamber. I believe the room number is EF-100. Thus, it was possible, in that room, for the senior members of the Appropriations Committees to meet. The House members sat on the House side of the Capitol and the Senate members sat on the Senate side of the Capitol, neither one under the jurisdiction of the other.

Thus, the troublesome controversy about where to meet on appropriation bills was resolved.

Mr. President, I would suggest that perhaps that precedent might serve as one idea for an appropriate meeting place, somewhere on the borders of the Iron Curtain or the Bamboo Curtain where our adversary is firmly in possession of one side and the United States could be firmly in possession of the other side. Each side could draw up its boundary line, or they could find a place where a nation is not trying to force one side

to yield to the other and agree upon some capital in a neutral nation, or anywhere else in a neutral nation as an adequate meeting place to hold the conference.

So with probably two-thirds of the area of the earth available for both sides to choose a meeting place. I would hope those powers in North Vietnam would agree with us on some reasonable, adequate, suitable, neutral meeting place. It could be at sea, anywhere on the high seas; it could be in some nation that would appear to be neutral with regard to the issues in contest; or it could even be in some nation that perhaps could be leaning toward the other side—provided that proper security and proper protection of the interests of the negotiators from this side could be guaranteed and secured.

So there is no real reason why that problem could not be resolved, and I look forward to the day when both sides will arrive at an agreement on a suitable meeting place. But we need not delay holding meetings to decide on a place where a peace conference could be held. That could be arrived at quickly and could be held almost anywhere.

RETIREMENT OF MAJ. ROBERT McLEAN FROM ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the directors of the Associated Press during its current meeting saluted Maj. Robert McLean as "a living symbol of the Associated Press—a personification of its ideals."

Major McLean yesterday retired as a member of the board of directors after 44 years of extraordinary service, including 19 years as president of the world's largest news-gathering organization.

Mr. McLean, chairman of the board of the Philadelphia Bulletin and the Santa Barbara, Calif., News Press, first was elected to the Associated Press board in 1926. The members reelected him 14 times to 3-year terms.

It was my privilege to serve alongside him as a member of the board of directors—and under his leadership as president—for 13 years. Never have I known an individual more dedicated to a cause than Robert McLean has been to the Associated Press and to the integrity and objectivity of its news report.

Robert McLean is, indeed, a living symbol of this news-gathering organization; he is, indeed, a personification of its ideals; he has, indeed, been a source of inspiration and confidence to his colleagues.

In speaking today of Robert McLean and his ideals, I want to broaden it to include the whole concept of a free press.

I speak as one who is convinced that democratic government and individual freedom cannot long exist unless its media of communication remain free.

I speak as one who is convinced that the media of communications cannot continually remain free without dedication to integrity and objectivity, and without having paramount the public interest.

Our Nation has two great news-gathering organizations, the Associated Press

and United Press International. It is important that we always have at least two strong competing nationwide and worldwide news-gathering services.

Over many years I have had close association with the directors, the management, and the talented personnel of the Associated Press; through the years I have had wide acquaintances among the reporters and the executives of United Press International.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I feel that our Nation is a better nation today—and a better informed nation—because of the aggressiveness, the initiative, and, above all, the integrity of AP and UPI.

Most of us in public life have from time to time had our quarrels with the press. Most of us at various times would like to have been quoted differently from what we were. Most of us are convinced, and I among them, that the communications media are not without their faults.

But I for one am convinced that, taken as a whole, those who toil in the vineyards of news gathering and dissemination are ably and conscientiously serving the public interest.

So as Robert McLean retires from 44 years as the director of the AP, I salute him, I salute him as a personification of the ideals of a free press.

DOCUMENTATION OF THE VESSEL "OCEAN DELIGHT"

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 10) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Ocean Delight*, owned by Saul Zwecker, of Port Clyde, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 10) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Ocean Delight*, owned by Saul Zwecker, of Port Clyde, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges, which was, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 and the provisions of Section 4132 of the Revised Statutes as amended the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall cause the vessel *Ocean Delight*, built in Meteghan, Nova Scotia, and now owned by Port Clyde Packing Co., Inc., of Port Clyde, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States, upon compliance with the usual requirements, to engage in the coastwise trade and the fisheries, so long as such vessel is owned by a citizen of the United States.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, S. 10 as amended by the House still retains the full intent and purpose of the measure as enacted by the Senate, and the amend-

ment made in the House is merely technical in nature.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alaska that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF THE VESSEL "ANNIE B." IN THE COASTWISE TRADE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I now ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1093) to authorize the use of the vessel *Annie B.* in the coastwise trade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1093) to authorize the use of the vessel *Annie B.* in the coastwise trade which was strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 and the provisions of Section 4132 of the Revised Statutes as amended the vessel *Annie B.*, owned by William M. Fifield of Stonington, Maine, may be used in the coastwise trade so long as such vessel is owned by a citizen of the United States and so long as it is used for the transportation of bait and supplies for the lobster and crab fisheries within the State of Maine.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, as was the case with regard to S. 10, this amendment is merely a technical amendment; and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTERS WATCH DEMOCRATS ON RIOTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column by David Lawrence entitled "Voters Watch Democrats on Riots," which appeared in yesterday's issue of the Washington Star.

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

VOTERS WATCH DEMOCRATS ON RIOTS

(By David Lawrence)

The American people will have an opportunity in November to vote for or against the Democratic party and pass judgment on the way it has dealt with the riots and disturbances in America.

Inasmuch as the Democratic party has been in control of the White House and the

Congress for the last eight years, the issue will be whether or not it has fulfilled its obligation to preserve law and order. "Peace at home" directly affects more people than "peace abroad."

Up till now, the usual alibi offered is that the states and the cities rather than the federal government have the major responsibility. The District of Columbia, however, is completely under the jurisdiction of the President and the Congress. In recent riots, several people were killed, many were injured, and large losses in property damage were inflicted upon the residents of the nation's capital. Although there are indications of planned operations to create disorder, prosecutions of such conspiracies have not materialized.

It is known that experts in making firebombs, as well as persons with criminal records, have been involved in the disorders. Some of the planning in the recent "disturbance" here called for diversionary maneuvers, designed to draw the police and federal troops away from the Capitol Building, as militants plotted to take over the Capitol Building itself. Only when large numbers of police and federal troops were spread throughout the area were the militants finally discouraged.

Sen. Russell Long, D-La., and majority whip in the senate, pledged in a television interview on Sunday to "keep a close watch" on the U.S. Department of Justice to see whether provisions in the recently passed Civil Rights Act concerning punishment for rioters will be enforced. He said:

"The provisions (in the law) will make the federal government help us do something about people that throw firebombs into a man's place of business or people who shoot at the policemen and firemen when they are trying to perform their duties."

Most of the persons killed and injured recently in the nationwide riots were Negroes. There has been a disposition nevertheless not to take vigorous action in handling the riots for fear of antagonizing large groups of Negro voters who, it has been assumed, might misinterpret firmness in dealing with disorders as merely opposition to displays or expression of opinion.

Communist organizations are believed to be in the background. It is to their interest to provoke as much discord as possible inside the United States. Some of the troublemakers have ties with Castro's Cuba and are directly or indirectly connected with Red Chinese agents who have been touring different countries in this hemisphere in an effort to stir up guerrilla warfare and carry on subversive acts.

The U.S. Senate Internal Security subcommittee charged in 1966 that the Communist party had played a key role in the campus revolts throughout the country. J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI, has described certain of the student clubs as "Communist-born." Many members of Congress suspect that a Communist angle exists in the plots and planned disorders. The theory is that, whenever a schedule of "demonstrations" is announced, the subversives prepare to move in behind the scenes. Then, when the marches and rallies occur, disorders break out in so many places that the police are unable to cope with them.

For a long time, it has been believed that Washington could be a model city because it has the benefit of close supervision by Congress and the President. Today, on the other hand, many residents of the District of Columbia are worried and apprehensive. The administration in power has the responsibility for maintenance of public order here. What it does in the next six months to expose the conspiracies behind the killing of innocent persons, the setting of fires and the looting of stores will be watched by the whole country. Failure to act will be an indication to the people that only an over-

whelming protest at the polls will wake up the politicians and convince them that public opinion doesn't want to see sociological reforms tackled on a large scale until after the security of the individual in American life has been assured.

CAN U.S. RIOT STRATEGY WORK AGAIN?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column by Orr Kelly, entitled "Can U.S. Riot Strategy Work Again?" which appeared in yesterday's issue of the Washington Star.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

CAN U.S. RIOT STRATEGY WORK AGAIN?

(By Orr Kelly)

The nation's police and military leaders have found the perfect strategy for dealing with civil disorders in American cities. The only trouble is, the strategy might not work the next time around.

Within hours after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. on April 4, elements of a carefully worked out military plan known as Operation Garden Plot began to go into effect, directed from the Army Operations Center at the Pentagon.

The theory behind Operation Garden Plot, applying lessons learned the hard way in Newark and Detroit last summer, was that a massive show of force would be sufficient to quell civil disturbances with a minimum loss of life.

Soldiers assigned to riot control duty received a wallet card listing nine special orders, including the following one, which emphasized the effort to avoid use of firearms:

"I will not load or fire my weapon except when authorized by an officer in person; when authorized in advance by an officer under certain specific conditions or when required to save my life."

In Washington, Baltimore and Chicago, where federal troops were deployed in large numbers, the approach worked.

Property loss, from fire and looting, was relatively high. But loss of life, especially in comparison with Detroit and Newark, was minimal.

The early imposition of a citywide curfew in Washington was also cited by Cyrus R. Vance, the former deputy defense secretary, as an important factor in restoring order without loss of life. This will undoubtedly be an important part of the new strategy if and when trouble breaks out again.

But at least some military officers who had an opportunity to observe the situation in several cities in the few days after the assassination are not at all optimistic that the strategy will work as well in the future as it appeared to work earlier this month.

The success the police and military achieved resulted from the use, under a carefully prepared plan, of disciplined forces in massive numbers (the division-sized force that rushed into Washington was larger than the allied force required to drive the Viet Cong from the city of Hue) against scattered, undisciplined groups of people acting without any apparent direction or plan.

Now, to see why the strategy that seemed to work so well might not prove so effective again, change that formula just a little bit.

Suppose there is even minimal planning for the arson, looting and rioting. Add a small number of disciplined leaders. Gather rioters in key spots so they cannot be effectively controlled without use of force.

With these rather small changes, a future

confrontation between rioters and the police and military could be far more bloody.

Loss of life would be particularly difficult to avoid if shots or grenades were directed at the police or soldiers from the midst of a mob in a deliberate and cynical attempt to create a bloody and inflammatory incident.

The problem would become vastly more complicated, too, if a small, disciplined group managed to disrupt police and military communications, or if fires were set in a pattern designed to overtax a city's fire-fighting capacity.

The debate over whether or not police should try to kill arsonists or maim looters misses the point.

A more meaningful question is whether the police and military could, if they were faced with a planned and disciplined effort to disrupt the life of a major American city, restore and maintain order without killing or wounding significant numbers of people.

It may be that the strategy of Operation Garden Plot can be adjusted to meet such a threat without serious bloodshed. But this month's experiences leave that question unanswered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY GEN. ERIK KRAGH, MEMBER OF THE DANISH PARLIAMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who are away from the floor at the moment, I have been asked to present to the Senate, Gen. Erik Kragh, Conservative Member of the Danish Parliament. Mr. Kragh, a retired major general, has been attending a meeting of the North Atlantic Assembly's Standing Committee here in Washington. General Kragh is Denmark's representative on that committee.

I take great pleasure in announcing to the Senate that General Kragh is present, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 2 minutes, so that Senators may welcome this distinguished visitor. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess.

Thereupon, at 1:41 p.m., the Senate took a recess for 2 minutes, and General Kragh was greeted by Senators.

The Senate reconvened at 1:43 p.m., upon the expiration of the recess, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair).

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 16409) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1965 to provide salary increases for teachers and school officers in the

District of Columbia public schools, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.**

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

**ADDITIONAL FACILITIES PROJECT PROPOSED FOR
NAVAL RESERVE**

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, the location, nature, and estimated cost of an additional facilities project proposed to be undertaken for the Naval Reserve, Naval Air Station, Dallas, Tex., new water well; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director of the American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the financial condition of the Legion as of December 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of Project Mohole by the National Science Foundation, dated April 23, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the need for improved communication between Army commands to avoid procurement of unneeded combat weapons systems, Department of the Army, dated April 24, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 913. A bill to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for the recording of trust agreements and other evidences of equipment indebtedness of water carriers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1094).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3368. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John D. Noble, Jr., U.S. Air Force Reserve; and

S. 3369. A bill for the relief of Dr. Israel Castellanos Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. MILLER):

S. 3370. A bill for the relief of Hua-Ling Nieh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 3371. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ramesh K. Kuba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3372. A bill for the relief of Antonio Carbone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3373. A bill for the relief of Dr. Andres Raul Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3374. A bill for the relief of Sabatino Contrisciani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 3375. A bill for the relief of Blandina Salvador; and

S. 3376. A bill for the relief of Christina Bangcawayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3377. A bill to increase the limitation on the number of officers for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 3378. A bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CASE):

S. 3379. A bill to designate certain lands in the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, Morris County, N.J., as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 3377—INTRODUCTION OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the Secretary of Transportation, a bill to increase the limitation on the number of officers for the U.S. Coast Guard.

Enactment of Public Law 89-444 increased the maximum number of authorized Coast Guard officers from 3,500 to 4,000. The 4,000-authorized-officer level will be reached in the near future due to the expanded role of the Coast Guard, including the deployment of forces in Southeast Asia. This bill would increase the maximum authorized limitation to 5,000 officers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there be printed in the RECORD the letter from the Secretary of Transportation to the President transmitting the proposed bill and a comparative type showing changes in existing law to be made by the proposed bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and comparative text will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3377) to increase the limitation on the number of officers for the Coast Guard, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and comparative type, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1968.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To increase the limitation on the number of officers for the Coast Guard."

The proposed bill would raise the limitation on the maximum number of officers,

excluding commissioned warrant officers, on active duty which could be authorized for the Coast Guard from four thousand to five thousand.

When the last increase in this maximum number was authorized, from three thousand five hundred to four thousand, with the enactment of Public Law 89-444, it was anticipated that the increase would accommodate planned growth until the 1970-1972 period. However, increased mission responsibilities of the Coast Guard including the deployment of forces to Southeast Asia and the transfer of new functions to the Coast Guard have combined with the expected growth to create a demand for personnel which exceeded original expectations.

As a result the existing limitation of four thousand will be reached in the very near future. In order to continue to meet immediate needs and provide a realistic ceiling for the foreseeable future, an increase in the maximum limitation to five thousand is necessary.

It should be observed that in itself, the proposed amendment will not result in an actual increase in the number of officers on active duty in the Coast Guard and therefore there are no costs associated with raising the limit. Actual increases will result only as program increases are authorized through the annual budget and appropriation process. Any additional officers allowed would parallel overall personnel strength increases authorized through the same process.

It would be appreciated if you would lay this proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

ALAN S. BOYD.

**COMPARATIVE TYPE SHOWING CHANGES IN
EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE PROPOSED BILL**

(Matter proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets; new matter is in italics)

TITLE 14

§ 42. Number and distribution of commissioned officers.

"(a) The total number of commissioned officers, excluding commissioned warrant officers, on active duty in the Coast Guard shall not exceed [four] *five* thousand."

**S. 3378—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL
TO PROVIDE FOR INCREASED
PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED
STATES IN THE INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION**

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, and for other purposes.

The proposed bill has been requested by the Secretary of the Treasury and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the

Secretary of the Treasury to the Vice President dated April 19, 1968, in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3378) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3378

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Development Association Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 10. The United States Governor is hereby authorized (1) to vote in favor of the Second Replenishment Resolutions providing for an increase in the resources of the Association, and (2) to agree on behalf of the United States to contribute to the Association the sum of \$480 million, as recommended by the Executive Directors in a report dated March 8, 1968, to the Board of Governors of the Association. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, \$480 million for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States share of the increase in the resources of the Association."

The letter, presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT, is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, April 19, 1968.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association."

In his foreign aid message, the President noted that the International Development Association, the World Bank's concessional lending affiliate, is almost without funds. He stated that "discussions to provide the needed capital and balance of payments safeguards are now under way. 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."

The Second Replenishment discussions have now been completed and the Board of Executive Directors of IDA has submitted a report and proposed Resolutions to the Governors embodying a specific proposal for replenishing the resources of the Association. The proposal calls for a total increase in resources of \$1.2 billion to be paid over a three-year period beginning in 1968. Other countries will contribute \$720 million and the U.S. share would be \$480 million—40 percent of the total—to be paid in three equal annual installments of \$160 million. This proposed \$160 million annual contribution represents a reduction of one-third from the FY 1969 Budget estimate of annual installments of \$240 million for the United States contribution to IDA. Furthermore, payment of the first \$160 million installment in FY 1969 and of the two further installments in each of the succeeding fiscal years is to be made in the form of a letter of credit and only a portion of the \$160 million would be reflected in actual cash expenditures in FY 1969. The

Second Replenishment proposal incorporates the balance of payments safeguards for the United States that we have regarded as essential. Until 1971 at a minimum, these safeguards will also result in a reduction of budgetary expenditures significantly below our annual commitment of \$160 million.

The draft bill would (a) authorize the U.S. Governor of IDA (1) to vote for the Resolutions providing the terms of the Second Replenishment, and (2) to agree to contribute the U.S. share of this replenishment, and (b) authorize the appropriation of \$480 million in order to make this payment.

The International Development Association was established in 1960 as an affiliate of the World Bank, to provide financing of development projects on easier repayment terms than the World Bank could provide. IDA's membership is divided into two classes: Part I countries, which are in a position to provide assistance to the developing countries; and Part II countries, which are still in the process of development. Initial subscriptions to the capital stock of the Association totaled \$767 million in convertible currencies and \$219 million in local currencies, and were paid in five annual installments over the period 1960-1964. The U.S. subscription was \$320 million.

The Part I countries contributed an additional \$750 million in convertible currencies over the three-year period 1965-1967. Congress approved a U.S. share of \$312 million—41.6 percent of the total. In addition, the World Bank has transferred \$210 million from its net income to the Association on a grant basis.

IDA credits have made a major contribution to the economic growth of the less-developed countries and the Association has achieved a high reputation for efficient and sound management of its resources. Since its inception, IDA has made 118 credits to 38 countries totaling \$1.7 billion for projects in transportation, agriculture, industry and education. Credits on IDA terms are essential if the pace of economic development is to be maintained and an intolerable debt burden on the developing nations is to be avoided. A replenishment of IDA will assure the continued flow of capital resources to developing nations on terms they can afford.

As of February 29, 1968, the Association committed \$1,741 million of its total convertible currency resources of \$1,793 million and thus had available only \$52 million. These funds will be fully committed by June 30, 1968. Unless the Second Replenishment Resolutions are adopted by June 30, IDA must cease making new commitments.

In March of last year, I was authorized by President Johnson to support a substantial IDA replenishment provided that account would be taken of the balance of payments problems of deficit donor countries in deciding how IDA's new resources would be made available. It is important that the Second Replenishment of IDA not impair the program to achieve equilibrium in our international accounts. The arrangements that have been negotiated to achieve this result.

The principal impact of the Second Replenishment balance of payments safeguards can be stated quite simply—the Second Replenishment will be managed for the next three years so as to avoid adding to any serious U.S. balance of payments deficit. In summary, the arrangements will provide that if identifiable procurement in the United States is less than our pro rata share of a draw down of our contribution, the difference would not be paid in and would be deferred for at least three years. To the extent of such deferment, cash expenditures at the time of deferment would be significantly less than our three-year annual commitment of \$160 million, although the deferred amounts would be called at a later time. There is no adverse balance of payments impact on the U.S. if disbursements to IDA are limited to an amount equal to pur-

chases of goods and services in the United States as a result of IDA credits.

Under the arrangements, no drawings at all may be made in excess of identifiable procurement until June 30, 1971. This was made possible by the willingness of some other countries, particularly some of the surplus countries, to allow accelerated drawings on their contributions in excess of their pro rata share. Only if this source of funds is used up, after June 30, 1971, the U.S. may be called upon for drawings in excess of identifiable procurement. Any amount that is deferred may not be called upon for three years regardless of whether the deferral occurs before or after June 30, 1971. The United States has represented its intention to waive these balance of payments safeguards when it considers its payments deficit no longer serious.

IDA must not be allowed to go out of business for want of funds. Prompt action by the United States is necessary in order to bring the Second Replenishment into effect by June 30. The continued successful operation of this multilateral financing institution is in our vital interest. The balance of payments safeguards incorporated into this proposal assure that our financial contribution will not have an adverse effect on our international accounts. I strongly recommend prompt enactment of this legislation.

A special report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies relating to the proposed Second Replenishment of IDA resources will be transmitted to you and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. An identical bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the proposed legislation would be in accordance with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

S. 3379—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO GREAT SWAMP WILDERNESS AREA

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Senator CASE, of New Jersey, a bill to place in wilderness status 3,750 acres of the Great Swamp in Morris County, N.J. An identical bill is being introduced today in the House of Representatives by Representative FRELINGHUYSEN, in whose district the Great Swamp lies. And the other 14 Members of the New Jersey House delegation are cosponsoring Representative FRELINGHUYSEN's bill. Thus the entire New Jersey congressional delegation is on record in support of this legislation.

I might add that, following hearings in Morris County last year, Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, also has recommended this tract, which is now a national wildlife refuge, for inclusion in the wilderness system.

Mr. President, it may seem incongruous to some to create a wilderness area—where, by law, man may be only a temporary visitor and his works are barred forever—in the teeming New York metropolitan area. But I find nothing incongruous in it. Indeed, I find it entirely fitting that the Nation's most urban State should also be one of the first to have a wilderness area designated within its borders.

In urban and suburban New Jersey, man has reshaped the earth to his own needs and wishes. The skyscraper and

the jetport, the freeway and the shopping center have left almost no trace of the land that our fathers found but three short centuries ago.

The Great Swamp is the last sizable vestige, in northern New Jersey, of that natural heritage. It has resisted the encroachments of man to this point because of an accident of topography and geography. But even these features will not be sufficient to protect it from the bulldozers if we do not act now.

Only by legislative fiat can we now preserve the island of beauty and solitude in the midst of 30 million people. Already, the developers have turned acquisitive eyes on this tract. Presently, it is the Port of New York Authority which wants to build a giant jetport, but if that threat is turned back there will be another and another and another until, finally, the pressures of our growing population would overwhelm and overpower those who seek to preserve this island in a sea of concrete.

I shall not burden the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the technical reasons why this section of the Great Swamp is deemed especially suitable for designation as a wilderness area. The Department of the Interior has amply documented these reasons and its report is readily available to those who wish to see it. Suffice to say that it more than meets all the criteria which have been established by the Congress and by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. President, I intend to ask the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who is chairman of the Subcommittee of Public Lands of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for an early hearing on this bill. It is relatively free of controversy—only three of more than 200 statements at last year's hearing were opposed to the measure—and I do not anticipate that the hearing would take more than 1 day.

At this point, I am optimistic that this bill can be reported favorably this year and that the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on its final passage before adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3379) to designate certain lands in the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, Morris County, N.J., as wilderness, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CASE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am glad to join with my colleague, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, in introducing legislation to create the Great Swamp Wilderness in Morris County, N.J.

Identical legislation also is being introduced today in the House. It is indicative of the strong support for this bill that all of New Jersey's 15 Congressmen have joined in introducing it in their body.

The Great Swamp bill has been strongly supported by the Secretary of the Interior and recommended to the Congress by the President. It has the endorsement of the Governor, of other State and local officials in New Jersey, of businessmen, of conservationists, and of

thousands of interested citizens. When field hearings on the proposal were held last year, 6,212 individual letters and wires were received and all but two were in support of the wilderness area proposal for the Great Swamp.

The bill before the Congress is a simple one. It would place about 3,750 acres of the swamp in a national wilderness area. The area to be so protected includes sections of land known as the M. Hartley Dodge and Harding Wildernesses. At present these areas are part of the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge which is administered by the U.S. Department of the Interior.

Because the Dodge and Harding units are, in effect, "roadless islands" with unusual ecological features, and are within a national wildlife refuge, they qualify for protection under the Wilderness Act. This protection would preserve them in their present wild state forever. No buildings would be permitted. Access would be by foot or horseback only.

Wilderness area designations are the surest guarantee we have against encroachments on the natural wonders of our land. Such designations are made by acts of Congress and, therefore, can only be changed by Congress. This contrasts with national wildlife refuges which are created by a special commission and placed under control of the Interior Department. As past experience has shown, this protection, as good as it is, can be vulnerable to political pressures.

The Great Swamp needs all the protection it can get. Since 1959 the Port of New York Authority has sought to convince the public that the swamp is the ideal site for a new global jetport the port authority wants to build in the metropolitan area. I and others have strongly opposed location of a jetport in the Great Swamp. Largely because of this opposition, reinforced by the State legislature, the port authority proposal for the swamp has not gotten to first base.

The port authority proposal in 1959 did, however, trigger a nationwide effort to save the Great Swamp. More than a million dollars was collected and with it some 3,000 acres acquired for donation to the Federal Government as part of a Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge. The refuge was established in May 1964 and eventually will consist of about 5,800 acres, including lands that are being purchased by the Federal Government.

More than half of the 5,800 acres will comprise the new wilderness area. The remainder of the refuge will continue to be managed by the Interior Department to enhance its use by migratory and nesting waterfowl.

Supporting it as it does a wide variety of plantlife and animal and bird species, the swamp is a priceless outdoor laboratory and classroom for scientists and scholars. In addition, it serves as a source of enjoyment for those simply interested in viewing the wonders of nature.

Moreover, the swamp is important to the water supply of the region. By holding runoff waters and releasing them gradually, the swamp exercises a beneficial influence on the level of the Passaic River. In this context, it is a natural

helpmate in the fight against flooding or pollution of the Passaic.

The Great Swamp is both "unique and the last of its kind," in northern New Jersey, according to the Department of the Interior. The swamp also has been described as an island of beauty in the midst of a sea of increasing urban ugliness. It is that and more. If Congress acts promptly, large portions of this unique natural wonder can be preserved untouched for the enrichment of present and future generations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON OBSERVANCE OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMISTICE DAY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I submit today a Senate concurrent resolution establishing a joint select committee to make plans for the appropriate observance of the 50th anniversary of Armistice Day, which is celebrated in many areas of the United States as Veterans Day.

November 11, 1968, will be the 50th anniversary of the armistice which ended the "war to end all wars."

As we are engaged in the conflict in Vietnam, it behooves us more than ever to pay homage to the millions of veterans who have protected their country, many with the ultimate sacrifice, from aggression around the world in an attempt to bring peace and prosperity to the world as a whole.

The dissension and the debate which has racked our country over our involvement in Vietnam should never be allowed to dim the high sacrifices made by our veterans or detract from the worthy objectives of this Nation over the past half a century in defending freedom. It is, therefore, even more appropriate that we pause during this dissent and during this debate in our country to reflect upon our Nation's goals and to honor all veterans.

The concurrent resolution would establish a joint select committee of Congress composed of 20 members. Ten Members of the House of Representatives would be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and would be divided equally among members of the two parties. The other 10 members would come from the Senate and would be appointed by the President of the Senate and would be divided equally among members of the two parties.

The committee would be directed to submit to Congress, no later than July 1, 1968, its recommendations as to the manner in which the Congress might give appropriate public recognition to the 50th anniversary of Armistice Day, together with such additional recommendations as the committee might consider useful with respect to concurrent observations by other departments and establishments of the Government, by the several States, by organizations of veterans, other patriotic organizations, and community groups.

It is my hope that should such legislation be enacted and should the com-

mittee report be adopted, our country would recognize this important anniversary with a general closing of all businesses so that the entire Nation may pause to pay homage to the veterans who made that day possible.

The importance of this 50th anniversary celebration was called to my attention by an old friend, Ray Gallagher, of Redfield, S. Dak., the present junior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Mr. Gallagher, who is a past commander of the South Dakota Veterans of Foreign Wars, accurately stated that such legislation should be supported in an attempt to impress upon our Nation the importance of our undertaking in Vietnam as well as recognition for past sacrifices by our veterans.

I ask unanimous consent that this concurrent resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 71) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 71

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That November 11, 1968, being the fiftieth anniversary of the date of the armistice which concluded hostilities in the armed conflict now known to history as World War I, there is established a joint select committee to make plans for the appropriate observance of this anniversary by the Congress, which committee shall be known as the Joint Select Committee on Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of Armistice Day (hereinafter in this concurrent resolution referred to as "the committee").

SEC. 2. The committee shall be composed of 20 members selected as follows:

(1) Ten Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to be divided equally among members of the two parties; and

(2) Ten Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, to be divided equally among members of the two parties.

(b) Any vacancy in the committee shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

SEC. 3. The committee shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The committee is authorized to procure necessary clerical assistance and office supplies and to utilize the services of the departments and establishments of the Government.

SEC. 5. As promptly as may be practicable, but not later than July 1, 1968, the committee shall submit to the Congress its recommendations as to the manner in which the Congress might give appropriate public recognition to the fiftieth anniversary of Armistice Day, presently celebrated in many areas of the country as Veterans' Day, together with such additional recommendations as the committee might consider useful with respect to concurrent observances by other departments and establishments of the Government, by the several States, and by organizations of veterans other patriotic organizations, and community groups.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee shall be paid equally from the contingent funds of the House of Representatives and the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman or the vice chairman of the committee.

SEC. 7. Within thirty days after November

11, 1968, the committee shall make a final report to the Congress, on submission of which report, the committee shall cease to exist.

RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZATION OF PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "PLANNING-PROGRAMING-BUDGETING: SELECTED COMMENT"

Mr. JACKSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 280); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 280

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations five thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "Planning-Programing-Budgeting: Selected Comment", issued by that committee during the Ninetieth Congress, first session.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 706

Mr. HOLLINGS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 724) for the relief of certain individuals, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Wednesday, May 1, 1968, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

June L. Green, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge, District of Columbia, vice Burnita S. Matthews, retired March 1, 1968.

John H. Pratt, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge, District of Columbia, vice Alexander Holtzoff, retired December 31, 1967.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON TAX CONVENTIONS WITH FRANCE AND THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to announce that a public hearing has been scheduled on the tax convention with France (Ex. N, 90-1) and the tax convention with the Philippines (Ex. D, 89-1). The hearing will be held at 10 a.m., Tuesday, April 30, 1968, in room 4221, New Senate Office Building.

Persons wishing to testify on either of these conventions should get in touch with Mr. Arthur M. Kuhl, the chief clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MISSIONS OF MERCY AND ACTS OF COMPASSION BY THE PEOPLE OF CICERO, ILL.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, during these times of tension among segments of our citizenry, there seems to be a tendency to highlight or emphasize every act of opposition, ill feeling, and mischief, with little recognition of Christian concern and civic contributions in times of crisis in certain communities such as that experienced in Cicero, Ill.

I believe it would be remiss to fail to mention publicly these missions of mercy and acts of compassion. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter of thanks to the people of Cicero by Rev. Henry Mitchell, director of the North Star United Missionary Workers of America, 1257 South Pulaski Road, Chicago, Ill., as it appeared in the April 17, 1968, issue of the Life newspapers.

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

A GRATEFUL NEGRO CLERGYMAN WRITES THANKS TO CICERO

(NOTE.—The following letter came to the Life Newspapers yesterday from the Reverend Henry Mitchell, director of the North Star United Missionary Workers of America, 1257 S. Pulaski rd., Chicago.)

To the Good People of Cicero:

It gives the North Star United Missionary Workers of America great joy to say "thanks" for the many blessings that you have bestowed upon our Negro community in time of our crisis.

It has been proven to the Negroes on the west side of Chicago that the people of Cicero care more for the poor people than many, many middle class income Negroes.

While Stokely Carmichael was telling Negroes to arm themselves with weapons and go out into the streets and kill all white people, the people of Cicero were arming themselves with clothes and food to give to the Negro community.

Every day we are opening our doors to distribute food and clothing to the poor and the needy. Before we let anyone in, I stand on a milk case and remind them of the sayings of Stokely Carmichael.

After reminding them recently of his statement, I asked them to let me see the hands of those to whom Carmichael has given their babies a can of milk, food, clothing or furniture?

Not one hand was raised. I asked them, "Who was their friend? Those that say 'get out in the streets and kill white people' are not those who feed them and clothe them in time of need."

There was a cry as never before saying, "They came to our rescue!"

The negro, along with the North Star organization, cannot find words to thank the leaders, business people and the community of Cicero for the good things that they have done for us. All we can say is "May God Forever Bless You."

After I saw the trailer loaded with clothing and food, knowing that God had blessed some hungry boy or girl, I could not hold back the tears of joy.

Last but not least, we would like to give special thanks to Atty. Christy Berkos and Sean O'Gara of the Life Newspapers for spearheading this program.

Rev. HENRY MITCHELL,
Director.

MILITARY WASTE?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, last Friday, after several days of debate—an

unusual amount of time to be given to a Defense procurement bill, the Senate approved S. 3293 authorizing a total of some \$21.3 billion for that purpose. That measure was, of course, only a part of the swollen Defense Department spending package that we will be asked to consider this year.

Proposals to make significant reductions in that measure were routinely defeated—although we did take a hopeful first step by imposing a reduction of roughly 3 percent. By and large we continued to apply a separate standard to outlays by the Department of Defense compared with expenditures by other agencies of the Government.

Over the weekend, shortly after the bill was passed, United Press International reported an announcement that serves as a painful question of the Pentagon's ability to handle the taxpayers' money wisely.

According to that report, the Pentagon has let contracts for the purchase of 120,000 M-16 rifles. Harrington and Richardson Co., of Worcester, Mass., will produce 60,000 and General Motors Corp., of Ypsilanti, Mich., will provide exactly the same number. Yet one contract is for \$15 million, and the other is for \$19 million—a difference of \$4 million.

The UPI indicated that the Pentagon was unable to explain the difference in prices.

Mr. President, we will have an opportunity to explore this subject more fully when Defense Department appropriations are brought up for consideration. I hope that in the interim we will hear a meaningful explanation of this shocking disclosure from the Department of Defense. I have requested an explanation of the matter in a letter to Secretary Clifford.

I ask unanimous consent that the press report be printed in the RECORD.

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

M-16 RIFLES ORDERED BY PENTAGON

The Pentagon announced yesterday contracts to purchase 120,000 lightweight rapid-fire M-16 rifles from two new producers as part of its program to equip South Vietnamese and additional U.S. forces.

Coit's Inc. has been the sole producer until now.

The Pentagon announced a \$15 million contract to Harrington & Richardson Co., of Worcester, Mass., for 60,000 rifles, and another \$19 million contract to General Motors Corp., Ypsilanti, Mich., for 60,000 rifles. The Pentagon said it was unable to explain the difference in prices.

Both contracts were for the first year of a multiyear program.

The U.S. will provide M-16's to the additional American forces to be deployed in Vietnam. It is also giving them to South Vietnamese regular forces and South Vietnamese militia known as regional and popular forces.

THE TELEPHONE STRIKE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, an interesting editorial concerning the present telephone strike was published in the Washington Post of Tuesday, April 23.

The article fairly and thoughtfully outlines the position of the two parties and concludes with the following statement:

We hope that the large measure of restraint and good judgment which have been shown on both sides will bring the dispute to an early and equitable settlement.

I sincerely hope that both the workers and management will heed this admonition and resolve their differences with fairness and expedition. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE TELEPHONE STRIKE

The country appears to have taken the telephone strike in stride. Though nearly 200,000 telephone workers have been out since last Thursday, telephone service has been widely maintained, thanks largely to the dial system. No national emergency has arisen, and there is substantial hope for a settlement without a prolonged struggle.

The contest is officially confined to the wage issue, as other provisions of the contract have 18 months to run. We get the impression that both management and the union are acting responsibly, although it appears to have been a mistake of judgment for the company to seek injunctions aimed at the strike in Alabama and Kentucky. The company had previously offered to resume negotiations and had talked favorably of the union idea of putting aside the present 18-month contract and seeking an entirely new three-year agreement, instead of dealing only with the wage issue. If they proceed on this basis, the negotiations will be more complicated but the outcome might be more satisfactory.

There is much other evidence of genuine collective bargaining. Before the strike began the union had made five different proposals to the company. For its part the Bell Telephone System claims to have made the largest wage offer in its history. It is said to be an increase of 7.5 per cent over 18 months or 5.4 per cent on an annual basis, which is close to the ceiling recommended by the Administration for the sake of stability. The union is said to be asking 10.5 per cent.

No doubt it will be difficult to close this gap, but it certainly should not be impossible. According to Joseph A. Beirne, president, the Communication Workers voted 17 to 1 to authorize a strike even though they have no substantial strike fund. Apparently they feel deeply about the wage issue, although Mr. Beirne insists that the union's position is fluid.

One other posture taken by the union has won it much sympathy. Mr. Beirne was asked whether he did not now regret having acquiesced in development of the dial system. In reply he insisted that his response would be the same if he had to meet the problem again tomorrow. "Some things come ahead of the union," he said. "Your country."

We hope that the large measure of restraint and good judgment which have been shown on both sides will bring the dispute to an early and equitable settlement.

EDNA FERBER: A GREAT LADY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Anchorage, Alaska, Daily News of April 19 published a tribute to Edna Ferber, written by George Sundborg, administrative assistant to my colleague from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. Mr. Sundborg

was one of those Alaskans who became acquainted with Miss Ferber while she was giving thought to writing a book about Alaska. With him as with others, that acquaintanceship ripened into friendship as Miss Ferber set herself to the task of writing a book which was published under the name "Ice Palace" and which many of us believe had an important part in the winning of the fight for Alaska statehood.

Mr. Sundborg has only praise for Miss Ferber. He describes her as "a great lady." With this judgment I concur without qualification. Miss Ferber had a sharp and incisive mind. She had an almost uncanny ability to "read" people, and with it all hers was a fine sense of humor.

Mr. President, yesterday I was talking with Senator GRUENING about Mr. Sundborg's tribute to Miss Ferber. At that time he reminded me of his early association with her and more specifically related how it was that she came to write "Ice Palace." Senator GRUENING had gone into this in his recently published book, "The Battle for Alaska Statehood," from which I quote:

In the closing weeks of the 2nd Session of the 85th Congress, we got an unexpected break. Edna Ferber's book: Ice Palace, appeared in March of 1958. I had gotten Edna to write this book which followed an acquaintance we had struck up some years before when she utilized a passage from my book: Mexico and Its Heritage, published in 1928, as the theme for one of her stories, which later became the title of the book that included that short story. It was entitled: They Brought Their Women.

In describing the differences between the early history of North America and Latin America, the former being settled, the latter conquered by people from the Old World, I had written as follows:

"The diversity between the two cultures south and north of the Rio Grande is sharply discernible in the respective status of their women. The North American settlers brought their women. The squaw-man was outcast. The exalted position of woman in the American ideology dates from the pioneer days of companionate hardship and effort . . . The Aztec female, on the other hand, played the part of handmaiden to the warrior male."

Edna Ferber wrote me that she was going to use this as the title of a short story and did so. Having been an admirer of her fiction for some years, I suggested to her that she ought to write a novel about Alaska, and told her of our problems and our desire for statehood. She became interested and made several trips to Alaska to get the necessary background.

Ice Palace made a strong case, in fiction form, for statehood. Some of the literary critics felt it was not up to her best work but one of them referred to it quite correctly as "the Uncle Tom's Cabin for Alaskan Statehood." Thousands who would never have been interested in any of our pro-statehood non-fiction magazine articles, of which I had written several for Harper's, the Atlantic Monthly, Current History, the New York Times Magazine Section, etc., did read novels.

In the closing weeks of our statehood drive, scores of people asked me whether I had read "Ice Palace." It was called to the attention of many Congressmen by readers who were also their constituents. I have no doubt that it changed quite a few votes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sundborg's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO EDNA FERBER

(NOTE.—Our guest columnist, George Sundborg, a former Alaska editor and publisher, is Sen. Ernest Gruening's administrative assistant.)

(By George Sundborg)

A great lady who has been described as the Harriet Beecher Stowe of the battle for Alaska statehood died Tuesday in New York. Edna Ferber with her book "Ice Palace" struck a blow for statehood at a time when the attention which the novel centered on Alaska may well have been decisive. It was in a similar way that "Uncle Tom's Cabin" 100 years earlier steered national determination to abolish slavery.

Miss Ferber's connection with Alaska was neither brief nor accidental. In the early 1950s her perceptive mind told her that an issue worthy of her time and attention probably existed in the efforts of Alaskans to attain full self-government under the American flag. Edna came to Alaska quietly not just once but three or four times on far-ranging trips.

Someone in Washington—I think it was then Delegate Bob Bartlett—had given her my name. On her first day in Alaska at Juneau she invited Mrs. Sundborg and me to have cocktails with her and without betraying any purpose proceeded to ask us a few hundred piercing questions about the Territory, its problems, its people, and its hopes for the future.

Miss Ferber was by no stretch of the imagination a pretty person. She was, in fact, almost grotesquely ugly. But so keen was her intelligence and so great her wisdom that I always thought of her as beautiful.

After she returned to New York from initial travels around the Territory I began to receive brief, pointed letters from her. Where should she go in Alaska to see a fish trap in operation? What salmon cannery would be representative and how would she get to it? What interests and people were opposing statehood and where should she go to try to understand their reasons?

After the second or third trip I mentioned in a column which I wrote for the little weekly newspaper in Juneau, of which I was then publisher, that Edna Ferber was undoubtedly gathering material for a novel about Alaska. She had subscribed to the paper, as I am sure she did to many newspapers in Alaska. That she read them carefully was attested to by prompt receipt at the office of the Juneau Independent of a letter taking me to task for drawing conclusions from her Alaska activities which she herself had never voiced or, according to claim, even determined upon.

But eventually a novel was written. We had become quite good friends by the time she was ready to confess that this was the fact. She told me that the final revision had to be done from a hospital bed in Arizona, where she had gone for treatment of a horribly painful affliction known as trigeminal neuralgia, sometimes called "the suicide disease."

"Ice Palace" met with a mixed reception in Alaska. Miss Ferber, in a manner which many literal-minded Alaskans could not accept, had scrambled half a dozen communities together to form one she called Baranof, which was the main scene of the action of her story. Although this mythical city was described as on an inlet with mountains all around, it was easy to recognize that in most street-by-street detail and in spirit the community was undeniably Fairbanks.

Not only places but times and persons were telescoped in the book. It could well be that the main issue of statehood and self-government was overstated in "Ice Palace" just as

the issue of slavery was drawn too crudely in "Uncle Tom's Cabin."

To me it seems that "Ice Palace" contains some simply wonderful vignettes of Alaska life. There is a description of the lobby of what has to be the Nordale Hotel in Fairbanks which is an absolute gem. Numerous characters in "Ice Palace" are obviously modeled on actual Alaskans.

The author found a gracious way too of flattering some of her Alaska friends by dropping their names into the dialogue. Thus I am able to impress bystanders at any point where I can get my hands on a copy of "Ice Palace" by turning to a page in which the heroine declaims: "Not if you knew the Alaskans I mean. Paul and Addie Barnett (fictional characters) and George Sundborg—he's an editor in Juneau—and the Atwoods in Anchorage and Herb Hilscher and Eva McGown in Fairbanks, and the Nordals and Bob Bartlett our Delegate, he's just the most wonderful—and Ernest Gruening—he was our Governor, you know, no, you don't know, I suppose."

Those who haven't read "Ice Palace" shouldn't judge it by the simply atrocious motion picture of the same name which was more or less based upon the novel. Edna herself couldn't understand why Hollywood did what it did with her books. She thought the movie "So Big" was so awful that she refused to go and see "Ice Palace" or any of the later ones. The one Ferber novel from which a really good motion picture was made was "Giant," but Miss Ferber wouldn't go to see that either.

The movie "Ice Palace" committed such atrocities as having Robert Ryan get off his salmon seining boat in a port which looked like Petersburg in summer and mashing by dog team directly into an Arctic blizzard which had to have been swirling through Anaktuvuk Pass. Edna Ferber was not guilty of such gross betrayals of nature and geography. Everyone who knew her was aware that she understood and loved Alaska.

Not many years ago in New York City I was walking along Park Avenue past a number which I recognized as the address on Edna Ferber's letters to me. It was a very rich apartment building. I phoned up from the street and she insisted I come up for luncheon and a visit. She talked entirely about Alaskans we both know, exhibiting a keen memory and interest. It was the last time I was to see her.

It is my impression that Edna Ferber, for all her great success, probably lived a very lonely life. She never married. She was in manner withdrawn, almost shy—this despite the positive way in which she could voice opinions about events and issues.

I think I admired her as much as anyone I ever met. She was unfailingly kind and generous even to those she knew only slightly.

I would like to end this tribute to the truly great lady who died this week by telling a story never told until now about one of her kindnesses of which I was the beneficiary.

When I was struggling with financial problems connected with publishing my weekly newspaper I received unsolicited a check from Edna Ferber for \$1,000. "Dear George Sundborg," she wrote—she always addressed me in just this way—"I was talking about you with Bob Bartlett today and he told me he thought you could use this." Could I? It looked to me just then like all the money in the world.

When, a few years later, I sold the publishing enterprise and sent Edna a check for the original \$1,000 plus some modest sum in interest, she sent it back promptly with a note saying to "Dear George Sundborg" that she had never considered this a loan but rather a gift to a dear friend and that she had forgotten about it long ago. She added that she was sure I needed the money more

than she did, and I could not argue with her about that.

Edna Ferber undoubtedly has many friends in Alaska who are having some of the same thoughts I am having about her this week. She gave to Alaskans and to everyone so much more than she took. We miss her already.

THE GUN TRAFFIC

Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. President, shortly the Senate will be taking up the safe streets and crime control bill. Title V of the bill contains a limited, modest, conservative gun control provision, designed primarily to limit access to handguns by criminals, juveniles, and the insane. The bill is basically concerned with concealed weapons. It imposes no unreasonable burdens on hunters and sportsmen and no burdens at all on domestic sale and purchase of rifles and shotguns. The amendment is the least Congress can do to meet the critical need and growing public demand for effective gun control.

The American people are fed up with the unlimited gun traffic in this country. They are grievously disappointed in congressional failure to take any action to keep concealed weapons out of the hands of criminals, juveniles, and the insane.

The American people want action now to control the gun traffic in this country. Americans want guns kept away from felons, children, and the mentally deranged. Americans want an end to the incredible condition we face in this country when any idiot, 10-year-old, or escaped convict can order a gun by mail in any State in the Union with total anonymity and impunity.

In fact, the American people, the President's National Crime Commission, J. Edgar Hoover, and police officials across the Nation all want legislation to compel registration of all firearms sales in this country.

Gun owners and non-gun-owners alike recognize that the presently virtually unlimited gun traffic threatens every law abiding American. In a series of public opinion polls during the past 2 years, both the Gallup and Harris organizations have found increasing public clamor among gun owners and the general public alike for rigid firearms control. In September 1966, Gallup reported 68 percent of all Americans favored legislation making a police permit a prerequisite to any gun purchase. A Harris poll released yesterday morning shows public support for registration of all gun sales has risen to 71 percent. That poll shows that three out of every four Americans favor Federal legislation to control the sales of guns, "such as making all persons register all gun purchases no matter where they buy them."

Most gun owners themselves support Federal firearms control, including registration, to an increasing degree. In September 1966, Gallup reported that 56 percent of all gun owners favored registration. By September 1967, this support had risen to 66 percent of all gun owners. Yesterday's Harris poll shows gun-owner support of Federal laws compelling registration remains at the two-thirds point, two out of every three gun owners favoring registration.

While congressional action on the gun

traffic has been stalled by the vocal, but relatively small, band of gun lobbyists, the American people have become increasingly critical of a Congress which cares more about the members of the NRA than the rest of the people of the United States of America. A Harris poll 3 months ago of this year indicated that the major cause of a 5-year low in public confidence in Congress is congressional failure to pass gun control legislation. Almost half of all citizens interviewed put congressional inaction on guns as the major cause for their loss of confidence in Congress.

The course the public expects from Congress is clear. The American people want the gun traffic brought under reasonable control. The modest, stripped-down gun control measure the Safe Streets Act contains is a minimum step to meet this longstanding and urgent public demand.

I believe title IV of the Safe Streets Act in fact falls short of adequately protecting the public interest. It contains no control at all over the domestic sale of rifles and shotguns. These weapons, which account for up to 30 percent of all gun crimes, will still be freely available over the country and by mail order over the country in every State in the Union.

But we need, at long last, a gun bill. Title IV of the Safe Streets Act is the first real gun bill taken up by the Senate in 30 years. Congress should not miss this chance to protect the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that the public opinion polls of the past 2 years on public attitudes on gun control be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE HARRIS SURVEY—CONFIDENCE IN CONGRESS AT LOW EBB, PRESIDENT NOW HAS HIGHER RATING

(By Louis Harris)

Public confidence in Congress has reached its lowest ebb in five years, with the American people giving the recently reconvened 90th Congress at 41 to 59 per cent negative job rating.

In fact, President Johnson, with a positive rating of 43 per cent, now is more favorably received by the public than is Congress.

Specific criticisms of last year's session are directed at failure to pass a gun control bill, cutting back aid to cities, not passing an open-housing law and cutting funds for the poverty program.

The House and Senate are credited for refusing to pass the income tax increase requested by the President, for increasing Social Security benefits, for extension of the draft and for cutting back funds for foreign aid.

Basically, the public's unhappiness with Congress stems from a feeling that in a time of crisis in Vietnam, racial turmoil at home and a rising cost of living, Congress has bogged down in cantankerous debate over peripheral issues and has not come up with a legislative program to meet urgent problems.

Here is the trend of confidence in Congress as measured in the last part of 1967, compared with similar readings over the past five years. A cross section of 1620 households selected on a careful probability basis across the country was asked:

"How would you rate the job this session of Congress (90th Congress) has done—excellent, pretty good, only fair or poor?"

Trend of confidence in Congress
[Percentage]

	Positive	Negative
1967 -----	41	59
1966 -----	54	46
1965 -----	71	29
1964 -----	64	36
1963 -----	35	65

Those with no opinion, 1 per cent, have been eliminated from this table in order to compare trends with other years.

The drop in esteem for Congress since the flood of Great Society legislation in 1964 and 1965 has been precipitous.

Significantly, people who voted for Barry Goldwater in 1964 are far more critical of Congress (2 to 1 negative) than those who voted for President Johnson four years ago (51-49) per cent favorable. This would indicate that the criticism of Congress is likely to work more against Mr. Johnson than his Republican opponent in this year's presidential election.

Among key groups in the electorate, independent voters, the better educated and younger people are most critical. Negroes and enrolled Democrats tend most to defend the record of Congress.

Specific assessment of legislative action by the 90th Congress showed these reactions by the cross section:

SPECIFIC RATINGS OF CONGRESS
[In percent]

	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Increasing social security benefits.....	55	30	15
Refusing to pass a tax increase.....	54	26	20
Cutting back foreign aid bill.....	43	34	23
Passing an extension of draft law.....	41	25	34
Cutting back the antipovertry program funds.....	34	45	21
Not passing an open housing law.....	33	38	29
Cutting back aid to the cities.....	29	41	30
Not passing gun control legislation.....	28	48	24

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 22, 1968]

TIGHT GUN RULES FAVORED 71 TO 23

(By Louis Harris)

By 71 to 23 per cent, the American people favor that passage of Federal laws that would place tight controls over the sale of guns in this country. These latest results mark a five-point rise in support of a gun control legislation from last August.

Such legislation has been before Congress for over a year, but the measure has encountered strong opposition from the National Rifle Association.

Significantly, people who own guns favor gun control laws by 65 to 31 per cent, better than a 2-to-1 margin.

The number of homes in which occupants say they have guns has now reached a majority, with 51 per cent reporting gun ownership. The largest incidence of acknowledged gun ownership is found in rural areas, where 78 per cent possess a gun; in the South, with 64 per cent, and small towns where 58 per cent own a gun in the household, compared with 32 per cent among Negroes.

Despite the heavy sentiment in favor of gun control legislation, the number of gun owners who say that they would use their weapon to shoot other people in case of a riot has risen from 29 to 51 per cent since last August. The reasons can be found in additional questioning which found that 48 per cent of all adult Americans now say they are personally more uneasy on the streets as a result of fear of racial violence.

Many added that in the absence of gun control and other measures, they felt they

had no alternative but to resort to measures of self-protection.

A cross-section of 1634 homes was asked this question on gun control legislation:

"Do you favor or oppose Federal laws which would control the sales of guns, such as making all persons register all gun purchases no matter where they buy them?"

[In percent]

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure
Nationwide.....	71	23	6
East.....	70	20	10
Midwest.....	69	27	4
South.....	71	22	7
West.....	77	22	1
Own gun.....	65	31	4
Don't own gun.....	79	13	8
Whites.....	71	23	6
Negroes.....	69	23	8

The patterns of gun ownership shows wide variation by region, size of place, and by race:

"Do you or does anyone in your house own a gun?"

[In percent]

	Own gun	Don't own gun
Nationwide.....	51	49
East.....	34	66
Midwest.....	55	45
South.....	64	36
West.....	53	47
Cities.....	47	53
Suburbs.....	47	53
Towns.....	58	42
Rural.....	78	22
All whites.....	55	45
Whites under \$15,000 income.....	47	53
All Negroes.....	32	68
Negroes under \$15,000 income.....	36	64

Last August and again in this latest survey, all gun owners were asked:

"Would you or a member of your family use your gun to shoot other people in case of a riot or not?"

[In percent]

	March	August
Would use gun.....	51	29
Would not use gun.....	32	62
Not sure.....	17	9

Students of gun usage under combat and other conditions of stress emphasize that there might be a wide divergence between a person's expressed willingness to use a weapon and his actual behavior when confronted with an actual shooting. So it is undoubtedly an overstatement to conclude that better than half of all gun owners today would actually use their weapons against other human beings.

But, the willingness to say they would shoot other people in case of a riot is symptomatic of the tension that exists in this country today. Another question illustrated this apprehension:

"Does the fear of racial violence make you feel personally more uneasy on the streets or not?"

[In percent]

	Uneasy	Not uneasy	Not sure
Nationwide.....	48	47	5
Cities.....	56	39	5
Suburbs.....	52	43	5
Towns.....	34	62	4
Rural.....	46	48	6
All whites.....	46	50	4
Whites under \$15,000.....	48	49	13
All Negroes.....	58	30	12
Negroes under \$15,000.....	60	31	9

Fear of physical safety due to possible outbreaks of racial violence runs higher among Negroes than whites, and highest among lower income Negroes.

In the absence of other measures, some Americans clearly have taken to arming themselves with guns. Unquestionably, however, the vast majority of people in this country would much prefer to see steps taken to curb violence. And one key step, nearly three out of every four feel, would be to have Congress pass gun control laws now.

THE HARRIS SURVEY

(By Louis Harris, Sept. 16, 1967)

A national survey indicates that 27 million white Americans, representing 54% of the nation's homes, own guns. A majority of gun owners say they would use their weapons to "shoot other people in case of a riot." Large numbers of white people in this country have apparently given serious thought to self-protection, and one person in every three believes that his own home or neighborhood might be affected by a riot.

It would be a mistake, however, to conclude from this evidence that most whites welcome the idea of unrestricted arms. To the contrary, by a decisive 66-to-28% margin, white gun owners favor passage of a law in Congress which would require that all persons "register all gun purchases no matter where they buy them."

Gun ownership shows wide variants by regions of the country:

Gun ownership among whites
[Percentage]

	Own	Don't own
Nationwide	54	46
By region:		
East	33	67
Midwest	63	37
South	67	33
West	59	41

Gun ownership is concentrated more in the South and the Midwest than in other parts of the country. The East, where the fewest own guns is also the area where gun owners would be least willing (46%) to use their firearms against fellow citizens.

The cross section of white gun owners was asked:

"Would you use your gun to shoot other people in case of a riot?"

Use gun to shoot people in riot

[Percentage]

	Gun owners	
	Would use	Not use
Nationwide	55	45
By region:		
East	46	54
Midwest	54	46
South	58	42
West	59	41

The willingness to use guns against other people seems to be related to white gun owners' attitudes toward a national firearms control law. Although a majority in the South and West favor such legislation, the percentages in favor are less than in the East and Midwest.

The cross section of white gun owners was asked:

"Do you favor or oppose federal laws which would control the sale of guns, such as making all persons register all gun purchases no matter where they buy them?"

REGISTRATION OF ALL GUNS

[In percent]

	Favor	Opposed	Not sure
All white gun owners	66	28	6
By region:			
East	70	21	9
Midwest	70	25	5
South	62	27	11
West	56	40	4

Clearly, the spate of civil disorders over the past summer has raised people's fears for their safety. This was evident in the replies of the special cross section of whites to this question:

"Do you fear that in a riot your own home or neighborhood might be affected?"

MIGHT BE AFFECTED BY RIOT

[In percent]

	Might be	Not be	Not sure
Total whites	34	58	8
By income:			
Under \$5,000	41	49	10
\$5,000 to \$9,999	33	60	7
\$10,000 and over	32	62	6

Low-income whites, many of whom live in fringe neighborhoods alongside Negroes, are most apprehensive.

It should be pointed out, however, that earlier Harris Surveys reported that when both Negroes and whites were asked how they feel about their personal safety on the streets, Negroes were far more anxious than whites. Fear of violence does not seem to show any color line.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 14, 1966]

THE GALLUP POLL: GUN OWNERS THEMSELVES FAVOR CURBS

PRINCETON, N.J., September 13.—Few issues spark such heated reactions as gun controls, and few issues are so widely misunderstood.

Some of the opposition to the registration of guns comes from those who think that this would mean banning all guns. Actually, the law proposed would not prohibit a person from owning a gun—either for sport or protection—but would require that a record be made of the name of the gun purchaser. The purpose of such a law would be to keep guns out of the hands of persons with a criminal record, the mentally disturbed and others unqualified to handle weapons.

The mood of the public for nearly three decades has been to impose controls on the sale and possession of weapons.

The survey questions and findings:

"Would you favor or oppose a law which would require a person to obtain a police permit before he or she could buy a gun?"

[Percentage]

	All persons	Gun owners
Yes	68	56
No	29	41
No opinion	3	3

Those who favor such a law:

1. Too many people get guns who are irresponsible, mentally ill, retarded, trigger happy, criminals.
2. It would save lives.
3. It's too easy to get guns.
4. It would be a help to the police.
5. It would keep guns out of the hands of teenagers.

Reasons of those who oppose such a law:

1. Such a law would take away the individual's rights.
2. Such a law wouldn't work—people would still get guns if they wanted to.
3. People need guns for protection.

"Which of those three plans would you prefer for the use of guns by persons under the age of 18—forbid their use completely, put restrictions on their use, or continue as at present with few regulations?"

[Percentage]

	All persons	Gun owners
Forbid use	27	17
Restrictions on use	55	59
Continue as at present	15	22
No opinion	3	2

THE RESPONSE TO HUNGER REVELATIONS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, there have been two responses to the report of the Citizens Board of Inquiry on Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States from distinguished sources that I would like to call to the attention of the Senate.

I am extremely pleased by both of them, for both indicate an awareness of an ill-advised attack in the report on agricultural agencies and programs, but neither was diverted from the urgency of the inexcusable hunger which exists in the United States.

The first of these two responses was by Secretary of Agriculture Orville S. Freeman, who outlines where we have progressed on food aid programs in recent years—and there has been progress—and calls attention to the need for legislative authorizations and funds to do a better job.

The second is an editorial in this morning's Washington Post, which, I am pleased to observe, agrees with my statement Monday that the report entitled "Hunger, U.S.A." was excessive in its indictment of agricultural agencies and programs, but also calls for approval of the resolution which I announced Monday to establish a Senate Select Committee to study the problems of unmet human needs in our affluent society.

I am happy to advise the Senate that more than 20 Senators have added their names as sponsors of the resolution, which will be formally submitted Friday, and the original sponsors—Senators MONDALE, BOGGS, HATFIELD, and I—will welcome others. Senators are invited to call my office to join in sponsoring the resolution.

There is one statement in the Washington Post's splendid editorial on which I would like to comment. The Post defends farm programs aimed at assisting farmers for it is one of the very few metropolitan daily newspapers which has made the effort to study and get a real understanding of their purpose and need. The editorial refers, correctly, to farmers who earn \$20,000 or more each year. I wish to point out, however, that the \$20,000 figure is gross earnings, not net. The \$20,000-a-year farmer can very well be going broke when his expenses for gasoline, fertilizer, feed, interest, taxes, and many other items have been deducted from that gross. Few are netting half that much.

But it is a fine editorial, and the Post's enlightenment in relation to agriculture is both appreciated and a real service to the national interest.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD Secretary Freeman's statement in response to the "Hunger, U.S.A." report, and the Post editorial.

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

[From the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Secretary, Apr. 23, 1968]

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BOARD OF INQUIRY INTO HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION IN THE UNITED STATES
Many of the findings of the Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition in the

United States parallel findings of Department of Agriculture studies and my own personal observations on field trips to hunger areas. The feelings of Board members at the disgraceful paradox of hunger amidst plenty are my feelings also.

So I welcome this group to what has often been a lonely battle to eradicate hunger in this Nation. Public awareness and public support of our efforts to feed the hungry are two commodities that have been in short supply over the past seven years. But despite this, more progress has been made in this period than in the preceding 25 years.

Because the Board of Inquiry's report overlooked this progress, and because the sharpness of its attack reflects upon the literally hundreds of thousands of persons—federal, state and local officials, volunteers who work in it—I believe it is important that we outline in some detail the very real successes we have had in meeting this problem.

When I became Secretary of Agriculture in 1961, only 1,200 counties (out of 3,091 in the Nation) had a food program. It consisted of the distribution of five surplus commodities worth about \$2.20 per person per month. Only 3½ million people were reached. President Kennedy's first executive order doubled the amount and increased the variety of these foods.

Surplus distribution provided only non-perishable foods and could not provide foods adequate to a balanced diet. By executive order I established a pilot food stamp program that allowed the poor to purchase a variety of foods in grocery stores. The Congress later made the program permanent and vastly enlarged it.

Today 2,200 counties have food programs, two-thirds of the counties in the U.S. Today, 5.8 million people are being fed, nearly double the number 7 years ago.

Those still on direct distribution now receive 16 different foods worth four times the amount they received in 1961. Food stamp recipients multiply their food dollars by \$15 million a month, \$180 million a year, in additional food purchasing power. They have a much more nutritious diet than is possible with direct distribution.

Compared to the peak year of direct distribution, 1962, when \$253 million was being spent to feed the poor, this fiscal year \$360 million is being expended in direct distribution and food stamps, a 70 percent increase in funds.

Although this progress is substantial, we realized it was not enough. So over the past nine months this Department has:

1. Gained commitments from local government to begin food programs in about 200 of the 330 poorest U.S. counties.
2. Extended food assistance to another one million people.
3. Reduced the amount needed for food stamps to 50 cents per person per month for the poorest of the poor.
4. Cut the payment in half for first month participants.

Reaching the remainder of the Nation's poorest counties has our top priority. In some of these areas local authorities refuse to cooperate. Ten days ago we initiated direct federal distribution of food in one of these counties, Elmore in Alabama, when we were unable to get a commitment from local government to administer the program. Similar action will be taken next month in a number of other counties. In addition, we are now paying all or part of food program administrative costs in many poorer counties that are cooperating.

We would do even more if we had money to do it with. We have reached our budget limit during this fiscal year on extending food stamps to more persons. Extension of the program to more people would mean reducing the amount of bonus stamps to persons already in the program.

The Department is now working to eradicate hunger to the limits of its budget; its available manpower and the legal framework in which it must operate. It is seeking new authority to allow it to better do its job of feeding the hungry, and welcomes the active support and participation of the Board in this endeavor.

This social ill is a great deal more complex than a simple lack of food. It is compounded of unemployment, lack of education, discrimination and a centuries-old culture of poverty that the Nation has only recognized in the past few years, to say nothing of attempting to solve.

Some of the Board's 14 recommendations are being accomplished now. For instance, USDA already is training 900 non-professional aides, recruited from the poor, to work in nutrition and in informing the poor of their rights under the stamp program. Eligibility for—and the amount of—food stamps are now keyed to income and number of dependents, as the Board suggests. We now have special feeding programs, including a breakfast program, for schools in low-income areas; for Head Start and other non-school feeding.

We do not, however, have all the authority that this Administration has asked for.

Accomplishing most of the Board's 14 recommendations will take new legislation and several billions of dollars from the Congress. Many of their ideas are workable and would help the Nation meet its commitment to the poor.

When and if they are presented to the Congress I will look forward to giving in full the Department's views on them.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1968]

HUNGER IN AMERICA

The Citizens' Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States has performed a public service by its appraisal of the problem of malnutrition in this country. Its eloquent and dismaying picture of the effects of dietary deficiencies in this country ought to produce at least some indicated improvements in state, local and federal administration of existing programs. Better yet, it should stimulate a re-examination of our whole approach to this problem.

It is unfortunate, however, that the committee went so far afield into agricultural policies never intended, except incidentally, to deal with this problem. Were the committee to succeed in bringing about the abolition of the major and basic farm programs, which it criticizes, farm income would drop 60 to 70 per cent, there would be more rural poverty than ever and there would be no Government food programs at all.

The committee criticizes the farm programs for not achieving welfare purposes they were not designed to achieve and blames an acreage retirement program for giving large payments to those who have large acreages—a logically inevitable result. It complains that farmers earning more than \$20,000 a year get 54 per cent of total farm payments; but farmers in this category produce 54 per cent of all sales of farm produce and so are sharing proportionately.

This is a kind of criticism of the acreage adjustment programs that has been made since they started. It is based on a confusion about the object and purpose of these programs which the committee's own distorted history further beclouds.

None of this detracts from the social importance of the committee's findings about nutrition. Hunger on the scale they have disclosed should not be tolerated in this country. It is an aspect of the larger problem of poverty as a whole. As Willard Cochrane, economic adviser to the Secretary of Agriculture, pointed out in 1965:

"Rural poverty has become a hard-core phenomenon. Poverty begets poverty in a

vicious circle. To date, policies and programs designed to cope with this social cancer have been too little, too late. They assist a family here and there, provide a few new jobs here and there, but they have not come to grips with the hard-core poverty problem—with the millions of men and women who grow up, marry, raise more children, and die in poverty. These millions live out an existence contributing little or nothing to the daily operation of society and the economy, and exert a positive drag on the development of society and the expansion of the economy."

Cochrane put a \$20 billion price tag on a program to deal with poverty. The country, so far, has found it too expensive. Senator George McGovern of South Dakota has proposed a Senate inquiry by members of the Agriculture, Labor and Public Welfare Committees with an added five other members, to re-examine the whole spectrum of poverty programs. It is a good idea. The Senate ought to approve it.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATIONS—ANNOUNCEMENT OF POSITION ON AMENDMENTS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I was unable to be present in the Senate during the consideration of four amendments offered to S. 3293, authorizing certain appropriations for the Department of Defense, and of two amendments offered to H.R. 14940, authorizing funds for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all six amendments. These amendments were offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] to limit authorizations for research and development to \$7,366,600,000; by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] to reduce by \$342.7 million authorizations for missiles; by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] to bar use of funds for deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system until the Secretary of Defense has certified to Congress that the system is practicable and its cost can be determined with reasonable accuracy; by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to weigh as a favorable factor in awarding defense contracts the undertaking by a contractor to employ a substantial number of unemployed or low-income persons thereon; by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to authorize \$33 million for ACDA for 3 years; and also by Senator CLARK, to authorize \$20 million for ACDA for 2 years.

A MEMORIAL TO DR. MARTIN KING

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, in the aftermath of the tragic assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, thousands of citizens around the country expressed not only shock and grief but their concern that substantial action be taken by the Congress and executive branch in the wake of his death.

Among those were more than 3,000 members of the Yale community in New Haven, Conn., who signed a petition sent to the offices of the congressional delegates from Connecticut. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the petition be printed in the RECORD.

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

We who are members of the New Haven and Yale Community are grieved at the death of Dr. Martin Luther King. We do not believe, however, that mere expression of grief is a satisfactory atonement and homage for his death. The history of civil rights legislation over the past twelve months has been informed by neither reasonable prudence nor humanity, but represents an utter travesty of justice. We urge you that a fitting and necessary memorial for Dr. King is the immediate passage of legislation which will guarantee the personal dignity and constitutional rights of every human being in this land.

PASSENGER TRAIN SERVICE

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, anyone who has ever had to take a train during the past 10 years owes a tremendous debt of gratitude to John S. Messer of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. Messer's ruling, announced yesterday, that railroads must maintain minimum standards of service for passenger trains is heartening and gives some hope that sometime it may once again be enjoyable to take the train.

It is my hope that the full Commission will adopt Mr. Messer's ruling and recommendation at its earliest opportunity.

If Mr. Messer's ruling is adopted, it will mean that passenger trains must be clean, that they must provide proper heating and air conditioning, that long-distance trains provide dining-car and sleeping-car service, and that the railroads will no longer be permitted to downgrade service and standards deliberately in an effort to make fewer and fewer people take the train.

American passenger trains are notorious for their lack of service and comfort. And the time will soon come when the skies over the United States will reach a saturation point as more and bigger planes compete for the traveler's dollar.

High-speed rail service still provides the best hope for moving large numbers of passengers over great distances.

Mr. Messer's ruling is a first step in what may well become a new "get tough" policy with the Nation's railroads.

It is about time that something were done to improve and expand railroad service. Today's ruling comes about 10 years late; nevertheless, it is a welcome ruling and a hopeful sign for the future.

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK M. COFFIN IN HONOR OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, Hon. Frank M. Coffin, of Portland, Maine, circuit judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals, delivered the principal address at a memorial service for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., at Portland High School on April 7.

Judge Coffin's remarks sum up the dilemma both blacks and whites face in the race issue, and his remarks accurately describe the special problems of responsible white Americans in working to resolve the issue.

I ask unanimous consent that Judge Coffin's remarks be printed in the RECORD, because I think every American,

whether living in the metropolitan centers of the Nation or in rural communities, can become better neighbors and citizens by understanding the dilemma as described by Judge Coffin.

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

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE FRANK M. COFFIN AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., PORTLAND HIGH SCHOOL, PORTLAND, MAINE, APRIL 7, 1968

When a great man dies in the evening of his years, the world pauses in mingled sadness and gratitude for his gifts to humanity. So we felt about Einstein, Schweitzer, and Pope John.

When such a man dies in the ripeness of his powers, the world grieves over its unmeasurable loss—as it did over Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Adlai Stevenson, and Dag Hammarskjöld.

When such a man is cut down by the hand of a deranged assassin, the world bleeds and its heart aches—as it did over Lincoln, Gandhi, and John F. Kennedy.

But when such a man is struck down by an assassin who pulled the trigger of a hate and a hardness of heart which are products of our times and ourselves, do we have the courage, the candor, and the love to give meaning to our mourning?

If our mourning is not to slide into an easy and cheap sentimentality, this should be a time of honesty, purification, and dedication. We have been selective in our grief and in our memory. Who recalls Mr. and Mrs. Harry Moore, the Florida NAACP leaders killed over a decade ago? or Reverend George Lee? or even Medgar Evers? And how many of us were perhaps relieved when violent death came to Malcolm X? I suspect that the purity of the grief of the white moderate today is tainted by his anguish that the apostle of non-violence has been snatched away.

Only twelve days ago Dr. King dared to say in restless Harlem: "We need an alternative to riots and to timid supplication. Nonviolence is our most potent weapon." This was comfortable doctrine. Even those who had criticized Dr. King for his earlier associations or for his opposition to government policy in Viet Nam came to look on him as the only buffer between us and ugly violence. We applauded his stand. We even sensed that it jeopardized his continuing leadership. But we never asked ourselves: what does it take on our part to make Dr. King's "militant nonviolence" a workable principle?

I am afraid that we looked on this as a way proposition. We felt it reasonable to demand patience and restraint from Dr. King's 22 million constituents, not so much in order that progress be speeded but that we avoid a backlash which could undo our gains. The front page of our morning paper was a lesson in irony. The banner headline at the top read: "More violence scars America." A smaller headline at the bottom read: "Open Housing Seen Eroding Liberty." The story told of opposition in Maine to the modified open housing provisions of the civil rights bill based on the fear that passage would bring a repressive backlash.

What we do not realize is that nonviolence is not acting as human beings normally act under pressure, insults, deprivation, and often the application of brute force. Dr. King's way required tremendous discipline, subordination of the self to indignities, and a surpassing faith in the ultimate power of love to bring about not so much victory as reconciliation. We asked all this. In return we had to say that if we were to avoid a tax increase, other expenditures were more urgent than those for education and poverty programs. As nearly as we could, we wanted

to conduct business as usual. But Dr. King's brand of nonviolence is far from conduct as usual. It is sacrificial. And for it to have a ghost of a chance of succeeding, it must be matched by an equally militant and sacrificial response.

We are, as a nation, at a watershed. For we are tempted to respond to the illegal violence of minorities by asserting the legal violence which a majority can always impose. Even before the tragedy of April 4, observers of the American scene were fearful of a swing of the national pendulum to a society, in Robert Lowell's words, of "piety and iron." This danger is now more acute. But Dr. King's death must make it clear that the healing way is for the majority now to share the burdens of self purification, patience, and restraint. At least for a time white people can not expect their efforts to be greeted with gratitude. At least for a time we must labor without the satisfaction of being loved. Our own love will be put to the acid test by working for bitter people who will not trust us, who will call us "Whitey" with contempt, and will refuse the hand of fellowship. This will wound liberal egos. But to ask that we swallow insults, yet patiently and in good spirit work more energetically for a society of equal opportunity and dignity for all, is no more than what Martin King has always asked of his followers.

We in Maine may feel remote from Memphis, Birmingham, Montgomery, and even Washington, Detroit, and Chicago. By and large, we like to think of ourselves as a relaxed, tolerant, and fair people. It is easy for us to be sympathetic, open hearted, and understanding. But whatever our parlor talk, it is easiest to be blandly indifferent to the canker of discrimination which still exists in our own state and communities. For we are not free of the impurity that struck down Dr. King.

Our body politic, if one looks closely, has its running sores. We would like to shut our eyes to our blighted Indian compounds, to our tattered pockets of rural and urban poverty, to a genteel, stabilized, unostentatious, and accepted discrimination against both Jew and Negro. And, despite the splendid brotherhood among the leadership of our faiths which brings us together today, we still have a residual amount of patronizing condescension if not intolerance. Whether our symptoms are ugly eruptions on the surface or a low grade infection within, the disease is the same—man's inhumanity to man.

In closing, I can do no better than use the words which Dr. King used at the death of President Kennedy. In a prophetic way they are even more applicable to Martin Luther King than to President Kennedy. He said:

"We were all involved in [his] death. . . . We tolerated hate; we tolerated the sick stimulation of violence in all walks of life; and we tolerated the differential application of law, which said that a man's life was sacred only if we agreed with his views. . . . We mourned a man who had become the pride of the nation, but we grieved as well for ourselves because we knew we were sick. . . . If [his] tragically premature end . . . will prove to have so enlarged the sense of humanity of a whole people, that in itself will be a monument of enduring strength."

The time is now; the place is here.

CANDIDATE NIXON SHOWS RARE COURAGE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I notice that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] has placed a series of editorials and articles commending Dick Nixon on his campaign positions. Senator HRUSKA in his own remarks especially com-

mended the former Vice President on his candor and courage in refusing to join the current mania for seeking to win votes by spending the taxpayers' money for any and every project which tends to meet a need, postpone a problem, or offer some hope of providing the candidate with blocs of voters come next November. Dick Nixon courageously said:

I refuse to play the game that way.

Nixon's wise statesmanlike statement is a sharp departure from prevailing trends and judging from the audiences I have addressed recently and the volume of correspondence I am receiving, it has impressed and encouraged a great segment of American feeling which is sick and tired of grandiose promises to spend glittering gold extracted from the taxpayers to promote the political interests of either an ambitious candidate or his political party. Certainly, if the Nixon example is followed by others, it may well usher in a new day in American politics, which in itself would greatly diminish the present perils of disastrous inflation. Promising to spend the other fellow's dollars on personal political preference is not the watermark of statesmanship.

I join the many others who are congratulating Dick Nixon on this bold and brave renunciation of the dismal but frequently successful formula of "spend, spend, and spend" and "elect, elect, and elect." I hope that all other candidates for the Presidency will reexamine their campaign appeals and follow the salutary standards which Nixon has established for his own campaign.

Indicative of the widespread editorial support commending Dick Nixon on his statements in Minneapolis and elsewhere, which reject the concept of trying to buy the votes of citizens with their own money, and to win their support by reckless and unredeemable promises of a gay and untroubled tomorrow for everybody, is an editorial from the Deep South, where respect for the dollar and for thrift has long been evident in many quarters. I allude to an editorial published in yesterday's edition of the *Roanoke, Va., World-News*. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

CANDIDATE NIXON SHOWS RARE COURAGE

Political cartoonists' namecalling and opposition jibes to the contrary notwithstanding, Candidate *Richard M. Nixon* grew tremendously in stature last week as he insisted on talking sense to the American people in the midst of partisan whoopla which at times was almost nauseating.

First of all, the former Vice President made an extraordinary impression Friday in Washington as he talked extemporaneously on national and world problems to an assemblage of newspaper executives noted for hard-nosed appraisal of politicians and their motives.

It was Saturday at Minneapolis, however, that Nixon earned the right to brand new respect when he pitched into the current cultivation of Negro votes by labelling "pie in the sky" promises of massive federal financial spending "dishonest and a cruel delusion."

Without mentioning names, he charged that the ghetto dwellers have been misled and "taken to the mountain top" from

whence they "have looked into the valley of despair."

What was he talking about?

Here's the way he put it:

What we are talking about now is an immediate financial crisis. And for any candidate or any political leader to come before the American people and tell a group of the poor, a group of people in poor housing, a group of people who want jobs, that right now the federal government is going to massively increase its spending program—that's dishonest and it's a cruel delusion to whom it's told.

And I'm just not going to join that game, whether it costs the election or not.

The nation is engaged in the war—the third bloodiest foreign war in history—and it simply does not have the billions of dollars to spend as suggested by the President's Commission on Civil Disorders, even if this were the proper answer, which is open to considerable doubt.

Administration action, taken in concert with other nations, to halt the run on gold and to stabilize the U.S. dollar, has been only a temporary remedy for the crisis which Nixon mentioned. Congress is aware that there must be severe cutbacks in federal spending to accompany imposition of a stiff tax surcharge if the budget is to be balanced and the dollar slide halted altogether.

Enactment of appropriations in the multi-billions on the domestic front before the Vietnam war can be brought to an end would perpetuate deficit financing and lead to almost certain disaster.

Offering instead a program of his own for "job banks" and bringing private enterprise into the slum areas to provide decent jobs for Negroes, the former Vice President quite obviously was laying his candidacy on the line.

Until now in the campaign, such candor and honest approach has been entirely lacking. On the Democratic side, both *Sen. Kennedy* and *Sen. McCarthy* have been too busy with their campus visitations to tackle the subject at all. Preoccupied with the war, *President Johnson* has dodged it and has avoided comment on the Commission report. *Vice President Humphrey*, who may announce this week, speaks glibly as usual but fine phrases do not solve situations.

Surely it must be dawning on Negro leaders that they have not been getting the truth and nobody can know better than they that the mere spending of money is not the answer to the anguish of their people.

Mr. Nixon displays rare courage at a time when demagoguery is rampant. Unless we miss our guess, the American people are in a mood to listen. If his frank and open stand compels his rivals of both parties to face the subject with candor there is hope that as a nation we shall do more than just try to muddle through.

A VITAL CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE IS AT STAKE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently the U.S. Tariff Commission reported to the Senate Finance Committee its views concerning Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, which declares it the sense of Congress that the International Antidumping Code, signed at Geneva on June 30, 1967, is in conflict with the American domestic law, the Antidumping Act of 1921 as amended.

The Commission report took cognizance of this conflict and noted the serious constitutional implications raised by the Executive's lone action in altering present standards and procedures for making determinations of the unfair

trade practice of dumping. In a speech before the Senate on April 4 I outlined the major conclusions of the report and again recommended that we take action to insure this matter be handled in the correct constitutional manner.

I would like now to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter by Norman Garland which appeared in the *Washington Post* for April 20, 1968, under the title "Dumping Code Flap." Mr. Garland, recognizing the constitutional significance of the Executive's usurpation of congressional authority, is replying to a recent *Post* editorial which had essentially taken the position of the administration that we should get on with implementation of the code in spite of the legal and constitutional questions involved.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Garland's letter may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

DUMPING CODE FLAP

In an editorial appearing in *The Washington Post* on April 11, you discussed the "Dumping Code Flap" and expressed views which surprised me. The editorial shows a misunderstanding of the U.S. domestic-law definition of dumping, the economic definition and impact of dumping, and the effect of the new International Antidumping Code upon international trade. Even more important, however, is the editorial's failure to recognize the main issue in the "Dumping Code Flap."

The U.S. Tariff Commission, in one of its most carefully considered reports of recent years, objectively and fully analyzes the Code, comparing it with the U.S. Antidumping Act. A majority of this body, charged with enforcement of a part of the Antidumping Act, has concluded that the code is in direct conflict with U.S. domestic law. Assuming this conclusion to be correct, the Executive Agreement which the U.S. entered into with the other nations which were parties to the Code, would be held invalid and ineffectual in our courts. It is not, as you allege, "unfortunate" that a majority of the Tariff Commission is of this view; rather, it is unfortunate that the Administration chose to enter into such an agreement without being absolutely sure that such agreement was in strict conformity with U.S. law. A vital Constitutional issue is at stake: Whether the President and the Executive branch has the power to contravene the law of the land by mere executive fiat.

To suggest that the International Antidumping Code is good and therefore justifies U.S. participation, is to pull oneself up by one's bootstraps. If the Administration has not acted properly, its difficulties cannot be cured by labeling all those who disagree "protectionists." Nor can the fundamental issues be blithely ignored in the name of free trade. Nor should the Executive branch proceed with probable unconstitutional actions rationalized only by the self-serving declaration that the courts can later untangle the matter.

Dumping is viewed as the antithesis of free trade in most nations. Dumping constitutes an unfair trade practice in international trade, and under U.S. law has been found to be harmful with or without a conspiracy or predatory intent. Economists nearly unanimously agree that dumping disrupts free trade. In fact, U.S. businessmen could be heavily fined and might even go to

fall for doing in domestic trade what some types of dumping do in international trade. While bringing an unfounded charge of dumping might very well constitute a non-tariff trade barrier, dumping itself is a far more pernicious barrier to free trade.

NORMAN M. GARLAND.

WASHINGTON.

NBC'S PROGRAM, "MAN AND THE SEA"

Mr. PELL, Mr. President, the National Broadcasting Co., as part of its series on the future, presented on April 19 a 1-hour program entitled "Man and the Sea."

The program was a vivid portrayal of the exciting prospects the sea holds for man in the coming decades. It presented objectively the progress we have made in exploiting the resources of the oceans and the technological and political problems that remain to be solved if man is to realize the full potential of the oceans in the future.

I was particularly pleased, Mr. President, at the recognition given in the program to the international legal uncertainties that exist in regard to ownership and jurisdiction over ocean resources. It was indeed these same uncertainties that led me last month to introduce in the Senate a draft Treaty on Ocean Space. I find it most encouraging that these international problems are gaining wide public recognition.

As one who has a deep interest in the development of this country's oceanologic programs, I want to commend the television network, the producer of the program, Mr. Craig Fisher; Mr. Stan Rosak, codirector with Mr. Fisher; and Mr. Frank McGee, the narrator, for a very competent presentation of a broad and complex subject. By focusing attention on both the prospects and problems of ocean development, NBC has made an important contribution to public understanding.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ADDRESSES THE ANNUAL LUNCHEON OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an interesting and thought-provoking address by Hon. Clark M. Clifford, Secretary of Defense, before the annual luncheon of the Associated Press last Monday be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY CLARK M. CLIFFORD, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, BEFORE ANNUAL LUNCHEON OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 22, 1968

Mr. Miller, ladies and gentlemen, I consider my presence here today to be particularly appropriate from a personal standpoint.

Not only have I received generous and sympathetic treatment by the press, but, from time to time, I have profited greatly by individual contacts with prominent members of your profession.

I recall clearly, although it was almost twenty-five years ago, when I first arrived in Washington, that I had an important conversation with the then Dean of the Washington correspondents.

I said, "Sir, I want to be a success here, and I have been told that the best thing to do—is just be myself."

He studied me for a few moments, and then said, "Young man, you have been given very bad advice."

It is seven weeks today since I first walked into my office at the Pentagon and assumed the duties that fall to the ninth Secretary of Defense. I knew then that the duties were to be arduous, not only from my own past experience in government, but also from my close reading of the newspapers which were unstinting in their advice to the ninth Secretary, and in their warnings—and even, on occasion, in their compassion.

I had learned from the columnists and analysts that the eighth Secretary of Defense had been a gentle, even lovable Dove—who was stepping aside for a bloodthirsty old Hawk, me.

Knowing that the credibility of these writers is beyond question, I worried with as much sincerity as I could muster, about the dreadful things that I was about to do.

The newspapers told me of many other problems that I was facing. One story out of Saigon summed up Vietnam for me:

It said, "From the mist-shrouded northern highlands to the swamps of the Ca Mau Peninsula the news is bad—all bad."

I was told that "My Pentagon" was using up all the nation's gold, that I would shortly send another 200,000 soldiers to the war, and that the office elevator wouldn't work.

Needless to say, I wasn't the least bit discouraged. With the help of my many advisors—even including those working for the government—I was sure that I could at least get the elevator working.

Although I would wish to speak to you today under any circumstances with as much candor as possible, there now exists a particularly compelling case for me to do so, without concern over possible political implications.

That reason is the selfless and personally noble decision of President Johnson voluntarily to remove himself as a candidate for re-election this year. He has taken this action in order that he can deal more effectively with the peaceful resolution of our problems, both in this country and in the world.

It was an unprecedented act of Presidential patriotism.

His personal renunciation of a legitimate political aspiration in the cause of peace evidences a concept of duty in the highest tradition of our American system.

History will, I predict, rank this extraordinarily able man in the top echelon of our Presidents—not only for this unique disregard of private ambition, but because no President in this nation's history has accomplished as much in the fields of civil rights, education, public health, poverty, housing and urban development, and conservation and environmental improvement.

As a personal matter, I am grateful to him for the opportunity to serve his administration.

The day before yesterday I returned from my first meeting with the Defense Ministers of the Nuclear Planning Group of the NATO countries held at The Hague.

This was an exceedingly valuable experience for me personally, for it constituted a dramatic illustration of the effectiveness with which we can work together with our allies in planning a joint defense against possible future aggression.

I was impressed by the open and free discussion among nations that have a common aim in finding solutions to problems in an atmosphere of mutual confidence and trust.

It was clear to me that from this meeting there emerged a better collective understanding of the role that various nuclear weapon systems could play in the event of

an emergency. The presence of both nuclear weapons and conventional forces constitutes a flexible response which presents a strong deterrent to any would-be aggressor.

Apart from the formal agenda, I had the opportunity to talk privately both with my Defense colleagues and with other Europeans who had no official status. I found that many Europeans had questions similar to those that are raised in this country. And their questions, sometimes asked obliquely and sometimes quite directly, centered upon this one basic subject: Is American really in trouble? They wondered whether somehow we had become a stumbling giant, unable to cope either with our own most pressing domestic problem or with our most acute international involvement.

Our European friends were troubled, as our own people at home are troubled, by the current strife in our cities and the status of our efforts in Vietnam.

They are asking whether we have lost the formula for continuing our social progress without unleashing a volatile and fiery inferno of civil disorder.

They are asking there, as many are asking here, whether we are bogged down in Vietnam, struggling in a conflict that we can neither win nor abandon, at the expense of our ability to cope with our other obligations and responsibilities throughout the world.

I gave them the answer I want to give to you today. America is not in trouble. It is steady on its course. It is making progress. Of course we have not yet solved all our problems, either foreign or domestic, in Vietnam or in the cities.

I find this a source of neither humiliation nor embarrassment. No nation in history has ever solved all the problems of humanity. We in the United States have every reason to be proud of our record. This nation has never been, and is not now, a stumbling giant. Throughout our history, it has had the faith and the courage and the willingness and the ability to face its problems, to meet its challenges and work towards solutions of its difficulties.

The problems of the past have not been overcome without a price and without pain.

The problems of today—those facing us both in the jungles and rice paddies in Vietnam and in the aging and crowded centers of American cities—will cost us dearly.

But let the pessimists and the doubters always remember this: We have the resources and determination to surmount these obstacles.

You are due a progress report on our problems, and I would like today to begin with a report on Vietnam.

In Europe and here at home, some people continue to ask why we have concerned ourselves in what they term the backwaters of Asia. And they wonder whether this involvement in what they regard as an internal Vietnam conflict is inconsistent both with our traditions and with our over-all national interest.

They ask questions which are even more basic. They ask whether we can ever win or even disengage from Southeast Asia with our national honor intact.

My first answer is that I believe deeply in the necessity for our presence in Vietnam. We are assisting that brave and beleaguered nation to fight aggression, under the SEATO Treaty and for the same reasons that we extended our aid to Greece and Turkey over twenty years ago.

This is in the tradition of the Truman Doctrine which announced twenty years ago that we would help defend the liberty of peoples who wished to defend themselves.

Where, some ask, is the America of the Marshall Plan?

It is in South Vietnam today carrying on

the same tradition. It is providing economic aid to help put that resolute country back on its feet. The Marshall Plan performed precisely the same mission for the war-shattered countries of Europe. And I might stress that some of those countries have no larger a population—and indeed some are even smaller—than the country of South Vietnam.

We went into South Vietnam in force in 1965—when it was on the verge of being cut in half by Hanoi's intervention. We went in to save the people of South Vietnam, when other nations would not, and they could not.

We went into South Vietnam in force to provide a shield behind which the people of South Vietnam could gradually strengthen themselves.

And they are doing so.

They are calling up another 135,000 troops. And they are going to take over more and more of the fighting.

The America that brought NATO into being is the same America supporting freedom in Asia today—and for the Asians, not for the Americans.

There is not a square foot of South Vietnam that we want to keep. There is not a bag of rice in South Vietnam that we need. There is not a base, nor a port, nor a landing field in South Vietnam that is going to remain American. Our aim there is identical with that which we had, and will continue to have, in NATO. We want only to assist the people of the area to acquire the ability to ensure their own security.

Of course there are those who say that the prospects are bleak and that the situation is hopeless.

This is not the first time in history that those on the sidelines have been without hope.

There were many who were faint-hearted about Berlin when the Soviets blockaded it. They said that the odds were against the United States position there, that the city was not really defensible, that it would be cut off and strangled, no matter what we did—and they said that it was best to give up gracefully and just get out.

Some of the comment I hear about South Vietnam has the same ring of despair.

Other critics, both here and overseas, ask why it is that we, with all our military might, cannot defeat North Vietnam. But they overlook the point that we are not attempting to conquer North Vietnam. We are not trying to destroy the government in the North. We just want the North Vietnamese to stop their aggression against the South.

This nation is interested in a free Asia, just as we are interested in a free Europe. But this does not mean that we see ourselves as the policemen of the world.

We have no illusions that we have the ability, or the duty, or the right to attempt to settle all the problems of the world by ourselves.

But there are areas of particular American concern, because of the threat they present to the stability of the world upon which depends our own peace, our prosperity and our continued opportunities for progress.

So I have no apologies to make to our European friends or to our American critics for the policy of the United States with respect to Vietnam.

Let us meet another question head-on. Some ask whether we in fact have any policy in Vietnam. They question whether there is anything other than the dismal prospect of more men, more money, more fighting and more death.

At the time I assumed office, the President ordered a comprehensive review of United States policy and programs in Vietnam.

A major part of my time during these past weeks has been occupied with that review. The results were clear and the results were encouraging. They disclosed that Hanoi could

not bend South Vietnam to its will by military force.

We concluded that Americans will not need always to do more and more, but rather that the increased effectiveness of the South Vietnamese Government and its fighting forces will now permit us to level off our effort—and in due time to begin the gradual process of reduction.

The review established to our satisfaction that Southeast Asia is not for us a "bottomless pit."

The review confirmed the judgment, already reached by President Thieu, that the South Vietnamese were ready to take on more of the responsibility and to carry more of the military burden.

As we level off our contribution of men, we are accelerating our delivery to the South Vietnamese armed forces of the most modern weapons and equipment.

We are increasing their supply of M-16 rifles. By July of this year, all combat elements of the regular South Vietnamese ground forces are to be equipped with the M-16. By November, 1968, 100,000 more M-16's will have been provided to the Regional and Popular forces. In addition, the South Vietnamese expanded Airborne Division is receiving M-60 machine guns, M-79 grenade launchers and M-29 mortars. The shipment of about 2,000 trucks and more than 6,000 radios is being expedited.

As the South Vietnamese gain in military strength, and as the enemy continues to sustain losses, we still hope, however, for a peaceful settlement instead of a military solution. A stable peace is the only true victory for Vietnam. As a result of the President's actions and at least a minimal response from Hanoi, there is some reason for hope. America has always held out its hand in peace, hoping our adversaries would grasp it. We continue to hold out our hand today and perhaps the fingertips will soon touch.

But if Hanoi would rather fight than talk, or elects both to talk and fight, the record of the success we have already achieved shows that military victory in South Vietnam is beyond Hanoi's reach.

The attempt of the North to take over the South by force of arms has been prevented. The South Vietnamese have acquired the capacity to begin to insure their own security through their own efforts. We will continue to help the South exploit these successes, even as we strive for peace through other means.

In summary, we are fulfilling our commitment; we have helped save South Vietnam from being overwhelmed by Communist aggression; we have helped provide the people of South Vietnam an opportunity for self-government; and we have helped give all the population of non-Communist Asia reason to hope for the continued security essential to their freedom. And freedom—like aggression—is contagious. The more there is elsewhere, the greater the chances of safeguarding your own.

I suggest that many present critics some day will applaud our stand in Southeast Asia. But we do not seek their applause. We only ask their realism about the problems and prospects in Southeast Asia.

Equal realism is demanded in the assessment of our foremost domestic difficulty—racial problems and civil disorder.

These are not new problems in America. They have continued throughout our nation's history. We are paying the price today for failing to solve them earlier.

One must regret that but one cannot fail to acknowledge it.

But in acknowledging it one need not accept the spectre of a nation robbed of reason and rationality, of riot and rage sweeping every American city, of some sort of uncontrollable civic insanity.

Examples of a breakdown of law and order do not establish that the entire nation has lost its way in a tangled jungle of emotion and extremism.

Part of this problem was solved with the Civil War. Part was solved with a historic decision of the Supreme Court in 1954. Part was solved a decade later when President Johnson proposed and Congress enacted perhaps the most fundamental piece of legislation on civil rights ever passed by an assembly of free men.

In 1965, and just now in 1968, the President achieved the passage of more sweeping laws in this field. Indeed, no President since Lincoln has accomplished as much for a minority group as Lyndon Johnson.

The ferment and difficulties in the country today over these issues are not the sign of failure. They are not a sign that our national fabric is being ripped apart. They are a sign that irrational inequities cannot be suppressed.

Of course violence and destruction in our streets cannot be condoned—and no sane man condones them. But neither should the causes be ignored.

Of course law and order must be maintained. But we must also face the challenge and eliminate the remaining injustices that condemn some citizens to an environment that breeds despair and violence.

America has met similar challenges in the past to the lasting betterment of all our people and the improved ability of our system to meet the continuing demands of a dynamic society.

One such epic challenge was that of the labor movement. Many today overlook the turbulence and trial through which it put our social conscience. The whole long, hard struggle for the rights of the working man the whole rich history of the trade union movement was attended by prophecies of doom.

In that period, also, some believed that an infection of violence was spreading across America. Existing statutes were challenged, strikers and strike-breakers fought in our streets, debates raged over rights and principles and duties. To some it seemed that our country was being torn apart, that its foundations were being shaken, that our political institutions were being paralyzed.

Men were killed then. Families suffered then. The nation was then divided in opinion and emotions, but out of that turmoil and that suffering and that strife, America emerged as an example to the world of how management and labor could live and thrive and progress together. In bridging these social rifts and healing these social wounds, our country became stronger, more resilient and more resourceful than it had ever been before.

We have met and solved, in this generation, within our own constitutional processes, another social problem of equivalent dimensions and complexity. That was the Great Depression of the 1930's, with the plight of hopelessness and fear it spread.

At one period, every bank in the country was ordered closed by the President, lest panic destroy the entire financial system overnight.

One-fourth of our entire working population was unemployed.

Fear, bewilderment and doubt of our ability to stem the economic paralysis were prevalent.

Once again, it appeared that our problems were threatening to tear our nation apart and some predicted that the free economic institutions under which we live would be overthrown or abandoned.

But we met this challenge as no stumbling giant could. The innovations and imaginative use of America's vast human and natural resources left us stronger, more resourceful

and more progressive than we had been in the pre-depression boom years.

Young, affluent Americans who did not live through the depression period cannot imagine what it was like. And there will come a time when young Americans—of all races—will be unable to comprehend what is taking place in our urban ghettos today. For the ghettos, one day, will be gone. The riots, the disorder, the violence that they breed will one day—and I pray one day soon—be over and forgotten.

Our civil rights problem can and must be solved without violent revolution.

In this regard, we are learning more about maintaining law and order in our cities. Specifically, we are learning more about the use of supplementary law enforcement, about the best way that National Guardsmen and Federal troops, if necessary, can help local and state civilian law enforcement authorities meet their problems.

In our society, enforcement of the law is basically a civilian responsibility. But last year, in Detroit, thousands of Federal troops had to be used to assist the police.

We have learned that manpower, not firepower, deals best with mass lawlessness. We have learned, too, that a curfew can help greatly in preventing clashes and conflict and possible bloodshed.

This year, in Washington, D.C., and in several other cities, we applied these lessons.

Thousands of Federal troops were involved. But not a single life was lost due to any action by those Federal troops.

We continue to learn as we continue to go forward.

Ladies and gentlemen, as we seek the answers to the myriad problems that beset us, there is one ultimate question left.

And that is: What is America?
What really is this country that brave men, hope blazing high in their hearts—once called the *New World*?

It is merely a geographical location, defined by latitude and longitude on a chart?

Or is America not more profoundly an idea: an affirmation, defined politically by a principle and a philosophy that have fired men's aspirations around the globe for nearly two centuries.

Perhaps America might be described as a dividing line in the ancient argument about man and his purposes.

This nation was forged in a furnace of faith: a faith that free men would prevail no matter what the struggle.

The nation's fiber was strengthened and tempered by the battle against those who have tried to impose limits on the nation's belief in itself.

This nation has found power in welding its people together in a common dedication—not to a dreary uniformity—but to a daring diversity.

If this nation is characterized by any single and unique quality out of the restless welter of opinion that a devotion to democracy demands, it is the stubborn belief that progress is our destiny—both individually, and as a society—and that no barrier to that destiny can be built that a determined America will not breach.

Ladies and gentlemen, this nation has never had much time for the past, and is forever impatient with the present.

From the very beginning, our chosen timeframe was the future.

Our motivating force has been to fashion a greater prospect, not only for America, but for free men everywhere.

We have faced fearful problems in the past and have solved them. We will meet those of today and surmount them.

As for tomorrow, I can promise only new and even more complex trials in the glorious and ever ascending journey on the path to greater human progress.

For those to whom much is given—much is expected. Thank you.

PAN AMERICAN MAKES SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO R. & R. PROGRAM FOR VIETNAM SOLDIERS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, a commendable article written by Bill Prochnau, of the Seattle Times, one of the west coast's finest writers, has recently been called to my attention. The article, "Vietnam Soldier Can Travel From War to World of Luxury," appeared in the Washington Star and deals with our rest and recuperation program now in progress in the Pacific. It tells of the tremendous job being done to airlift our fighting men away from the battlefronts when their time comes for a break from combat for the purpose of refreshing and revitalizing the mind and body.

As the article indicates, nothing ever attempted before on an R. & R. basis can compare with opportunities now being afforded our men to "get away from it all" in the days allotted them. As every American fighting man is offered a 5-day vacation somewhere near the halfway mark of his 1-year tour in Vietnam, the obvious desire is to get as far away from the horrors of war, as quickly as possible. This is where Pan Am has stepped in with its jet fleet, staffed with their prettiest and most charming stewardesses, and loaded with first-class delicacies, usually known only to the passengers who book themselves "first cabin." Nothing is too good for the men on R. & R. and so Pan Am furnishes them with steak and ice cream, midflight movies, if possible, and an aura of luxury. They are jetted away to one of several locations of their choice, to any of nine of the most exotic and exciting cities in the Far East or they can opt to travel to Sydney or as close to home as Hawaii. The airline also offers discounted fares to the wives or parents meeting the men in the islands.

Pan Am originally donated its planes to the Government for a token payment of \$1 a month to get things started and had its R. & R. airlift in operation just 3 weeks after the Government decision to start the program. The airlift is now provided through a nonprofit contract with the Government and is described by men who ride it as the closest thing to heaven they can imagine.

Mr. President, as this article indicates, a tremendous job is being done by this company to see that our men on R. & R. lack nothing enroute to their brief respite from the rigors of war. Pan Am even maintains a better on-time rating on its R. & R. flights than most airlines do in their commercial operations, knowing how disappointing a delayed or scrubbed flight would be for these eager GI's.

Problems of wartime logistics are not new to Pan American World Airways. The Berlin airlift was accomplished with the use of Pan Am's planes and cooperation. The Korean airlift could not have been accomplished without Pan Am's help. In World War II Pan Am made its entire fleet of aircraft available to the Air Transport Command and NATS and scouted the sites for 56 airbases as well.

It has been demonstrated that in times of international strife, Pan Am, like many major American businesses, can be

counted on to step forth with what is needed to do the job.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Mr. Prochnau, and published in the Washington Evening Star, be printed in the RECORD.

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

VIETNAM SOLDIER CAN TRAVEL FROM WAR TO WORLD OF LUXURY

(By William W. Prochnau)

HONG KONG.—Alexander the Great's warriors took their rest and recuperation where they could find it along the battle trail to Persia.

Caesar's legions lived it up in conquered European villages, spreading Roman culture and progeny throughout most of the civilized world.

The luckiest of the weary American G.I.'s in the Second World War could hop a jeep and bump down to the Riviera for a day or two away from hell.

Rest and recuperation, a soldier's respite from the dirt and death of battle, is as old as war itself.

But none of those earlier soldiers could have imagined R. & R. as it is today. The American soldier in Vietnam is given the best money can buy. His R. & R. not only is no exception but probably is the best example.

NINE R. & R. LOCATIONS

Somewhere near the midpoint of his one-year tour in Vietnam, every American fighting man is offered a five-day vacation. But no longer does that mean frolicking in a conquered village or hitch-hiking a jeep ride away from the lines.

Today's G.I. is given a choice of a holiday in any of nine of the most romantic and exotic cities in the world. He can fly 6,000 miles to Honolulu for an idyllic rendezvous with his wife. He can travel to Sydney where he can forget the war briefly in a sea of Australian miniskirts and the world's warmest hospitality.

Or he can choose Tokyo, Hong Kong, Taipei, Penang, Singapore, Bangkok or Kuala Lumpur—each an Oriental pearl.

Everything about R. & R. is luxurious and designed to put miles—mentally and physically—between the fighting man and his war.

The luxury begins the moment a G.I. steps aboard the airplane. The prettiest and most charming stewardess of the Pan American line will serve him steak and ice cream. He might get an in-flight movie and surely will get all the first-class accoutrements expected by any sophisticated traveler.

The air travel is provided by the government through a no-profit contract with Pan Am. The rest of the R. & R. expenses are paid by the soldiers themselves.

But they find discounts at most of the best hotels in most R. & R. cities. Restaurants, bars, tour guides and even taxicab drivers knock down their prices for vacation G.I.'s.

The result is a once-in-a-lifetime experience, a holiday that would be the envy of any well-to-do and well-traveled civilian.

"I don't know who dreamed all this up," an enlisted man said here, "but he oughta get a medal."

FEW PROBLEMS

During the past 12 months 400,000 war-weary servicemen have flown into another world. That great exodus of young Americans could have been fraught with problems—and many officials, both American and foreign, expected trouble. But few problems have materialized since the R. & R. programs began 21 months ago.

The Vietnam-era soldier is one of a new breed—better educated and more sophisticated than his predecessors. Like any soldier coming out of war, he is likely to look for

a girl, a bar and all the high living he can cram into five days.

But today's G.I. is busting up far fewer hotel rooms and bars than his father did in the Second World War. He is doing much less street brawling. And he is far more likely to visit a palace in Thailand, a sheep ranch in Australia or a Shinto temple in Japan.

The R. & R. program has been so successful that American officials now are beginning to add up some unexpected bonuses—most notably the chance to show one of America's best faces, its youth, in a part of the world in which the United States would like to woo and keep friends.

Commanders say their troops work better, think better and fight better after R. & R. The G.I.'s themselves just count the days to eligibility.

For the fighting man who takes his R. & R. in Honolulu, it is like being ejected from hell into paradise—and getting a second honeymoon thrown in.

Waikiki Beach is good-time, wealthy, peaceful America at play. The war in Vietnam simply doesn't exist here.

HONOLULU MOST POPULAR

Every month 7,000 American fighting men go to Honolulu for R. & R. It is the war's biggest and most popular R. & R. center. It is the only American city that a vacationing G.I. can visit. It is balmy, tropical and serene. The way of life is devoted to pleasure—a hedonistic antithesis of the life the soldiers temporarily are leaving behind.

But hedonism is not the main Hawaiian attraction for American G.I.'s. Hawaii is just close enough to the mainland for a rendezvous with the girl he left behind. Almost 80 percent of the G.I.'s who select Honolulu are meeting their wives there.

The emotion-jarring experience of meeting and then leaving your spouse once again causes some war-separated families to decide against Honolulu for a second honeymoon.

Down Under, in Australia, R. & R. has different attractions.

Twenty-five years ago the Yanks charged into Australia for their first taste of its unique brand of hospitality.

Rambunctious and eager, they came away from the bloody beach landings and the bitter jungle fighting of the Pacific war for a few days of rest and recuperation in a land few of them ever had seen before.

They got little rest and they did little recuperating. In fact, those high-living Yanks of the Second World War just about tore old Sydney Town apart. And the Australians, rambunctious themselves, loved every minute of it.

Now the Yanks are coming again from a different, dirty little jungle war in Asia. When the word got out last fall that American fighting men would come here from Vietnam for rest and recuperation, memories of times past prepared Australians for an onslaught.

THE QUIET AMERICANS

The Aussies, hoping for the worst, were a little disappointed.

The new Yanks doffed their uniforms, donned civilian clothes and quietly melted into Sydney's teeming crowds.

"I see about one of 'em a week," said a taxi driver with a dismayed look that reflected a lost experience, not a lost fare.

The Australians have named their guests the "Quiet Americans." But if the new American soldier is more subdued than his dad, he still hasn't lost any of that old camaraderie with the Australians.

Of all the nine cities a Vietnam fighting man can visit on R. & R., Sydney is the one that swamps him with the most hospitality.

Taxi drivers have turned off their meters and taken G.I.'s on all-day tours. Australian families are on waiting lists to invite soldiers

to dinner. And ranchers in Australia's "out-back" have been known to pay a serviceman's air fare to their homes in the interior.

When a G.I. arrives there, he is greeted by a group of Australian matrons at the R. & R. center in a downtown hotel. The women ask each visiting soldier what he wants to do in Australia. Most of the requests, from petting a kangaroo to visiting an Australian home, are filled almost immediately.

While the married men head for Honolulu and some of the servicemen are flying to Australia, R. & R. for most of the Vietnam fighting men means five days in one of seven Oriental cities.

ASIAN ATTRACTIONS

Each Asian center has its own special attractions. Few G.I.'s are disgruntled if they show up in Kuala Lumpur instead of Tokyo or in Taipei instead of Bangkok. Still, as often as possible, the G.I.'s are allowed to select the site.

So a G.I. might head for Tokyo because his big brother extolled Japan's mama-san reputation after the Korean War.

Another might choose Hong Kong because, as the sailors say, it's the biggest PX in the world. They come back carting tape recorders, cameras, tailor-made suits and, usually, hangovers.

Few of them had ever heard of Penang before Vietnam, but now that Malaysian city is a favorite among the Marines.

Bangkok, all the returnees say, has the friendliest and prettiest girls.

Taipei is picking up a word-of-mouth reputation as the most underrated of all the R. & R. cities. The word is out that the smart set heads for the Nationalist China capital.

History buffs like Singapore, but they usually find more than history there.

It is obvious that there are many more chances for trouble in the rest-and-recuperation program in the Asian cities. Almost all the cities are risking political problems and antiwar demonstrations by allowing visits by Vietnam fighting men.

In Hong Kong, for instance, where the British and the Communist Chinese have been involved in an eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation, one of the sorepoints is the R. & R. program.

AVOID DEMONSTRATIONS

But most of the G.I.'s are smart enough to steer a wide course around political demonstrations.

The G.I. who is cut loose for five days in Bangkok or Taipei or any of the Asian centers finds plenty of opportunities for therapeutic hell-raising—maybe too many opportunities to suit a worried Mom back home. But almost anyone in Vietnam who is interested in the welfare of the G.I.'s thinks that R. & R. hell-raising, after all, is the best medicine in the world for a war-weary American fighting man.

There is no one in Vietnam any more concerned about the welfare of his "boys" than the Army's 4th Division chaplain, a rough-edged and crusty Catholic priest from Brooklyn, Father Joseph Francis Sheehan.

Father Sheehan gets a little sore when someone attaches what he calls the "stigma that my boys are all off sinning" when they are on R. & R.

"You can't stop a man from going to hell if he wants to get there," the priest says. "And it doesn't make any difference whether he's in a little town in Georgia, in the city of New York or in Hong Kong."

Father Sheehan says that R. & R. is not just important but also essential for the morale of the troops.

UNIQUE AIRLINE

Here in Hong Kong Pan American operates a unique airline within an airline that whisks the G.I.'s out of the war and into the world.

The most discouraging thing that could happen to an eager G.I. heading for R. & R. would be to have his flight scrubbed or delayed seriously. The R. & R. airline has had an on-time rating of between 90 and 92 percent, far higher than the record of most commercial airlines.

Much of the credit for the almost flawless record of the R. & R. airline belongs to a soft-spoken former Pan Am pilot named Thomas J. Flanagan. Recently named Pan Am's vice president for Far East operations, Flanagan had the R. & R. airline in operation only three weeks after the government decided to start the program.

And the stewardesses have developed a rapport with their passengers that you see on few commercial flights.

"Getting on a plane with 162 soldiers is a bit unnerving the first time," said Peggy Deuringer of South Bend, Ind. "You expect them to tear everything apart. But it's just the opposite. They aren't rowdy. They're the most polite people you'll ever meet."

DR. MUELLER, OF WISCONSIN, APPOINTED EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF CABINET COMMITTEE ON PRICE STABILITY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, President Johnson could not have made a better choice than Willard F. Mueller to be Executive Director for the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability. Dr. Mueller has had a highly distinguished career in economics and is eminently qualified for this important position.

Following his service in the U.S. Navy from 1943 to 1946, Dr. Mueller attended the University of Wisconsin where he received his B.S. and M.S. degrees. He was awarded the Ph. D. degree in economics from Vanderbilt University in 1955.

Dr. Mueller had served on the faculties of the University of California and the University of Wisconsin prior to his appointment in 1961 as chief economist of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives. Since that time he has been Chief Economist and Director of the Bureau of Economics of the Federal Trade Commission.

Dr. Mueller's book on the "Changing Structure of Food Retailing," as well as his many professional articles in the field of industrial organization, demonstrate his special competence and knowledge of the problems involved in achieving price stability.

In his new position Dr. Mueller will be responsible for planning the research and staff work for the committee, as well as the conferences to be sponsored by the Cabinet Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the White House release concerning Dr. Mueller be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,

April 13, 1968.

The President announced today his intention to appoint Willard F. Mueller of Wisconsin, currently Chief Economist of the Federal Trade Commission, as Executive Director for the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability. In this newly created position, Dr. Mueller will be responsible for planning the research and staff work for the Committee, as well as the conferences to be sponsored by the Cabinet Committee.

The President established the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability in a memorandum issued February 23, 1968. The members of the Committee are the Secretaries of Treasury, Commerce, and Labor, the Director of the Budget, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. In establishing this Committee the President said:

"This Cabinet Committee reflects our deep concern for a more effective Government effort in dealing with the long-run problems of inflation. This step will fortify our fiscal and monetary policies which are the first line of defense against inflation. As I said in my Economic Report, 'Existing Government organization is not effectively suited to deal with the full range and dimensions of the problem of prices.' We must develop a strong and imaginative program for 1968 and subsequent years through the work of this Committee. This program is intended to strengthen free market institutions."

As Executive Director, Dr. Mueller will work with the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, who has been designated by the President to coordinate the work of the Committee and to supervise the professional staff.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON WILLARD F. MUELLER

Willard F. Mueller was born in Minnesota in 1925. After serving in the United States Navy from 1943 to 1946, he attended the University of Wisconsin where he received his B.S. and M.S. degrees, and Vanderbilt University where he was awarded the Ph.D. degree in economics in 1955.

Dr. Mueller was on the faculty of the University of California from 1954 until 1957 and the University of Wisconsin from 1957 to 1961. In 1961 he served as Chief Economist of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, U.S. Congress. Since 1961 he has been Chief Economist and Director of the Bureau of Economics of the Federal Trade Commission.

Dr. Mueller has also been a Professorial Lecturer at American University and a visiting Professor of Economics at Michigan State University. He currently is a part-time staff member in the Department of Economics at the University of Maryland. Dr. Mueller has written a book on the "Changing Structure of Food Retailing" as well as many professional articles in the field of industrial organization and public policy. He has testified frequently before Congressional Committees. He is a member of the American Economic Association.

In 1948 he married the former Shirley Irene Liesch of Laona, Wisconsin. Mr. and Mrs. Mueller have three children: Keith, age 14, Scott, age 12, and Kay, age 10. The Muellers are residents of Madison, Wisconsin, and currently reside at 504 G Street, S.W., Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL FIRE SERVICE RECOGNITION DAY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on March 13, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] introduced Senate Joint Resolution 152, which would designate the second Saturday of May of each year as National Fire Service Recognition Day.

It is most appropriate that the Nation pay tribute to the unselfishness and devotion to duty that the public has come to expect and receives from the Nation's firemen.

As in other areas, technology has come a long way since the early bucket brigade. Yet, despite these advances, the key to successful firefighting remains the individual fireman. His devotion and

courage, sometimes in the face of impossible odds, make all of us rest a little easier.

Damage from the recent riots which swept the Nation was minimized by the prompt response and long hours spent by the firemen in saving human life and property. These events help to underscore the importance to society of these dedicated men.

Mr. President, I wish to add my support to the joint resolution, and I hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will take early and favorable action on it.

CONNECTICUT DIVISION OF AAUW CHAMPION'S HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I know that every Senator is aware of the splendid, patriotic work done by the American Association of University Women. Not the least of their services has been the championing of the human rights conventions.

The Connecticut division is an excellent example of the fine work being done by the AAUW in the field of human rights. The members of the Connecticut division have been hard at work interesting others in the cause of human rights. So far, the Connecticut branches of the YWCA, United Church Women, Council of Churches, and UNA-USA have all pledged their support to work for the ratification of the human rights treaties.

The Connecticut division of the AAUW has also sent a letter to President Johnson and Senators RIBICOFF, DODD, and FULBRIGHT, among others, expressing the division's view of the human rights conventions. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

NIGHT LETTER

APRIL 16, 1968.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.
Senator THOMAS DODD.
Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT.

At this time when the Congress is faced with many decisions, which involve vast spending, Senators can take a long neglected action with no spending needed.

On behalf of the 2500 members of the Connecticut division of the American Association of University Women, I urge that the three human rights conventions on genocide, political rights of women, and forced labor now in committee be presented to the Senate for ratification.

Sincerely yours,

CLAIRE FULCHER, President.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, today marks the second anniversary of scheduled jet operations at Washington National Airport. I believe it is an appropriate time to evaluate what has happened during the intervening period and what is now being proposed for the future.

In January 1966, when the Federal Aviation Administration first announced it was reversing a longstanding policy banning scheduled jet operations in and out of National Airport, I voiced

opposition to such a move. This opposition was not a matter of mere personal whim, but rather it was based on facts and reason. First, the FAA had consistently maintained that National Airport was not safe for large jet aircraft. Second, there were, and still are, two underutilized jet airport facilities serving the Nation's Capital—Dulles and Friendship. It was clear that National Airport was already severely overcrowded and that the introduction of jets would further aggravate that condition. Third, it was immediately apparent that jets would create an intolerable noise problem over densely populated areas of the Washington metropolitan region. In response to citizen protests, the FAA established a noise abatement procedure and a noise monitoring system. The noise abatement procedure was immediately criticized by the Airline Pilots Association and has rarely been followed. The monitoring system resulted in a whitewash of the jet noise problem. Citizens were told that jets are really quiet. Despite such assurances, however, school classes continue to be interrupted, a number of hospitals are subject to constant noise, and homeowners are continuing to protest this unwarranted intrusion into their daily lives.

Last week word leaked out that plans are afoot to launch a campaign to make National the airbus depot for Washington. This latest development was too much for Washington's Evening Star which originally welcomed the introduction of jet service to National. In an editorial the other day entitled "Enough is Enough," the Star stated that some major airlines seem unable to abandon the "irrational dream" of further substantial flight increases at National.

I ask unanimous consent to place this pertinent editorial in the RECORD.

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

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

Washington National Airport was built to handle a load of about 4 million passengers a year; the volume last year exceeded 8 million. This in itself, as Senator Byrd of Virginia suggests, is sufficient reason to justify an intensification of efforts to divert some of National's flights to Dulles. To speak at this point of substantial further flight increases at National is preposterous.

Yet that is the irrational dream that some of the major airlines seem unable to abandon. Their campaign is by no means new. For a long time now, they have nourished the illusion of how lovely it would be if the huge jumbojets of the near future were able to lumber into National, disgorging their hundreds of passengers conveniently on the doorstep of the Capital. According to one report, a recent session produced the idea that National's main runway might be extended into the Potomac River in order to make this hope a reality.

As pointed out the other day by Charles Yarborough, The Star's aviation editor, however, there is fortunately nothing to suggest a wavering on this subject by Federal Aviation Administrator William F. McKee. A report will be forthcoming soon on improvements at National which is expected to deal with facilitating the handling of the present crowds of people. But there must be no eas-

ing of the present ban on larger jets or on hourly limits on jet use.

ALL ALONE WITH THE FEDERAL RESERVE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a thought-provoking editorial in the Kansas City Times of April 20 points up the burden which has been placed on the Federal Reserve in attempting to stem the rising inflation in this country.

Without the exercise of long overdue fiscal discipline in the form of budget reductions and increased taxes, however, it is doubtful the Federal Reserve can single-handedly prevent further deterioration in the purchasing power of the dollar. Fiscal and monetary policy must work in concert in effort to stabilize the economy and restore confidence in the dollar.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in question, "All Alone With the Federal Reserve," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ALL ALONE WITH THE FEDERAL RESERVE

The Federal Reserve system has again flashed the red alert in the nation's battle against inflation. But the only weapon it can use is monetary restraint. The weapon was employed again this week. But unfortunately Congress continues to sit there, deaf to the exhortations of the administration and of most economists: That tight monetary policy, in this situation of spiraling inflation, is inadequate, and that Congress should sign on for the duration of the war against inflation. It could do so by increasing taxes and by imposing a priority structure on the federal budget that would establish what the nation must do and what it would like to do, but for financial reasons, cannot.

Here, we will avoid the technicalities of the issue and speak to principle. Suffice to say, credit has once more been tightened, and for obviously sound reasons. On the day that the independent Federal Reserve made its move, the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers explained the necessity:

"In the absence of tax action or a big dose of added monetary restraint, an excessive rate of economic growth would be in prospect as far as one could see out to the horizon."

At the horizon, we might add, there is a loud and sudden drop into economic chaos.

The peril is inflation, and a lot of people have been screaming about that for some time. In the absence of any real self-restraint on the part of labor and business, in the absence of any self-restraint on the part of government (which can be brought about only by Congress)—in these circumstances the one available alternative was credit restraint. The Federal Reserve's action was thus not a great surprise, although some had expected it to come a bit later, after Congress had had time to consider the tax and budget matter in more detail.

But the Federal's board of governors seems to be as skeptical of Congress as are many citizens, and felt it could not wait.

Thus the nation finds itself in a situation similar to that of some two years ago when tight monetary policy was employed but Congress refused to go the tax-increase route (and Mr. Johnson refused to lead). The seeds of our present difficulty were then cast to the winds. The dollar has suffered. Every citizen has suffered.

But Congress, sublime in its inactivity, has refused to come to the aid of its country. As unpleasant as credit-restraint medicine is, it is far better than nothing. But is it enough? That's the question Congress must ask. The answer is obvious.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The following Senators answered to their names:

	[No. 119 Leg.]	
Bartlett	Holland	Pearson
Bayh	Hruska	Pell
Bennett	Inouye	Prouty
Boggs	Jackson	Proxmire
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Russell
Carlson	Long, La.	Smith
Clark	McClellan	Sparkman
Cotton	McGee	Talmadge
Curtis	McGovern	Thurmond
Dirksen	Monroney	Tydings
Ellender	Morse	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Murphy	Young, Ohio
Hickenlooper	Muskie	
Hill	Pastore	

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Aiken	Fannin	Miller
Allott	Fong	Mondale
Anderson	Fulbright	Morton
Baker	Griffin	Mundt
Bible	Hansen	Nelson
Brewster	Harris	Percy
Brooke	Hart	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Hartke	Smathers
Cannon	Hatfield	Spong
Case	Hayden	Stennis
Church	Hollings	Symington
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Dodd	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Dominick	McIntyre	
Eastland	Metcalfe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). A quorum is present.

AMENDMENT OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. S. 1401, a bill to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my senior colleague [Mr. ELLENDER].

So far as I know, no one in this body opposes the purpose of providing large amounts of money for recreational areas and to provide better development of the recreational areas we already have.

The amendment offered by the senior Senator from Louisiana makes it clear that we favor an authorization of such amount as may be necessary to proceed with the full and complete development, as rapidly as funds can be made available, of the recreational facilities of this country.

So the amendment, offered by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], would make it clear that we would authorize the amount of funds requested by the sponsors of S. 1401 to be appropriated for the purposes that the sponsors of that measure request. Where we take issue with the sponsors of that bill is that we believe it is bad legislative practice to attempt to earmark the revenues to be derived from exploration of the Outer Continental Shelf to a recreation program. In that respect the bill would be very bad law. It would set a bad precedent. It would mortgage the future of the coastal States for programs having no relation to the origin of these funds.

On that basis, Mr. President, we feel that the bill should be amended to provide for authorization. As one Member of this body, I would expect to vote for the appropriation of funds to support the authorization to provide for the purposes set forth in the bill and the purposes indicated in the committee report.

As one who is chairman of the Committee on Finance, if need be I would even be willing to vote for a tax to provide the funds to advance the needs of recreation, as well as other purposes that we find to be desirable, if the funds for them should not be adequate for the purpose. But, Mr. President, there are some things that are seriously wrong about the bill, particularly when it comes to earmarking these revenues for a recreation program.

The legislation purports to dispose of funds which are presently subject to judicial proceedings before the Supreme Court of the United States. In a case to which the United States and Louisiana are parties, the Court is, at this time, attempting to determine the location of Louisiana's coastline. The resolution of the question of just where this coastline begins is essential to the ultimate determination of which party owns what part of the offshore lands. Pending the final decision of the Court on this question, as Senators are aware, the funds

yielded from the disputed area are deposited in an escrow account.

This escrow account has now grown to a billion dollars and increases every day. While, to be sure, not all of the Outer Continental Shelf revenues are held in escrow, a substantial part of these proceeds are so encumbered and will remain so until released by a decision of the Court. Despite this, the bill before us would include these impounded funds to the extent to which the Federal Government is determined to own them.

I submit, Mr. President, that it is not sound policy to legislate the disposition of property rights the ownership of which is still subject to judicial determination.

A second objection which I have to the method used in this bill to derive the needed revenues is that the normal appropriating process is largely bypassed and instead a procedure which, if not exactly "back door financing," is what we might call funding through an unlocked side door. S. 1401 dedicates approximately \$100 million a year for the first 3 years and \$200 million a year for the following 2 years from the Outer Continental Shelf revenues to the land and water conservation fund, which is primarily a fund to provide additional recreation facilities.

This is a total of \$700 million over a 5-year period. This money, once deposited in this fund, would be subject to appropriation by Congress before it could be spent for the purposes set forth in the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965. The fact remains, however, that subjecting of this money to the control of Congress before leaving the fund is an empty gesture, since the truth of the matter is that Congress will be compelled to either appropriate the full amount in the fund or see the money accumulate and remain unused. I cannot believe that Congress wishes to hamstring itself in this way. I cannot believe that we want to tie the hands of our Appropriation Committees by passing to them a locked strongbox that only one key will open. I doubt that, at a time when the Nation is at war and faces the greatest budgetary deficit in its history, with urgent and justifiable demands for more and more funds to cure the plethora of domestic ills we face, we should proceed to deny Congress flexible access to this \$700 million for use as prudently set priorities demand.

For example, if our boys, who are fighting a war in Vietnam, needed to be provided with weapons to fight that war, I doubt if Congress would want a law on the statute books which provided that we could not use revenues derived from the Outer Continental Shelf to provide for that war or to provide weapons for the men to defend themselves because we had locked that fund up for other purposes.

Or if someone wanted to be paid for performing a contract for the Federal Government, I doubt that we would want to say, "We cannot pay the bill we owe you, because, while we have the money on hand, we have the money locked up to provide for more land for parks and recreational purposes." I doubt that Congress would want to do that.

When someone presented his Government bond and asked to be paid the principal and interest owed by the Federal Government, I doubt that the Federal Government would like to establish a procedure which said, "I am sorry; we cannot pay the interest on the Federal debt because we have locked the money up in a fund far beyond its immediate needs to be used exclusively for recreational purposes."

In other words, recreation, like the poverty program, the urban development program, the flood control program, the navigation program, the program for development of our resources, a great number of fine programs which I could list here, should be considered on its merits, the priorities should be judged, and the extent to which Federal resources could be devoted to its purposes, as well as others, should then be determined.

I notice that the sponsors of the measure, in the committee hearings, and to some extent in the committee report, made a great deal of the fact that Congress has not appropriated enough money for recreational purposes, as indicated by the Land and Water Conservation Act. That is not the fault of the junior Senator from Louisiana. If more money had been asked for, the junior Senator from Louisiana would have been willing to vote for it, and I think a number of the rest of us would have been willing to vote for it. But if Congress, in its judgment, did not think enough of the program to vote the amount of money the sponsors of the bill believe we should have voted, if Congress did not place that high a priority on the program, at a time when we have a deficit of more than \$20 billion, at a time when we are having to cut back on programs for health and welfare, at a time when we are being asked right now to vote a big tax increase for the people of the country, can it be said that we have such a surplus of funds that we can dedicate the resources of the Outer Continental Shelf to recreation? Can we justify doing this when we cannot find funds to provide for greatly needed and essential activities in this country? I doubt that Congress would want to hamstring itself in that fashion.

May I say further that to buy the argument of the sponsors of this bill that we must dedicate a huge portion of the revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf to recreational purposes, and to the purchase of more land in pursuit of such purposes, because Congress has been too niggardly in appropriating funds for that purpose in the past, is, in effect, for Congress to vote a condemnation of itself.

"We did not vote enough money for this purpose," Congress would in effect be saying, "and, that being the case, we want to dedicate the whole of the resources to be produced in the Outer Continental Shelf to be used for no other purpose but this very worthy purpose of recreation."

Some time ago, some Senators wanted to dedicate the resources of the Outer Continental Shelf to education, and they mustered a very substantial vote in support of that view. That happened when we were debating the tidelands bill, or

the Outer Continental Shelf bill. It was felt by Congress that the resources of the area should go into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States, and, as part of the general revenues, Congress could then decide the best use to make of the income from the resources of these lands which constitute the Outer Continental Shelf.

I must confess, Mr. President, that I have received the impression from time to time that some people view the revenue from oil produced beyond a State boundary as just a pot of gold that somebody has found out there at the end of the rainbow, for which no one paid anything. They would like us to regard it as sort of like gold coins dropping from heaven that nobody knew what to do with, and that therefore it would be desirable to dedicate them to this or that use.

Mr. President, why should not these revenues, presently accruing to the Government of the United States, be spent the same as other revenues accruing to the Government of the United States? Why should they not be used in whatever manner Congress may please, to meet all national needs, all national priorities, in whatever amount Congress may find to be useful for this purpose?

An argument that can be made to the contrary is that there is sometimes a connection between a particular purpose and the funds that come to be dedicated for that purpose. We have seen such special connections. It was contended, when we undertook to build a national Interstate Highway System, that we should increase the gasoline tax. That tax is, in effect, a user tax on those who use the highways; and so it was argued, with good logic, that that money should be dedicated to building highways. People who paid that gasoline tax would know that they were then paying for more highways and for better highways.

That kind of dedication can be well understood. It is more understandable to a taxpayer when he is called upon to pay a high tax on gasoline, since he knows that he is paying the tax for the highway he is driving on; and it is found to be more acceptable, in some instances, on that basis.

The committee seeks to find a connection between the Outer Continental Shelf and the national parks and recreational activities in its report. It says, on page 2 of the report:

The committee's recommendation regarding the use of a portion of the receipts from Outer Continental Shelf lands as an additional source of revenue to finance the outdoor recreation programs authorized by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act is based on the fully tenable proposition that the revenues from one natural resource which belongs to all the people—

Now, get this, Mr. President—that the revenues from one natural resource which belongs to all the people of the United States—in this instance a depleting resource—should be reinvested in outdoor recreation areas and developments which become a part of the permanent estate of the Nation for the use, benefit, and enjoyment of all its citizens of this and future generations.

Mr. President, on that committee serve a number of very able Senators who come from States where the Federal Government owns large amounts of land. The revenues from those lands, from the timber resources and the oil and gas beneath those lands, can equally be regarded as a natural resource belonging to all the people of the United States. But in years past, Congress has found a higher use for the revenues derived from the minerals under those federally owned public lands than to put them to recreational uses. The higher use, in the main, has been to take the depleting resources that have been developed from those lands, and use the revenues thus derived to build power facilities, to capture the waters of the streams that flow through or within the areas, to build irrigation structures, and to make arable arid lands which would otherwise be nonproductive, so that when the resource is depleted, there will be something there to take its place. People can then live on the land, farm it, and make income from it. They can make it productive.

A Federal program of that sort is directed toward those States where large amounts of Federal land are located. This is a better use, because it takes the depleting resource and uses the income from it to develop the same geographical area that is being depleted.

I suppose it never occurred to the sponsors of this legislation that the Outer Continental Shelf itself is a vast resource of the Federal Government. It can be claimed to belong to all people of the United States, should not be damaged or destroyed. It should be used constructively for development of its resources, so that when those resources are gone, we may have not just a polluted site or an eyesore for the country, but instead a great national asset that may continue to produce, and from which people can make their livelihood when they can no longer work it to produce oil, gas, phosphates, sulfur, and other minerals from the sea.

Some day, those resources will be gone. Some day, I have no doubt, we will succeed in convincing the majority of both the House of Representatives and the Senate that the enormous resources of the ocean, those on the Continental Shelf of the United States in particular, should be developed, and that the precedents set by the reclamation laws, that took the revenues of that development and reinvested them in providing resources that would last for many years, if not hundreds of years and indefinitely into the future, if they were developed and properly used, should be followed in seeking to find higher purposes for these revenues than to dedicate them to recreation.

That is something, however, that would have to depend on the judgment of Congress. And, if such a decision should be reached, at least it should follow the sound conservation principle that we would first use revenues from those resources to repair the damage done to it by exploiting it and, second, would use the revenues to develop something that could be put there when the resources

that are being depleted have been taken away and are gone. In that way we will have something that people can use indefinitely into the future to provide income and opportunity for the people. In other words, the resources of the sea do not constitute merely a pot of gold that somebody locked onto. They are a God-given asset. They were intended to be used by mankind.

Mr. President, the bill as written is a wrong step in the right direction. To accomplish an altogether salutary end, it would, in an unnecessary way, make meaningless our normal appropriating process and would absolve Congress of its responsibility to plan and carry out an active and direct role in the fiscal processes of the Federal Government.

I will not dwell further on this point, since my senior colleague from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], a member of the Appropriations Committee, has already addressed himself to this point. I do want to emphasize strongly, however, that the method proposed here to finance this fund is imprudent, unwise, and wholly unnecessary. There is no valid reason for linking the Outer Continental Shelf revenues to the needs of the land and water conservation fund, and should the sponsors agree to an amendment severing this ill-conceived connection and proceed through normal channels to fund this worthy program, I would be happy to support their good cause.

There are other and perhaps more compelling reasons for refusing to link up offshore mineral revenues with the land and water conservation fund. There can be no valid argument for tying the two together.

As I understand the argument advanced in the committee report accompanying S. 1401, there is clearly no justification in terms of sound fiscal planning for bypassing the normal Appropriations Committee procedures of this body. As a result, the argument of the sponsors of the bill rests entirely upon the creation of a fictional connection between the Outer Continental Shelf and the need of our citizens for recreational facilities. The proponents attempt to justify the tapping of Outer Continental Shelf receipts and the dedicating of them by maintaining that this connection represents sound conservationist policy.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was not present to listen to the remarks of the able Senator from the very beginning. However, I gather that the pending bill proposes to use funds derived from the Outer Continental Shelf in the interior of our country.

Does the able Senator not feel that it would be a bit more logical to use these funds to enhance the ocean resources? For example, I can see many uses that will be derived from oceanography. One would be to clear up the pollution in our waters, not just the rivers, but also the oceans.

I was quite interested in and impressed by the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana yesterday about the

pollution of Waikiki Beach by oil. The elimination of this pollution would be one use for which the moneys could be expended.

I am personally very much impressed by the potentials of oceanography. It has been reported that, with the employment of the proper techniques in this field, the fish catch would be improved 100-fold. It has been said furthermore that there are enough food and minerals in the ocean bed to supply mankind for time immemorial.

Would the Senator oppose any move to earmark these moneys for the development of ocean resources?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it would seem to me that the first order of priority, if we are talking in terms of earmarking the funds derived from the depleted resources, would be to put something in the place of what we are taking away. If we are talking about the resources of the sea and the resources from beneath the sea, we certainly would not want to leave the sea as one big cesspool with more dead fish floating on the sea than were swimming in it. We would not want to leave it so putrid that people dare not go swimming in it or enjoy it. We would want it to be useful.

The first principle of conservation is that from the beginning we should repair the damage done from the time we start to exploit those resources.

Let us take one simple example. The sea is suffering horrible pollution. The pollution covers a large area. The currents move the pollution around. One area suffers from pollution for a while and then later it is not quite as bad. However, some areas stay polluted constantly at the present time.

I have but to refer the Senator to the Potomac River flowing past the Nation's Capital. If the child of the Senator fell in that river, the Senator would be well advised to take the child to the doctor immediately and have the child examined. The doctor would be well advised to put the child in the hospital for a week or two for fear that he had acquired typhoid or hepatitis.

The Potomac River was once a valuable asset. When President Johnson signed the bill—for which there was very meager funding—to do something about pollution, he referred to the fact that Theodore Roosevelt proudly walked out from the White House and swam in the Potomac River where the Washington Monument now is, which would be within easy walking distance from the White House.

Sometimes an oil well comes in with a fantastic pressure from below the sea that blows all pipe, tubing, and casing into the air, and it costs millions of dollars to get down and counterbuild it so as to shut off the flow of oil into the sea. While that is being done, oil is coming out under thousands of pounds of pressure per square inch. The entire area is filled with pollution. It is brought under control eventually.

When people find oil under the sea or land, they put that oil in tankers, some of which hold as much as 100,000 gallons of oil. Sometimes those tankers are de-

stroyed during war. At other times, the ravages of the sea breaks a tanker in two. Airplane pilots have reported oil slicks as large as 100 miles wide and 3 or 4 miles long.

Recently, an oil slick drifted onto the coast of England. They had a bad season as a result of that. They could not swim or enjoy that recreational area because the water was filled with oil which had floated in from the ocean.

If one wants to exploit the resources of the sea, he should first repair the damage that is being done by producing the oil around and moving the oil. It is true that some of the oil is not produced from the sea, but the pollution of the sea is becoming greater and greater.

I would say that if a big oil slick that was miles wide washed up on Waikiki Beach and stayed there for a few months, the economy would suffer greatly because people who wanted to go there and enjoy the recreational facilities of Waikiki Beach and the other gorgeous beaches of Hawaii would not be able to enjoy them. The beaches would be ruined.

Mr. INOUE. We would have to apply for disaster funds.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is about the size of it.

Furthermore, Mr. President (Mr. Spang in the chair), as the Senator has well pointed out, the estimates are that the potential yield of the sea, in terms of fish, shrimp, lobsters, oysters, and other food, is approximately 40 to 100 times the present yield. People who have made some study of the situation point out that one could farm the sea the way one farms the land and increase the yield fantastically.

A comparison was made by a witness who appeared before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when I was a member of that fine committee. He said that a good comparison would be the amount of nuts one would get by going into the forest and just looking for nuts and the amount one could get by planting the best kind of pecan trees, properly spaced, fertilizing them, spraying them for protection against insects, and harvesting the crop at the end of the season.

In one instance, he could probably bring home only the amount that would fit in his pockets. By contrast, if the other method were used, he could have enough nutmeat to provide a good living for any number of families, depending upon how much forest had been put to a constructive use. The ground would literally be covered with pecans. The Senator is aware of what the situation would be in a good pecan orchard.

Another illustration is one of people catching hogs. If a person just went out into the forest and tried to kill the wild hogs, he would find that he would not make much of a living by producing ham or any other kind of meat from a hog. On the other hand, if the person carefully raised the hogs, separated them from the predators, and fed the hogs properly, he could have a very good yield.

The same comparison would be true with respect to the yield one could get from corn or wheat if he just went out, willy-nilly, across the countryside and looked among the weed to see if he could

find some grain, compared with what he would have if he plowed the land.

In Louisiana, we had vast areas that were regarded as relatively useless marshland. The Louisiana Land and Exploration Co. recently undertook to see if it could produce shrimp in that land, and they found that they could produce 200 pounds of shrimp per acre by simply controlling the mixture of sea water with fresh water, the fresh water being the rain that fell, and the land being subjected to inundation by the sea. By controlling the salinity of the water, they could produce 200 pounds of shrimp per acre.

I am told that in India, and perhaps in some other areas where they have been working at this matter longer, they are producing 1,000 pounds of shrimp per acre.

If one compared that with the yield of the sea, it would be approximately many times its potential, when we consider what happens to the schools of tiny larvae of shrimp in the sea. The larger shrimp eat millions of them a day. If one simply cut off the predators, killed the bonitas and the other fish that are feeding on the larvae, so that the growth of these resources could be developed, the yield easily could be doubled. In fact, with a reasonable and substantial investment, the yield could be increased tenfold without much difficulty.

Over a period of time, as the proper techniques of aquaculture, which is a term used for farming the sea—it rhymes with "agriculture," but its meaning is a little different—are developed, the yield of the sea with respect to fish could be multiplied enormously. It would mean spawning the kind of fish that multiply best in some areas and spawning the kind of marine life that spawn and multiply most rapidly in other areas. Louisiana is a good area in which to spawn shrimp, and areas along the eastern seaboard, in the Carolinas, are some of the best places to spawn certain other marine life.

I am not an expert on this subject, but I have heard some experts speak on it; and I am convinced beyond any doubt that the time will come when, with proper investment and proper incentives, the income of the State of Hawaii, for example, from the marine resources will be worth literally hundreds of millions of dollars a year, and it might even approach the billion-dollar figure, considering the ocean area which can be planted, spawned, and harvested.

People who know something about the resources of the sea and the potential of the sea stress the fact that to develop those resources, it is not simply a matter of going out there and harvesting what is found. Planting comes first, just as in agriculture. One must plant the seed he hopes to harvest. Then it is nurtured and protected from the predators and from the elements of nature that could harm it. Then, as the yield is developed, it is harvested at the proper time.

I regret to say that, despite all the talk we have done about our research—\$15 billion a year—this Nation is far be-

hind Japan, for example, in developing its sea resources. Perhaps in some respects this is due to the fact that Japan had greater need. But this Nation has neglected its water resources more than any other resource.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. INOUE. I have been told that our scientists in the United States know more about the surface of the moon than about the ocean bed. If this is so, it is a shameful situation, because the potential on the ocean floor, for example, for mining purposes is literally unlimited.

The funds that are concerned in this bill come from the ocean floor—primarily from oil wells. Why cannot these funds be used now for the mining of, say, magnesium or phosphate or bauxite, which scientists tell us should be in immense quantities on the floor of the ocean? These are the minerals and the natural resources we need to keep our Nation progressing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is no reason at all why it cannot be done. All that is needed is the money to develop the method and to find the ways to do it.

Of course, at present we are just beginning to develop our oil resources in the sea. We got there by developing the upland until it reached the sea, and gradually we proceeded into the sea with it; because one could move a little farther out to sea, build a platform, and produce oil. As we went progressively out, we saw an indication of the potential.

Thus far, we have not even been able to get sufficient funds for development of the sea resources in order to find what is there, as the Senator has well pointed out. It may be, as the Senator has suggested, that we actually have made a greater investment in trying to learn what is on the moon than what is beneath the land that is owned by the people of the United States, beneath the sea itself.

These enormous resources, this fantastic potential, according to conservation principles, should be dedicated, first, to repairing the damage done in developing the area; and second, the revenues should be used to develop the potential of the sea, by replacing the resources that are taken from the sea.

There is a very fine program—and I am happy to support it—in which money is plowed back into developing resources in large Federal land holdings in the reclamation States where, for instance, oil and gas are produced. The money is plowed back into the development of resources there, so that in the future when the oil is gone, the gas is gone, and the copper is gone, there would be something there with which people could support themselves and, hopefully, their income would be greater and more abundant than the income they receive from producing oil and gas.

Mr. INOUE. Is it not true that the funds raised in those enterprises just mentioned are primarily plowed back into the States?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They are. As a matter of fact, one might say they are almost 100 percent plowed back; 52.5

percent goes to the reclamation fund; 37.5 percent goes to those States where the minerals are produced to help them provide essential services to the people producing the revenue in those areas—to provide the necessary education for their children for roads, and such; the other 10 percent, if I recall correctly, generally goes toward administration.

I am not an expert on that program; I would be if I represented one of the States having large Federal land holdings. However, it has been a principle advocated and spoken for eloquently in the Senate since the turn of the century that these mineral resources, as they are extracted, should be devoted, at least in part, and as a practical matter almost entirely, to the development and advancement of those States whose lands yield these revenues.

It is true that everyone can claim he has an interest in the offshore resources of the United States, but the proper way to exercise this claim, would be to, first, repair the damage done in the development of that resource; and, second, to put something there to replace what is being taken away. Then, if one wanted to think in terms of what might be done, he could think in terms of the equities of those who helped to develop the resources.

However, when we speak about water resources generally, I do not think that anyone in this Chamber can say that any other resource in the country has been more sadly neglected, to the very point of criminality, than the water resources of the United States.

Mr. President, look at the Great Lakes, and particularly at Lake Erie. Lake Erie is a good example. People who live in that area call it the world's biggest cesspool. It is so badly polluted it does not produce fish. Its recreational advantages are, for the most part, destroyed. If one were to see that body of water he would not want to swim in it.

Certain areas of the Chesapeake Bay are in about the same shape. The Delaware Bay was once one of our great natural assets. Look at Lake Pontchartrain which is near the city of New Orleans. That lake was once one of the most beautiful recreation areas in the world. We had to close it to swimming because some people were pumping sewage into that body of water. We had to undertake a major program to help clean up that lake.

If someone wants to lay a proper claim to the resources beneath the water, it would be fair for one to proceed in this order: first, repair the mischief and the damage that man is doing to that water now, and then proceed to develop those water resources so that when the minerals beneath them are gone the people can still make a good living.

In the beautiful State of Hawaii, which I have had occasion to visit from time to time, development of recreational assets is a tremendous thing. However, the time will come when the potential of the ocean areas surrounding that great State will be an even greater asset than now. Of course, the old Hawaiians looked upon the sea as an important asset to them, apart from the actual production

of oil from the bottom of the sea. But there is such a tremendous potential there, it would seem that if there is to be a dedication of the water resources of Hawaii, first there should be a dedication to the needs of the sea itself and the people bordering it, and to replace the damage that has been done there, and then, to dedicate those resources to other national needs.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I am deeply impressed by the able Senator's logical argument. I wish to advise my friend that I am on his side in this matter. I thank the Senator for giving me this opportunity to enter into the colloquy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I very much appreciate the assurances of the Senator from Hawaii. The Senator has taken a great interest in the development of the resources of his great area, as well as the resources of the rest of the country.

When we discuss the resources of the sea, it would be well to consider the fact that we receive large amounts of money from it. I am not endorsing a proposal to earmark those moneys for Louisiana. I do think we have have equities which should be considered one day.

However, I am frank to say that when people go into the sea and produce \$1 billion for the United States, and that figure will increase as the years go by, it would be fair to ask, as one part of the development program, that there be provided some minimal protection for those people from the ravages of the sea.

I have heard about the tidal waves that on occasion have struck the beautiful island of Hawaii. I can only imagine what the damage and devastation has been. I do not have to imagine the damage and devastation which Louisiana has suffered. I have seen what hurricanes can do. People were forewarned when Hurricane Audrey hit Cameron Parish in Louisiana. In Louisiana we call the counties parishes because of the French and Catholic ancestry of the people there. When Hurricane Audrey hit that area, the loss of life was almost 400 people.

Mr. President, that may not sound like a tremendous loss of lives until one realizes that there are only about 2,000 people who live in that particular parish. Therefore, about one-fifth of the people there were killed by that hurricane. One reason that the hurricane killed so many was that it tended to build up the water before it; there was a substantial rise in the water in front of the hurricane as it moved forward. It was not exactly a tidal wave but it had something of that effect, for several feet.

Those people who lost their lives in that hurricane should have some protection, if they are the ones who helped to make this money. That resource is not just a pot of gold that has been found at the end of the rainbow. Someone has to go out and risk his life to develop it. Someone has to build the platforms on the Continental Shelf; someone has to drill for the resources; someone has to haul them to shore; and someone has to

lay the pipelines on the bottom, if the oil is not brought in by barge or ship.

It would be fair to expect people who work in that area and in all coastal areas in the production of those resources and the development of the sea to have some reasonable protection of life and property. There has been some small amount of help. It has been niggardly, but we have been extremely grateful for it.

After Hurricane Betsy, in Louisiana alone, the property damage amounted to \$1 billion. We were grateful to the Federal Government for the loans and grants which it advanced to help our people overcome the ravages of the sea. But go along the beautiful coast of this country, I do not care whether it is Maryland, Virginia, Delaware, South Carolina, North Carolina, Maine, Louisiana, Florida, Mississippi, Alabama, or Texas, where dwellings and other structures are found along the seashore, most are very cheap and flimsy. They are built on the theory that if the sea should "take them," or a hurricane hit there and wipe them out completely, the owners would not have lost too much.

Yet the people who live in those flimsy structures are the very people who are expected to produce billions of dollars in revenue for a recreation program under this bill.

Recreation is a fine purpose but if we are thinking in terms of what we can do, it would be well that the resources of the Outer Continental Shelf and the sea itself should be developed so that when the minerals are gone, the people there will not have to leave, will not have to become migrants, will not have to go somewhere else and look for jobs. We should not be bleeding away the resources; we should be developing the potential of the sea.

There will not only be recreational advantages, and not necessarily federally owned facilities—there is nothing wrong with private ownership of a hotel on the beach or private ownership of a recreational area—but there would also be the potential to produce tremendous amounts of fish, shrimp, lobsters, and all sorts of other edible marine life which would be a great asset to be developed in the years to come.

If one wishes to earmark revenues of the sea for something, here is something that could be supported because of its direct relationship between the source of revenues and the purpose to which those revenues are put.

I would emphasize that there is a good purpose in developing a parks program but that the proposed method would do more harm than good unless the amendment of my colleague [Mr. ELLENDER] is agreed to.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] talks only about conservation as it relates to our national parks. But the bill turns its back entirely on all of the serious conservation problems that exist outside of our national parks.

Are not conservation measures needed to deal with such problems as water pollution, flood control, hurricane protection, fisheries development, mineral resource development? Indeed, are not conservation measures needed to pre-

serve both our coastal waters as well as our great lakes and rivers for recreational and economic use?

Once again, I want to make it clear that I am fully in agreement with the need to develop our park program. But I do disagree with the proposed method which, in longrun terms, will undoubtedly have the effect of creating warring camps among the conservationists themselves.

Should the marine conservationists and the park conservationists be locked in battle against each other as a matter of congressional policy? Should they be compelled to engage in regional disputes as to which areas of the country ought to be conserved at the price of other areas? I say that the problem of how the money for conservation is to be raised is not a problem that the conservationists themselves should be forced to grapple with. The problem of raising revenues is our problem. It is the undeniable responsibility of Congress.

The enactment of S. 1401 in its present form would establish the dangerous precedent of dividing the conservationists into two camps and causing them to have to make decisions which would involve the sacrificing of worthy causes in some areas of the country in order to support other worthy causes in other areas. There is clearly no need for such a precedent. The land and water conservation fund is so worthy a cause that it ought to stand on its own two feet. It ought to receive the appropriations that the committee has asked for without our having to engage in a form of fiscal juggling which can only serve to create confusion and controversy in all of our future planning with respect to conservation.

Is there any Member of this body who will agree that the need to conserve our parks is greater than the need to conserve our water resources? If there is a need to conserve our parks, we should assume our responsibility and meet that need. If there is a like need to conserve our water resources, then that need ought to be met, too. Unless we are fully convinced that one need is, by far, greater than the other, we ought not adopt the policy for the years ahead which compels us to favor one program over the other.

I repeat, Mr. President, this approach to the financing of even such a worthwhile program disturbs me. I am deeply concerned that should we tap the Outer Continental Shelf for the funding of this program, even to the limited extent suggested by the administration, we will have set a precedent which could result in a raid on these revenues for a variety of projects without proper regard for national priorities or prudent conservation practices. The fund could become an easy mark for a variety of pet schemes which could not stand the test of the normal appropriations process.

We must remember that minerals are, by definition, a depleting asset and that reason and foresight force us to utilize these limited resources in ways which will leave our society with tangible permanent assets.

Such a carefully planned and coordi-

nated program will take time. While this coordinated effort is taking place, the precedent which S. 1401 establishes could start a hodgepodge disorganized diversion of the Outer Continental Shelf funds into any number of unrelated programs.

I propose, then, that the Senate give careful consideration to amending the bill so as to leave the Outer Continental Shelf funds completely unencumbered so that an overall comprehensive program founded on sound conservation principles can be developed.

Such an amendment would authorize for the land and water conservation fund the same amount of money requested by the Secretary of the Interior. It would, however, go the more direct route through normal appropriation channels for the funds rather than have them transferred directly from the Outer Continental Shelf receipts.

This would achieve the principal purposes set forth in the bill of adequately funding the program but would avoid the danger of making more difficult a broad and permanent program for the use of all of the Outer Continental Shelf receipts.

Our storehouse of mineral assets is a depleting or a wasting asset. We consume our gas and oil reserves at an alarming rate and we know that there is a limit to how long the supply will last. This sobering fact compels us to think seriously and rationally about how we should best utilize this depleting resource.

We are about to enter a period of gigantic growth in offshore petroleum production. After a while I shall demonstrate how relatively unimportant the offshore petroleum industry will be, in time, when compared with all the other potential resources of the sea; but, at present, I just refer to what we are doing in developing offshore resources in petroleum alone.

On February 5 of this year, Secretary of the Interior Udall told the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

During the past 5 years, receipts from the Outer Continental Shelf lands have averaged \$265 million annually. They are forecast for the next 5 years to average about \$500 million a year.

A few weeks ago we read of the largest Outer Continental Shelf mineral lease sale in history, \$603 million off the shores of the State of California.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for a moment, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington, under those conditions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] may be added as a cosponsor of S. 1401.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I cite these growth figures to illustrate the compelling need for a long range, comprehensive program for channeling these resources, which we know to

have a limited life, into programs for developing assets permanent in nature governed by sound conservation principles. It was just this type of prudent thinking which prompted Congress to include as an essential part of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1900 a provision for requiring that 52½ percent of the mineral receipts from public lands be earmarked for the reclamation fund and thus returned to those States where the revenues were derived for use in a sound conservationist program.

This income from mineral leasing has been the prime source of revenue for the reclamation fund since 1920. Up to June 30, 1967, the total paid into the fund from such oil and potassium leasing receipts has been \$818,047,572. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, such receipts amounted to \$56,493,935. The beneficiaries of the reclamation fund have been the 17 Western States, to whose growth and prosperity the programs benefited have greatly contributed.

I firmly believe that history, precedent, and basic considerations of fairplay require that this formula be extended to the federally owned submerged lands. Indeed, the factors which prompted Congress to allocate receipts derived from the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 are just as valid and compelling today, as they were nearly 60 years ago.

We must bear in mind that today, as in 1920, we are dealing with proceeds derived from a wasting asset. Each barrel of oil produced from the submerged lands, each Mc.f. of gas produced from America's Continental Shelf, is a depletion of a capital asset. We must consider these proceeds in that context, and legislation involving their disposition must be permanent in nature. Our solution must be founded upon sound principles of conservation and the prudent utilization of natural resources with a limited life.

I would plan to work in this body with a number of my colleagues in this body to devise a permanent program for the disposition of revenues produced from the public submerged lands, just as Congress has already developed and enacted a permanent program for the disposition of revenues yielded from the lands of the interior of our Nation.

Our long experience with the reclamation fund has proved the logic, and the necessity, of the formula devised by the Congress for the disposition of revenues from the public lands of the interior. Its extension to the public lands underlying the sea would be a prudent investment, more in light of this experience.

Certainly, our national interest demands the maximum development of these areas. The very nature of the mineral development which we have experienced from our seabeds dictates the utilization of the proceeds of such development for purposes of the broadest possible public interest. These resources are depletable. Minerals, by their nature, are capital assets; their commercial development into consumable items amounts to a consumption of a non-recurring asset. Thus, it would be totally imprudent for any responsible government to utilize the economic benefits of

such development for anything but the acquisition of additional capital items.

This conservation principle is embodied in the Mineral Leasing Act.

I feel very strongly in the logic and wisdom of extending that principle to the submerged lands. A substantial proportion of offshore mineral revenues should be dedicated to permanent, long-range programs to foster further development and protection of the resources of the sea.

A major portion of the revenues derived from offshore mineral development should be applied to such high-priority items as control of water pollution which I am informed, would cost about \$50 billion to bring under control; imagine, Mr. President, \$50 billion to just correct the damage the people of this country have already done to their water resources.

Such a program should include increased research in the field of oceanography, hurricane protection, research into the causes, and possible sources and mitigation of earthquakes, for fisheries research, and similar purposes.

The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] recently introduced a bill to earmark portions of the Federal revenue from Outer Continental Shelf leases for a sea grant college program and for the exploration and mapping of marine environment. We are badly in need of these sea grant colleges, if we are to properly develop these facilities.

There are so many things that these colleges could do. As I see it, just one project of such a college would more than justify their existence. This project is that of utilizing the sea as a source of food for this Nation and the entire world. Mr. President, let us be realistic—feeding the Nation and the world is a problem which will get progressively worse before it gets better.

Now as in the past, this country, as well as the other nations of the world, has looked to the sea as a direct and also indirect source of food. The United States is consuming about 12 billion pounds of fish each year. This amount includes fish used for human food and also for poultry and other stock. We believe that by the year 2000, a scant 32 years from now, this country is very likely to need close to 30 billion pounds of fish for the consumption and use of its citizens. This means that our fishing industry has an opportunity that it never had before. It means that Congress and the Government have an obligation that we have perhaps never sufficiently realized before—to provide the ways and means of increasing the use of the resources adjacent to our own coasts better than two times; that is, from our present 12 billion pounds to more than 24 billion pounds.

If we look at the world consumption of fishery products and the world need for food, we see an even more astounding picture. The world production of all living marine products at the present time is somewhere in the vicinity of 60 million metric tons. It is very likely that in 32 years the world's need will be well over 100 million metric tons, or well over

twice the present production of fish and food.

Let us look at this need from another standpoint. Very recently one of the top officials in Washington estimated that over one-half of the children born into the world each year die before reaching 5 years of age; these deaths, to a considerable degree, are attributed to malnutrition. The greatest cause of death due to malnutrition today is from the lack of adequate protein in the diet. Within the next 32 years, without question, the world is going to need additional food in tremendous quantities. Pinpointing this to fish itself, we are going to need somewhere between two and four times the amount of production from the sea that we are gaining at the present time.

This is an urgent need. It is not something we can wait for; it is not something that is simply a whim or notion of a segment of our economy. It is a tremendous need for our Nation and for the world. The benefits to be derived from the full use of the resources of the sea, and especially those resources around the United States, can have a major favorable impact upon the economy of our country and a major impact upon resolution of perhaps the most important problem facing the world tomorrow—that of feeding its hungry billions.

The seas and ocean bottoms adjacent to the coast of the continental United States and its island possessions are among the richest in the world and, to a considerable degree, less than fully harvested.

As I said before, we are now using about 12 billion pounds of fish every year. Of this, the United States catch is only 5 billion, which means that 7 billion pounds of fish a year are imported into the United States at the present time. Our scientists, in exploring the Continental Shelf and the seas above the Continental Shelf around our coastline, have estimated that we very likely could harvest in a conservative manner—that is, on a sustained yield basis—well over 25 billion pounds of fish without really leaving our own shores or without attempting to fish on the high seas.

Although there is not complete agreement, marine biologists estimate that the seas of the world could annually sustain a catch of 400 to 500 billion pounds of fish—a very real potential for supplying critically needed sources of animal protein. Tragically, about 85 percent of this potential supply is now going to waste. This is true despite the fact that nearly every inhabited coastal area has some sort of fishing activity.

Systematic efforts to farm the seas have lagged far behind land efforts. Yet the seas, today a vast reservoir producing animal protein, can, with proper techniques, provide us with even more protein than we can now estimate.

There are many other logical and worthy uses that some of the funds from the outer Continental Shelf leases can be used for. But, these uses should be well planned ahead of time so that our generation and the generations to come can show that they have put funds from a depleting asset to the wisest and best

use. These resources should be used in a way to show that we have been good stewards of this resource. We should not have a hodge-podge, uncoordinated division of the total Outer Continental Shelf funds into any number of programs unrelated to the source of these revenues, particularly when the argument is made that the need for this proposal is that Congress has not realized the necessity for appropriating funds for that purpose sufficiently and has not appropriated a sum adequate to get on with what many believe to be a very desirable program.

We have also been tragically neglectful, in my opinion, in our efforts to discover and develop other resources of the sea. We just do not know what resources exist off our shores, and we have failed to apply either the dedication or the money necessary to get the job done.

We have lagged behind shamefully in the field of pollution abatement and in devising ways and means of controlling, or, even better yet, preventing the pollution of our oceans, rivers, and streams.

Our failure to devise an adequate system of hurricane protection, to protect the areas which produce the very revenues we are considering here today, has brought repeated disaster which I have discussed to some degree already.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to quote from the forward of a recent Department of the Interior bulletin, published in May 1966, in which the chairman of the Energy Policy Staff observed:

The preponderant part of offshore exploratory activity over the past 20 years has been concentrated in the area off the Louisiana Coast in water depths rarely exceeding 200 feet and to distances no more than 75 miles from shore. The remainder of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the contiguous United States and comprising well over 200,000 square miles has hardly been touched, although virtually all of it is considered to be favorable for the occurrence of petroleum deposits.

And, in fact, for other minerals.

A study prepared by the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution reported the existence of tremendous phosphorite and manganese deposits off the coast of Florida, North Carolina, and South Carolina, with significant deposits of petroleum indicated to be present off the coasts of all the Atlantic States, as far north as Massachusetts and Maine.

Thus the evidence is clear that after some 20 years of experience with submerged lands mineral production, we have not begun to even discover the magnitude of the resources which lie beneath the entire coast of this great Nation.

I am suggesting a program based upon the highest and best principles of enlightened conservation, utilizing a major portion of the proceeds derived from offshore development for the further development of those areas—for their protection, enhancement, and safekeeping. I urge this program, not only on the basis of precedent, but with the overriding conviction that the national interest can afford no other.

I refer to a permanent Federal program for the acquisition of knowledge and the

conservation and development of our vast and varied marine resources; water pollution control and abatement on the Continental Shelves and adjacent areas and in the Great Lakes; aquaculture; prevention of beach erosion; hurricane protection; aid to sea-grant colleges; fisheries development; the creation and maintenance of waterfront recreation facilities; oceanographic research; and increased support for desalinization research.

This would be an intensive, permanent, long-range program for research and maximum development of the vast and unbelievable potential of the sea. The food and mineral resources of the oceans are the greatest hope for coping with the overpopulation that is now coming upon us. Let it not ever be said that we lacked the foresight, the vision or the will to provide for the well being or even the survival of future generations.

We have made some token efforts in exploring the riches of the sea, skimming the surface of vast and varied potential resources which can only be discovered and produced if the kind of program I have in mind is adopted.

The program a number of us are anxious to promote will get this country on the way to stopping the dissipation of our national resources and instead put them to the greatest possible use of the people. We have made great strides in reclaiming the natural resources of the inland States. If we follow the same successful formula of turning revenues from the extraction of minerals back into efforts to further develop those areas, we could very quickly turn our coastal assets into a major new source of permanent national wealth.

It should be noted that one of the objectives of a Federal program should be the creation and maintenance of waterfront recreational facilities. The creation and maintenance of recreational facilities are the primary objectives of S. 1401 and of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, which S. 1401 proposes to amend. The supporters of S. 1401 should also support this item of the Federal program I favor, which would benefit such facilities on waterfronts.

In furtherance of the national interest in conservation, the depleting mineral resources of the Outer Continental Shelf areas must be used, in major part, to discover and develop all the resources of the sea, just as the Mineral Leasing Act provides that 52½ percent of the revenues from the depleting minerals of the Federal lands shall be dedicated to the reclamation of the arid land of the West.

Mr. President, I have here an illustration of the meagerness of the funds that have been invested in finding what we have in the sea and moving toward development of those resources. The size of that investment might be looked upon in comparison with the \$100 million of revenue per year produced from the sea for 3 years, and the \$200 million per year produced for the following 2 years, a total of \$700 million, which the sponsor of this bill would ask us to provide for additional park lands.

It is interesting to measure these figures against the funds available, and requested, to fund programs related to

improvement of the coastal zone; that is, the ocean and estuary areas adjacent to the coasts of our coastal States.

The March 1968 report of the President to the Congress on marine resources and engineering development states:

... Federal funding for these purposes amounted to \$21.4 million in FY 1967 and will reach \$28.7 million in FY 1968. Appropriation requests for FY 1969 are \$28.6 million.

Conservation and Recreation is the major cost category and is the one in which the major part of the FY 1968 expense occurred: \$20.2 million in FY 1968, as compared with \$15.4 million in FY 1967. . . .

Another important increase in Federal responsibility, largely stemming from new legislation of 1965-66, has been in water quality management. Some of the most difficult water pollution problems are those in the Coastal Zone—the Great Lakes, estuaries, and other near-shore waters. For water quality management in the marine environment, expenditures in FY 1967 were \$4.5 million; funding for FY 1968 is estimated at \$7.0 million, and the appropriations requested for FY 1969 to \$8.7 million.

Imagine this, Mr. President: This bill would dedicate \$100 million in fiscal year 1969 for the purchase of park lands, the \$100 million to be drawn from resources yielded by our oceans, yet, during that same period, less than 10 percent of that amount would be available to halt pollution of our coastal waters. Indeed, the total Federal budget for programs operating in the entire coastal zone of our entire Nation aggregates only about one-third of the amount which the pending bill would dedicate to parks in 1 year alone.

Mr. President, when one pursues the logic of the committee report, the logic that Congress has been too niggardly in appropriating money for this purpose and that, therefore, all of the resources of the Outer Continental Shelf should be dedicated to this purpose and appropriated to none other—that is, to the extent of \$100 million a year for the first 3 years and \$200 million a year for the 2 years next following—it sets a precedent for everyone who has a good program. And I am sure that they would all be good programs or, at least, worthy of consideration. They would all come in and say, "Look, we have fine programs. We want you to earmark the remaining Outer Continental Shelf revenues, or some part of them, for our programs."

The able Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], when he was a delegate to the United Nations, suggested that the resources of the sea ought to be dedicated to the United Nations so that the United Nations could get on with its programs. There was some complaint at that time that the United Nations did not have enough funds, although the United States had always been the principal supporter of the United Nations. It was suggested, however, that the United Nations should be the recipient of what we could derive from the development of the resources of the sea.

When we considered the Submerged Lands Act several years ago, quite a few people wanted to dedicate the revenues from federally controlled lands beneath the sea to education—certainly a very

worthy purpose. However, well intended as it might be, as a practical matter the revenue that is derived from such resources, if it is to be dedicated at all—and I am not asking that it be dedicated at this point—should be dedicated to the support of certain reasonable, conservation practices that would provide, as a starting point, that as these resources are depleted they should be replaced with resources of permanent value, would something that could at least be replenished over and over again; we should replace these depleted resources with things of at least equal value, so that people in the coastal areas could survive, rather than simply depleting the resources and leaving nothing to take their place.

We have had experience through the years in which people have exploited some resources in order to get what they could out of them without putting anything back to replace them. Those experiences have all been glaring examples of poor conservation.

Some of the mining procedures used in the early years despoiled the whole countryside and left nothing there of value for the future.

We voted appropriations to create an Appalachia program. And I was proud to vote for the appropriation of money to help build the resources of an area which had been exploited without adequate reinvestment being made to develop something to take the place of the resources that had been removed.

I can well remember how in my boyhood one could look across the countryside at what had once been the gorgeous, virgin timberlands of Louisiana. There was not so much as a small tree to be seen. There was nothing but stumps and barren land that had been despoiled and destroyed by the harvesting of timber with no conservation practices pursued whatever.

They dragged the logs across the countryside on skids that ripped loose and destroyed what small plants and trees remained in the ground so that the whole countryside was barren for 60 years thereafter. Having raped these resources, the companies that had raped them, simply moved on.

I can recall a story an old-timer from north Louisiana told me about one of those lumber companies. The company was moving out. They had cut all of the trees. The people there had always voted against my father because the lumber companies had been opposed to him. Those companies had a great deal of influence with their labor because it was before the days when that kind of labor was organized at all.

The companies were in the process of moving out. The people were not moving out. They were being left there.

An oldtimer told me what my father told the people. He had said: "There goes that company. They have exploited all your resources, destroyed your timber, and damaged your land to the point that it will not produce anything for another 50 years. Nothing is left here worth having except maybe you. Now that these resources have been destroyed, they have no use for you either. So they are going

and telling you, like that oldtime country boy, 'Goodby, my honey. I am going. I will see you no more.'

That is about the kind of practice proposed when one suggests that we use and deplete these resources and dedicate their revenues to a totally unrelated purpose and put them where they cannot be used even to offset the damage that has been caused.

Mr. President, the inadequate consideration given to the matter by those who recommended the pending legislation and those who approved it in committee can well be illustrated by the pitiful treatment of the pollution problem.

Let me read what the committee report states in its cursory touching upon the pollution problem. The committee said that there was some suggestion that something ought to be done about pollution.

I will read this to show how the committee, composed primarily of Senators from interior States, could touch upon a problem and dismiss it with such light consideration when the problem is so tremendous and so important. Their action is due in large measure, I suppose, to the fact that those Senators and the people advising them never have studied in great depth the problem to which I refer.

On page 10 of the committee report, under the heading "Outer Shelf Protection," it states:

In considering making available a part of the revenues from mineral leasing operations on the Outer Continental Shelf, as provided in section 1(a), the committee also gave study to the danger of pollution from such operations.

Generally speaking, an oil company would be liable for any pollution damage resulting from negligence in its exploration, drilling, production, or transportation activities.

I pause there to show how completely the committee and its advisers missed the target.

When we have an oyster bed in the coastal waters, be they coastal waters where they are producing oil or coastal waters where oil will be produced in the future—in the Chesapeake Bay, one of its estuaries opening into that bay, or in the open sea—and find that the oysters are dead and are no longer there, one cannot say exactly why they are no longer there.

In Louisiana, where we are well aware of the problem, we cannot pinpoint exactly who is responsible for the fact that the oysters are dead or no longer existing there.

If one can establish—which cannot very well be done—why the oysters die, he cannot say who is responsible for it.

Texaco Inc. has a lease to the right. Shell Oil Co. has a lease to the left. Humble Oil Co. has a lease to the south. Chevron Oil Co. has a lease to the north. Kerr McGee has a lease to the southwest. We do not know who spilled the oil. We cannot prove that any one of those companies did it. However, the oysters are no longer there.

One has to find some other area in which to plant the oysters and start all over again. That resource has been damaged and destroyed completely. There is no one to sue. The only way to make good

on that resource is for the government to collect the money—just as the States and the Federal Government are doing—from the oil companies and have the government spend that money to overcome the damage that has been done to the area.

Mr. President, I read further from page 10 of the committee report:

However, a different problem would arise should pollution be caused by an act of God or should a ship crash into an offshore drilling or production structure, causing oil to flow into the sea. In the latter instance, as a matter of law, the negligent party would be liable for the resulting damage.

Mr. President, let me just discuss a problem that perhaps never occurred to the committee. It occurred to me at one time. Let me discuss this problem with respect to an experience I once had.

In some of the European countries which have had more experience with some of these pollution problems than we have had in some parts of the United States, laws have been passed, and have been in effect for years, to the effect that one cannot pump oil that might be polluted or contaminated into the harbors or into the bay in order to get rid of it.

At a time when I was in charge of a small naval craft, the ravages of the sea caused some damage to the bottom of the vessel, and salt water got into the diesel fuel. A large amount of diesel fuel was aboard the craft. The British were in control of the port of Philippeville at that time.

I asked an Englishman there: "How do I get rid of this contaminated diesel fuel?"

The fellow said: "Gee, I would not know. About the only thing I could see to do, if I had your problem, is to just sneak out to sea some night and pump that stuff overboard and pretend it never happened."

That is one way one might do it, and it would not be the first time someone disposed of diesel, or some other petroleum product that had become contaminated, in that manner. But in a situation like that, the damage of the pollution is done and no one knows who did it.

The committee report continues:

But, if the ship were a relatively small, individually owned vessel, for example, there well might not be sufficient assets to pay the costs of shoreline rehabilitation.

Mr. President, airline pilots tell me that they fly over oil slicks on the ocean which appear to be as much as 100 miles long. No one knows how those oil slicks occurred, but they had to occur from one of several reasons: A ship was torpedoed; a ship came to pieces in a storm; or, in the production of oil, a well got out of control and large amounts of oil came to the surface and drifted, pushed by the wind in one direction or the other, to where the pollution occurred.

Furthermore, the report does not discuss one of the other aspects of the pollution of the sea with which I am sure the distinguished junior Senator from Texas—who I am pleased to see in the Chamber—is familiar. So far as oil pollution is concerned, in many instances much of it results from the production

of oil in the upland areas. In the arid areas of Oklahoma or Texas or Louisiana, a fellow drills and tries to get some oil. He does the best he can, but he does not have much luck at it. He has a sludge pit in which he tries to separate the water from the oil. A big rain comes along and causes the sludge pit to overflow, and the contents of the pit go into the stream and find their way into the river, and eventually into the sea, where the ocean becomes polluted. Eventually, the stream is cleared out, but the ocean is polluted.

It is true that we have regulations by which we try to discourage people from flowing more oil than is necessary through those wells. But we cannot really be completely unkind toward the problems of a small, independent producer when he brings in a well that is producing very little oil, mostly salt water, and lets it run for a few days, in the hope that it might flush out the salt water and come in with a substantial amount of oil production—particularly if the game warden, who sees fish are being killed, is a relative or a friend. The game warden might realize that the man has lost quite a bit of money on the well and be tolerant with him and not be quick to force him to shut the well down when he is trying to bring it in.

Also, there is the spillage of oil and the spillage of gas on the highways and on the land around the areas where it is being refined and captured. That spillage, to a considerable extent, eventually is washed away by waters. It finds its way into the streams and on into the ocean, which is the final receptacle of all the pollutant. That is just one way in which the sea becomes polluted.

Another way in which the sea becomes polluted is by the failure to properly treat sewage which is produced in all parts of the country. In many instances it is pumped into the streams and washed down the rivers, into the oceans, creating a serious problem.

Some time ago we had a big fish kill in the Mississippi River. For a long time people thought those fish were killed by endrin, a commercial pesticide used in agriculture, which had been washed by the rain into the streams, down the rivers, and into the Gulf of Mexico. In Louisiana, we were told that certain oysters had to be taken off the market, and certain areas were examined very carefully, for fear that great additional areas would have to be taken out of seafood production because endrin had been found in the Mississippi River.

Presumably, that poison had got there because it had been used on growing crops, had been washed from the crops into the streams, and eventually found its way into the rivers and into the gulf. Subsequently, someone concluded that it is more likely that the endrin got there because a plant producing that chemical was located around Memphis and that one day, in getting rid of a lot of waste material, they just pumped the endrin into the Mississippi. That caused the pollution.

The point is that, in most instances, one cannot establish from where the pollution came, no more than one can pre-

cisely establish, simply by looking at the Potomac River or Lake Erie, the source of all that pollution.

But all sorts of dead fish and dead animal matter are around which indicate, if anyone has a doubt about it, that the water is polluted.

So there is a big problem, which one might say is glossed over in the committee report.

Mr. President, the report continues:

A proposal by Senator Kuchel that study be given to having an additional share of the offshore revenues available to pay for the cleaning of an area damaged by pollution in a situation where individual liability is inadequate or cannot be determined, was tentatively accepted for further consideration.

Accordingly, the committee requests that the Secretary of the Interior make investigation and report on such a proposal.

The committee wishes to make clear its intent that the proposal does not contemplate that the Federal Government would be an insurer against pollution or other damage resulting from offshore oil and gas operations. Rather, existing law and practices with respect to liability would continue in full force and effect. Fund monies would be available only in emergency situations or when no other sources were available.

After receiving the Secretary's reports and comments on the proposal, the committee will give the matter full and careful consideration.

Mr. President, the point I wish to make is that there is vast pollution now in the rivers flowing into the coastal areas, which flow into the Great Lakes, and which flow into the very areas which produce the revenues which this bill would earmark for parks and playgrounds. No matter how much one studies the matter, he is still going to find that it is an enormous task, and one which requires tremendous resources to clear up.

If one wishes to dedicate the resources produced by this oil to meet the pollution problem, be it the Connecticut River, the Mississippi River, or the Potomac River, it is better that these funds be dedicated to controlling the polluted water that is flowing in these rivers and polluting all of the sea for all time to come, than that there should be a dedication of the funds to use them to acquire more recreational purposes.

It seems to me that this program for providing more land for parks and recreation, desirable though it may be, should take its place in line with the great number of other Federal programs that would provide, in one respect or another, for advancing the national interest, each in its own way.

The resources we can make available for this purpose should be authorized and appropriated. The amendment proposed by my distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] proposes that a substantial amount—in fact, the same amount of authorization that the Interior Committee would request—be made available. It would prevent an unwise and improper dedication of the source of these revenues to totally irrelevant purposes. In doing so, it would maintain the sound principles that Congress has pursued up to this point: that these revenues would go into the general

funds of the Treasury, and be available for whatever purposes Congress should authorize and appropriate money. At such time as Congress sees fit to provide for recreation or any other desirable purpose, it would provide whatever amount should be needed.

I look forward to the day when some of us can fully make our case, with adequate support and research to back up the point, that there are certain other needs directly related to the Outer Continental Shelf, particularly the development and exploration, to develop the vast resources it contains, which would justify a dedication. I do not ask for that now. I simply ask that these funds remain, as is the case with other Federal revenue, to be allocated by appropriation to purposes determined by the Congress to be in the best national interest.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington and the other members of the Interior Committee are to be complimented for the fine work that they have done in regard to S. 1401, which amends the land and water conservation measures that we in the Senate have previously passed. I have, of course, long supported conservation measures. As such, I am in agreement with the aims of the measure currently before us. Ever since the days of Theodore Roosevelt, America has been dedicated to the idea of setting aside a portion of its land to make certain that when land was depleted for mining, foresting, or other such purposes, at least a portion of it should be restored or maintained in its natural state. We have made good progress in the conservation and restoration fields, and I am sure that we shall make better progress in the future.

Nevertheless, a number of things trouble me greatly about S. 1401. It is not the aims of the measure, but rather the way that the funds are procured for it. It has been the historical custom of the Senate to authorize measures and then send the request for the funds with which to carry them out to the Appropriations Committee for judicious consideration.

Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] for his very eloquent discussion of this matter and calling the attention of the Senate and the public generally to some

aspects of the pending bill which should be carefully considered.

I should also like to commend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for offering his amendment which, I think, is a constructive and sound approach to this matter and which, I hope, will be adopted by the Senate.

Here are considered such things as national priorities, the overall availability of funds, the effect of particular expenditures on the economy, and the apportionment of available financial resources. It is a tried and true formula that has served us well in the past and continues to do so. We must not allow the Appropriations Committee to be bypassed in this instance, even for this most worthy cause, in order that the responsibility of the Congress to oversee the expenditure of funds shall not be usurped.

Of course, there is the objection that we have raised relative to the method of authorization and appropriation to which the Ellender amendment addresses itself, and which I believe would remedy.

Under the provisions of S. 1401, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to speculate in public property, practically free of all congressional control. He may, for example, buy a piece of land and hold it for a period of time, then resell it for a profit, retaining the profit in the trust fund for land purchases. The possibility thus exists that the fund could grow to be a multi-billion-dollar complex, far beyond anything that Congress has envisioned, leaving this money unavailable for appropriation by us to help solve the greatly expanding problems of America.

Another matter of concern in reviewing S. 1401 is the fact that the funds which are earmarked for this program come from the revenue being derived and to be derived from the Outer Continental Shelf. This money currently goes into the miscellaneous account of the Federal Treasury.

The proponents of using such funds would have us believe that they have discovered a treasure chest at the bottom of the sea to pay for this program. That, Mr. President, simply is not the case. As I mentioned a moment ago, these lands are currently being leased by the Government and the funds are going into the Federal Treasury. This money is currently vitally needed in the light of the present financial straits in which we find ourselves.

Mr. President, this does not seem to be the time to determine just what use will be made of the revenue that will be obtained from leasing the Outer Continental Shelf lands. There are currently many areas of dispute, and these should all be solved, or at least better understood, before such determination is even considered. It is my understanding that we do not know just what wealth may lie on the Outer Continental Shelf. I am advised that the Interior Committee has ordered a study of the matter superficially to determine just what the actual revenue might eventually be from this source. I believe that it would be much better to at least await the completion of this report before we divide up the dividends.

There are still other reasons to delay the disposition of the Outer Continental Shelf question. One of the best ones is the fact that the Outer Continental Shelf is a marine resource, and there has been as yet no comprehensive plan of marine conservation developed. It has been the historic practice to use resources developed from the land to finance land conservation projects. In fact, this has been the whole backbone of the conservation program and the reason for having it: we have determined to return to the land those resources which have been depleted from it. It has also been the historic precedent to use resources taken from the sea to replete the same. Thus, much of the money that has been taken in under the tidelands leasing arrangements has gone back into the sea in fishery projects, hurricane abatement, flood control, and navigational instruments. We should move cautiously if we are going to change this long-standing procedure.

Further, Mr. President, before a disposition of the funds derived from leasing the Outer Continental Shelf is finally arrived at in this body, we should await the easing of the budgetary situation and the development of comprehensive programs for the use of such lands. I can envision now that if we start using this revenue specifically for this purpose, next week someone may want to use another portion of it for something else, the next week there will be still more proposals to use more of the funds, and so on, until all of the funds, and possibly more, are dedicated to projects that have no relation whatsoever to the sea.

I need not remind the Members of this body of the great problems that have been arising in regard to the pollution of our oceans and the very serious need for developing a program in this area. Also, our fishing industry is in desperate need of help as their supplies in American waters are being depleted, and they must go thousands of miles from our coast to find a profitable catch. The Outer Continental Shelf simply must not be used as a submerged pork-barrel to finance the projects that we cannot finance through appropriate channels.

As I have stated previously, I support the objectives of S. 1401, and thus urge the Members of the Senate to enthusiastically endorse the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Louisiana, our colleague, Senator ELLENDER. This would authorize all the funds requested for the purchase of the desired locations, while at the same time requiring that this program, just like any other, go through the normal processes that all other measures must go through. I, for one, hope that all the funds for the measure will be authorized and appropriated. The measure, with the reservations that I have stated, is a just one and deserves our approval. However, in light of the fact that we have just seen fit in this body to pass the 10-percent surtax and to extend the excise taxes, I feel compelled to suggest that we cannot now begin to earmark funds that bypass our Appropriations Committee. If anything, now is the time for national belt-tightening and to let the world

know that we intend to live within our budget.

I feel certain that this is the best way to maintain our strong conservation program and to make certain in the future that we shall be able to have just as strong a maritime conservation program. I shall vote for the Ellender amendment and, I am very hopeful that my colleagues will, and I urge them to, do likewise.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the objectives of the pending measure are most certainly meritorious and the able chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. JACKSON] is to be commended.

The primary purpose of this legislation is to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965—Public Law 88-578—by providing more funds for needed outdoor recreation programs at all levels of government throughout the Nation.

I voted for passage of the original land and water conservation bill when it was before the Senate on August 12, 1964, and I support the objectives that this measure would accomplish.

Within my own State, moneys available through the grant-in-aid program have made possible significant progress in assuring that West Virginians—today and in the future—will have an opportunity to enjoy the out of doors.

During consideration of this legislation, Carl L. Bradford, senior recreation planner for the State of West Virginia, appeared before the committee in support of this proposal. He represented the Honorable Hulett C. Smith, Governor of West Virginia, and Commerce Commissioner Angus E. Peyton. Mr. Bradford stated:

The immediate implementation of this program of development of the State's outdoor recreation resources is necessary due to urbanization, disappearing quality recreation lands, and escalation of both acquisition and development costs. Implementation of this program is estimated to require an investment of some \$42 million by the State (West Virginia) and its local governmental subdivisions during the next 5 years. Much of the success of this program hinges upon the availability of financial assistance from the land and water conservation fund . . .

In conclusion, West Virginia strongly urges favorable action on Senate bill 1401 and that utmost consideration be given to raising the fund ceiling above the \$200 million level recommended by the administration.

Moneys from the land and water fund are being used to establish the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area and would also be available to help establish the Potomac National River which the administration proposed this last month.

The committee report—No. 1071—

clearly points out the necessity for action as follows:

Indisputedly, the land and water conservation fund has on the whole been a success during its first 3 years of operation. However, the money has not been sufficient to fulfill the objectives of the law, and unless new revenues are provided, the State and Federal outdoor recreation programs are in jeopardy.

The committee report then continues:

The deficiency of the fund is directly attributable to two causes: First, and most important, the skyrocketing rise in land prices as soon as it becomes known that the Federal Government is considering acquisition of an area, and second, the failure of the three sources established in the law to produce as much revenue as had been estimated at the time of enactment.

The matter of escalating land prices—which is of great concern to the members of the Public Works Committee in our consideration of Federal land costs for reservoir sites and highways—is covered by providing advance land acquisition authority to the Secretary of the Interior. Committee members will follow this closely as it may be one way to combat land cost escalations occasionally observed at water resource development programs handled by the Corps of Engineers.

One major impact of the proposed bill is to supplement the land and water conservation fund by earmarking about \$102 million annually for fiscal years 1969, 1970, and 1971 from the Outer Continental Shelf revenues from the sale of oil and gas and \$215 million annually for fiscal years 1972 and 1973. Although I have supported, and still do support the primary objectives of the pending bill by providing more money for public outdoor recreation opportunities, I cannot support the additional earmarking of miscellaneous receipts.

I remind the Senate that during our deliberation on the excise tax bill the Senate expressed the desire that all programs should be considered on their merit at the time the annual appropriations bills are thoroughly considered. To earmark the offshore oil receipts for any purpose gives special consideration to that purpose. The argument for the need for additional funds to accelerate worthy programs can just as soundly be applied to the flood control, navigation, municipal water supply, and other public works programs of the corps, to the program in Appalachia, water quality and air pollution control measures and Federal aid to schools, to name just a few.

We are concerned about funding Federal programs. However, we cannot create special earmarked funds from the General Treasury to carry out these worthy objectives. The only way that we can make a rational decision on these vital matters is to consider each program on its merit, which is in turn balanced against total budgetary constraints.

For these reasons I support the amendment No. 704, introduced by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, unfortunately the very able and articulate senior Senator from California is necessarily absent during the pending debate on this

important measure now before the Senate, S. 1401, of which the Senator is a cosponsor. Because I know Senators would benefit from reading the remarks of the ranking member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the pending bill, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL

The last decade has been a decade of awakening for the United States—awakening to the importance of conservation of our limited and priceless natural resources.

In recent years, Congress has authorized the addition of more than fifty new areas to the national park system.

Public use of recreation areas has also greatly increased. Last year, it is estimated that 1.5 billion visits were made to public recreation areas—federal, state and local, nearly double the 1960 estimate of 820 million visits.

We need more recreation areas. As Americans gain more leisure time, and as population grows, we especially need areas readily available to the growing urban population centers.

Three years ago, for the first time, America was given a continuing source of money to help provide expanded outdoor recreation opportunities. That source is the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Through the first three years, \$214,314,000 has been made available for state and local needs on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis from the Land Water Conservation Fund. Another \$131,152,000 has been allocated from the Fund to acquire needed recreation lands and waters in national parks, national forests, national wildlife refuges, and other federal recreation areas.

In spite of the tremendous accomplishments of the Fund in stimulating efforts to meet the recreation needs of the American people, it has still fallen far behind the surging demand. Parks cost money—money to acquire property, money for development, money to maintain and expand existing facilities.

My own State of California has a crucial stake in the matter. By the turn of the century our population is expected to be 50 million, more than double what it is today. Action must be taken now to assure that adequate parks, recreation areas, seashores and wilderness areas are provided to keep pace with the huge human influx.

There is a large and growing gap between the cost of protecting our natural heritage for future generations, and the money available in the Land and Water Conservation Fund. As the result of a six-month study, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation concluded: "It seems fairly clear that the Land and Water Conservation Fund will fail to meet minimum program needs over the next 10 years by possibly \$2.7 billion, considering both Federal and State needs."

Unless this conservation gap is closed, much of the magnificent park legislation which has passed through this Committee, and the Congress, in the past few years may stand on the statute books as unfulfilled dreams.

To meet that conservation gap, the Chairman of the Interior Committee (Mr. Jackson) has proposed a bill, S. 1401, which I am privileged to cosponsor. This bill should meet the need to have adequate funds to purchase park and recreation lands and waters before they are priced out of reach or committed irrevocably to other uses, and

to insure acquisition of property quickly after congressional authorization of park or recreation areas.

S. 1401 solves the first problem by providing for additional revenues to the Land and Water Conservation Fund from a portion of the Outer Continental Shelf leasing revenues which presently go into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The State of California pioneered a similar approach over 20 years ago. For many years, and during the time when I was State Controller, California was financing its state park acquisitions with its tidelands' oil revenues. By spending the peoples' income from their land resources for the acquisition and development of recreation areas, the State of California built an unparalleled state park system.

Our Nation should follow the example set by California. These earnings, which represent the earnings of the American people from their depleting resources, should be returned to the people in the form of a new and lasting land resource, parks and recreation areas.

The problem of insufficient funds is complicated by the rising cost of land acquisition and development. The time gap between the designation of an area for consideration for national enjoyment, its approval by Congress, and the appropriation of funds to carry out the plan of procurement and development, is often great. Often a period of several years elapses before funds are available to perform the actual land purchases.

The problem of land price escalation for public park and recreation areas is grave. The Point Reyes National Seashore is a staggering example. The 1962 Act establishing that seashore carried a \$14 million price tag. Congress has boosted the ceiling slightly, to \$19,135,000, but it has already been put on notice that the final cost may run in excess of \$55 million.

The most important factor in controlling land price is time. If property can be acquired quickly, it can be acquired at less cost. S. 1401 authorizes the head of an agency to obligate the federal government by contract in advance of actual appropriations. This authority is limited to the next two fiscal years and to an amount not exceeding \$30 million per year.

An amendment has been offered by the Senior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Ellender), who is Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on which I have the honor to serve as ranking Republican. While I have great respect for his judgment, and the highest regard for his friendship, I must oppose the amendment.

The Ellender amendment would gut S. 1401. It would be worse for conservation than the status quo. It would, I fear, spell doom for the Redwood National Park, and for many other national, state and local parks which depend for their fulfillment on the enactment of legislation to provide an adequate Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The telegram which was sent to me by the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources on February 20, 1968, and which opposes the Ellender amendment, is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 20, 1968.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

An amendment to S. 1401 would remove the new sources of revenue for the land and water conservation fund provided in S. 1401. The amendment would substitute for the loss of these new revenue sources authorizations to be appropriated at a level of \$200 million from the general fund. We oppose this amendment. The fund was established originally because of the failure in obtaining necessary appropriations from the general fund and the advanced appropriations authorized by the land and water conservation

fund from the general fund have not been appropriated. A so-called compromise amendment would allocate 37½ percent of the Outer Continental Shelf leasing revenues to the States which are contiguous to the water areas where leases are established. The remaining 62½ percent of the Outer Continental Shelf lease revenues would be credited to the land and water conservation fund. We oppose this compromise amendment since it would unnecessarily ally land and water conservation fund revenues with a special privilege to a few States and if accepted make passage of S. 1401 highly questionable.

SPENCER M. SMITH, JR.,
Secretary, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

The bill now pending before the Senate is the most important conservation measure which will come before the Senate this year. Without an adequate Fund, legislation authorizing new parks will be meaningless.

This bill represents the future of conservation in America. It presents the Congress with an opportunity to decide whether we, as a nation are committed to conservation only in word, or whether we truly believe that we must act to protect the God-given world of nature from despoliation. In this legislation we have an opportunity to demonstrate our determination to give future generations of Americans a better environment in which to live. I urge each and every one of my colleagues to vote for S. 1401.

The California Director of Parks and Recreation, Mr. William Penn Mott, representing Governor Ronald Reagan, testified before our Committee that California alone needs six times the amount of money that has been available to it from the fund. The testimony of Mr. Mott, in support of S. 1401, is as follows:

"STATEMENT OF WILLIAM PENN MOTT, JR., DIRECTOR OF PARKS AND RECREATION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

"Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there is before your committee two bills pertaining to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program, Senate bill 1401, introduced by Senator Henry M. Jackson, and Senate bill S. 531, introduced by Senator Thomas H. Kuchel.

"I wish to speak in support of the concept which these two bills present, namely providing additional funds for the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program, July 1, 1967, marked the third year in which applications have been accepted in California for consideration under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program. During this period in which \$11 million was available as California's share of this fund, we received applications far in excess of \$70 million worth of projects. In other words, the demand for funds exceeded the money available by more than 600 percent.

"This demand for funds for land acquisition and capital improvement to meet the recreation demands in California is directly related to the rapid growth being experienced by the State. The California State Department of Finance estimated that the population of California as of January 1, 1968, was 19,774,000, an increase of more than 2 percent over the January 1, 1967, figure of 19,380,000. California's population has increased more than 4 percent during the period of its participation in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act program; however, during this same period our annual apportionment has actually decreased. Based upon an average increase in population of 2 percent a year, it is estimated that California's population will increase more than 20 percent in the next 10 years.

"We find that even at the present time, our population is continuing to increase at the rate of approximately 1,000 people per month. With this growth rate, which is one of the fastest in the Nation, we are confident that

the demand for land and water conservation funds will continue to outstrip the supply of these funds. Statistics gathered in California indicate that the local cities, counties, and special districts are capable of matching funds from the land and water conservation fund to at least four times the amount now being received by California from the fund, which is approximately \$3½ million.

"California is proud of its record in the distribution of these funds. Of the \$11 million received, we have distributed this money to 57 separate projects; \$6,400,000, or 59 percent, has been obligated to 35 acquisition projects, 4 of them State and 21 local; \$4,500,000, or 40 percent, has been for 31 development projects, 7 State projects and 24 local; and \$100,000, or 1 percent, has been obligated for one planning project. It should be noted that the percentage distribution of acquisition projects over development projects is consistent with that suggested by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

"Of the 57 funded projects, 43 are local projects sponsored by 33 separate local jurisdictions: 15 counties, 15 cities and 3 recreation and park districts represent the local jurisdictions. These are distributed quite evenly throughout the entire State. Twelve State projects have been funded. Six of these projects are the responsibility of the Department of Parks and Recreation and six of them are the responsibility of the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Board.

"Of the \$11 million received in California, \$3,200,000 has been requested or paid out by the end of the current fiscal year, June 30, 1968, and before the end of this fiscal year, an additional \$2 million will be either requested from the Federal Government or disbursed to participants. California has received, in addition to the \$11 million, approval for \$3,500,000 from the Secretary's special contingency fund; \$2 million of this has been received and disbursed for the acquisition of the Pepperwood Grove project in the Humboldt Redwoods State Park. The additional \$1,500,000 will be received by the end of the current fiscal year. This will complete the contingency fund project.

"The Department held during the month of January 1968, four public hearings to discuss the rules and regulations for the disbursement of Federal funds to State agencies and local jurisdictions. Although land acquisition remains critical, particularly for the larger metropolitan areas, the rural areas of the State feel that there must be greater emphasis placed on development in order for them to continue with land acquisition. There appears to be considerable feeling in the rural and suburban areas that allowing open space to remain undeveloped may prohibit further acquisition or make it impossible to hold open space for park and recreation purposes.

"The department of parks and recreation for the State of California now owns, operates, and maintains in excess of 800,000 acres of land comprised of 200 units which make up the State park system. Although there are critical needs for land acquisition, such as the beaches, rounding out existing State parks, and eliminating inholdings within State parks, and the acquisition of State parks which will serve the major metropolitan areas, the greater emphasis should be placed on developing existing State parks.

"Mr. Chairman, the above information should provide your committee with ample evidence that additional funds are desperately needed during the next several years to meet, in California, the demand for funds from the land and water conservation fund and it is for this reason that I strongly recommend your approving either Senate bill 1401 or S. 531.

"Thank you."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is to be

complimented for his leadership in bringing to the floor of the Senate S. 1401. It is noteworthy also that the vote of the Senate Interior Committee in reporting this bill, as amended, was unanimous.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, which this bill would strengthen, has met an urgent need in the Nation as a whole and in Michigan. I was a cosponsor of the original bill, as I am of S. 1401, recognizing as I do that our generation has an obligation to preserve unspoiled areas for the refreshment of future generations.

The fund desperately needs additional sources of revenue. It is also imperative that the Secretary of the Interior be provided with advance contract authority and with authority to acquire options. All of us who have struggled to establish national parks or lakeshores in our States are aware of the destruction of scenic values and the land-cost escalation that take place during the years that are involved in securing congressional approval of the proposal.

Admittedly, Mr. President, I have a parochial interest in this legislation. The acquisition and development plan at the recently established Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore will be drawn from this fund, as will future expenditures for our long overdue Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. But all Senators have land preservation proposals—large or small—which are in a now-or-never status and for which the answer will be never unless this bill passes.

Mr. President, I join in urging Senate approval of this important bill. The Michigan Department of Conservation, which has responsibility for our State's water pollution program as well as for our land resource program, has given this legislation high priority. It is in truth emergency legislation.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I would like to express my strong support of S. 1401. I can think of no more important conservation legislation in this session of the Congress than this bill to put new and adequate resources into the land and water conservation fund.

As floor manager for the land and water conservation fund bill when it passed the Senate in 1965, as a ranking member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and as one who attended the committee's hearings on this proposed amendment, I am convinced of its need.

This is an emergency measure vitally necessary to help resolve the ever-increasing land price escalation problem. It is also designed to carry out our original legislative intent to encourage the States to expand outdoor recreational opportunities for their people.

My own State of Idaho provides an example of how land and water conservation funds have been successfully used, and why additional funding is needed. My State has 39 projects totaling over \$2.9 million which have been implemented through the fund. Yet, through fiscal 1967, all of the funds allocated to the State under this act have been obligated and funds apportioned under fiscal 1968 will be obligated by June 30, 1968.

Our State has more money available than there is Federal money to match, particularly for park developments. I am informed by Ernest E. Day, chairman of the Idaho State Park Board, that the State's outdoor recreation needs cannot be met at the current level of funding.

I am sure this same situation must exist in other States, which have been encouraged to place a priority on their outdoor recreation programs.

At the same time, I think Idaho's program bears out the success of this legislation and represents, in my judgment, an outstanding example of effective partnership between Federal and State Governments in this field.

I am more than pleased to join in the fullest support of this important measure.

STATEMENT OF POSITION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have a scheduled engagement in Wisconsin starting tomorrow. I am unable to ascertain whether or not we are going to vote on the pending amendment to the bill on Thursday, Friday, or at all this week, or whether there will be an agreed-upon time to vote next week. I have discussed the matter with the majority whip. He has advised me that, in the event there should be a vote on Thursday or Friday—which he does not know, either—he will undertake to get a pair for me.

If I were present, I would vote against the pending amendment and for the bill, S. 1401.

REPEAL OF SECTION 315—FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS ACT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, 9 years ago, in 1959, I introduced a bill to repeal section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934. Later I suggested that, at the very least, newscasts and public affairs programs be exempt from the provisions of this section.

From my proposed Fair Political Broadcasting Code of 1959, came an easing to the restrictions imposed upon broadcasters. This was, in fact, first official recognition by Congress that the communications media were at least mature enough to make their own public affairs and news judgments.

In 1960 provisions of the act were suspended so that the public could see two candidates for the Presidency debate the issues and answer questions from panels of newsmen. Without this suspension, networks and stations would not have given freely of their precious time for the great Kennedy-Nixon debates. Without this suspension, the same privilege would have to be given to an assortment of minor candidates unknown to the vast general public.

I proposed then that section 315 be suspended, too, for similar airing of debates and other appearances of substantial candidates for various offices. We discussed and we debated advisability of suspension of the act on purely local elections, on congressional, senatorial, and gubernatorial races.

Finally, the free and open exchange between the late John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon took place. And the presidential debates became a part of the

fabric of American political life. Overnight the soapbox and the political rally gave way to millions of Americans who could sit in their living rooms and run up the highest record ratings while watching two major candidates for President. Those who could not watch, could hear on radio.

In 1961, the Federal Communications Commission reported that nearly all network affiliates in both radio and television carried the debates. It has been estimated that at least 120 million persons watched and heard them.

The suspension of section 315 in connection with the presidential race also made it possible in turning over to candidates and their committees considerable additional time for programs of their own preparation. In 1960 the three TV networks provided 37 hours and 47 minutes of free sustaining time in this fashion. Four years before, only 19 hours and 8 minutes was provided.

Radio networks also increased the sustaining time given to the two major candidates and their committees from 20 hours and 38 minutes in 1956 to 42 hours and 23 minutes in 1960.

When we lifted the restrictions on newscasts, panel shows, and public affairs discussions, there were those in this body who were genuinely concerned lest the industry misuse this new freedom. Every study has shown the broadcast media to be temperate, prudent, and generally fair. After all, fairness can hardly be legislated, while unfairness may be practiced even when it is illegal. The definitions of fairness and equality vary with the judge.

Following the temporary lifting of section 315 for the presidential debates of 1960, many of us hoped we would see repeal of this section. I have introduced several repealers myself.

In 1964, with an incumbent President as a candidate for reelection, it was natural to assume that there was no great desire on the part of many to lose this advantage by virtually legislating free and open debates in which the challenger would gain some benefit from appearing with the President. This was an insufficient excuse for me.

In any event, we have no such excuse this year. Let us, then, provide for the debates that lie ahead in this exciting and unpredictable political year. There are many respected voices in the broadcasting industry that have spoken out clearly for temporary lifting of section 315 as it pertains to the presidential campaign.

I have said before and I say again that a provision of law that must periodically be suspended is not worth leaving on the books. Besides, if presidential debates are good, so are others for other offices.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who is chairman of the very important Communications Subcommittee, has been ill. Now that he is back among us, I certainly hope he will be able to schedule an early executive session on the proposal to repeal section 315.

In 1960, suspension was approved only

90 days before election. Let us not delay so that the 1968 campaign coverage and debates will be rushed at the last minute. And while we are providing for the debates by presidential candidates, why not finish the job for all time for all offices and repeal section 315?

I am certain the Federal Communications Commission has plenty of tools left to insure that the stations and the networks will do what most of us know full well they will—provide fair and honest and complete coverage to the limit of their ability.

"COMMONSENSE AND THE RISKS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KUCHEL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished minority deputy leader, the Honorable THOMAS KUCHEL, of California, today made a statement in Long Beach, Calif., to the Long Beach Rotary Club. I have here a partial text of the remarks of our distinguished colleague, under the title of "Commonsense and the Risks in Southeast Asia."

I must say that it is a quite pragmatic and realistic statement, and I think our colleague sets out fully what the situation is and what the course before us is. He describes it as long and hard, and with that I think everybody will agree.

Our colleague carries one quotation in the partial text that I had forgotten, but it came back to me when I saw it. It was a statement made by Adm. C. Turner Joy, whom I think we consider as a distinguished hero, who put up with continual harassment while negotiating peace in Korea.

At that time Admiral Joy warned:

To concede a minor point to the Communists without a like concession from them is but to convince them that in more substantive issues, you will ultimately submit to their viewpoint.

I think history shows and bears out the truth of that statement. Nobody knows it any better than our principal negotiator at that time, Admiral Joy, long years ago in Korea.

I commend the distinguished Republican whip on this statement, and ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the partial text of the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONSENSE AND THE RISKS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the Long Beach Rotary Club, Lafayette Hotel, Long Beach, Calif., April 24, 1968)

A new phase of the war in Vietnam has opened with recent, albeit halting, steps toward negotiation. We all would rejoice at the transfer of the conflict from the battlefield to the bargaining table. Such a welcome move would not suggest that our military effort has been unavailing. To the contrary, the Communist armies of the Viet Cong and of North Vietnam have failed to achieve the conquest of the South. They have been prevented by superior forces from achieving an evil goal, which in the anxious months of 1965 seemed within their grasp.

The aim of America and her allies in the conflict in Vietnam has long been a just settlement and an enduring peace based on the free choice of the peoples in each nation of the Far East. Surely this has not been an easy policy for America and her allies to pursue. Some argue that we could have ignored events, allowing the conquest of South Vietnam by Ho Chi Minh. Such a course would neither have been wise nor just. It would have been morally wrong, and it could have represented a very disheartening milestone in the progress of Asiatic Communism for the rest of the world to see.

It would have meant taking an enormous risk. The leaders of the non-Communist nations of Asia have repeatedly warned of the grim potential of a Communist onslaught beyond Vietnam. The jungles of Laos are seething with Communist troops. Even Cambodia has a Communist uprising. Thailand faces a serious subversive threat. Neutral Burma, after 20 years, knows no peace. The Huks are reappearing in the Philippine jungles. All across the southern flank of East Asia there is a zone of rising conflict.

A total peace must be sought if we are to end war in Asia in this decade. We must beware of oversimplification. We confront a highly complex situation not susceptible to solution by an easy cease fire. Indeed, an easy cease fire could be a shame to those who love peace. In the long run, the difference between military success and diplomatic settlement may be much less than that between settlement and surrender.

The President has chosen, by suddenly terminating his own career, to remove any doubt about America's willingness to seek an honorable peace through honorable negotiation. I support this effort as a means of gaining a true and durable peace. I would not support window dressing to disguise our unilateral withdrawal.

The tortured history of Asia has brought Americans to fight on Oriental shores three times in the past generation. Our goal must be that this cycle of bloodshed be brought to an end, once and for all. The greater risk for America today is to ignore the lessons of history or to be too proud and, perhaps, too dumb to try to profit from experience.

The road out of Vietnam is going to be long and difficult. Of course, our people want an end to the conflict. But peace cannot be achieved merely by excusing ourselves from the scene of carnage and suffering and stealing away. That course would only lead to further conflagration.

Our military leaders, it seems to me, have been correct in trying to keep the scale of fighting in Vietnam below the threshold of global conflict. Such a danger has always been present and real. By the same token, Vietnam is a part of a larger picture. A sacrifice of that relatively small and unimportant country to the insatiable appetite of Asiatic Communism would not gain another hour of independence for Laos, Cambodia or Thailand, or the countries beyond the land mass of Southeast Asia.

The path to settlement requires that these broader factors be taken fully into account. The wrangle over where to meet is simply the first, and surely not the most important, of the knots to be untied. Admiral C. Turner Joy, a distinguished American hero, who put up with continual harassment while negotiating peace in Korea, warned, "To concede a minor point to the Communists without a like concession from them is but to convince them that in more substantive issues, you will ultimately submit to their viewpoint."

I believe we shall get to the point of actual negotiation but the process will be long and arduous. There are a few simple precepts which ought to guide us.

In negotiation we need to move from strength. The doctrines of Mao prescribe a

tactic known as "fighting while negotiating". The continued, covert buildup of North Vietnamese troops in the Saigon area is evidence that their present gestures toward talks of peace are in keeping with this rule. Free World forces will need to respond in kind. The heroic and successful defense of Khe-sanh has shown our ability to accomplish such a purpose. Our government and our people must beware of tactical maneuvers and surprise by the Communists, for propaganda or political ends. For example, the North might conceivably and histrionically choose unilaterally to impose a cease fire on its own terms. Such a maneuver would catch us ill-prepared and in unsound defensive positions. God alone knows what some in our society who scream for peace at almost any price would do under such conditions.

Unwise counsel can be particularly dangerous in this situation. Some of my Senate colleagues, by criticizing the moves of our military commanders, may well be limiting America's options in terms of correct response to Communist duplicity. We have nothing to fear from continuing to maintain our forces at full strength as the bilateral talks hopefully may begin and proceed. Indeed, that would seem to be the only safe course open to us.

Neither political leaders, nor the public at large, as I view those momentous days, should seek continually to second guess our professional leadership, either military or diplomatic, who have to deal daily with the vexing puzzle of how to grope towards an honorable peace. The people of this country have shown that they place a decent peace above indecent politics. They want settlement, but not surrender. Each of us, the governing and the governed, has a duty to perform in maintaining unity behind this national must. Members of Congress, Senators, and the President himself, cannot be exempt from this responsibility.

We must assure that bilateral talks between America and Hanoi are quickly expanded to include all parties to the conflict. A lasting peace will require a broad meeting generally along the line of the 1954 Geneva meeting. I doubt very much that, in her extreme isolationism and widespread convulsions, Communist China would attend, but I do believe that we must pin down the Communist world to a full settlement in Asia. This is, after all, the goal of our policy. This Administration has a somewhat regrettable penchant for acting on its own without ever touching base with our allies, or, as we have just seen in Hawaii, at least until after the fact. Our role in Asia is part of a joint effort at collective security. America cannot go it alone—neither by withdrawing to some kind of an isolated nuclear defense, nor by trying to be the world's policeman in any of the far flung hemispheres of our planet.

One of the problems constantly plaguing our effort in Southeast Asia has been an over-concentration of control in the White House. At regular Tuesday White House luncheons, the President and one or two advisors have picked impending bombing targets. There has been similar concentrated pre-occupation with the details of day by day diplomacy. It is not in our national interest to promise to meet "anywhere anytime" if we later find we are not prepared to do so. It is not in our interest to promise, as we did at Manila, to leave Vietnam in six months, if we later find that such precipitate withdrawal would endanger the lives of millions of Vietnamese.

Common sense tells us that effective negotiations require the Communist side to understand that we stand by what we say, both in terms of our commitment to freedom, and to the cause of a just peace.

Realism demands that we keep our options open.

Experience has shown us time and again that we must not be wed to past mistakes.

History will record as a major event in modern times the abrupt termination of a career of the most powerful public servant on earth, to the cause of peace in a small country half way around the world. That act by the President was courageous. You and I commend it. But it demonstrates that we have indeed come to a crisis of leadership in our country.

Mere recognition of that apparently unselfish act does not extricate us from terrible and hazardous ground where we have fallen. The principles needed to bring us to better days are rooted in the essential American belief that our country must remain strong in order that she shall remain free.

Without in any sense making these comments partisan, I devoutly believe that my political party has a unique moment in the history of our Republic to rise to the challenge of America.

The option for settlement by negotiations offers the best chance of peace to a united people. If we can move forward with confidence and determination, the pace towards solution could accelerate. Each step away from the law of the jungle world makes it harder for either side to resort to warfare. The need for peace, we can be sure, is felt keenly by the Communist North. A momentum can build, if given a start, making a return to escalation more and more unlikely and unnecessary. That is the course of events for which we pray. It requires that we keep our wits, and that we make our moves unmistakably clear.

The great Nineteenth Century British statesman Benjamin Disraeli, in a masterful understatement, once said that "frank and explicit" is the best diplomatic attitude to keep "our own minds clear, while confusing the minds of others." We have got to see things as they are, and stake out our course with courage and conviction. A united America can do this now, as a united America has done before, and as we must do, if your and my freedom are to have a sound hope for survival.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3135) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the authorization of appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14940) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MORGAN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HAYS, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. MAILLIARD, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 13738) to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the

House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 655) recognizing the 25th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 13738) to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PLACED ON CALENDAR

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 655) recognizing the 25th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, was placed on the calendar.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, there is at the desk House Concurrent Resolution 655, to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto. It passed the House yesterday. I assume I ought to ask unanimous consent now that it be placed on the Senate Calendar, so it can be called up and acted upon tomorrow; and I do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 25, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 24, 1968:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962.

Gen. William Childs Westmoreland, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3034.

IN THE NAVY

Adm. Ulysses S. G. Sharp, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Honorable Edward Clark

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the pleasure of being present when the Honorable Edward Clark received his commission from President Johnson as Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Our Nation is very fortunate to have available the services of such an able and dedicated individual as Ed Clark, of Texas. Ed, who is a longtime friend of mine, most recently served as our Ambassador to Australia. Certainly never in our history has our representative to that nation been received with such warmth as was accorded him.

Prior to that service, Mr. Clark established an outstanding reputation as an attorney, businessman, and a banker. Because of this background, it would be difficult to find an individual who would be as totally qualified as he is for his new position. As Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank, he will certainly find need to call upon his past experience as a diplomat, a banker, a lawyer, and a businessman.

In making the presentation yesterday, President Johnson expressed his high esteem for and the great confidence which he has in Ambassador Clark. The text of those remarks follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT FOLLOWING THE SIGNING OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES TREATY AMENDMENT, THE EAST ROOM, APRIL 23, 1968

I want to take advantage of this occasion to introduce all of you to a distinguished American who is with us this morning who will be playing a key role in the days ahead in our relations with Latin America.

The man who I have reference to has just completed a tour of duty as our Ambassador to Australia. As Ambassador to Australia, I believe that he learned and understood and knew more about the geography of that country, the resources of that country and the people of that country and had more interest in them than, generally speaking, most Ambassadors are able to display or to accumulate in that brief period.

He did such an outstanding job that when I gave thought to the selection of someone as United States Executive Director on the Inter-American Development Bank, someone who I wanted to know the geography of Latin America, someone who I wanted to know the resources of Latin America, someone who I wanted to know the people of Latin America and to bring all three of these together in the way that the Inter-American Development Bank could play its major role and the United States of America could give its major contribution, I asked Ambassador Clark to take this assignment.

The Bank, as you know, is the financial cornerstone of our Alliance for Progress. In the first seven years of its operation, it has authorized more than 450 loans totaling close to \$2.5 billion. These loans have gone for water systems, schools, health stations and huge dams and highways, satellite communications, and many other activities.

That is why the Bank has earned the title of the Bank of the Alliance in integration.

While Ambassador Clark will be only one of many individuals who make up the personnel of that great institution, I feel sure that he will be an interested one and a very active one.

Last Friday the Senate confirmed Ambassador Clark's appointment to this Bank. It gives me a great deal of pleasure this morning to wish him well in this new assignment and to say to our friends in Latin America that I don't know of an individual in this country who, in my judgment, could or would or can or will display more interest in your problems or do more about helping you solve them.

Thank you very much.

Arson by Juveniles

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article entitled "Four Arson Cases Last Night Are Blamed on Juveniles," published on page B-1 of yesterday's Washington Evening Star.

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

FOUR ARSON CASES LAST NIGHT ARE BLAMED ON JUVENILES

(By Woody West)

District police reported four more cases of arson here last night, all of them minor and all believed to have involved juveniles. This brings to nine the number of arson cases or suspected arsons in Washington in the last 48 hours.

A 13-year-old youth was charged by District police yesterday in connection with at least two fires during the month's riots after being picked up Sunday by Alexandria police investigating a burglary.

During the Alexandria investigation, the youth denied that some clothing in his possession was from the Virginia burglary and told police he had gotten it during the looting here.

The youth, whose mother lives in Alexandria, was turned over to District police and, after questioning, is being held at the Receiving Home pending action by juvenile court.

GRAND JURY TO MEET

Meanwhile, a special grand jury will begin hearing evidence tomorrow on possibly more than 1,000 cases stemming from the disorders early this month, the balance of them expected to be for burglary II (looting).

The first of last night's fires occurred at 7:22 p.m. when trash was set afire in the basement of a vacant two-story brick building at 721 18th St. NE. The blaze caused only minor damage and police are seeking a 13-year-old youth in connection with the incident.

Less than 20 minutes later, the J. T. Carver Food Market, 5575 Central Ave., which was looted but not burned during the riots, suffered minor damage to shelving and food cartons after a fire was set in the front of the building. Juveniles are believed responsible. Damage was estimated at \$100.

The grocery is next door to a barbershop

in which a fire was set early yesterday, apparently to cover a burglary.

LIQUOR STORE FIRE

At 8:15 p.m. firemen quickly extinguished a blaze in the rear of Wheeler Liquors, 4137 Wheeler Road SE, which also was looted but not burned during the riots.

Fire officials said that a rear door was forced, apparently by juveniles, and the blaze set. Damage was less than \$100 and some liquor may have been taken.

A minor blaze in a vacant store at 1618 8th St. NW, again believed started by juveniles, caused less than \$100 in damage after trash in a first-floor closet was set afire.

Oklahoma Legislators Call for VA Hospital Improvement

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, for many years a number of us have been working hard to get the U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital at Muskogee, Okla., modernized and air conditioned.

This hospital serves a large area of eastern Oklahoma and the neighboring States, and does not have central air conditioning. Despite a number of window units that have been installed, some of the rooms and wards in our veterans hospital range from uncomfortable to intolerable during very hot weather. Our veterans are entitled to a better break when hospitalized.

Mr. Speaker, the Oklahoma Legislature recognizes this problem, and in enrolled House Concurrent Resolution No. 567, the legislature urges Congress to appropriate funds to provide for air conditioning for this hospital. I would like to have this resolution appear in the RECORD. I wholeheartedly support this legislative request, and I deeply appreciate this action by the legislature.

The resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 567

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to allocate funds and provide for the air-conditioning of Veteran's hospital located at Muskogee, Okla.; and directing distribution

Whereas, the country is deeply indebted to those veterans hospitalized at the Veterans' Hospital located at Muskogee, Oklahoma; and

Whereas, those valorous Americans should be made as comfortable as possible in order to insure rapid recovery and rehabilitation; and

Whereas, the Veterans' Hospital located at Muskogee, Oklahoma, is badly in need of air-conditioning.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the house of representatives of the second session of the thirty-first Oklahoma Legislature, the senate concurring therein:

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully urged to adopt a measure allocating funds and providing for the air-conditioning of the Veterans' Hospital located at Muskogee, Oklahoma.

SEC. 2. That duly authenticated copies of this Resolution, after consideration and enrollment, be prepared for and transmitted to each member of the Oklahoma Congressional Delegation.

Adopted by the House of Representatives the 20th day of February, 1968.

REX PRIVETT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the Senate the 8th day of April, 1968.

DON BALDWIN,

Acting President of the Senate.

Address Delivered by Vice President Humphrey at National Farmers Union Convention

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, American agriculture has many friends in public life but few are as knowledgeable of its contribution or as familiar with its problems as Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. In addition, few men in public life are as deeply committed to preserving the rural way of life upon which our Nation has built and prospered as Mr. HUMPHREY.

It is understandable, therefore, that any remarks made by the Vice President to a farming group bear careful reading. On March 18, at the National Farmers Union Convention in Minneapolis, Vice President HUMPHREY delivered a major farm statement. In his remarks the Vice President reviewed the farm message sent recently to the Congress by President Johnson. Mr. HUMPHREY's observations respecting the components of the administration's farm program—extension of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, a 3-year extension of the Food for Freedom Act, and a national food bank for certain commodities—are incisive and informative. I particularly wish to call attention to his remarks favoring the enactment of legislation I have authored in the Senate, the proposed National Agricultural Bargaining Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's speech on this occasion be reprinted at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, THE VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION CONVENTION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., MARCH 18, 1968

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mr. President. It seems like every meeting I go to I always have to start out by saying, "thank you Mr. President." And just in case I get a little bit too big for my boots back home, why The Mr. President comes up here to check on me a little bit. And not only that, to tell tales about me which I, well, which are only partially true. I really did get up in less than forty-five minutes this morning after he called.

I'm very happy that you've had the privilege of listening to my good friends, Senator Mondale and Congresswoman Sullivan. You couldn't have two finer representatives of the Congress of the United States and

two better friends of the American people and, particularly, the American farmer, than these two very able congressional public servants. And, Leonor, I'm so happy to have you in Minnesota. We've worked—I liked that wink, too. Do that again—she's not only a very intelligent Congresswoman, she's very pretty, too. This very fine lady is one that has helped us so much in everything relating to the well being of the American people. I remember her great work for the food stamp program when we were working together trying to get that out of Congress and, just recently, her tremendous efforts and tremendous work in the truth-in-lending program to see to it that the American people, particularly the working people, the farm people, the low- and middle-income people, did not pay exorbitant interest rates, interest charges for farm credit.

You've done a great service for the American people, Leonor, and we want to thank you.

And over here to my left, your right, is this fellow who came down to Washington in that great 89th Session of Congress and he came back here to Minnesota and said, "You know, I've only been down here three months and I've got more work done and more accomplished in three months than Humphrey did in sixteen years." And now he says that it's true. And I don't believe I'll even deny it 'cause I can't think of anyone who has proven himself to be a more dedicated and able and powerful Member of the Congress in the sense of power for good than Senator Walter Mondale and, Fritz, we're proud of you and we wish to goodness that every Member of Congress had all the spunk and get-up-and-go and all the knowledge and brain power and all the people power and farm power that Walter Mondale has.

Well, we've had quite a day. You know, I wasn't so sure I was going to get to speak or not, but some of our friends who were out here with the Washington press corps would have told you, "Well, that's not unusual." I go to these meetings in Washington, D.C. and they're always waiting to see whether or not the President is going to come. He gives us a lot of surprises, you know. And I'll be sitting there and I'll have my notes tucked in my pocket and I'm just getting ready to get up and speak, and just about the time I get up and start to take the first deep breath, in he walks. And I have an understanding with him now that if he doesn't get there by at least 10:30 p.m. that I can bolt the doors and make my speech. And this morning, he arrived here by 10:30 a.m. so we let him speak.

And I'll tell you it was a wonderful occasion and I hope my dear friend, Tony Dechant, knows that the presence of the President here today, the President of the United States, was not important because of the message he gave us, but its importance was also that he came here to the National Convention of the National Farmers Union, this great farm organization of farm families throughout America. It's an honor and a privilege to be here.

You sure do have a lot of the government here today. . . . I hope you can take it. The President, Vice President, Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, this wonderful Congresswoman, this distinguished Senator from Minnesota. You're going to have the Secretary of Agriculture out here. You're really going to get a chance to see all of Washington—I hope you don't get unhappy about it all—I trust you'll like it.

I talked to Orville Freeman on the telephone just before I came down here and he told me, of course, that he's expecting to be out here with you this week—I believe Wednesday night—and he asked me to bring you his warm greetings right now. I told him a few things that I wanted him to bring along that the presidents of the state organizations had already told me about at noon. So, if Orville comes out here with a large suitcase, it isn't because he's bringing shirts. We had

some program things that we were talking about and I want Ed Christianson and Tony Dechant to know that we're going to try to be as helpful as possible.

One other person I want to comment about here just for a minute. When I came to Washington as a young Senator in 1949, we had a great Secretary of Agriculture and I was one of his advocates. I'm happy to say that the President of the United States at that time, Mr. Truman, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, were both under attack by the opposition and even under attack by some of the democrats. It isn't unusual—we seem to do a little of that. But I'm happy to tell you that then Senator Humphrey wasn't one of the attackers. I was one of the supporters of Mr. Truman, and I was one of the supporters of Charlie Brannan. And I've lived to see the day that the American people recognize that in Charlie Brannan they had a great Secretary of Agriculture, and in Harry Truman they had one of the greatest Presidents this country's ever had.

I knew Mondale couldn't take that. I'll let you in on it—the Senator's going to do a little work for me this afternoon. He always is. He's working for you 99 percent of the time and gives me 1 percent of the time and leaves none for himself. That's the kind of a man he is.

But in all sincerity, friends, I don't want to look at the history of the past except for an inspiration for the present. But isn't it interesting how people finally get a sense of perspective and judgment? The Brannan plan—oh, how they ridiculed it. Well, let me say to all of America that the proposals Charles Brannan made as Secretary of Agriculture, which were beaten down and ridiculed, are today in the law books and have helped the farmers of America survive during these years and, hopefully, to give them a better future. And believe me, you can walk out of this hotel and stop anybody on the street and say, "Name me five great American Presidents" and I'll bet my life that one of the five will be none other than that spunky, courageous man from Independence, Missouri, a fighting, courageous President who was a friend of the farmer and didn't hesitate to say so and prove it. Boy, am I a Truman Democrat. I just want you to know that I really am. Every time I get discouraged—and that does happen—I go down to Independence, Missouri and go in and just see him. And when I see that dear man, I walk out feeling a little better, a little younger, just a little stronger, and a little more determined. Greatness—greatness in his simplicity; greatness in his honor; greatness in his courage . . . and how they did berate him. I haven't forgotten, and I don't intend to, either. Because it's very difficult, may I say, to remember the little ones who took out after him, but you'll always remember the great one that survived.

Well, we had a good message this morning. I thought it was a humdinger. And I particularly liked it when the President got rid of those notes, just like I'm going to get rid of mine pretty quick, and really started talking to you. I'm going to talk to you today from some notes, but I'm going to basically talk to you from the heart. I think the members of this great organization know that I have never hidden my colors in terms of my friendship for the Farmers Union and my support of the programs and the policies that this great organization has advocated. I've gone up and down, the length and breadth of this state—not once, but a hundred times—even helped in organizing Farmers Union and proud of it because I've never known, I have not known a single request that the Farmers Union has ever made of their government or of their nation that ultimately wasn't good for the country. It's not a self-seeking organization. And there isn't a piece of legislation on the statute books today that's worthy of being called good legislation relating to agriculture that the Farmers Union didn't have something

to do with. You can go back to the days of Franklin Delano Roosevelt right up to this particular time, and you'll find that the statutes that helped Mr. Farmer—that have helped strengthen this farm economy—that had some consideration for the American farm family—that every one of those laws had the input and the inspiration and the backing of the National Farmers Union—everyone.

So I wish you well. I'm proud of you, proud to have had your support in my days in public life, but I'm particularly proud of your friendship. I'm sure everyone here knows that your officers are among my closest personal friends. I'm sure that some of you know that Ed Christianson here in Minnesota has been one of my closest advisors and personal friends, and I'm sure you know that the former President, Jim Patton, and now your President, Tony Dechant, are two of the kindest men, two of the men we look to, that Hubert Humphrey looks to and, more important, that President Lyndon looks to, for guidance and for counsel and sometimes for comfort—and we always get it.

Well, I don't suppose there's any hard news in that stuff, boys, but it's good for the soul. Let me tell you. One thing you learn about this politics is that when you got a friend they're precious, believe me, particularly if they stick with you, and I know where the friends are and we don't always have to look alike and we don't have to agree on everything and we don't always have to speak alike... we just have a sort of common philosophy—we happen to believe that this nation is quite a great place to be in—and this government of ours is one that is designed to serve the people.

I want to talk to you about the farm message of your President. I'm sure that Senator Mondale has done this. I spoke, I visited this noon, with the presidents of the state organizations and I said to them what I am now about to say to you, that a message is a plan of action. It is not action, it is a plan of action. A message is a series of proposals around which we can rally. A message from the President is a line of direction toward which we can point, or a road that we can travel—and that farm message, that agricultural message that the President sent to the Congress, is a charter of hope for American agriculture. It is a program of promise and of performance for American agriculture. And if it's good for the American farm community, the American agricultural community, then it's good for America. Make no mistake about it, because you cannot have a prosperous America and a depressed agriculture. You cannot have a happy, peaceful cities and a growing plight of rural poverty. You cannot have a just America if there's inequity and injustice in rural America. And the one thing that President Johnson and your Vice President are trying to talk to this country about is that we're one great nation and that we have to move together—that the problems of the city are the problems of rural America and the problems of rural America are also the problems of the city. And your President outlined that this morning when he pointed out how all too often we transfer the poverty of rural America into the slums of the city only to find it aggravated and intensified. This is why he emphasized in the moments he had with you the importance of social and economic policies and programs in rural America that lift the quality of life there, that help maintain an economic level in rural America that permits good living. Now, let's take a good look at that message. I've got some notes here and I'm going to run through them.

Point 1.—This, getting right down to cases, calls for the extension of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. Now, why? Because as long as American farmers produce more than we can consume, we're going to need the machinery in government to help balance supply and demand to avoid the income-

depressing, farm-killing cycle of glut and scarcity. Now every farmer knows this and I think that every person that's near a farm producer knows it. This year the Food and Agriculture Act has faced its severest test.

Increased wheat and feed grain allotments for 1967 crops were followed by a series of unforeseen events, and you know in Washington we've got a phrase called the "credibility gap." Nobody quite knows what it means but it sounds interesting and that's why it becomes used more and more. Well, I suppose that you know you can get a little credibility gap if the weather gangs up on you and what happens? We had this year, contrary to all the predictions of all the experts, including ministers and economists, politicians and doctors, we had that world-wide bumper crop all over. Total smaller total demand, and that resulted in lower prices.

Ladies and gentlemen, you can no longer isolate the crop of one country from another. When you produce wheat, it's a world-wide crop. When you produce feed grains, it's a world-wide crop. This world of ours is smaller and the American farmer feels it almost more than any one else. Thirty-five to forty years ago, the American farmer could pretty well judge what was going to happen to his prices by what happened in production in America. No longer, because of the rapid communication, because of the market systems that we have, because of transportation, because of financing. All of the world production comes into one pool, not a series of little lakes like it was 25-40 years ago, but one big ocean. And when that ocean's levels rise, prices fall and they fall world-wide.

Well, that's what happened this past year. We didn't plan it that way. It was no mean, nasty trick on the part of the President or the Secretary of Agriculture, and I'm not going to blame God... I need Him on my side. But it happened, and we didn't know it was going to happen. And I didn't know that it was going to be as dry this winter as it's been and I didn't know it was going to rain today. You just can't predict all these things and that's why we need these farm programs. Well this act, I think, this Food and Agriculture Act, passed a pretty severe test. Its direct payments provided the margin between profit and loss to a great many farmers. It provided an additional 48 cents for each bushel of wheat, 15 cents for each pound of cotton, 20 cents for each bushel of corn, and I'll tell you, my dear friends, had we had none of these programs, agricultural income would have been reduced by one third—and that's a most conservative estimate.

And we wouldn't have had these programs had you folks not fought for them, had you not have taken the constructive policy line of going down the legislative route—not to fight out on the streets but coming down to fight in Washington—and to work to see that a farm program became law.

You know, I had a little something to do with that law when I was the majority whip with the United States Senate. I helped to pass a farm bill three times in one year before we finally got it to the President of the United States—three times because we kept losing it either in the Senate one time or in the House another time. And where were you? You were right there in the front line helping us get it. I think you know what the alternative would have been without this act: Lower prices, lower income. Indeed, the specialists tell us that farm income, as I said, would have dropped as much as a third back to the 1959 levels—wheat at \$1.10 a bushel, corn at 75 cents. Now the President explicitly recognizes that the present act can be improved and we need to work closely with you to improve it.

Now, what's Point 2 of this message? A three-year extension for the Food for Freedom Act. I'm only going to take a minute. The Food for Freedom Act goes far beyond

the old Food for Peace Act, of which I was one of the cosponsors. You know I'm talking about some of my own children here. I'm not one of these fellows that's been out here on the sidelines—I've been in the middle of the fight, and every farmer in this audience knows it. Some of these Johnny-come-latelys, farm specialists that don't know the difference between a ukelele and a corn cob, don't impress me greatly, I'll tell you.

Well, this Food for Freedom Act recognizes that this world of ours needs this blessing of food and fiber in a world that knows too much of hate and selfishness. Our food aid programs have stood out year after year as a great humanitarian beacon of hope and that, within itself, is an ample justification of the Food for Freedom program.

Let me just say to this audience something that I don't have in these notes... that this world of ours faces the specter of famine in ten years. We ought to remember that. Every prediction that's being made today by any specialist, scientist or economist or agricultural expert tells us that unless there is literally a miracle breakthrough, mankind in many parts of this world faces the specter of wholesale famine. This is why Food for Freedom becomes important... this is why what I'm about to talk about—this Reserve program—becomes important. This is why we must preserve our American agricultural system, because we have the most efficient system of agriculture that the world has ever known. And we've got to keep it working, together. We can't afford to dissipate it in the name of cost accounting or in the name of some kind of theoretical efficiency or in the name of what they call change. No part of the American economy is more efficient. No part of the American economy has changed more with the times. No part of the American economy has done more for more people, with fewer people doing it than the American agricultural economy, and every city dweller (and this will get me a bad headline in New York and I know it, but let it go anyway), every city dweller owes a debt of gratitude to the farm producers of America because the farmers have subsidized the food bill for hundreds and thousands, yea, millions of American people.

And that is as true as any man can make a statement. The share of the dollar spent for food today is less than it's been for years. And when I hear people say, "Well, we can't afford to have those farmers get paid a little more because it will cut into the consumer," let's remember we're all consumers and we'd all like to be bigger ones. You would be, but I learned in my dad's drugstore, when you don't have any money you're not a consumer, you're just a visitor, and there's a lot of difference.

Let me also point out that this overseas food assistance, and we poured it out in billions of dollars, billions of dollars, has not only been good compassion, peace and charity, but has been good business because today, American agricultural products find great markets in Japan and Turkey, Greece, Italy, Spain and other parts of the world which once received food assistance as a gift, and who now are cash customers.

You know everybody talked about this balance of payments. Very few know what it means, but they talk a lot about it. It's one of the reasons we talk a lot about it. So, if you don't know what it means, you don't have to feel responsible, you know. Very few people understand the problem about gold except that there isn't as much of it around here as there used to be. But I'll tell you what you can understand—that if it were not for American agricultural exports that are dollar earners, gold earners for America, this American economy would be in serious trouble. American agricultural exports can compete with any agricultural economy and any agricultural product anywhere in the world. We can out-produce, we can outsell,

we can out-distribute any country in the world when it comes to agricultural products. Pretty good record, I'd say, for just a bunch of farmers. Wouldn't you say so?

So when I say to you that food aid is more than being kind and good, it's more than good neighborliness—it's good business, it's good foreign policy, and it's one of the building blocks of peace. The late, beloved Pope John said, "Where there is constant want there is no peace." And when you think of peace, work for peace, want peace, you better think about food and fiber, you better think about God's children that are hungry, ill clothed, sick, the victims of poverty, hopelessness. There isn't any peace in that kind of a world. And I'm looking at more peace makers in this audience than all the sign carriers put together across this country.

Now I want to talk to you about another little matter, and that is a program that relates to Point 3 of the President's message, namely, a National Food Bank for wheat, feed grains and soybeans. That's Point 3. We call this the food reserve. This isn't new, we've just been fighting for it for years. I can remember as a Senator when I introduced this legislation. We passed it a couple of times in the Senate, Lenore, but we couldn't get some of those folks over in the House to help us. You did, but we couldn't get some of them. Well, the food bank would serve multiple purposes. It would protect the consumer against food scarcity. It would protect the farmer against falling prices and would further cushion the ups and downs of any commodity program. This program has three critical ingredients and we need to have our people understand it.

A reserve owned by farmers under strengthened resale provisions in a price support program. The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has always believed that farmers should be able to retain their equity as long as possible, and the inventory in the hands of Commodity Credit Corporation should be reduced to a safe minimum. That is why we extended recently the resale privilege to warehouses. If we get this food reserve program, this food bank, we'll have for the first time the kind of assured stability with a forward movement of progress for agriculture that a continuing efficient and prosperous agriculture needs. And I appeal to you today to have your voices heard on Capitol Hill, to speak to your Congressmen and your Representatives and your Senators to see if we can't get this food bank, this great reserve program of commodities that the President discussed this morning, to see if we can't get this program on the statute books.

This particular proposal also provides authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to buy additional reserves at market prices without waiting until prices drop to support levels, and it provides insulation of the food bank from the commercial market. And one of the reasons we've been concerned over the years about the reserve program is that it might be used as a dumping mechanism to depress prices. The Administration proposal and the proposal supported by Congressman Poage and Senator Mondale is a proposal which will insulate these reserves from the commercial market so that the country can be sure of a food supply and the farmers can be sure of a decent price in the marketplace. That's the only kind of a reserve program that's worth while.

Now let's talk a little bit about Point 4. This is perhaps the most important of all the points in the President's message. All of the other programs put together require this program if we're really going to have an effective farm program, and I'm talking about increased bargaining power for the farmer in the American marketplace. This isn't the first time I've talked about it. And I'm proud, boy am I proud, to have a Senator from Minnesota who is the author of this bill . . . and there it is, S. 2973, by

Senator Mondale . . . and I believe there are eighteen co-sponsors. If you will get behind this proposal, if you will go with every member of the Senate, if you will speak with your friends in the House—Republican or Democrat—and there are several different kinds of Democrats this day, take any kind you want). Just go talk to them. If you go talk to them, talk to them plainly, talk to them constructively, talk to them patiently, talk to them insistently. I think we can get some action.

Tony Dechant was in Des Moines reminding the National Farm Institute last month that the farmer is the only businessman left in America who is still forced to sell his products at wholesale prices set by somebody else . . . that's a losing game, friends . . . and to buy his products at wholesale prices, also set by somebody else. Heads I win, tails you lose. When a farmer has to have his wholesale prices set by somebody else and the retail prices for the things he buys set by somebody else, he's in trouble. So, what we're talking about when we talk about bargaining power is to no longer permit the farmer to get what somebody else offers him, but to charge what he thinks is fair and reasonable for his commodity and to go into the competitive marketplace with his price tag on him. That's what you do when you buy a car or a plow or a tractor.

Yes, it's interesting, this kind of language. The farmer gets a certain price. Somebody else charges a certain price. When you go to see your lawyer or your doctor, your druggist, your hardware merchant, your implement dealer, he says if you want this service or this product, the price is so much. Mr. Farmer goes in with his commodities, somebody says, "Well, how ya doin', Jake. I'll give ya so much." When you're on the "give ya" line and the other fellas on the "charge ya" line, you're at the end of the line and you know it.

Real and effective bargaining power is long overdue, particularly for commodities like livestock, poultry, fruits and vegetables, which are not covered by any price support payment programs, and I have said already that we have this bill before us which has several titles in it, but Title I has the National Agriculture Relations Act. The National Agriculture Relations Act, which was designed and conceived by the people in this organization. It was advocated many times by Tony Dechant and your officers, and may I say also, by that old firebrand from over at GTA, Bill Thatcher. I've heard him talk about it time after time.

Imagine what the labor movement would be without a National Labor Relations Board. Imagine what American agriculture can be with a National Agriculture Relations Act, which permits you to, in a sense, bargain for yourselves, organize for yourselves, within the rules laid down by public policy by government. It'll make a better America, friends.

Now, we don't know all of the how's and the if's and the and's of effective farm bargaining, but we know that it is possible. More importantly, we know that it is necessary and I want to make it quite clear now, lest there be any doubt, that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is for it, and we're going to fight for it too.

The Farmers Union has a long record of building cooperatives. And you can't really have any prosperous, even a reasonably prosperous, farm economy without our cooperatives. They've already increased the farmer's voice in the marketplace and they're going to be a crucial element in this future bargaining strength. But let me re-emphasize that partnership between the farmers and the government is essential to bargaining power. If you're going to have effective bargaining, you can have it, you can do most of it yourself, but you're going to need the partnership with the friendly government, and be sure that it's friendly. I'll get to that a little later on.

Now, when you have the machinery, let

me talk to you about bargaining for a minute. I've been thinking about this for several years and, as you know, this isn't my first time to talk to you about it. When you have the machinery to maintain a reasonable supply-demand balance like you have in your Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, only then farm bargaining power increases. When you allow farmers to reveal their grain on their farm or under their ownership, farm bargaining power increases. When you improve nutrition for children under the School Milk program, School Lunch, Food Stamp, Domestic Donation program, farm bargaining power increases. When you reduce unemployment, when you employ the hard-core unemployed, when you help people lift themselves out of poverty so that they become producing citizens and consuming citizens, and when you enable more Americans to have a decent diet—and this Administration has done these things more than any other—then farm bargaining power increases.

Remember, Mr. and Mrs. Farmer, every time you read that a hard-core unemployed worker in Harlem or Cleveland or Chicago or Detroit is employed, and he starts to earn a paycheck, you've helped yourself. He helps you because his standard of living comes up and he starts to consume, he starts to use food and fiber. So all of these programs are tied together. When you negotiate an international commodity agreement, as Tony Dechant and others helped us to do last summer over in Europe in the Kennedy Round trade negotiations, farm bargaining power increases. When you do any of these and all of these things you add to the sum total of your strength in the marketplace, you increase your bargaining and, with the National Agriculture Relations Act and with the improvement in commodity agreements and marketing agreements and marketing orders, then you begin to get strength so that you can start determining your own destiny within the rules laid down by public policy. But, more importantly, with a partnership with your government. And it's bargaining power that can put the American farmer firmly on his two feet in the American marketplace. And that's why we're for it . . . it's good for this country.

Just imagine what America would have been like today with sweat-shop labor. Imagine what America would be like today if people weren't paid a living wage and a decent wage in our factories. And let me be quite candid with you, Mr. Farmer . . . every time a worker gets a decent wage, he's a better customer. And, Mr. Worker, let me be equally candid with you . . . every time a farmer gets a fair price he can buy what you produce in that factory—automobiles, textiles, home appliances. The thousand and one things that people want for what we call a good standard of living are only possible when people are paid a fair wage for their work and receive a fair price for their production. And when you get the fair wage and the fair price for production, you never fail to make a profit, Mr. Businessman. Profits are made, not out of the poor; profits are made out of the people who have decent income and decent prices and a decent reward for their work and their services. That's the way you do it in a great economy.

Your President emphasized this morning that we have a number of proposals to improve the general quality of life in rural America. And it's essential that we do so. Our young people are not going to stay in rural America just because the air is clean. As a matter of fact, pollution is extending that far out now. They're not going to stay in rural America just because they can read nice stories about grandfather and grandmother. They're not going to stay in rural America if they find out they can earn more per hour working in a filling station than they can with a \$100 thousand or a \$50

thousand investment on the farm. And they're not going to stay in rural America either after they've had a highschool education, and many of them a college education, when they find out that the schools are not as good or that the hospitals are not as good, or that the library is non-existent, or that the town is starting to dry up.

So we have got to get in this country an urban-rural balance. Part of the answer to the problem of the over-crowded city is a better and more modern American countryside . . . not to keep the boys simply down on the farm, but to see that this great population explosion that we have in America . . . which will increase our population by 100 million people between now and the year 2000 . . . that those 100 million will not just filter into the over-crowded metropolitan centers but they'll find opportunity and they'll find decent living—they'll find a good wage—they'll find a wholesome environment out in what we call rural America. And part of all of that means that the producers of food and fiber in rural America must share equitably, must share fairly in the economic growth and the prosperity of this nation. It isn't good enough any longer just to conjure up beautiful memories about this wonderful countryside of ours.

You can't live on memories. You can't live on fiction. You cannot live even on nice poetry. Your young men and women have television and can see what's going on in this world. They are better educated than any generation in our history. They're going to want a modern community next door. They're going to want a decent home on their farm if they're going to live there. They're going to want running water—that's not the name of an Indian Chief, you know. They're going to want inside sanitary facilities, they're going to want a modern living experience. And if we're going to have it we're going to have to do the things that we've done for our urban communities and then some. I'm happy to tell you that as your Vice President, I chair a Cabinet committee of the top Cabinet officers of this government to try to bring to bear in rural America today more and more of these programs for better roads, for sanitary facilities, for hospitals, for schools, for cultural centers, for new industries, so that if some members of the family who live out in the country and produce food and fiber wish to go to town and work in the factory, there'll be a factory there; that they don't have to run off to Chicago or even to Minneapolis, or to Peoria or someplace else; they can be near Worthington, or Huron, or Butte, or some other place. I think I know these communities.

Well, we have Operation Out-Reach which will continue to bring ninety federal programs designed to improve everything from health to housing, from education to economic development right out in the countryside.

So parity for the farmer today is not just parity of price, it's parity of living, because man does not live by bread alone. Parity of living—all of the benefits that come with a good American life.

Now for the final words to you—I want to talk to you—and I'm very reluctant to do this, as you know. I'd like to reluctantly talk a little to you about politics. All kinds of politics. Republican politics; Democratic politics; concerned Democratic politics; Republican conservatives—we've got all kinds of politics in this country.

And I want to talk to you about farm politics for a minute. You're practical people. And passing farm programs is a practical business. What's the use of standing here at these meetings and talking about a legislative program if we're not going to do anything about it. And I know how important it is to pass these programs.

But I'll tell you something else, friends . . . it's important to find out who your friends are and who your enemies are, and even if you can't pass them, you ought to get a vote on them and then you have your day. I tell you you never, you just cannot imagine how pious and how repenting a man can be the closer he comes to hanging. And the closer that people become—the closer that people in Congress and elsewhere come to that election—the more they seem to see in you and I think you ought to take a look and see what's in them. And having been down in Washington for twenty years, there's only one way to find out. Have the eyes and the nays, the yeses and the noes, call the roll, because when they call the roll in Congress there is no little line that says maybe. It's either yes or no, and then you can find out who your friends are and who your enemies are.

And I'm going to give you that old Samuel Gompers labor leader formula—punish your enemies and reward your friends—and if you find some in the Democratic Party that haven't been helping you, you know what to do about it. And if you want to look over in the other party, the hunting will be much better. You'll know what to do about it.

I remind this audience that on Election Day in November, you're going to negotiate a four-year contract and it's not subject to renegotiate in the middle . . . a four-year contract for whoever is to be President—a two-year contract for your Congressman—a six-year contract for your Senators, if you have a Senator up in your state . . . and every one of them are final. Very seldom do we impeach anybody or recall them around this country. So whatever you vote for on that day, until the next election do us part, you're stuck with them. And you better be careful. You're going to the marketplace of political decision to decide what happens to American agriculture.

I happen to be one that maybe has a slightly prejudiced point of view about this. You have to take that into consideration. I think you already have.

That reminds me of a story that I heard about a football team—and we tell it down in Washington. We've got what we call the "Redskins" down there. Shows how far this country's come—we're even willing to have some Reds around Washington—some Redskins. Otto Graham's our coach. He used to play football at Northwestern University. They tell this story about a young fellow that came out of college and this great professional football team was looking for talent. Otto Graham was interviewing this half-back and this half-back said, "Listen, coach, I'm good. I can run a hundred yards fully uniformed in ten seconds." The coach said, "That's almost impossible." He said, "Well, I can do it. I've been doing it all the time." And then the fellow said, "And that's not all coach. Listen, my average punt last year was 72 yards." The coach looked at him disbelieving. He said, "That's a fact, coach. You can look at my record. My average punt is 72 yards." The coach said, "Well, that's fantastic—that's phenomenal." The player said, "But that isn't all. My average pass for the last three years, and I played varsity at the University for three years, was fifty-two yards, and I was always on target." Coach Graham said, "My goodness. I've never heard anything like it. You are the most incredible, you are the most fantastic football player I've ever heard of. Now, you've told me all about your assets, do you have any limitations?" And this young fellow said, "Well, coach, I do exaggerate a bit."

And I suppose when you're in political life, you tend to once in a while get a little over-exuberant. Well, I'd just like to take a few minutes to tell you that you take off ten percent now if you wish to for exuberance. But I don't think you have to take off that much. First of all, I believe that we have a President today whose record as a

Senator, whose record as a Congressman, whose record as President is clear and unequivocal pro farmer. We have a President who's fought from the days that he served in the House of Representatives to the White House for fair prices, for a decent profit for the farmer, for protection from the speculator, and the unpredictable forces of the market, and the health and welfare of rural America.

I served in that Senate with him for sixteen years and I'll challenge anyone in this office, in this audience, to find one time that Lyndon Johnson, Senator, or Lyndon Johnson, Congressman, did not support the program that the Farmers Union had before the Congress of the United States for American agriculture. He believes in parity for American agriculture—not just parity of price but of opportunity and living. I doubt if you've forgotten the effects of some neglect . . . and it was some Republican neglect . . . a few years ago. I haven't. I was serving in the Senate when you people used to come to me when we had another Secretary of Agriculture. I really miss that fellow. I made some of the best speeches of my life in the name of Benson, but I don't blame just him alone.

Farm income dropped a full twenty percent in eight years. And that's net income. I know it's not as good now as I'd like it or as you'd like it, but, oh, let me tell you it looks like a paradise compared to what it was back eight years ago . . . down \$2¼ billion and by 1960 the Commodity Credit Corporation had \$8 billion worth of surplus supplies in stock. And we've been bailing ourselves out of that surplus ever since. I know what that meant out here in Minnesota. I don't think this nation or its food producers wants to go through it again.

I think you've got a different situation today. I know that you have a friend in the President and in the Vice President and in those who have been with you here today. But it takes a lot more than a strong determined friend of the farmer in the White House to enact sound farm legislation. Much of what I've said here today will just be another speech unless we can get it through Congress. The people in Congress, ultimately set the policy and there's nothing automatic about Congress adopting farm programs anymore. Particularly when some Senators and some Representatives, even from rural districts, vote against them.

So keep this in mind when you look over your presidential and congressional candidates in the months ahead. Find out where they and their supporters stand on farm prices, farm programs, farm bargaining, Food for Freedom, the Reserve bill, the Food Bank. Ask them, and then take a look at the list of sponsors of the Curtis bill . . . the Curtis bill—that's farm poison you know—agricultural arsenic—a program to eliminate all farm programs and introduced by a prominent member of the House of Representatives . . . and plenty of people who support it, as Lenore Sullivan can tell you here today. It includes the names of some of the Republicans who voted 110 to 14 to kill the 1965 Farm Act. You know I've been down there fighting with these fellows . . . if I sort of wiggle and wobble a little bit, it's still that I'm suffering from the blows. I know what it takes, so do you.

Democrats, farm and city alike, provided the margin to get that 1965 act through. We got more votes out of Chicago Democrats than we got out of farm Republicans. Somebody said to me, "Now what in the world has happened?" Why don't we do better in the Ninetieth Congress? Well, I'll tell you why. I was talking to our friend here from Iowa. When you lose three or four good congressmen from the state of Iowa who voted solidly for the farm program, who backed the Farmers Union program, who backed the Administration program . . . when you lose forty-

seven congressmen in one election that went down the line for you, you don't need to look any further as to why you have trouble. Believe me.

Sam Rayburn, the Speaker of the House, used to say that any mule can kick a barn down, but it takes a good carpenter to build one. Well, we've got some barn kickers around, and they've been kicking. I urge you to ask some pointed questions before you step up to the polls, not just questions on peace and war, not just questions on taxes and on beautification or on highway construction, but ask some questions, too, about your program.

There are many issues that confront the American people. There's a lot of unfinished business ahead of us in America and a lot of unfinished business for American agriculture. And it's going to take some builders and not barn wreckers to carry on and, hopefully, to finish that business.

Now, my fellow Americans, you've been kind to me again today. You've listened to my message and, in a very real sense, my plea to you. Cause if there's been one lesson that I've learned in my public life, it is that no man alone can do very much. You can be an advocate, you can speak, you can work, and you can vote, but it takes a lot of us pulling together, building together. Ben Franklin once said we're either going to hang together or we're going to hang separately. And you're not going to find very much success in the future unless you're able to find people that you can work with and build with and help create the kind of America that we want.

And I don't come here just to tell you to think of the farmer. I come here to tell you to think of your country, to think of every part of it, to think of every city, to think of every county and every state . . . to remember that this is one nation and it needs your help. Your President asked for it today. I shall not repeat his words. I ask you to remember just this . . . that every American is entitled to his chance whether he's black or white, city or rural, poor or rich. He's entitled to his chance to live and to work and to be himself, and he's entitled from this government of ours to at least have the gates of opportunity thrown open so if he can bring to bear his talents and his capacities, possibly he can make something out of his life.

We're in a great adventure in this America of ours today. An adventure in opportunity. Millions of our fellow Americans that never before even knew what it was to realize first-class citizenship are beginning to . . . beginning to taste it, beginning to have it. Millions of people have been broken out of the prison and bondage of poverty in the last four or five years. We've expanded our programs in education more in three years than we did in one hundred. We've increased our programs in health for the young, for the elderly in medical research, 300 percent in four years. We have created a great partnership in this country. At least we're in the beginning of creating one between the government and the people. Just last Saturday I stood with a thousand of the corporate directors of this country and some of the top labor leaders talking to them about business and labor joining together in a mighty effort, in an alliance, to provide jobs, not relief, not a dole . . . but jobs—good-paying jobs for the hard-core unemployed. It's a difficult assignment, but one that has to be done.

I've gone the length and breadth of this country as your Vice President. I've been in over 500 of the communities of this nation. I've traveled over a half million miles. I've been with the richest of the rich and the poorest of the poor. I've been in the penthouses and the palaces, and I've been in the slums and the dirty, filthy shacks. I think I know a little bit about what's going on in

this country. Some of our fellow Americans would have you believe that America is sick. I tell you it's not sick at all. America is going through a great change. It's in ferment, it's restless, and a person that's sick doesn't have the strength for ferment and for change and for restlessness. A great moral decision is being made in this country—a decision about people. That decision is that if you bear the title "Citizen of the United States," you have the greatest title that anybody can give you . . . and that as a citizen of this Republic, regardless of your station in life, regardless of your color, or your religion, or your political affiliation, you're entitled to a fair break . . . you're entitled to a chance. And we are breaking through the barriers of yesterday, the barriers of race, the barriers of class, the barriers of discrimination, the barriers of hate and, at long last, we're beginning to stand up like real Americans. Oh, I know it's troublesome, and I know that those who preach doom and despondency and despair can make a wonderful case unless you start to examine it.

But there's never been a time when there were great changes in the world that there wasn't turbulence and tension and some degree of restlessness—never . . . always been the same. When labor unions were organized, when the industrial age came upon us, when political democracy was on the march . . . always what some people call trouble . . . but what I call the growing pains of a free people.

In a very little while I'll take off in a plane and fly back to Washington. I've looked at the weather map, and I've used this analogy because it's so true. And, like you, I always wonder how, what kind of a flight it's going to be, but I've been told they're going to go out of a low, with rain and clouds and fog, and we're finally—after we get out around Detroit—we're going to come into a high. And the pilot has already said, "Mr. Vice President, when we go through that fine line between the low and the high, you're going to have some turbulence, so put on your seat belt."

Ladies and gentlemen, you've all traveled, you know of what I speak. And when you're going through that turbulence, you don't get up and start running around the cabin shouting and hollering and then want to throw the pilot out. They used to say, don't change horses in the middle of the stream. I say, don't change pilots in the middle of a storm. And believe me, if you stay with us, and if you have faith in your country and what it stands for, faith in yourself, of the knowledge of this country and its great resources, with a commitment of yourself and your courage and your energy, we're going to get out of this turbulent period. We're going to get through this band of storm clouds, and we're going to come into the bright sunlight of a better day. We'll be in the high of American democracy. That's what's happening in this country. That's what's happening in this world.

All over the world there's this restlessness, and it's not bad. Not bad, my friends, except for those that will it. For the strong and the brave and the conscientious and the determined, and people that know what they want and are willing to make some sacrifices for it, I swear to you that if we stick with what we're doing at home and abroad, if we do not yield, if we do not panic, if we do not retreat, if we do not despair, if we will be the kind of Americans we think we are and that we say we are, that we've got a better day coming, the likes of which no nation has known.

Boy, am I proud to live at this time and be a part of this history . . . proud to be an American in the last third of the twentieth century because, as surely as I stand before you, I know that in the decade ahead America will be even better than the America that you and I have known.

Thank you, and good luck!

This is ZIP?

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include a remarkable editorial from the Kewaunee Enterprise, a weekly newspaper in my district.

The editorial, written by Mabel K. Temby, editor of the paper, portrays graphically the problems confronting weekly newspapers and other businesses in complying with the mountains of red-tape involved in postal regulations and the various interpretations thereof.

I agree with Mrs. Temby that "drastic changes" are needed.

The editorial follows:

THIS IS ZIP?

Rep. John W. Byrnes has introduced a bill to take postmaster and rural carrier appointments out of politics.

I would go a long step farther and take the entire postal system out of government and into private industry.

In 1960 our postage bill was \$1,535.47. In 1967 it was \$4,854.14.

In 1960 we addressed our newspapers and took them to the post office. They were mailed, and they were delivered. Today we address, zip code, and package. Where we had about 25 packages, we now have more than 100 to wrap. Our entire mailing list had to be redone. Every zip code of more than 6 of the same number must be packaged separately. Each area with the first 3 digits of the zip code the same, 6 or more, must be packaged separately. Sounds confusing? It is. In order to get and keep this straight we have a directory with 1,772 pages. One week we will have an area with 6 papers. If we have a drop-out that means 5, and they must all be refiled into a different bundle. Then we will have an additional one in a section where we had 5 papers. This must now be repackaged into a different bundle with a different label. Mailing takes us six times as long with twice as many people as it did in 1960.

We print Press Woman, a magazine for the National Federation of Press Women. We go through this whole bit, but worse, since most of them are out of state, and where we used to have 28 bundles, we now have 174.

Until last week. Then this mailing has been increased to about 775 packages instead of 174.

A postmaster in Little Rock, Ark., wrote to say that all magazines that were bundled in the miscellaneous for that state have to be wrapped individually. These were nice, flat magazines, now they are going to be rolled, and they will be harder to handle than the flat.

But the rule book at the postoffice was studied, and they decided, yes, he was right; yes, we had to wrap each one separately, and that includes the newspaper, too.

"Well," I said, "it is a good thing we just bought a tying machine to cope with our wrapping problem." It was \$921.00. "I don't know if you can tie them," I was told, "The rule says the package must be closed."

"I intend to close it with twine," I retorted, only to be told that permission would have to be obtained, since it was their opinion that twine would not "close" the package, but a strip of gummed tape would.

"And we would like them flat," I was told. "You were getting them flat, if we have to wrap them they are going to be rolled."

They brought the Reader's Digest as a sample. "Do it like that," I was told. The Readers Digest and this newspaper are two different things. It is one thing to keep a thick magazine flat, and another thing to keep a 10 to 12 page newspaper flat, with a wrapper around it. "Use envelopes," I was told.

All right! Stuff 250 or more newspapers in an envelope, with one eye on the clock. Envelopes are costly.

Then, no two post offices interpret the rule book in the same way. What is permissible to one, is not to another. This is not surprising. One of the areas in which no one seems to understand the rules is the stuffing of supplements in a newspaper. Some postmasters allow what others refuse.

No, this is not surprising. I read an article this week about the filing of income tax returns. One man took his statement of earnings and deductions to five different accountants, and each one ended up with a different figure as to the amount due.

The rules are so confusing the experts themselves cannot agree on an interpretation.

At the time I redid the mailing list for Press Woman, I inquired of a firm who corrected mailing lists, of the cost. It was \$480.00, plus the cost of the stencils. The stencils cost 3½ cents each. Since I took the job on a two-year basis, with a fixed budget, I had to do the work myself. It took an entire year and many, many Sundays, plus any spare hour anyone in the family had.

Now we bring all the second class mail to the post office, carefully labeled as to where it should go, properly zipped according to the 1,772-page book, paying three and one-half times what we did five years ago, thousands of dollars to keep the mailing list according to the rules, and what happens?

We mail the Luxemburg News on Thursday. People on a Kewaunee route tell us they usually receive it on Saturday. This week it was received on Monday. Luxemburg is 13 miles from Kewaunee. Five days for delivery? This is zip?

We do a monthly bulletin for the American Association of University Women, Chicago Branch. The editor sends us the copy, we mail her a proof, first class mail. First class mail to Chicago—five days. Special delivery is better, that made it in 3. Then the proof has to come back to us. Three, four days it takes, usually; once it took nine days! First class mail. The reply we got to this was that it was in a large envelope, and probably the mailmen thought it was third class mail. Front and back it was marked First Class, and first class postage was paid.

The corrected proof of the bulletin then must be mailed back to us, but we no longer can trust the mail to get it back in time to meet the deadline, so we use the phone for corrections.

We do printing for several customers in Green Bay. A package sent to Green Bay—a program—did not arrive there until 7 days after it had been mailed in Kewaunee, 7 days—28 miles! Meanwhile, we had to re-print the program and deliver it personally so it would be there on time. The original package was insured. We checked here, in Green Bay our customer checked at the postoffice there. No one had it. So we reprinted an order that cost more than \$40.00. I filed a claim. Did I get paid? No sir, the package was not lost, just delayed.

At no time in the years we have been in the newspaper business have we had the complaints about mail delivery that we have today. Today a subscriber said her son had not received the paper for the last month. The stencil was checked, the address was correct. Then you do what? You can have it traced. The post office does that. And that week the son's paper was delivered nice and promptly, and a slip comes back saying it was delivered Thursday. The week of the check-up, of course.

I am absolutely in earnest when I say the postoffice belongs out of government. Every-

time we have an increase in rates for postage the answer is that the volume has increased so much. In any other business but postal, when volume goes up cost goes down. Look at what United Parcel has done for parcel post. The mail order catalog store came into being because of dissatisfaction with parcel post.

The post office department continues to operate parts of their business that take up their time and lose money for the taxpayer. Postal money orders should have been dumped many years ago. And so should the printing of envelopes. Anyone knows that you cannot sell a post card for the cost of a stamp. The paper stock costs something. Or that it costs more money to deliver a letter to San Francisco than it does across the street.

Private industry, running its business like the postal department, would be out of business in six months. And out of customers, too, if they had a competitor. What businessman could set up the dictatorial rules customers are given by the postal authorities and get away with it?

We have to measure the amount of advertising in the paper each week, and report the percentage to the postmaster. Each ad must be marked as such. We always marked them with an X. A few years ago a postal inspector arrived, and came to tell us that from now on they had to be "circled" not X'ed. When I asked why, there was no answer except that was how he wanted it done. Someone, with nothing to do, had to find something to "correct" in order to feel he was doing something. Anyone knows it is easier to X a square than circle it. Ever try circling a full page? This is the kind of outrageous bureaucratic stupidity that drives a busy person really wild.

And—along with all of this—we have to figure out how much each paper weighs, and how much each sheet weighs, and figure the poundage. I can understand that we need to know how much each paper weighs in order to get a pound weight, but no one has ever explained to me any reason why I have to figure out how much each sheet weighs. I never use that figure in reaching my totals, but it must be there! At the end of the month we used to take the percentage of each week's advertising, and divide it by four, the number of issues. But this was too easy, so we were told we had to add the inches of advertising each week, get the total inches of the papers each month, and figure the percentage that way. It never came out any differently than the first way, but it was a lot harder to do, and by all means let's make things as rough as possible for the customer.

Incidentally, I love all the post office boys across the street. I just think that they are part and parcel of a vicious system that is choking American business, and needs some drastic changes.

Code of Ethics for Political Campaign Advertising

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, on April 19 the American Association of Advertising Agencies announced the issuance of a code of ethics for political campaign advertising for the guidance of those advertising agencies which might become involved in political campaigns.

The code has been endorsed by the Fair Campaign Practices Committee and the League of Women Voters. I am sure that

Senators will be interested in the association's concise and penetrating code. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF ADVERTISING AGENCIES' CODE OF ETHICS FOR POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS ADVERTISING

The advertising agency has become an increasingly important factor in the conduct of American political campaigns. Just as the political candidate must observe the highest standards of fairness and morality in his campaign, so must the advertising agency operate under a code that reflects the finest values of our political system rather than any unethical temptations that arise in the heat of battle.

The advertising agency should not represent any candidate who has not signed or who does not observe the Code of Fair Campaign Practices of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, endorsed by the A.A.A.A.

The agency should not knowingly misrepresent the views or stated record of any candidates nor quote them out of proper context.

The agency should not prepare any material which unfairly or prejudicially exploits the race, creed or national origin of any candidate.

The agency should take care to avoid unsubstantial charges and accusations, especially those deliberately made too late in the campaign for opposing candidates to answer.

The agency should stand as an independent judge of fair campaign practices, rather than automatically yield to the wishes of the candidate or his authorized representatives.

The agency should not indulge in any practices which might be deceptive or misleading in word, photograph, film or sound.

Adopted by the Board of Directors of the American Association of Advertising Agencies, February 22, 1968.

Endorsed by Fair Campaign Practices Committee and League of Women Voters.

This Is My Country

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to attend the 27th annual banquet of the American Slovak Society of Lackawanna and Susquehanna Counties, which was held last Sunday, April 21, in the Hotel Jermyn in Scranton, Pa.

It was, I assure you, a delightful and moving experience to be there.

The distinguished chairman, Michael C. Spigut was his usual splendid self. President Michael Zurine and Toastmaster John Sirotnak, M.D., were most professional in moving the program; and the Reverends John A. Balberchak and John Zipay were the embodiment of religious dignity in rendering the invocation and benediction.

But of all those present, certainly every one of us will remember the splendid oration by the principal speaker, the Right Reverend Jerome Koval, O.S.B., abbot of St. Andrew's Abbey, Cleveland, Ohio.

On the program which was given me

when I came to the dinner was the motto: "To Promote Spiritual, Cultural, and Social Activities." When the abbot spoke, there was the very personification of the promotion of all these activities in his words, as well as a ringing testimony to the work of building the greatness of America in the past, and a call to continue that building in the future.

I will include here the words of Father Abbot Jerome:

THIS IS MY COUNTRY

Once again through the kindness of your program committee I am back home. I greatly appreciate this opportunity to revisit the scenes of my happy boyhood days in Wilkes-Barre, and I feel highly honored to have the privilege of addressing you on the occasion of your traditional annual dinner sponsored by the American Slovaks of Lackawanna and Susquehanna Counties.

This annual affair helps to keep alive the Slovak spirit that prompted our Slovak fathers and mothers or grandparents as the case may be, to cross the ocean and settle here in quest of a better way of life. That they found the answer to their everyday needs appears to be true in view of the fact that the great majority of the newcomers from Slovakia chose to remain here. They organized societies, built churches and schools soon after their coming—obviously they intended to establish a permanent residence in their new homeland—contrary to the false charge, that all that these strangers to American shores wanted, was to get rich and return to the old country with their savings. You know, and I know, that our Slovak pioneers worked hard for their living. They put in an honest day's work for every dollar they earned in those first years of toll underground where they kept an endless procession of coal cars on the move through long tunnels to the breakers outside. They furnished the fuel for heat, energy, and power for millions of homes, and thousands of factories and mills throughout the land. Our Slovaks here constituted the bulk of the man-power in many communities in an age that antedated the machine-age and automation which have largely supplanted human brawn in our present-day world.

Many changes in all walks of life have occurred recently. Life is not the same, but the life of the Slovak mine-worker over a period of a half century that saw the United States emerge as a world power remains a colorful chapter in the saga of the black-diamond industry of northeastern Pennsylvania.

If one could total up the long line of coal cars loaded by the intrepid Slovak miner, who worked faithfully and tirelessly alongside his Polish, Ukrainian or Russian companions hundreds or thousands of feet below ground, this would encircle the globe, not once perhaps but a number of times. Only a modern computer could accurately estimate the grand total of tons of coal that filled thousands of freight cars destined for all parts of our great country.

We Slovaks, here and elsewhere, have much to be grateful for; much to be proud of and much to emulate in the future.

We thank a kind providence that directed our forebears here where they learned to enjoy freedom, make use of every opportunity and share the responsibilities and bear the burdens of their new homeland, for they came not merely to take but to give. We can be proud of their industrial, moral, and civic record of achievement. We can all profit by their noble example as God-fearing people and loyal citizens of this country, our country.

The early Slovaks, your parents and grandparents and mine, too, were people of great courage, deep faith, unique endurance and integrity. They possessed humility and idealism, and all the ingredients of true greatness of character that seem to be vanishing

from our daily life as godlessness, cowardice, violence, dishonesty, cynicism and apathy march together to disaster. We who are the proud heirs of a great Christian heritage of a thousand years must stem this tide of despair and destruction by cherishing the ideals and traditions of our Slovak predecessors who knew how to live and die as men and women of prayer. If ever anyone deserved the title, "People of God," I, for one, believe firmly they did.

While we are reminiscing, we must not lose sight of a little known and unappreciated phase in the life of our Slovak pioneers. That was their willingness to share their blessings with their fellow countrymen overseas. Accordingly, in World War I, the American Slovaks under the leadership of such great Slovaks as Father Murgas and Michael Bosak, Sr. donated generously to a nationwide campaign for the liberation of Slovakia. They did not forget their native country where they were born. After World War II, when the Slovaks suffered from the invasion of their country by no less than three Russian armies, it was the American Slovaks who helped to feed and clothe more than four million war-battered fellow countrymen in their historic homeland below the Tatra mountains in picturesque Slovakia. Moreover, thousands of Slovak refugees found ready help here and in nearby Canada wherever the Slovaks lived.

It is no wonder that our Slovaks did not get rich, for they always believed it was more blessed to give than to receive. Yet they were truly rich in other ways. They were contented, and they were ever ready to do their duty and fulfill their obligations towards God, their Church and their Country. Their record speaks for itself and the motto on our nation's currency, "In God we trust," was more than a high-sounding phrase. It was, for them, as it must be for us, a daily reminder that we are all in the hands of God.

Our salvation and the national security of our country depend upon a renewal of a strong faith in God that characterized the lives of our pioneer Slovaks who migrated to our shores from their homeland across the sea. A land filled and overrun by beatniks, hippies, protesters, and groups of imported banshees wailing with anguish over synthetic woes dreamed up by LSD addicts—all seeking a Shangri-la at somebody else's expense—cannot long endure. Unless we replenish this great land of ours with honest, God-fearing folk, strong men of faith and many virtues, we too, will perish, for no country can afford to tolerate for too long destructive elements that endanger its foundations.

May God in His mercy and goodness watch over us and guide us. May He inspire genuine renewal of spirit that touches our very souls so that we will go forward to our destiny, in this world and in the world here-after, united and strong, loyal and brave, fearless and invincible in a common cause against the evils of the world, the spirit of darkness, ignorance and sin. Life, as St. Paul reminded us, is a warfare and a man must be willing to fight if he is to merit a reward. Our daily fight is against many evils that endanger body and soul. Our Slovak fathers and mothers fought the good fight, and now they are at rest. God grant that we do as well as they did in their time.

Better Training for Foreign Service Officers

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, next October begins the 50th anniversary year of

the School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University. The school is now in the process of revising its curriculum in the hope of making it even more effective in preparing young men and women for serving their country abroad. As the Nation's oldest institution for the training of personnel for careers in both diplomacy and trade, the school of foreign service has produced in its half century an impressive number of graduates.

Dr. Carroll Quigley, a professor of history at the school of foreign service for 28 years, has written an informative and interesting article about the changes now underway in this leading institution. He argues persuasively that when the founder and regent of the school, Rev. Dr. Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., revised the curriculum in 1951, shortly before his death, he envisioned a course of education that would provide the student with a broad, interrelated background in government, economics, history, languages, and philosophy. This, rather than any specialized or narrow training, would best prepare men to grapple with the problems of international relations and foreign trade. Because of the significance of this development, not only to other colleges and universities but also to those who are intending to prepare themselves for service abroad, I ask unanimous consent that the article, which appeared in the November 16 issue of the *Hoya*, be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

QUIGLEY PROBES POSSIBILITIES FOR FOREIGN SERVICE CURRICULUM REFORM
(By Carroll Quigley, Ph. D.)

Those who ignore history are condemned to repeat it.

Ends should determine means. These two rules should be the guide posts to any reform of the curriculum of the Foreign Service School, as to most other things. That means that anyone talking or planning on this subject must be aware of what the aim of the Foreign Service School is and of what has been done in the past for achieving that aim.

In the last few years, there has been a fair amount of talk about SFS curriculum reform, but most of it has been very badly informed in respect to these two indispensable foundations. This article will seek to sketch these as I have come to know them in my 26 years in this School.

The goal of the SFS never was to prepare students for careers in the Foreign Service of the United States, since the latter was not established until the school was five years old. The similarity of name is thus only coincidental. The School was established in 1919 in recognition of the fact that the United States had just become a World Power with obligations in private as well as public areas. There was a new need for trained personnel for many international agencies besides those of our own government. The fact that the League of Nations was founded in the same year as the Foreign Service School is much more significant than the fact that the Diplomatic Corps and the Consular Service of the United States were combined into a single agency called "the Foreign Service of the United States" in 1924, five years after the School was established. Moreover, it was always expected that more graduates would go into private activities overseas than would go to work for public agencies. For this reason, the curriculum included study of accounting and

commercial law as required courses until fairly recently.

The wisdom of this early and persistent view of the goals of the School will be evident to anyone who examines the areas in which Foreign Service graduates have worked successfully. In the years after World War II, when the largest classes were graduated, not over 3 or 4% even took the State Department Foreign Service examinations. On the other hand, many graduates went into a great variety of overseas work, in airlines and shipping, in education and journalism in foreign areas, as well as all kinds of overseas business. For these positions they needed a broad and integrated preparation in all aspects of international work.

In time this broad and integrated program came to provide one of the best undergraduate programs in general social sciences available in the United States, and it thus became, without anyone intending it, one of the best preparations available for law school or for graduate work in one of the social science specialties such as history, political science, or economics. For graduate school the SFS curriculum was better preparation than an undergraduate major in the same field, either here or anywhere else, because it meant that a SFS alumnus at graduate school in one of these fields had a solid grounding in the other two, something which is absolutely essential, but is rarely obtained from an ordinary undergraduate major, since most colleges do not require this and many advise against it. Yet any one who examines what is done in graduate schools and by their graduates can see that a history major, for example, needs some knowledge of both economics and government, just as concentrators in the latter two fields need some knowledge of the other as well as of history. Moreover, knowledge of these fields used to be obtained in the SFS in an atmosphere where the emphasis was on teaching and understanding these subjects, and on explaining their mutual interrelationships in the actual experience of human life, and, above all, on the *understanding of this nexus as a basis for decision-making in active life*, and not taught, as they usually are in university-colleges today, as preparation for specialized work, especially research, on the graduate level. This last point is fundamental; it was at the basis of the thinking of Constantine McGuire and Father Walsh when they founded the School (see my article, "Constantine McGuire: Man of Mystery" in *Courier*, December 1965).

WARTIME EFFORTS

The curriculum of the SFS was directed to these ends, as judged best by Father Walsh and his advisers, from 1919 until the School was mobilized for the war effort in June 1943. During that time, there were no departments and no faculty ranks (all the faculty were called "lecturers"). For much of that time, most of the faculty and many of the students were part-time, and all courses were offered in the evening, although, by 1930, most courses were repeated in the day-time. Each course was two credit hours, and a student often took eight or more courses at a time. In time, as new courses were added, the integration among them came to be less than desired. By 1940 or so, curriculum reform was very necessary, but the outbreak of war put such demands on the School, and above all on Father Walsh, that the task could not be tackled until 1950.

The SFS made a major effort in the war, turning almost entirely to training of men in uniform in June 1943 and being swamped with returning veterans as soon as the fighting stopped. In 1947 the School had about 2300 students (more than twice its present enrollment). In those first postwar years, Father Walsh was very busy with missions to Germany and Japan, with writing two major books, and with the establishment of the Institute of Languages and Linguistics. As a result, the long needed reform of the Foreign

Service curriculum was not undertaken until the spring of 1950.

Perhaps because this task had been so long delayed, it was done very thoroughly. Members of the faculty and administration met about a dozen times, under the chairmanship of Father Walsh and with Walter I. Giles as secretary, in Room 8 Healy, the "Constitution Room." Most of these assemblies lasted several hours, some of them for a good part of Saturday mornings. The whole group was divided up into smaller committees which met elsewhere to work on parts of the problem before reporting back to the plenary sessions. The general ground rules were set by Father Walsh, after discussion with many others.

REVISED CURRICULUM

These general rules were as follows: (1) The number of courses taken at any one time must be reduced, and the courses themselves strengthened so that they should leave the student with a real familiarity with the subject concerned; (2) the courses should be made more general, with the numerous specialized courses which had grown up over the years either eliminated or made electives; (3) a balance must be maintained between the various academic disciplines so that a graduate would be familiar in some depth with all the tools he might need in his post-graduate experience; and (4) the School must ensure that these various disciplines and courses are integrated in the students mind, and not simply memorized as discrete academic subjects.

Two difficulties, from opposite directions, arose in the general discussions. On one side, those who had been teaching specialized courses, such as "Staple Commodities in World Trade," or "Exporting Practice," or commercial law, accounting, and shipping, objected to their subjects being reduced in time or made electives. On the other hand, a group of the political scientists insisted that international affairs was merely one part of the general subject of political science and should be treated as such, with the main core of the curriculum built on a political science department expanded to include additional courses, especially a new course in "International Relations." Father Walsh was most emphatic in rejecting this last suggestion, insisting that the whole program of study of the School was on international relations, and that this subject was not simply a matter of political science but was equally concerned with economic, psychological, intellectual, and other issues. He emphasized, against the efforts of this group to cut down the time devoted to economics, that even in the Foreign Service of the United States 80 percent of the time of personnel on the lower levels was devoted to economic issues not to political ones.

In this reform, most courses which were retained as required courses were increased from two to three hours a week, and, at the same time, the number of courses taken each year was reduced, with freshmen and sophomores taking only five courses. Father Walsh insisted that this adoption of the standard three-credit course must not lead students to look at the achievement of the degree as simply the accumulation of a number of discrete and separate courses. To avoid this danger, it was decided to introduce an oral comprehensive examination for all seniors to force them to review the work of the first three years and to look at the assemblage of courses as a single comprehensive body of knowledge. To assist in this end, each professor was to prepare and submit for mimeograph publication a syllabus of the content of his course so that all might know what was in each course and how it fitted in with the others.

This curriculum reform of 1950 took months of work and established the outlines of the program still found at the School of Foreign Service. However, it has been so much subjected to tinkering and manipula-

tion that much of its original value has been lost. These changes arose from two directions. On the one hand, new administrators who knew nothing about the original reasons for the courses as they were established made or allowed changes which weakened the whole effect. On the other hand, the establishment of university-wide departments, which did not exist in 1950, led to changes in the content, sequence, and perspective of both faculty and courses so that they fitted together less effectively for the SFS curriculum.

As set up in 1950, there were four years of history and political science, three of economics, and two each of English, philosophy, and language. The two years of required religion for Catholics were non-credit courses. In the early 1950's, the religion courses were given credit to force students to take them more seriously. A few years later, a new Regent could not see why Catholics had to take 12 credit hours more than non-Catholics to get the same degree, so the latter were forced to take 12 hours more of history of political theory as a substitute for religion. These 12 hours have since been juggled in various ways. About the same time, a University official felt that freshmen were not able to handle generalities, so used his influence to have the SFS required freshman course in "Principles of Political Science" abolished, with the result that most of them now never get much of the material which was in that course.

The greatest changes in the curriculum, however, were not ones which could be seen in the catalogue, but were simply the result of the establishment of University-wide departments since 1950. During Father Walsh's regime, the SFS was a completely separate entity whose only connection with the University was that it gave its degrees under the University charter and rented room-space from the University. It had a separate library, bank account, admissions policy, administration, and faculty. In fact, about that time, the College issued a ruling that no one who taught in the College could also teach in the SFS. As a result of this order, William Flaherty, one of the greatest teachers in the history of the School, resigned from both and left to become, in a short while, chief statistician of Chrysler Corporation.

The creation of University departments meant that the course syllabi were forgotten, the content of the courses changed even when names remained the same, and the whole context of the School's educational process changed, with the substitution of departmental courses aiming toward preparation for graduate work in that departmental discipline replacing foreign service courses aiming at the establishment of an integrated understanding of international affairs as an area of decision-making and action. At the same time, the new University faculty, possessed by the unique value of their own subject, or even of their narrow specialty within that subject, were increasingly unable to ask or to judge comprehensive questions on the oral comprehensive examinations. In fact one of the amusing evidences of this process has been the growing reluctance of the examiners to judge the candidates in all three fields as the rules of the examination have always required them to do.

CRUCIAL PROBLEMS

There is no need to explain in detail what has gone wrong with the SFS curriculum in recent years. It should be sufficient to say that many of the courses no longer contain what they should contain or even what their titles would lead one to expect, because their teachers are often off riding hobby-horses instead of teaching what the SFS curriculum requires them to teach. Thus students often have had no logic, even when their transcript lists a course called "Logic," their courses in English now often consist of impressionistic studies of literature rather

than the training in verbal communication skills which the curriculum requires; they may well graduate with all kinds of specialized knowledge in government, but are unable to define such basic concepts as "state," "nationalism," or "democracy;" in a similar way they often miss fundamental movements in the historical past depending on which section they happened to be in in the required history courses; and, most astounding of all, they take a degree in "Foreign Service" without ever having studied geography, simply because the teacher of that subject refused to teach the course described in the syllabus. And, finally as a culmination of all these erosions of a once-excellent program, the fitting together and integration of the courses has become disjointed, the years of study have become unbalanced (so that the freshman year is now too easy and the sophomore year too difficult), and the better students in the last few years are constantly being drained away from the SFS curriculum to fill up special elective and proseminar courses so that teachers whose primary interest is in some special subject on the graduate level may have a sufficiently large group of good students to make his efforts satisfactory to himself.

"Red Relative" Racket

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I introduced legislation to block the outflow of U.S. decedents estates to persons in countries where the government does not allow estates to be paid to American beneficiaries. My bill was particularly concerned with the flight of dollars behind the Iron Curtain. In the New York Knickerbocker of April 14, 1968, Columnist Ed Mowery explains how another Communist racket is draining dollars out of the United States for the benefit of Red bloc economies.

In my opinion, our national balance-of-payments program is missing a great opportunity in not taking stiffer measures to curb these abuses. I realize that this administration is very much in favor of trade with and aid to the Soviet bloc, but I would hope that it is not in favor of these clandestine transactions which bilk American citizens and fuel the economies of the Communist bloc nations.

The article referred to follows:

"RED RELATIVE" RACKET

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—Uncle Sam is probing every avenue to halt the dollar flow to Europe. But little or no attention has apparently been given to the multimillion-dollar flow of greenbacks sent by compassionate Americans to ease the economic plight of relatives behind the Iron Curtain.

Certainly no blame can be attached to thousands of Americans who send their hostage relatives dollars for food and the barest living necessities. But dollar-hungry officials of communist countries have turned the Good Samaritan gesture into a lush racket.

A newly-released study made by the Czechoslovak National Council of America blueprints the operations of a "thriving" Communist government business invented for the extraction of dollars from Americans. Similar dollar-drain schemes presumably function in every Iron Curtain country.

The Czech government operates its merchandising racket through a sort of chain-store outlet known as Tuzex, which has numerous agents in the United States who deluge Americans of Czech descent with elaborate brochures of items exchangeable for dollars.

REDS BLOCK REAL DONATIONS

Red cunning plugs all loopholes in the normal donation of gift packages to Czech residents. The Czech government has halted receipt of such packages from America through a prohibitive duty. Food and worn clothing gifts from U.S. citizens are out. Instead, American relatives of trapped Czechs must purchase Tuzex coupons with dollars. The coupons are then redeemed at Tuzex stores by recipient relatives.

It's a cute swindle to replenish the empty Czech treasury. Our dollars are then used to purchase raw materials for the manufacture of goods flowing to the USSR and communist bloc.

The startling ease with which the communist Czech government can grab American dollars is reflected in the mushrooming growth of the Tuzex enterprise. For 20 years, the disconsolate Czechs have borne communist rule. Their businesses, homes, possessions expropriated, they became drones in a steadily-deteriorating economy.

Gift packages of food and used clothing often made life bearable. Then came creation of the dollar-draining Tuzex gimmick. And Czech-made goods could no longer be purchased for Czech crowns. Tuzex became a government monopoly, expanding its inventory from "necessity" items to luxury bait.

In addition to clothing, shoes, glassware, etc., Czechs with dollar-backed Tuzex coupons can now purchase Russian vodka, Pilsner beer, plum brandy slivovic, TV sets, transistor radios and automobiles—the current Czech "status" symbol formerly available only to communist bigshots.

Tens of thousands of Americans receiving the Tuzex catalogue gasped at the Reds' newest lure. American dollars can now buy a co-operative apartment or private homes (with gardens) for Czechs scratching to make ends meet. Homes are offered in four models, and furniture is "readily available" for enough U.S. bucks.

The "private" homes, of course, would revert to government ownership upon completion. And because of the Reds neglect of properties they seized massive dilapidation haunts urban housing. The shortage is acute.

What can the United States do to halt the deluge of dollars into Iron Curtain treasuries? It's a sticky question now being debated. The Czech National Council in its current issue of the American Bulletin urges U.S. officials to "plug the Iron Curtain holes through which millions of dollars are being drained."

It might be tough on Czechs and other hostages for a while. But the swindle cries for official action.

Dr. Harold Taylor's "The World and the American Teacher"

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Dr. Harold Taylor recently made the final report of a 2-year study which he directed concerning the education of teachers in world affairs for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education. The entire 300-page publication,

entitled "The World and the American Teacher," will be published early in May.

Dr. Taylor is an internationally known educator, lecturer, and writer. He is the author of "On Education and Freedom," "Art and the Intellect," coauthor and editor of "Essays in Teaching," and editor of "The Idea of a World University," written by Michael Zweig. In 1963, he served as director of a pilot project in a world college, and in 1965-66 was consultant in human rights to the late Adlai E. Stevenson and the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation. Before assuming the presidency of Sarah Lawrence College in 1945, a post he held for 14 years, Dr. Taylor taught philosophy at the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of Dr. Taylor's report, entitled "The World and the American Teacher," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE WORLD AND THE AMERICAN TEACHER

(Final report of a study directed by Dr. Harold Taylor of the education of teachers in world affairs for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education)

After directing a two-year study of the education of American teachers in world affairs, Dr. Harold Taylor, former president of Sarah Lawrence College, has concluded in his final report that the standard curriculum in American higher education, through which teachers and most college students go, has become obsolete both in method and content. The Report calls for large scale revision in the way teachers are educated for every part of the educational system, from nursery school to graduate education, beginning with the formation of a nation-wide volunteer Student Corps of 25,000 students as an extension of the ideas of VISTA, Head Start, the National Teacher Corps, the Peace Corps and exchange Peace Corps programs, with service and study in foreign and American communities considered as a regular part of the student's program.

"With world society in a state of expanding revolution and our own society and its place in the world changing radically before our eyes," says Dr. Taylor, "the American educational system has remained frozen into older patterns of thought and content. One result is that the average student's idea of the world, like that of so many other citizens, is dangerously out of touch with reality."

"As presently organized, the standard curriculum for undergraduates takes as its framework white American middle class society in a setting of Western culture, and the student is seldom given direct experience or knowledge of people in cultures other than his own, either inside the United States or in non-Western societies. Accordingly, the student learns to develop a parochial view of the world which, if he becomes a teacher, is transferred back into the school curriculum and reinforced there by the ideas and values of the local community. Either that or the parochialism makes it impossible for him to break through to the culture of the children he is teaching."

The 300 page publication, entitled *The World and the American Teacher* will be released in early spring. It is based on extensive research in the United States and abroad, on conferences and interviews with administrators, students and faculty, along with classroom visits and discussions in a cross-section of 50 American colleges and universities where teachers are educated.

Contrary to present trends in university

thought, Dr. Taylor holds that students are the major resource for transmitting and recreating their own culture, that the primary purpose of the university is to teach students, and that the best way to do so is by teaching them to teach themselves. He calls for a reorganization of the colleges and universities to give responsibility for teaching to all students, graduate and undergraduate, as a regular part of their education—through student courses and seminars, tutorials, team-study and research, student symposia, field work, study-travel projects in the United States and overseas, study and service in local communities in whatever capacity student talents can be used. The college campus should become "a staging-ground for expeditions into the world, a place where students can learn to use the world as an educational instrument."

"In modern society," says Dr. Taylor, "there are no 'foreign' cultures and problems, only human problems shared by all societies. The problems of the world are reflected in those of American social change, the issues of racial conflict, poverty, under-privilege, unemployment, educational shortages, the development of the arts, national and cultural identity, ideological dispute, leadership, war and peace, political freedom and control, human rights and social action, the fulfillment of human lives. Involvement by students in studies and action in the field of cultural change, in the United States and abroad, is a means of coming to terms with the natural concerns of the world's people, and of developing an empathy with members of foreign cultures, societies and political systems."

"The American teacher is linked to the wider world by the experience available to him in his own society. This is not merely a question of taking courses in world affairs and non-Western cultures in his academic program. A main route to the understanding of world affairs lies through direct and deep experience in the varieties of American culture, ranging from the Spanish-American, Indian, Negro, Puerto Rican, Chinese-American and others, to the culture of the urban and rural poor."

The Report defines education as a social science, a branch of the humanities and of the healing arts, and it recommends the fusion of liberal and professional studies in education, especially in the fields of cultural anthropology, psychology and educational sociology, and the inclusion of the creative arts on an international scale as a primary element in the education of teachers.

Among the findings of the Report are the following:

New and promising trends in the direction of internationalism in higher education have come as a result of efforts by the foundations, educational associations such as AACTE, Government projects in AID and other agencies, consortia of colleges and universities, several State Departments of Education, NEA institutes in foreign language and cultures, volunteer service organizations, the appointment of Directors of International Programs in more than 100 colleges and universities, research institutes in educational problems of developing countries, the extension of Junior Year Abroad programs to include more than 35,000 students, and the work of the foundation-supported programs of the private organization, Education and World Affairs.

The effect of the Peace Corps in recruiting, training and providing foreign teaching experience for a majority of 7,000 new volunteers each year is beginning to show in increased interest in teaching and world affairs on the part of American students, and is a major resource, along with the exchange Peace Corps, for ideas and programs in the international education of teachers.

The younger generation of social and political activities and educational reformers in the student movement constitute a force for

the development of internationalism in student outlook; if such students are to become teachers with a knowledge of the world, they should be given a chance to join forces with foreign students and to try out their own educational ideas in practice, in their own schools and colleges and within the American communities at large.

Only three to five percent of teachers in the public schools have, in their preparation to teach, taken courses which deal with world society, international issues, or non-Western materials.

The standard professional courses in education, potentially a major center for stimulating the interest of students in social and educational issues and in world affairs, currently offer little opportunity for the study of foreign cultures and their educational systems.

In relying on the lecture system, tests, grades and credits as its mode of instruction, the present undergraduate curriculum, for students of education and others, gives the student almost no responsibility for conducting his own education or for teaching himself and others; it teaches him to accept and rely on intellectual and political authority rather than to take his own initiatives or to extend his range of enquiry into world affairs or world problems.

The best kind of program for educating teachers in world affairs is a cross between the Peace Corps, the National Student Corps, VISTA, and the Experiment in International Living, with the emphasis on teaching and practical experience in a foreign culture (foreign in the sense that it is not one's own) combined with selected studies in the arts, sciences and foreign languages, including the languages of American subcultures, chosen for their relevance to the subjects to be taught and to the culture in which the teaching is to be carried on.

International programs such as those in operation at Justin Morrill College at Michigan State University, Wilmington College in Wilmington, Ohio, the University of Michigan College of Education in Ann Arbor, Antioch College in Yellow Springs, Ohio, and San Francisco State College provide models on which new forms of international teacher education can be built.

In a wide-ranging set of recommendations, the Taylor Report provides an analysis of the problems of teacher education, not only as they relate to education in world affairs, but to the major areas where reforms are already under national discussion—in the system of teacher certification, in the professional education courses, practice teaching, urban education, the arts and sciences curriculum, teacher recruitment, graduate schools of education, and methods of instruction.

"Historically," says Taylor, "the system of teacher education has been the outcome of local efforts by citizens through their schools and related institutions—normal schools, certifying agencies, teachers colleges—to arrange for the education of their children, and has not, until very recently, been brought in touch with the main stream of higher education, university life, world problems and cultural affairs. It has been a populist movement, carried on outside the colleges and universities, urged on by those seeking improvement and advancement in the educational, economic and social position of children and youth without previous access to full educational opportunity. In the past, teacher education has been ignored by the universities. This has meant that the education of teachers for the universities and for the schools has been placed far down on the national educational agenda and has been scandalously neglected. While funds for university research, graduate study, professional schools and the B.A. degree in the universities have sharply increased over the years, support and concern for teacher education of all kinds, for the schools or for the colleges, has been comparatively negligible."

Among further recommendations of the Report are:

State Departments of Education, certification agencies and colleges of education should take the initiative in including foreign and domestic service in teaching and community development as favored elements in qualifying students for the teaching certificate.

That a network of connections between American and foreign institutions of teacher education be organized through initiatives by State Departments of Education, school systems, colleges and universities for the exchange of students, faculty members, research and curricular materials, as called for in the International Education Act and its proposed Center for Educational Cooperation.

That World Urban Teaching Centers be established on American campuses to which students and educators from foreign countries would come to work with their American counterparts on the educational problems of the world's cities, with the American urban community used as a laboratory for international work in educational and social change.

That the international educational programs of the State Department, AID and other Government agencies, including the Office of Overseas Schools, concentrate their efforts and budgets on the education of teachers, and that faculty members serving AID projects abroad take students of education with them for research and teaching experience in foreign countries.

That foreign students already in the United States and others recruited from abroad for that purpose be invited to act as student-teachers in American public schools and colleges, in an extension of the exchange Peace Corps idea to a national and international scale.

That the idea of the world as a campus be made central to the thinking and planning of American educators, and that practical programs reflecting this idea become a major concern of all those working on problems of teacher education.

That the creative arts of all cultures be brought directly into the curriculum of teacher education, through International Festivals of the Arts on American campuses and abroad, with student performers, poets, composers, painters, sculptors and others recruited for service in the communities and schools.

That wherever there are organizations and agencies with international connections and interests—the United Nations Association, UNICEF, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Science Foundation, AID, the Atomic Energy Commission, AACTE, and the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession—arrangements for specific projects in the education of teachers be built into existing programs.

That the test of a teacher and the award of a teaching certificate should be made to depend on his proven ability to enable students to learn the subjects he is teaching, and not on the completion of a series of academic and professional courses prescribed by the controlling agencies.

That new Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy degrees be developed in the Universities and colleges of education, through which returned Peace Corps volunteers and others with foreign experience and service can, without formal course requirements, build upon their previous experience.

(a) by studying in greater depth the foreign culture and region from which they have returned,

(b) by developing new curriculum materials based on the previous experience and present study and trying them out as interns in schools, and

(c) by studying local educational and community problems on a comparative basis with those encountered in service abroad.

That two and three year M.A. and Ph.D. degrees programs be developed in which one year is spent in study, teaching and community service abroad, with parallel studies, teaching and service on the home campus and its surrounding communities.

Other recommendations, more than forty in all, have to do with the revision of college curricula, international summer institutes in the United States and abroad, extensive collaboration with the Peace Corps, linking graduate research centers to teacher education, appointment of foreign teachers and scholars to the staff of State Departments and colleges of Education, extending the Junior Year Abroad to student-teachers, recruiting veterans of Vietnam for teaching preparation and later duties there and in Southeast Asia, developing new graduate programs with a component of foreign study and teaching, replacing former CIA subsidies to students by Government and foundation grants for student-initiated projects in international education.

Dr. Taylor, an internationally known educator, is the author of *On Education and Freedom, Art and the Intellect*, and was co-author and editor of *Essays in Teaching*, editor of *The Idea of a World University* by Michael Zweig, served in 1963 as director of a pilot project in a World College and, in 1965-66, was consultant in human rights to the late Adlai E. Stevenson and the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation. Before assuming the presidency of Sarah Lawrence College in 1945, a post he held for fourteen years, Dr. Taylor taught philosophy at the University of Wisconsin.

Crane Haussamen, former minister from the United States to UNESCO, served as research associate in the study; Miss Miriam Willey and Miss Clara Grossman as administrative and research assistants. Members of the Advisory Committee for the study were:

Harris Wofford, President, State University of New York at Old Westbury, and former Associate Director of the Peace Corps in charge of the Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Research.

Brian Urquhart, Office of the Secretary General of the United Nations.

Henry Steele Commager, Professor of American History, Amherst College.

Peter Gillingham, Executive Associate of Education and World Affairs, Counsel to the House of Representatives Task Force on the International Education Act.

Frank Hamblin, Academic Vice President, Northern Arizona University, and current Chairman, Committee on International Relations of The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Kenneth Barker, Dean, School of Education, University of Akron.

Frank H. Klassen, Associate Secretary of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in charge of International Relations.

Resolution Adopted by the Lions Club of Kearny, N.J.

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to inform all Members of this House that the Lions Club of Kearny, N.J., has adopted a resolution passed earlier by the board of governors of the Lions Club of New Jersey. Under unanimous consent I shall insert it following my remarks.

The Lions, who have done splendid work, are asking the Congress to set up a

National Eye Institute under the aegis of the National Institutes of Health.

I would like to announce my support of this worthy proposal, and I urge all Members to join with me in support of the establishment of such an Institute.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the Kearny Lions and, as a Lion myself, I am very proud to tell my colleagues that the principles of Lionism and the principles of Americanism are totally indistinguishable.

The resolution follows:

Whereas, The cardinal aim of Lionism is Sight Conservation and Aid to the blind; and Whereas, Blindness and disorders are increasing at an alarming rate; and

Whereas, Among other sight statistics it is estimated that 90,000,000 Americans have some ocular malfunction—that 12,000,000 school children need some form of eye care—that 1,000,000 Americans are functionally blind—and that 42,000 persons go blind each year; and

Whereas, Eight percent of all blindness is the result of diseases whose causes are unknown to science; and

Whereas, There is indicated a tremendous need for a vastly accelerated and intensified program of Eye Research so as to provide medical science with additional knowledge and tools to cope with visual disorders; and

Whereas, There is pending before the Congress of the United States a proposal to establish a separate National Eye Institute within the National Institutes of Health; and

Whereas, There is pending before the Congress of the United States a proposal to establish a separate National Eye Institute within the National Institutes of Health; and

Whereas, The establishment of the aforementioned National Eye Institute would make more funds available for Eye Research and would further provide the organizational means and the impetus for greater Eye Research Programs inuring to the benefit of all mankind; now therefore be it

Resolved, That we the Council of Governors of Multiple District No. 16, New Jersey, Lions International, in meeting assembled at New Brunswick, New Jersey this 29th day of January, 1968 enthusiastically endorse the proposal to establish a National Eye Institute within the National Institutes of Health; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Representative from New Jersey apprising them of the action taken by the Council of Governors representing approximately 12,000 Lions members in New Jersey and soliciting their support for the pending legislation.

LIONS INTERNATIONAL, MULTIPLE DISTRICT 16, NEW JERSEY
WILLIAM F. RINALDI, Secretary.

I hereby certify that the above Resolution was approved at a meeting of the Directors of the Palisades Park, Lions Club, Palisades Park, N.J.

Gradualism: Fuel of Wars

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the U.S. News & World Report, April 29, 1968, issue carries an excellent article describing the major points of the Republican coordinating committee paper, "Gradualism: Fuel of Wars."

Some of the Nation's top military experts serve on the committee that prepared this report. Included are two former

Secretaries of Defense, Neil H. McElroy and Thomas S. Gates, Jr.; two former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Nathan W. Twining and Adm. Arthur W. Radford; and Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, and many others.

Principal among the committee's criticisms of the military policy of the present administration, is the use of flexible response as a military concept. The committee report called flexible response, "a new open door policy for Soviets," and recommended several constructive policies to correct errors of the past.

These are primarily concerned with using sufficient force to meet any challenge, being prepared to crush all threats to peace with force, if required, and utilizing force to the fullest extent that the situation may demand.

The committee members concluded that flexible response and gradualism, as developed by the administration, exposed the country and the world to intolerable, but largely avoidable, risks. These doctrines are costly in lives and resources, and are perilous to our security and world peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the Extensions of Remarks at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

MILITARY EXPERTS TELL WHY "GRADUALISM" FAILED IN VIETNAM

(NOTE.—Why does victory seem out of reach in Vietnam?)

(Is it U.S. policy now to be deliberately satisfied with stalemate everywhere? What happened to the idea of fighting to win? In practical terms, exactly what has "gradualism" meant?)

(U.S. defense strategy has been closely examined by a panel of experts—the Republican Task Force on National Security. On the panel: two former Defense Secretaries, top military commanders with outstanding records.

(In the report are charges that the administration's policy has been "tragic" for the country, a failure that prolonged and escalated the war. Also expressed—a deep concern for the future.

(The judgment and experience of many of the nation's top military experts is reflected in the accompanying report on U.S. strategy. Its authors include the following: Neil H. McElroy, cochairman, Secretary of Defense, 1957-59; Thomas S. Gates, Jr., cochairman, Secretary of Defense, 1959-61; Wilfred J. McNeil, vice chairman, Assistant Secretary of Defense and Comptroller, 1949-59; Alfred M. Gruenther, Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, 1953-56; Nathan W. Twining, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1957-60; Arthur W. Radford, chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1953-57; Bernard A. Schriever, Commander, Air Force Systems Command, 1961-66; Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of U.S. Naval Operations, 1955-61; George H. Decker, Chief of Staff, United States Army, 1960-62; and Harry D. Felt, Commander in Chief in Pacific, 1958-64.

(The following is from the text of a Republican coordinating committee paper "Gradualism Fuel of Wars," released April 18, 1968.)

A military power strong enough to maintain the peace must follow four principles as old as warfare and diplomacy: It must maintain a force strong enough to meet any challenge; it must be prepared to crush all threats to the peace with force, if required;

it must clearly convince those who would disturb the peace that force will be used against them, and, once force is brought into play, it must be applied to the fullest extent the situation may demand.

Beginning in 1961, two related doctrines began to evolve, and in succeeding years have radically altered our nation's defense planning. One is a basic revision of an earlier concept known as "flexible response." The other was a singular stratagem called "gradualism."

Flexible response, in the current thinking, does not mean, as it has historically meant, the capability to respond to a variety of threats with applicable and sufficient force to crush it. It has come to designate, instead, a deliberate policy of reaction which induces stalemate.

Though separate doctrines conceptually, they have the same effect—to de-emphasize our strength, leash our power and replace our superiority with "parity," all in the euphoric hope that, through such demonstrations of peaceful purpose and restraint, America would entice her sworn enemies away from aggression and subversion and into the pathways of peace.

However well intended, these departures have been tragic for America. Prudent firmness was displaced by extreme caution, then hesitancy, then indecisiveness. Unchallengeable power was eroded by the fact or appearance of a wavering will. Our tested guardians of peace—manifest strength and determination—have lost credibility throughout the world.

And so, two doctrines—the revised flexible response and gradualism—have grievously disserved the United States. They have fostered aggression. They have prolonged and escalated a war, undermined our alliances, divided the nation and stripped our reserves to the bone.

As doctrines of response, not of initiative, they have created a worldwide crisis of confidence in United States deterrence. In place of peace they have spawned the very evils they were conceived to banish—war and escalation of war.

Flexible response, a traditional military concept, is neither complex nor objectionable. It prescribes the maintenance of military forces capable of containing all levels of aggression from guerrilla actions to unlimited war. For many years the armed forces of the United States adhered to this doctrine.

In very recent years a deadly new definition has been introduced transforming flexible response from an instrument for peace into a trigger of wars. As revised by the present Administration, flexible response means to an aggressor that his military excursions will initially encounter only comparable force.

Thus war is invited as aggressors measure attractive options—freedom to choose the time, the place and the means of doing battle, all with an acceptable risk. Assured that America's crushing force will be dribbled into battle, the military marauder is encouraged to believe that even a protracted conflict will be pursued on his terms. It is this new application of flexible response that is conveyed when the expression appears in this paper.

As the new version of flexible response invites war, so gradualism escalates war once begun.

Ironically, gradualism—designed to prevent intensification of war—does the very opposite by preventing timely use of force against aggression. While flexible response blunts our first reactions, gradualism assures the aggressor that our subsequent reactions will also be cautiously phased to prevent overapplication of force. Skillfully and patiently applied, the process can hardly fail to nourish a skirmish into a major war.

HOW PAUSES IN WAR AID ENEMY

Moreover, after each carefully restrained escalation, gradualism dictates a pause. This ingenious stratagem is, in effect, a one-sided military recess during which the enemy is

importuned to recalculate his risks and contritely review his indiscretions as his own depredations continue. The pause, occurring when the aggressor's force has been at least temporarily stalemated by our military effort, actually enables the enemy to recoup his strength at his most vulnerable moment. Thus rejuvenated by successive pauses, the struggle continues and intensifies.

America's laboratory for testing the gradualism experiment has been Vietnam. There it has failed—it has prolonged and escalated the war.

It has permitted North Vietnam to acquire the weapons, supplies and training from the Soviet Union and Communist China needed to maintain and expand its war-making capability and to withstand punishing attacks. It has preserved the sanctuaries in which the Communists can safely regroup and reinforce. It has long delayed interdiction of the flow of supplies to the South. It has denied our own military the strength and decisiveness the circumstances have required.

So completely has the Administration applied this policy of gradualism that tactical military decisions have been often made by civilians 9,000 miles away in Washington.

Even advance warnings to the enemy of U.S. steps to augment her forces or otherwise strengthen her military position have characterized gradualism in Vietnam. The professed object of this surprising tactic has been to prevent "overreaction" by the enemy or his allies. One result, however, is clear: The enemy has been allowed to phase his buildup with our own.

Thus, gradualism has salvaged the enemy's warmaking capacity, enabling the tiny nation of North Vietnam to develop a major capability to sustain aggression in the South, and to obtain massive assistance from the Soviet Union and Red China to offset U.S. pressure from land, sea and air. America's overwhelming power has been fended off, not by the enemy, but by our own hand. We have escalated, through gradualism, a minor engagement into our fourth-largest war.

The shackling of our Air Force and naval air power in Vietnam affords us a striking exhibition of gradualism in action.

In our system it is axiomatic that the highest civilian level of Government must establish broad policies to govern the general direction in which our nation is to move. An obsession with preventing escalation of the air war in Vietnam, however, has led the Administration to transfer approval of attacks on specific targets from field commanders and even the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the President himself.

Operational decisions reached far away in Washington have prevented some attacks altogether, and in other instances have been so delayed as to forfeit precious military advantage. Certain targets unanimously recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff two years ago have but recently been placed on the approved lists.

During this long interval between target recommendations and approval, the enemy vastly strengthened his ability to withstand U.S. pressure from the air. He scattered his targets. Many of his vital operations were moved underground. With Soviet assistance he multiplied his air defenses.

In the 18 months prior to August, 1967, the number of antiaircraft guns deployed in North Vietnam increased more than 250 per cent. Surface-to-air missile (SA-2) sites more than doubled. Radar early-warning capability tripled, and radar fire-control capability increased at an even faster rate. U.S. losses in pilots and equipment soared.

Surveying this appalling sequence, the Military Preparedness Subcommittee of the United States reported on Aug. 31, 1967: "It is not our intention to point a finger or to second-guess those who determine this policy, but the cold fact is that this policy has not done the job, and it has been contrary to military judgment."

A similar sequence has marked the pros-

ecution of the ground actions of this solicitously directed war. As in the application of air power, "too little, too late" has been the pattern dictated by gradualism, with consequent terrible cost to us and the stricken people of Vietnam.

For many months, the military leadership vainly pressed the Administration for a substantial increase of ground forces for Vietnam....

Gradualism has restrained us from applying enough pressure, in adequate time, to convince the enemy of the futility of his effort. Restraints, imposed not by the enemy but by ourselves, have made it possible for him to carry forward an aggression with a growing expectation of at least partial success.

This conduct of our efforts in Vietnam has been bitterly disappointing both militarily and politically and has imposed immense costs upon the American people.

The war has already caused over 100,000 U.S. casualties, consumed some 50 billions of dollars, gravely impaired our international relationships and sharply divided the American people. Continued adherence to this doctrine promises not only more disappointments, but also an escalating risk of world war. The newly revised doctrine of flexible response is not regional in scope. Its injury to our nation's vital interests has been worldwide.

DAMAGE TO ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

Announcement of adoption by NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) of the Administration's version of flexible response was made as recently as December, 1967, but U.S. acceptance of this doctrine in the early '60s left NATO no alternative. Now, Soviet Communism in Eastern Europe can reasonably conclude from U.S. and NATO policy that military response to a thrust from the east would be initially opposed only with commensurate force.

For NATO, however, conventional response to a major conventional military thrust would be unrealistic. NATO military strategists are acutely aware of this. The huge conventional forces of East European Communism, coupled with the political realities of the region, suggest that the new doctrine of flexible response may gravely menace all of Europe.

Before this basic strategic revision, the NATO security design had given full consideration to conventional responses to acts of aggression short of major war. However, it was universally recognized and stressed that this capability had severe limitations. For the enemy who pushed the Alliance beyond these limits, such force as necessary would be swiftly applied. That this force might not materialize was never contemplated. Because it was known to all that the NATO nations had not only the capability but also the will to repel aggression, peace was preserved.

The doctrine of flexible response as now incorporated into NATO planning would seem to dictate initial reliance on conventional defense—a doctrine conceding the loss of forward areas early in any conflict. Then, with enemy forces occupying Allied territory, our own military options would become critically restricted. Expecting an enemy to desist following his initial success is at best a deadly gamble, and at worst inviting defeat.

NEW OPEN DOOR POLICY: FOR SOVIETS

For the new flexible response to become credible for Western Europe, a major increase of conventional forces would be required—an increase so great as to be economically and politically impracticable. We view the incorporation of this new doctrine into NATO security planning as a new Open Door policy—for Soviet Communism.

Shortly after this new doctrine was enunciated, former Chancellor Adenauer (of West Germany) expressed concern that it would weaken NATO and cause fragmentation of the Alliance. His assessment has since been borne out.

Thus, in but a brief span of years the new defense doctrine, flexible response, has gravely weakened the West's long-established objective of presenting any aggressor in Europe with unacceptable risks.

In contrast to the Administration's premises, we are convinced that these judgments must underpin America's security policy:

(1) Our defense posture must confront an enemy with a clearly unacceptable risk; otherwise it invites political opportunism and aggression.

(2) Our policies in the course of a conflict must not allow an enemy to control the level and nature of the U.S. military response, or allow him to disengage at will; otherwise they invite a continuing escalation of the conflict.

(3) Our policies must not publicly proclaim that America will withhold any element of her might to prevent or repel aggression; otherwise they strip this nation of those military and diplomatic options indispensable to the attainment of her national goals, the success of her foreign policies and her influence for peace.

These criticisms of the current doctrines in no way diminish our concern for safeguarding against irresponsibility in the use of military force. In a world of nuclear peril, application of direct military force must always be a last resort. Rather, we are convinced that an intensive re-examination of this country's national-security policies is long overdue. A reappraisal of our strategic policies for countering aggression has become critical in the light of our mismanagement of the Vietnam conflict and the thrust of events elsewhere in the world.

It is recognized that certain types of conflict are not susceptible to solution by military power alone. This paper cannot properly be read as embracing the proposition that a military solution to the situation in Vietnam should have been undertaken at its inception six years ago. It should also be noted that the paper does not attempt in any way to treat the exceedingly complicated military-diplomatic issue of whether or not this war, having been so grievously mismanaged, can now reach a military solution lacking very major escalations evidently not now contemplated by the Administration.

There is urgent need to establish a credibility with the world at large—indeed, with our own people—that the U.S. does have the determination, and does have the will, to use its strength to restore and keep the peace.

The Administration's beguiling formulation for these new doctrines of flexible response and gradualism conceals a perilous unreality. Offered in the name of prudence and humanitarianism, in application these doctrines are breeders of war and killers of men. . . .

Once this nation resorts to arms to stem aggression, force should be applied quickly and decisively to bring the conflict swiftly to an end. The longer a conflict is indulged, the greater the likelihood of its escalation and expansion, and the greater its casualties and destruction. And once America is committed to military action, we must no longer merely respond; we must achieve and maintain the initiative.

In view of the current tensions and instability of world affairs, America can little afford to forearm potential aggressors with the assurance that she is unlikely to use any element of her power against them. Where our vital interests are at stake, meddlers and brigands must know that the risks they face are unacceptable.

Looking to the future, there remains a probability of conflicts in other parts of the world. Communism is still enamored of fomenting "wars of national liberation."

Communist forces are actively probing in the Middle East, Africa and South America, as well as Asia, undermining the established orders and relentlessly striving to extend

their influence. The thrust of their effort is still to weaken U.S. and free-world positions in international affairs. Many areas under increasing pressure in recent months are vital to the interests of the United States and the West, as well as to indigenous forces of freedom.

America has neither the aspiration nor the resources to serve as policeman of the world. Yet, realities of geography, ideology, and international politics dictate that this nation's vital interests project far beyond her shores. We must maintain these interests, and we must defend them. Policies and a posture which unmistakably show this nation's determination to protect these interests will discourage nibbling aggression and reduce the number of U.S. physical involvements. Such policies, and such a posture, do not exist today.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

The doctrines of flexible response and gradualism as developed by this Administration expose this nation and the world to intolerable, largely avoidable risks. They impose terrible costs in lives and resources. They are incompatible with the security of the United States and perilous to world peace.

Our country should announce at the highest level the resumption of a national-security policy that the size of our response to aggression will be our own decision tailored to each situation as it arises. A potential enemy will be denied the assurance he has appeared to have under the gradualism policy of a moderate and limited price in response to aggression. At the same time, we will continue to have the leeway to make our response as moderate or as potent as we consider appropriate.

Government Spending the True Cause of Our Current Inflation

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the April 16, 1968, issue of the Journal of Commerce contains an editorial on the subject of inflation that is most pertinent to discussions currently going on in the Congress.

The basic point made by the editorial is that the reasons for the current growing rate of inflation will not be cured by a tax increase alone. The real cause of the trouble is massive Government spending. If a tax increase could indeed be seen as going to reduce the deficit caused by this spending, I believe the Congress would immediately respond. But the fear of many of us is that any additional revenues that might be produced by a tax increase would merely lead to increased Government spending. This in turn would push the rate of inflation even higher.

To give us confidence that it really means to put its fiscal house in order, the administration must make a clear-cut public commitment to reduce current spending levels. Until that occurs, opposition to a tax increase will remain strong.

For the valid points this editorial makes, I commend it to your attention, as follows:

THE SILENT TREATMENT

Those who are saying that U.S. spending is going to remain high for at least a year,

regardless of whatever settlement Washington may be able to negotiate with Hanoi, are right. It may be possible to avoid significant increases in defense outlays, but there is so much already committed that little chance remains of making substantial cuts in overseas expenditures for a year and perhaps for the better part of two.

But those who use this in support of arguments that the House must pass and the President approve the 10 per cent tax surcharge increase voted by the Senate are still on dubious ground.

Inflation is certainly with us and its steady spread strikes many as providing solid reasons for raising income taxes. Still, it didn't get here all by itself. It was ushered in by a combination of administration policies. These won't be corrected by a tax increase alone. Not for a minute.

When the government spends consistently more than it takes in and finances the shortfall by borrowing and by increasing the money supply, it is natural that the consequences are inflationary, as pointed out last week by Virginia Polytechnic Institute's Prof. Paul C. Roberts.

To argue, however, that because inflation of itself is a threat to the nation's economic stability is not necessarily to present a convincing case for higher taxes. Why take the point of view that it is inflation alone that has made higher taxes imperative? Why not admit the truth of the matter: namely, that massive spending on all sorts of old and new programs, social welfare in particular, is the cause of the real trouble? Too many people who should know better are giving this question the silent treatment.

The answer, we think is clear. If it is only to fight inflation that a tax increase is considered necessary, opposition to the latter will melt, as indeed it has in a great many quarters.

But what would the public reaction be if the questions were put like this: Are you willing to pay substantially heavier taxes to maintain existing welfare programs and make way for new ones? If offered the alternative two years ago, together with a warning that spending at this rate would certainly create inflationary conditions (and thereby bring closer the imminence of tax boost), would you have approved the administration's choice or disapproved of it with this foreknowledge?

We have said before that the principal basis of our opposition to the income tax increase is economic and have done our best to explain why we feel as we do.

The considerations raised by Professor Roberts are more political, but they are important, too. If a government, equipped with a formidable array of new economic thought, can force the nation into an inflationary situation by borrowing heavily to finance war and the Great Society simultaneously, then it really seldom need go back to the people and ask whether they approve of its measures or not. Taxes can be forced steadily upward (always disguised as means of combating inflation) and the higher revenues can be used to finance still more social programs.

They can, that is, if tax revenues actually do prove higher (there is a good case to be made for the likelihood they won't, and may even drift lower, along with trends in business activity). After all, if the effect of 1964's tax cuts was to increase revenues through a vigorous stimulation of production, who can be so confident that an increase now wouldn't accomplish the very opposite of what the administration seems to expect of it?

If there were today any real grounds for confidence that a tax increase this year would mark the limits of the distance Congress is willing to go in this direction, and that it would be followed by a return to something approaching fiscal prudence in Washington, that would be one thing. It might almost make the game worth the candle.

But the growing talk of massive new outlays in the cities, together with the govern-

ment's stubborn refusal to drop such redundant older programs as rural electrification (long since completed) indicate to us nothing more pleasant than the prospect of more of the same—more new programs, more borrowing, more boosts in the money supply, more inflation and, in consequence, more pressure for more tax increases.

It is true that Mr. Johnson can stand pretty well aside from these basic pressures now. While he has one more budget to prepare, its implementation will actually be the responsibility of his successor, who can change it. But Messrs. Humphrey, Nixon, Kennedy, probably Rockefeller and McCarthy ought to have something to say about them, especially now that Vietnam is receding as an American political issue. How long can so many so-called leaders of the nation's two great political parties go on pretending that one of the most urgent issues facing the American people is either secondary or simply doesn't exist?

**Employ the Handicapped: Essay by
Karen L. Caprai, Boise, Idaho**

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we all know of the important work being done by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, which will be meeting in Washington next week. Working with all segments of our society, the Committee undertakes the important task of enlisting public and private groups in a year-round program to promote the employment of physically and mentally handicapped workers.

To emphasize the importance of its work, the Committee each year sponsors the "ability counts" essay contest. Idaho's entry in this year's national competition is an excellent essay written by Miss Karen L. Caprai, a student at Boise High School. Karen's essay calls attention to the handicapped who are successfully employed in Idaho's capital city.

Not only was Karen's essay judged to be the best in Idaho, but I am pleased to report that it was named to share honors for fifth place in the national competition.

In order that all Senators may have a chance to read this excellent essay, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CHALLENGE OF EMPLOYMENT BARRIERS TO THE HANDICAPPED: A COMMUNITY SURVEY

(By Karen L. Caprai, Boise High School, Boise, Idaho)

The bell atop the old country school rings merrily, announcing the beginning of class. In the seventh grade classroom, the teacher (who also happens to double as school principal) sits behind his enormous wooden desk, tolling over a mountain of papers. When the last student is finally seated, he leaves his work and starts the class off with a cheery remark. Then it's down to business, a full day's curriculum ahead. The students all think he's great. He is more than a teacher,

he is a friend! He gladly spends any free time he has teaching his students art crafts. He also coaches the school baseball, football, and basketball teams; and usually finds a free Saturday every now and then to take some of the boys fishing.

In a nearby high school, a biology teacher sits at a lab table peering into a microscope. Looking around the room, you will see shelves of sparkling test tubes, row upon row of scientific data, and several experiments in the making. A very interesting room, and an even more interesting teacher—the kind of teacher who can keep a class of students enthralled in a subject well known as being boring. He is a fine man, with a cup of coffee and a warm smile for everyone.

In other parts of the city—a television announcer sits in front of a huge camera preparing for his daily news broadcast. At the cameraman's signal, he greets his television audience with a cheerful smile and the latest breaking news. An architect sits in front of his drawing board carefully sketching plans for a new office building. He is a man well known in our community for his original, artistic designs. A female artist adds the final touches to a painting. This woman's artwork is viewed by many people. She's the art director for the State Employment Agency.

After reading about the above people, I am sure you would agree they are all quite outstanding. However, one more thing about them makes their accomplishments even greater. Our country school teacher walks with crutches because of childhood muscular disease. The biology teacher has an arm missing. The television announcer is a polio victim. The architect and the artist are both confined to a wheelchair, the architect having lost his legs in the war and the artist's legs were paralyzed in an automobile accident.

Although these people now hold excellent jobs, they, like thousands of other handicapped persons, had several employment barriers to overcome before gaining their desired professions or jobs.

Prejudice is usually the most difficult and disheartening barrier confronting the handicapped person. Prejudices formed by people who are afraid of something or someone that is different. They look at only the person's disability and not his abilities. The architect, for example, can handle his job skillfully because the use of the legs is not required. Some employers, however, would think someone confined to a wheelchair could not handle such a job, although the architect has proven they can.

The handicapped person may even have some doubts about his own ability. He must gain confidence in himself if he wants someone else to have confidence in him. He must learn to use his abilities to overcome his disability. The country school teacher did not let his disability get him down. With the aid of the Vocational Rehabilitation Center and wages earned repairing watches in a jewelry store, he made his way through college. This teacher was Idaho's Handicapped Person for 1966.

The handicapped employee also has to overcome construction barriers. Our country school teacher had quite some time getting up the steps of the school. This, however, was soon remedied. He had a ramp built that he can easily get up and down. Wheelchair employees have difficulty in the use of such facilities as telephone booths which are out of reach, and with doors that are too narrow. Special arrangements can usually be made quite easily so that these people can have access to facilities that we take for granted.

The handicapped person, as you have seen, is faced with many employment barriers, but as these people, and thousands more like them, have proven—these barriers can be surpassed!

What Is a Volunteer Fireman?

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the volunteer fireman is one of the most important public servants in the Nation. Through his unselfish efforts millions of dollars worth of property is prevented from destruction each year and countless lives are saved. The volunteer fireman is the unsung hero of our Nation.

A very fine editorial appeared in the April 11, 1968, edition of the News-Herald, Morganton, N.C., entitled "What's a Volunteer Fireman?" I believe the editorial will be of interest to everyone who shares my appreciation for the fine work that these unselfish Americans are performing 24 hours a day each day in the year. I insert the editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS A VOLUNTEER FIREMAN?

As have many others, we have wondered often what makes a volunteer fireman tick.

What sense of selfless service causes a man to make himself available at all hours to go to the rescue of life and property in a frequently thankless task of fighting fires?

This and other questions serve only to heighten gratitude the public should hold for volunteer firemen.

It remained for a chief of a volunteer fire department in Guilford County to answer our question and to explain something of the difficulties which a volunteer encounters in filling his role.

It's so good that we pass along these extracts:

What makes a volunteer fireman get up in the middle of the night or the wee hours of the morning, and go fight a fire realizing that he must put in a long hard day on his job tomorrow?

What makes him endure the stinging criticism for not getting there sooner—when maybe one of the city's newest fire engines could not have gotten there any earlier? However, if he is more hasty he may find himself facing a stiff fine for speeding. These are very difficult to pay indeed when first of all he is not receiving one cent for his services. These speeding tickets go over great when he gets home and tells the "little woman" what has happened.

To add to his troubles, she has already been trying to get her man to stop this foolishness. However, I wonder if the invalid that he has just rescued from a burning building thought what he was doing was just a lot of bunk.

To top it all, he pays just as much "fire tax" as anyone else. He goes to the grocery store on Friday and takes Johnny to the dentist. On his way home he stops by the drug store and gets a prescription filled for his daughter who is sick. All these bills run just as high for him as anyone else.

Tonight is also his night to sleep at the fire house. So in the event of a fire his department will be able to respond instantly. However, when he arrives on the scene he hears that age old cry. "I called you thirty minutes ago." However, the truth finally comes to light. The property owner didn't know how to call the fire department so he ran out in the front yard and began to shout "my house is on fire." His cry was heard by a neighbor but he doesn't call the fire department. He calls the telephone operator. Many precious minutes are lost in this fashion. So—the firemen are blamed for it all.

Not being a fainthearted man, our fireman sighs and thinks about tomorrow and smiles to himself. For tomorrow is Saturday and he has plans to take his young son, Johnny, hunting. Although, what he doesn't realize is that all his neighbors are going to be at home tomorrow, too. Many of them have planned to burn off their garden or leaves in their yard. Early Saturday morning our fireman and his son are just about to get into the car and be on their merry way, when the fire house siren sounds.

Being truly a servant of others, he drops everything and rushes to the fire station. He learns that Mr. X who lives in the community, set a pile of leaves on fire and went back into the house. Now this pile of leaves has ignited about 15 acres of woodland. No hunting today, for this will take about three hours of hard labor to extinguish Mr. X's pile of leaves.

Yes, friend, this is the type individual you are criticizing when you criticize a volunteer fireman.

I believe that our volunteer fireman became a volunteer because of his concern for the safety of his friends, neighbors and loved ones.

He became what he is because he realizes that criticism never changed anything. Only by hard work can things be improved.

Our volunteer became a volunteer fireman because he realized his community must have protection. Not being one to shirk responsibility he joined the fire department in his respective community. I believe the thing that makes him tick is the satisfaction of helping others. The old proverb of placing others above self is a reality with him.

Why Celebrate Illinois' Sesquicentennial?

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article entitled "Why Celebrate Illinois' Sesquicentennial?" written by Ralph G. Newman, chairman of the Illinois Sesquicentennial Commission, and published in Illinois Public Official for March 1968.

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

WHY CELEBRATE ILLINOIS' SESQUICENTENNIAL?
(By Ralph G. Newman, chairman, Illinois Sesquicentennial Commission)

Why celebrate Illinois' Sesquicentennial? A good question—it deserves a thoughtful answer. How about the one the explorer gave for scaling Mount Everest: "Because it's there." Excepting that in the case of Illinois' 150th birthday, one had better say "Because it's here."

It is here—a party a "year long and a state wide," as Governor Otto Kerner has so aptly said. Actually the Jubilee State in '68 will celebrate more than 1,500 birthday parties from Chicago to Cairo, from Galena to Shawneetown, with special fetes in Springfield, Vandalia, Nauvoo and Carbondale, among hundreds of others. And, guests from everywhere in the world will be made truly welcome.

Even though Illinois contains only a tiny bit of the world's real estate, it has given more than its share of ideas that have made for progress and enriched civilization.

Illinois, at the 150-year landmark, can look back at a proud past, a dynamic present and a promising future.

CITES STATE'S HERITAGE

The heritage of Illinois includes the gift of Abraham Lincoln to the nation, of Jane Addams, of Carl Sandburg, and of Adlai Stevenson. It includes great scientists and industrialists who gave us the steel plow and the harvester, radio and television, and the men who measured the speed of light, Michelson and Morley.

Illinois gave the world great architects who invented the skyscraper and produced other innovations in building that are copied all over the world; medical scientists who vastly lengthened the human life span; pioneers in physics who first split the atom and now have developed the peaceful uses for nuclear energy to their greatest promise in Illinois. The vast development of railroads in Illinois made it the crossroads of the nation and Chicago the hub of the continent. And now, in the air age, O'Hare International Airport has become the busiest airport in the nation—and the world.

These are only a few of the great achievements in Illinois. But, they opened the door to the great NOW—the present in Illinois! A magnificent record! Illinois is the greatest state in agriculture and exports. It is an Empire by an inland sea. It is the center of population in the United States! It is the heartland of America.

POETIC QUOTES NOTED

The late Donald Culross Peattie, a native who, however, spent most of his adult life in California, called it "The best State of the Fifty." Why? "Illinois is the best State precisely because it is so American—Illinois is core America—it is American in its unappreciated beauty of plainness—something that Thoreau would have understood, perhaps, something that the three poets of the State who really sound to me like Illinois, give voice to—Sandburg, all of the time; Vachel Lindsay, sometimes; and, Edgar Lee Masters in "Spoon River Anthology."—Illinois is beautiful, it seems to me, as only a great fertile plain can be beautiful."

A fertile plain, if you wish, but still a State of great hustle and bustle. Chicago may well be the most dynamic of American cities, as it bursts its seams and great new towers rise to the skies. It is rapidly developing the most beautiful waterfront in the world.

EDUCATION NOW ESTABLISHED

Only a few years ago it suffered from a brain drain—to the east and west coasts. That trend seems now to have been reversed with the tremendous growth and expansion of education in Illinois, especially at the level of advanced study and research—in all the great universities of the State: Chicago, Northwestern, Illinois, Southern Illinois, Northern Illinois, Eastern Illinois, and many others. Everywhere town and gown are working together to give Illinois a fuller, richer life. Marvin Camras developed the wire recorder at Armour Research Foundation; Enrico Fermi led the team of nuclear physicists to the first self-sustained nuclear reaction; Charles B. Huggins won the 1966 Nobel Prize in medicine. Only recently, Illinois won the great nuclear prize—the greatest of all atom smashers—to be built at Weston.

George W. Beadle, University of Chicago President and Nobel-prize winning geneticist, (Nobel winners from the University number 25) puts it this way: "Chicagoland is home to a great many Universities. They all contribute to a climate in which research and development activities can thrive."

PROGRESS DEMONSTRATED

Research and development opens the door to industry and manufacture. More and more businesses are finding homes—good new homes in Illinois. There's the gigantic new Chrysler Plant at Belvidere. Bell Telephone Laboratories has built the new Indian Hill Center for some 1,200 scientists and engineers at Naperville. Bell is also building a big new technical center at Lisle. Jones and

Laughlin Steel Company has built a great new 150 Million Dollar steel plant at Hennepin on the Illinois River. Republic Steel Company has announced a new \$35,000,000 expansion program in East Chicago, Indiana, Caterpillar Tractor, at Peoria, and John Deere Company become ever greater giants. The First National Bank and the John Hancock Center rise majestically skyward—Chicago's tallest structures. Hancock will be a 100-story tower, topped by the City's TV antennae.

A new 30-story \$40,000,000 Mies Van der Rohe designed structure is to rise at Wacker Drive, east of Michigan Avenue. This will give added beauty to Michigan Avenue, which rapidly is becoming one of the great streets of the world, comparable to the Champs Elysees, Fifth Avenue, and Wilshire Boulevard. The Civic Center in Chicago now boasts the new Picasso.

ATTRACTIONS FOR TOURISTS

Illinois is a great place to visit. Tourism is a Two Billion Dollar business annually in the State. Springfield is the City that has the greatest attraction for foreign visitors, especially those from the underdeveloped nations, because of its Lincoln heritage. The beauty of Galena, New Salem, the Threshermen's Reunion at Pontiac, the magnolias of Cairo, the Shawnee National Forest, the Art Institute of Chicago, the Crab Orchard Wild Life Refuge—all are places of great attraction that come to mind. There are hundreds of others. The National Campers and Hikers Association is holding its national convention at DuQuoin, from July 15th to 18th. Some 35,000 persons are coming.

Doesn't this suggest that Illinois is going to be the place to come to in 1968? For great things are happening in Illinois! So, make a date and celebrate with this great State in '68.

Anniversary in Greece

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an especially timely and succulent editorial in yesterday's Washington Evening Star dealt with recent developments in Greece. In view of the barrage of criticism to which the Greek Government has been subjected over the last year, this editorial on the anniversary of the Greek Army coup merits attention.

The editorial follows:

ANNIVERSARY IN GREECE

Melina Mercouri, the sexy far-left movie actress, tried to stir things up in London. But the first anniversary of the Greek army coup—coinciding with the Orthodox Easter—was marked in Athens with complete quiet, if not indifference.

The fact seems to be that the people of Greece do not feel terribly upset by the military junta now ruling them. The junta, headed by Premier George Papadopoulos, still holds over 2,000 persons in prison or under house arrest, but the International Red Cross—which has looked into the situation—has absolved it of charges of cruelty. The charges have been made by absentee Greeks like Miss Mercouri, but they appear to amount to little more than propaganda.

It is noteworthy, in any case, that the Greeks—a volatile and voluble people—have reacted to both Easter and the coup anniversary with a degree of calm suggesting that they may not be unhappy with the absence of their old political pandemonium. The Papadopoulos junta has established order in place of the chaos threatened under the free-wheel-

ing politics of the ousted—and sinister—80-year-old Premier George Papandreou. What is promised now is a national referendum on a new constitution designed to guarantee all the basic freedoms for Greece, the great historic birthplace of democracy.

The Greek leftists are doing their best to discredit the referendum before it is held—a characteristic Communist tactic. After it takes place, however, Greece itself should be the stronger for it.

Trend Toward Huge Farms and Declining Rural Opportunity

HON. GEORGE MCGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an excellent article by Farm Editor Don Muhm, published in the Des Moines Register, reporting the acquisition of 10,000 acres of land in three counties in that State by a single farm operator.

The article is not only a striking illustration of the trend toward huge farming operations, and the elimination of family agriculture, it is an unusually competent job of reporting by Mr. Muhm, who has developed factually, in a news story, the effect of this type of agricultural trend on rural communities.

Mr. Muhm has interviewed bankers and merchants in the communities involved, who see in the huge semitrailers hauling in large cargoes of fertilizer a decline in business and banking volume for their towns. Muhm reports the decline in farm population in one of the counties—Wayne County, Iowa—which has already occurred, from 5,757 in 1947 to 3,528 today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Muhm's article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

MISSOURIAN BUYS 10,000 ACRES OF IOWA LAND—BIG LAND BUYER PAYS \$100 TO \$400 AN ACRE

(By Don Muhm)

HUMESTON, IOWA.—A new concern about farming and its future exists in this southern Iowa community following the purchases of about 10,000 acres of land by a Missouri man.

The purchases actually began a couple of years ago with transactions involving about 1,800 acres.

But then last fall, in mid-October, a one-man buying wave began that resulted in the purchase of 13 farms through one Humeston farm realtor by the Missourian.

While there is no exact figure available as to how much land was actually bought, or how much was paid, one reliable report indicated that the Missourian bought at least \$1 million worth of land from one farm realtor alone.

There's talk about the "big land buyer" along the main street of this Wayne County town of about 638 persons.

And there's talk in the country, where the farmers usually worry more about weather, commodity prices and machinery costs.

Included in these conversations are comments about "corporate farms," the decline in farm numbers and farm population and the average age of farmers.

Little is known locally about the buyer. But land sale records at the courthouses in three counties—Wayne, Decatur and Lucas—list his name as Adrian Craigmiles of Rich Hill, Mo.

Craigmiles has both banking interests. He is young (41 years old) and was once named Farmer of the Year in Bates County, Mo., by the Farm Bureau.

It is believed that his many recent farm real estate purchases make him the owner of the largest amount of Iowa land owned by any one individual.

Estimates currently indicate that he owns about 4,000 more acres than is involved in Iowa's most famous 6,000-acre operation near Odebolt in Sac County, now known as Shinrone Farms. Until recently it was the Lakin Ranch and before that was the Adams Ranch.

The chief difference between the Odebolt "ranch" and the Craigmiles property is that the Odebolt property is in one tract, while the Missourian's land is scattered across three counties of southern Iowa.

Folks here in general express concern about the future, and wonder about the things taking place in their farming community.

Many know that there has been a substantial migration away from the land during the past 20 years. In 1947, there were 1,829 farms in Wayne County; today, there are about 645 fewer farms in that county.

In other words, there has been an average of 30 farm families leaving the land annually in Wayne County during the past two decades.

The farm population in Wayne County was 5,757 in 1947; today it is 3,528.

Wayne County is not unique in the loss of farms and farm population. Annually anywhere from 3,000 to 5,000 farm families in Iowa call it quits for various reasons and leave the land.

Into this out-migration picture last fall entered the Missouri buyer.

The sale of this large amount of land brings forth ready comments from Humeston citizens.

"This is pretty tough competition for the young farmer who has a hard time picking up land anyway," said Lester Ragan, Humeston implement dealer.

"Besides, people are leaving the farm fast enough because of low farm income without someone coming in and trying to monopolize the land."

Two bank officers in Humeston also commented on the purchases:

"This won't do either the town or the bank much good," said Glen Greenlee of the Citizens State Bank.

"We're afraid that all of the buying of supply items will be done centrally, and that our local merchants will be left out," said A. E. Jennison, also an officer in the Humeston bank.

"They've got semi-trucks coming in here loaded with fertilizer," said one businessman who declined to be identified. "I question whether this guy will buy anything locally."

The first man to sell his farm to the Missouri buyer last October was Daryl Carter, 57, of Humeston. Carter's 320-acre farm had been listed for sale for two years, according to M. F. Latham, Humeston realtor.

"I didn't have any idea of what was going to follow," said Carter.

He had planned, however, to spend more time in a seed corn and insurance business that he had developed. Also he and his wife plan to build a new home in Humeston.

Carter had farmed the 320-acre unit for 37 years, raising crops and livestock.

Latham, the farm realtor, provided information about the Carter farm sale as well as 12 other sales made to the Missourian. Latham operates Agri-Business Associates, which specializes in farm real estate and farm management pursuits.

Here is Latham's own schedule beginning Oct. 9:

320-acre farm sold by Daryl Carter of Humeston.

360-acre farm sold by Warren Exley of Humeston, who plans to curtail his farming efforts and will operate about 280 acres he has left.

240-acre farm sold by Harold Rood, who is thinking about retiring from the farm and may live in Humeston.

900-acre farm sold by Charles Shivers of Corydon, a farmer and farm inventor.

167-acre farm owned by Roy Johnson, an absentee landlord from Corwith in north central Iowa.

720 acres in two farms sold by James Woosley of Garden Grove, a former Illinois farmer who has rented back the land and who will act as a farm manager for the Missouri owner.

940-acre farm owned by Eric Olson of Garden Grove who, according to Latham, is thinking about retirement.

160-acre farm owned by L. C. Cantwell, a former career military man who lives near Garden Grove but now lives in California.

934-acre farm (in Lucas County) owned by Balley Bros. of Leeton, Mo.

760-acre farm in Decatur County owned by Paul J. Kelly of Britt and his brother, Joseph R. Kelly.

140-acre farm owned by Vernon Marks of Lucas.

150-acre farm owned by Boyce Estate of Humeston.

In total these 13 farms amount to nearly 6,000 acres of land—or about the same size as Shinrone Farms at Odebolt.

Other realtors sold about 4,000 acres of land in this area to Craigmiles.

The purchases from one realtor alone amounted to about \$1 million worth of Iowa farm land.

Latham said that the land was purchased on a contract basis, with 25 per cent of the purchase price paid at the time of the transaction and the balance to be paid over a 10-year period.

Latham said that the farm land sold in a range of from \$100 to \$400 an acre.

By comparison, the Iowa State University annual survey of land prices indicated that in November, 1967, the average price of "southern pasture land" was \$244 an acre, up \$19 an acre from price levels of a year earlier.

The Missouri buyer bought all kinds of land—flat row crop fields and rough, hilly ground, pasture land and wooded land.

Virtually all of the land is being farmed by tenants. One of the tenants is James Woosley, 34, who also is acting as farm manager.

Woosley sold 720 acres to the Missourian, as well as 375 acres to another family. He and his brother, William, 29, will conduct a farming operation on a total of 3,700 acres.

They will have the aid of one farm employe, Gary Thomas, and part-time help during the busy seasons.

The Woosleys originally farmed in Illinois.

"This is good land in here," said James Woosley. "It responds good to fertilizer. If you take care of it, it's going to give you a good return."

"I think a lot of people have been selling southern Iowa short."

One of the reasons for his appreciation of the land in this area is the fact that for a couple of years his brother, William, has won the county corn-growing contest. One year he harvested 157 bushels of corn per acre; last year, his official yield was 150 bushels.

Woosley said that the new owner plans to raise a lot of corn, grub out trees and fence-lines with bulldozers to make the land tillable in these areas. Also, he indicated that much of the land would be seeded down to grasses, and a livestock operation started.

Latham pointed out that the Missourian

has run a beef cow herd on his land near Rich Hill, Mo., raising Angus, Hereford, Charolais and Santa Gertrudis cattle.

Latham, a former teacher and vocational agriculture instructor, feels much like Woosley about the southern Iowa farm land.

"The potential growth is bigger in this area than in any area I know," said Latham.

"Where land sells for \$600 an acre or more in north central Iowa, generally the top price here is \$350 an acre. And I know they can't raise two bushels of corn for every bushel we raise down here."

Latham admits that there has been criticism of his role in selling nearly 6,000 acres to the Missouri buyer. But he points out that also involved in the sales were Alvin R. Reynolds, a Chillicothe, Mo., realtor and William J. Carter, a farm specialist with the National Bank & Trust Co. of Chariton.

"If we hadn't sold the land to him, someone else would have," added Latham.

The Humeston realtor doesn't believe that the Missourian is tied in with a farm corporation, or that he intends to set up a corporate farm, or a farm conglomerate.

"He had the money and the desire to buy and he feels the same way about the great potential for his country that I and others do," he said.

"This area can raise good crops. And there is a great avenue wide open here for the development of a good livestock industry, cattle feeding, cattle raising, hog production and so on.

"This potential figures into what's happening here now."

But the Missourian, Craigmiles, did sell land to a relatively new, large Kansas City, Mo., farm corporation. And money from this land sale was used by him to make his purchase of the Iowa farms.

Double Standard: U.S. Style

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, it was not until dozens of patriotic organizations throughout this Nation began to alert the American people to the dangers of the Socialist-Communist ascendancy to power in this country, that the hierarchy of the Communist international conspiracy decided that it was high time to destroy the anti-Communists. To this end, they called a meeting in Moscow, which was attended by 80 Communist organizations from all parts of the world. The delegates to this meeting were instructed to return to their respective countries and begin a massive program to destroy all anti-Communists. Gus Hall, president of the Communist Party, U.S.A., returned from Moscow and inaugurated that program of destruction. The first to feel the ax was General Walker, who was indoctrinating his troops so that they would recognize the dangers of communism as a conspiracy and so that they would not be brainwashed as they were in Korea. For this bit of patriotism he was dismissed, degraded, demoted, and deprived of his rights under the Constitution.

This served only to accelerate and intensify the work of patriotic anti-Communist organizations. The administration was frantic because the New Frontier was being equated with social-

ism and socialism with communism, and something had to be done. Who was to do it? None other than Walter and Victor Reuther, who came to Washington in the fall of 1961 and had a strategy conference. At this conference Walter Reuther promised to write a memorandum for Attorney General ROBERT KENNEDY. That memo was a 24-page blueprint for the destruction of the anti-Communists. The memo was actually written by Victor Reuther, whom you remember as being the Soviet devotee, who in his earlier days spent some time in Russia writing glowing reports on the Soviet socialist program, and in a moment of reverie wrote a letter to his colleagues in America urging them to "keep up the fight for a Soviet America." This man, then became the chief adviser to the administration on how to deal with the anti-Communists. In his note, which accompanied the memo, he said:

We are hopeful that this memorandum may have some value to you in focusing attention upon possible administration policies and programs to combat the radical right.

Now it must be understood that the "radical right" refers to any and all patriotic organizations which stand opposed to the Socialist-Communist doctrine as set forth in the Communist manifesto of 1848 and restated by the Moscow Communist Convention in 1960. That, of course, means you as well as me.

Woodrow Wilson said many years ago:

Liberty cannot exist where government takes care of the people, but it can only thrive where the people take care of the government.

He might just as well have spelled it out more clearly by saying that liberty and socialism cannot coexist, that they are incompatible and only one can survive. In 1937, Pope Pius XI asked a searching question:

How is it possible that such a system long since rejected scientifically and now proved erroneous by experience, how is it, we ask, that such a system could spread so rapidly in all parts of the world?

If Pope Pius XI was shocked in 1937, what would he say today after seeing an additional 750 million human beings swept behind the Iron Curtain? Pope Pius XI also said in 1931 that the Socialist state cannot exist without an obviously excessive use of force. We are seeing that excessive use of force not only in the Communist countries, such as East Germany, Hungary, and Cuba, but also in our own country.

Now let us examine the recommendations of the Reuther brothers to be used for your own destruction. The first recommendation was:

The radical right inside the Armed Forces poses an immediate and special problem requiring immediate and special measures.

Under this heading, he recommended that Secretary McNamara investigate the extent of the radical right in the military. The memorandum claimed that it was widespread pressure from rightwing generals and admirals in the Pentagon which brought about the recall of Gen. James Van Fleet to active duty. What was wrong with General Van Fleet? Simply this, he was a member of the

board of For America, he endorsed the Florida Coalition of Patriotic Societies, and he was on the board of advisers of H. L. Hunt's Life Lines. The memorandum complained that all that Van Fleet accomplished was to embarrass Adlai Stevenson by saying that Stevenson was to blame for the U.S. failure to provide air support in the Bay of Pigs invasion and that General Van Fleet would have fired Stevenson. Had I been President, I would not have fired Adlai Stevenson for the simple reason that I would never have hired him in the first place.

The No. 2 complaint in the Reuther memorandum was that the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations is lending aid and comfort to the radical right—that's you. The memo goes on to state:

Although the radical right poses a far greater danger to the success of this country in its battle against international communism than does the domestic Communist movement, the latter has been branded subversive by the Government and the former (radical right) has not.

The memo goes on to state:

The list today is almost like a Good House-keeping seal for the radical right and as long as it exists (indicating it should be abolished) it should not remain one sided and permitted to work in favor of the radical right.

It is interesting to note that the adjective "radical" precedes any mention of "right." You see, radicalism has always been an offensive word to the American people, and, if the brothers Reuther can implant the word "radical" in connection with conservatism or rightwing movements, it would prove destructive.

The memo continues:

It might be advisable for the Attorney General to announce at this time that he is going to investigate one or more of these organizations with a view of determining whether charges will be filed and hearings held on the question of listing one or more of these organizations. The mere act of indicating that an investigation will be made will certainly bring home to many people something they have never considered—the subversive character of these organizations and the similarity to listed groups on the left.

Now that is really something. Many of these organizations to which Reuther refers have requested an investigation, and I can assure you that if one is held there will be no witness who will take the fifth amendment.

One specific proposal in the memo was that FBI agents infiltrate ultraconservative organizations to determine whether they should be classified as subversive or not. My dear friends, the FBI does not have to infiltrate these organizations. They have an open invitation to join with any of them.

The third suggestion was:

The flow of big money to the radical right should be dammed to the extent possible.

You should note that the word "dammed" is spelled with two m's although their direct intent was to spell it the other way. The proposal further stated:

As funds are a source of power to the radical right, action to dam up these funds may be the quickest way to turn the tide now running in their favor.

At least that is an admission never before heard, that the tide is running in our favor. The memo suggested that tax exemptions be carefully checked and that the list of major donors to the far right be made public and that the Federal Communications Commission check radio and television stations carrying far-propaganda, but listing their programs as religious, news analysis, or public service, and that the program, "Know Your Enemy," emanating from Washington would be a good place to start.

Incidentally, immediately after the memo was circulated, the income tax reports of Walter Knott of Knott's Berry Farm, one of the greatest exponents of free enterprise, and a true patriot, were examined and he was found liable for deductions which he had taken on contributions to support the California Free Enterprise Association. It is amazing how easy it is to deduct money for contributions to the Fund for the Republic and other leftwing organizations which support the socialistic Communist ideology, but when you attempt to educate people on the free-enterprise capitalistic system, you are then dispensing political propaganda. When you consider the massive political propaganda spewed forth by the National Education Association, the Rural Electrification outfit, and even the National Council of Churches, the double standard becomes so apparent that a schoolchild would recognize it.

Skipping one recommendation, I go to the fifth, which was:

The domestic Communist problems should be put into proper perspective for the American people, thus exposing the basic fallacy of the radical right.

What we are doing here tonight is putting the domestic Communist problem in its proper perspective for the American people, and in so doing we are not exposing any basic fallacy of the conservative right.

Now we come to the real "meat and potatoes" of what seems to be bothering the liberals, and that is that the Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, "exaggerates the domestic Communist menace at every turn, and contributes to the public's frame of mind upon which the radical right feeds." The memo further charges that Assistant Attorney General J. Walter Yeagley, who continues in charge of internal security matters, has always maximized the domestic Communist menace.

The memo continues:

There is no need of a further effort to dramatize the Communist issue, the need now is to rein in those who have created the unreasoned fear of the domestic Communist movement in the minds of American people and to slowly develop a more rational attitude toward the strength of this movement.

In other words, the rational attitude which the pseudoliberals want is that we should appease and even embrace the international Communist menace. The memo suggests that it would not be well to forbid dissenting officials from expressing a contrary view for fear of the charge that the administration was attempting to muzzle J. Edgar Hoover, but

that "any effort to take a more realistic view by the leaders of this administration would probably cause most of the administration officials to fall in line, and even some legislators might be affected thereby."

This, then, is the key to the recent attacks upon our patriotic conservatism by some Members of the U.S. Senate and some Members of the House, and, if you will read these attacks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you will be amazed to see how closely they have followed the substance and the language used in the 24-page memo of Victor Reuther.

The authors of the book, "The Far Right," Donald Janson and Bernard Eisemann, state:

No formal action was taken on the suggestions, although the document was read by key members of the administration and circulated to sympathetic Congressmen.

With that statement I completely disagree, for sympathetic Congressmen and Senators have been following the directions of this memorandum, and many TV and radio station licenses are being withheld. These charges by sympathetic Congressmen are replete with the charge of guilt by association and similar techniques, and anyone who disagrees with these so-called sympathetic Congressmen becomes anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, and is charged with being a greater menace to American society than is the domestic Communist establishment.

At this point I wish to refer to the third suggestion in the Reuther memorandum:

The flow of big money to the radical right should be dammed to the extent possible.

The implementation of this recommendation began shortly after it was issued, and actions were commenced by the Internal Revenue Service to eliminate the tax exemption for most or all of the active conservative organizations throughout the country. The next step was initiated by the Federal Communications Commission, to curtail the broadcasting privileges of conservative and patriotic people, such as Dr. Carl McIntire and the Reverend Billy James Hargis.

At no time was there any effort to remove the tax exemption of the liberal, Socialist foundations, which far outnumber the patriotic and conservative institutions. This is a double standard which should not be countenanced by this Republic.

I am including herewith a recent statement by Dr. Hargis on this subject:

Twenty years ago, Dr. Billy James Hargis began Christian Crusade. In a very real sense, it was a "pulpit" from which he could tell his story to the people about what was happening to the churches and to the nation.

On March 12, 1953, the U.S. Treasury Department recognized the ministry of Christian Crusade in a ruling letter which granted tax exemption. This meant, of course, gifts to the religious, non-profit organization were tax deductible, and the organization would incur no liability in the matter of social security taxes.

On September 22, 1966, the Treasury Department completely reversed itself and arbitrarily revoked this tax-exempt status,

allegedly on the grounds Christian Crusade is not operating as a religious or educational institution and is influencing legislation and intervening in political campaigns.

During these years, between 1953 and 1966, the content and vigor of the message proclaimed by Billy James Hargis have remained unchanged. He has been uncompromising in his exposure of and opposition to religious apostasy and godless communism. Consequently, he is either loyally supported or bitterly attacked.

But, not until immediately after the elections of 1964, when the Internal Revenue Service made its first threat, has any agency of government sought to interfere with his right as a crusading evangelist to express his convictions and to speak out fearlessly for Christ and against communism.

Why the change? The true story has never been told to the public at large in the press or communications media. For this reason, the staff of Christian Crusade has prepared this message, setting forth the facts simply and concisely, and hoping it will receive wide public distribution.

Two things especially are worthy of explanation and public attention. (1) The real influence behind the government's action against Christian Crusade; and (2) the unjust treatment Christian Crusade has received at the hands of the Internal Revenue Service.

On December 19, 1961, Walter Reuther delivered his infamous Reuther Memorandum to the Justice Department, a twenty-four-page blueprint for action against anti-Communists unprecedented in the history of this country. On pages 20 and 21, Reuther suggested that Christian Crusade could be destroyed by revoking its tax-exempt status. (Copies of the Reuther Memorandum are available for 50 cents by writing Christian Crusade Publications, P.O. Box 977, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74102.)

Within a period of time after the memorandum was dispatched to all high Administration officials and, in fact, became policy, this organization has been subjected to threats, intimidations and harassment, resulting finally in the actual revocation of its tax exemption effective October 10, 1966.

The grounds on which the IRS made its arbitrary decision are utterly false and unfounded. Christian Crusade as an organization has never, directly or indirectly, intervened on the part of any political candidate. It does, however, as a matter of Christian principle, support amendments for voluntary prayer and Bible reading in the schools, but certainly not in the sense of lobbying or picketing.

Obviously, a double standard exists in the matter of tax exemption. Any number of leftwing organizations actively support or denounce political candidates and maintain lobbyists in Washington for the purpose of influencing legislation—all the while enjoying a tax-exempt status.

In its treatment of Christian Crusade, the IRS has acted in a manner, characterized by one American, as "a law unto itself." You may recall the article, "Tyranny in the Internal Revenue Service," in Reader's Digest of August, 1967.

In January, 1968, the Internal Revenue Service assessed Christian Crusade for payment of social security taxes retroactive from 1961 through 1965—an unheard of action. Remember, during these years, we operated as a tax-exempt organization by authority of the U.S. Treasury Department itself with the assurance in its own words we were not liable for social security taxes. This assessment, with interest and penalties, amounted to \$61,691.70.

Put yourself in our place for a moment. What would it do to you as an individual or to your business if all contributions you have made in the last ten years to your church or charitable organizations should become taxable on a retroactive basis?

Can the IRS make this action against Christian Crusade stick? IRS officials doubt it themselves (so we have been informed by our attorneys).

One of our tax accountants, who worked for years as an employee of the IRS, told us that in the case of Christian Crusade, the IRS is moving more rapidly than it did in any case during his entire employment. Much of the information on assessments and penalties has been handled by long distance telephone between IRS offices instead of the usual exchange of mail. It did not allow Christian Crusade the usual ten days to pay the assessment, but demanded immediate payment. It did not grant the customary postponement of an appeals hearing (which often amounts to weeks or months) when such postponements are requested. Attorneys for Christian Crusade were allowed only a two-day postponement.

Through persistence, our attorneys have unearthed another ominous development—more than sixty-eight Christian, anti-Communist leaders and prominent public figures are being involved in the case by the federal government through the taking of depositions. What is the purpose? What else but to range far and wide in an attempt to harass and intimidate patriotic Christian Americans, in the implementing of the Reuther Memorandum?

You may rest assured that Dr. Hargis and Christian Crusade will fight this injustice now and in the months to come. The point is—it is not our fight alone. The issue in the case of Christian Crusade is that a court—eventually the Supreme Court—will decide what is religion . . . so that what happens to Christian Crusade will conceivably affect all churches, all religious institutions, as well as all Conservatives and anti-Communist causes.

Because we believe in the power of prayer, freedom and justice, this tyranny will be providentially overruled . . . and we will win.

Income Maintenance

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last year, Congress passed one of the most regressive social security bills in the history of this Nation. It was punitive; it was restrictive; and it betrayed the attitude that those unfortunate enough to be on welfare should be punished for their inability to be self-sufficient.

I was pleased at the Senate action aimed at removing many of the bill's deficiencies in this session. Unfortunately, these gains may be lost unless action is taken to turn this action into law in this session.

For it is not as if we were doing very much that was positive. At best, these amendments represent a short-term response to the problems of the Nation's welfare system.

Longer run solutions are needed, one of which may well be some kind of guaranteed annual income, or negative income tax arrangement. A Presidential Commission now is studying the matter, and I eagerly await the results of its endeavors.

A recent article in Look magazine, "Do We Owe People a Living?" by George T. Harris, discusses many of the issues this Nation will have to face. I ask unanimous

consent to the inclusion of his article in the Extensions of Remarks to forward the public discussion of income maintenance.

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

THE CRY FOR THE NEGATIVE INCOME TAX SETS UP THE MEANEST DEBATE SINCE PROHIBITION: DO WE OWE PEOPLE A LIVING?

(By T. George Harris)

Having just mailed in Form 1040, along with the skin off your soul, you may get sore at the Guaranteed Income (GI) movement. These GI's, not soldiers, are a strangely mixed group of liberals, Negro mothers, conservatives and radicals. They are moving right along to their common goal: to make Uncle Sam give poor families and their children cash enough to live in moderate ease—whether they work, loaf or riot. The first Federal test of GI is now at the start-up stage in New Jersey.

The notion is simple. Taxes withheld from our paychecks will slide straight through the U.S. Treasury and out again into the mail as Government Issue pay for any citizen who happens to eat low on the hog.

Payouts will be automatic, not as a welfare dole but as a civil right insured by law. The hardluck victim will get no preference over the lusty freeloader whose only social contribution is an upward push on the birth-rate.

The prospect looks like a victory for Robert Theobald, 38, India-born guru of the free-money sect. "Some form of national-payments system is coming—that's no longer the issue," he says, with passion bristling from both bars of his mustache. "My greatest problem is that Americans have a pathological desire to toll, and we have more people who want to toll than we have opportunities [jobs] for toll. . . . Guaranteed Income involves a total change in the values of the society."

Theobald preaches openly, and has for years, against capitalism's ancient habit of requiring a man to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow or the muscle of his brain. "We must," he insists, "break the link between job and income."

Why? This socioeconomicist believes that automation is destroying jobs so fast that government must take over most of the money-spreading duty from employers. Since his prophecies of doomsday unemployment have so far proved false, he has countered, like an end-of-the-world preacher, by moving his disaster dates forward.

Between trips on the lecture circuit, Theobald beats out books in Apartment 19H of a private-housing project looking north over New York's Harlem. Here lately, he has spied another sign of Armageddon in the sky: credit cards. Without GI, the buy-everything cards will bring on the bloodiest rebellion yet imagined, he tells me, because they draw the first clear and absolute line between those who have and those who have not.

Nor does the worry stop with cash-passing. Theobald also tolls over plans to keep people busy enough to stay out of trouble once they are forced into well-subsidized leisure: "A GI that is not accompanied by a strong thrust to provide meaningful activity would be a disaster."

It might be restful to pause for a paragraph while Theobald's ideas cool. He confirms the worst fears, and wildest dreams, aroused by income-maintenance thought. His is an original mind, and uncommonly provocative, but he sometimes sees mountains that, on closer study, are mounds. After talking with him, you need considerable time to absorb a new, little-known political fact: the GI notion is also selling like hot cakes among big businessmen and Republican bigwigs.

Detroit's Arjay Miller, vice-chairman of

Ford Motor Co., has taken a public stand. Other industrialists and bankers, generally the opinion-setters of commerce, have surprised me in quiet talks by shifting sharply toward Miller's view.

"Five years ago, even three," mutters a blue-chip chief, "this kind of talk would have gotten a man drummed out of the private-sector corps."

Chicago & North Western Railway boss Ben Heineman, already on record for measures very close to GI, is heading a Presidential commission on income distribution. "I'm not worried about positions that might upset conventional wisdom," says Democrat Heineman. Last month, a leading banker delved into the tangle of Federal housing, decided it might be simpler to give people cash and let them find their own homes in the market. Others see hope for the poverty pockets, white and black, to sprout a self-service commercial sector.

The change in sentiment makes blips on Washington's political radar. Richard Nixon's closest advisers have been urging him to campaign hard for Guaranteed Income, taking it away from LBJ. "For one thing," says Nixon economic consultant Pierre Rinfret, "it would be a strong stabilizer against business cycles."

Wisconsin's Melvin Laird, chairman of the House Republican Conference, is drafting a bill on the subject. Since liberals charge that Laird "stands at the center of the largest conservative apparatus in American politics," his GI proposal will stir up press dust when it hits the hopper. It will also notify both parties that committee hearings and a mean battle aren't far up the road. If Vietnam ever quits drawing the butterfat out of the economy, a few billions are apt to get churned into a new kind of poor law.

Heaven save the John Birchers! Here's the GOP taking up the same cause as Theobald, whose ambition is to scrub out capitalism's labor system. Just as Mr. Robert Welch says, the Commie conspiracy is brainwashing us for sure. Even the debate teams in U.S. colleges are talking GI this year. Worst of all, Republican leaders are being led down this strange path by Sen. Barry Goldwater's Presidential campaign policy adviser: Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago, chief economist to the American Right.

Nervous friends dearly hope that Professor Friedman is kidding, playing an impractical joke. But he, a bouncy egghead of 55 and not famous for humility, confesses that he had the idea, and published it, before the Left took it up. Indeed, most GI's admit, Friedman invented the most efficient way to pass the cash: the Negative Income Tax.

Back in World War II, while in the Treasury Department, economist Friedman decided that if Federal revenue is raised by positive taxes, then public outlays have to be thought of as reverse, or negative, taxes. He believed, as a conservative, that voters would be less spendthrift if they could see where the positive taxes came from to match each negative tax. In a series of lectures, given in 1956 and published in '62, he outlined a below-ground extension for the income tax system. It would pipe money directly, instantly, from the high and middle brackets down to those too poor to pay.

"It gives help in the form most useful to the individual, namely, cash," he wrote.

The scheme would be far less expensive, Friedman argued, than the welfare, public housing, farm subsidy and other projects being run in the name of the needy. His figures showed that in 1961, the Federal, state and local governments sank \$33 billion into such efforts, but only one dollar in five ever reached the empty pocket to which it was addressed. His purpose, then a nutty notion to both liberals and conservatives, was to replace inefficient bureaucracy with a check-mailing machine. The urgency of the need to avoid total reliance on public agencies for services was not to become clear

until the advent of the new strike era among public employees.

Friedman also had his eye on such sacred but scrubby cows as minimum wage. He foresaw the day when the legal minimum, putting entry-level jobs out of reach of low-skill workers, would consign millions to a sub-machine caste. (The latest three-stage boost of the legal wage, to \$1.60, has wiped out enough jobs to nullify the efforts of Government and industry to train and hire more Negro teen-agers.) Friedman's version of GI would supplement low wages, draw idle teen-agers into their first jobs and undercut future demands for fast boosts in the minimum wage.

And there was, above all, Friedman's pet hate: the harsh Federal penalty on work by the poor. A man or woman on welfare was taxed 100 percent, often several hundred, on any income he earned. Here's how: if he went out and got a low-pay or part-time job, his welfare payments would be cut dollar for dollar. If the job petered out, as often happened, he might not get the payments restored for months. It was (and is) hazardous to try that big jump out of the welfare trap. A negative income tax, Friedman argued, would let people climb out step by step.

The thing sounds weird at first, but once you get the hang of it, nothing could be more like horse sense. Friedman's Negative Income Payments—let's call them NIP's—are to be graduated the way our positive taxes are. Those who earn least will draw the most, but earnings on a job will not be confiscated dollar for dollar.

People who earn nothing at all will live on a basic payment from Uncle Sam, say between \$1,500 and \$3,200 a year to cover a family of four. For each dollar earned by working, the recipient will be able to keep 50 cents. (To put it another way, if his job pay is \$40 a week, his NIP check goes down \$20.) The payments taper off to nothing just before a worker moves up to the wage level where he or she is initiated, like the rest of us, into the joys of tax-paying instead of tax-taking. Thus improved, the dear old Internal Revenue Service will look like Dr. Dolittle's pushmi-pullyu.

"Everyone would fill out the same Form 1040, and get the same exemptions and deductions," says Friedman. "Some will pay taxes, and some will be paid." Not since Beardsley Ruml invented pay-as-you-go withholding has a new idea grabbed the minds of so many policy makers.

Something was needed. The gathering racial storm in the cities finally brought on one of those rare searches for new insight. Neither Friedman nor Theobald got much attention when, in 1962 and 1963, each published a guaranteed-income proposal without knowing of the other's effort. They lived in different worlds of ideology, the Right and the Left, I don't even remember hearing of Theobald until Ralph Helstein, president of the United Packinghouse Workers, took me, in late '63, to a New York luncheon given by a small, informed band of thinking in the AFL-CIO. Most, including me, were cool to Theobald's work-is-passé pitch over coffee, but Helstein saw the income floor as "a way to hold out hope" to members of his automation-hurt union.

Collaborating with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Helstein soon joined 36 academics, writers and random brains in signing a 1964 document dubbed *The Triple Revolution*. As boss of a tough union, he gave practical reality to an otherwise free-form group. Their paper, widely quoted, pushed Theobald and his GI into the national limelight. Negro hopes raised by civil rights, it argued, would be frustrated by the loss of jobs through automation and by cuts in war production under the nuclear standoff.

Helstein, round as a dumpling but with a very hard core, stayed way out front in the racial struggle. He had put up seed money

to help start Martin Luther King's SCLC, funded early SNCC projects and served as a director of hell-raiser Saul Alinsky's Industrial Areas Foundation. In the winter of 1964-65, Helstein happened across a copy of *Context*, an eggy magazine now defunct, that reprinted Friedman's Negative Income Tax proposal.

"That's it," Helstein told the Theobald group. "This conservative has provided us with a way to get guaranteed income."

Others agreed, or had the notion serendipitously. Soon, liberals and conservatives alike were touting NIP's not sure who was conning whom. President Johnson, in signing the 1964 tax-cut bill, promised the next slice to "those who need it most." By 1965, Treasury statisticians were doing feasibility numbers on cuts for the lower brackets and pushing the data on down to cover negative-tax proposals. It was an academic exercise, of course, since the general public had not yet heard of NIP's, let alone work up a hunger for them.

Meanwhile, the big-income play came rolling out of the Labor Department. Assistant Secretary Daniel "Pat" Moynihan, a 6'5" leprechaun trained in a Manhattan bar, flew boisterously back from an Irishman's tour of Europe with an entirely different scheme for income maintenance. "We're the only industrial democracy left," he reported, "without a family, or children's allowance."

France, Canada and 50 other countries pay per-child state subsidies to every family, rich or poor. The family allowance, while an expensive and inefficient way to aid the poor and near-poor, jibed with Moynihan's belief in "unities." By that, he meant programs that build bridges of mutual interest (e.g., money) across income and race divisions. Two out of three poverty families are white, but most Federal schemes focus, realistically, upon poverty's concentrated growth sector, the ghetto. Moynihan wanted to make a political sale based on the needs of 13.9 million innocent victims, poverty's children. "Everybody knows that the day after we pass a family allowance," he still believes, "it will be the most popular legislation on the books."

So it might. But Moynihan made what can only be called an expert's error. Author of a remarkable study on the sensitive pride of ethnic groups, he set up the Administration case for family allowances in a report that offended the pride of his biggest target group, Negro families. The "Moynihan Report" said their society was a shambles.

Rising advocates of Black Power raged on into 1966 against both his report and his allowance. President Johnson, thus forced to retreat to routine urban spending, fell back on the barnyard idiom to express his dismay. "If the niggers want crap," he told an aide, "we'll give them crap."

As a young man, the President had seen ragged white folks use New Deal agencies to buy their homes, reclaim bankrupt farms, set up their own electrical companies (REA cops), boost production with fertilizer and hybrids, make homelife bearable and get their kids educated. By comparison, today's urban programs are leftover scraps for the leftover poor. Urban-renewal bulldozers destroy more homes than they build. Public housing locks tenants into high-rise slave quarters. Poverty Warriors, for all their good intent, pour their money into middle-class professionals, urban experts, in the faint hope that some will trickle down to the poverty people. The welfare state seems to have turned the New Deal upside down.

Though allergic to any lessons from Friedman, many an earnest liberal has begun to doubt agencies that once were sacrosanct. Moynihan, who fled Washington for Harvard, compares the old system to a plan for fattening the sparrows in the street by feeding the horses. "We might as well admit that Government is a disaster at distributing services," he says. "It is rather good at distrib-

uting income." That's what the income tax, positive division, has been doing since 1913.

The most savage attacks have been thrown against welfare itself, mainly by those who know it best: its bosses and customers. Mitchell Ginsberg, as New York's welfare commissioner, wrote of the whole welfare establishment as "bankrupt."

The trouble centers in the federally sponsored AFDC—Aid to Families with Dependent Children—which annually enrolls thousands of new clients from among Negro migrants to Northern ghettos. With the onrush of affluence, all other kinds of relief have, in recent years, lost absolute or relative numbers. U.S. welfare costs have slid well below one percent of gross personal income.

The horror is in the effect on people. Intended to sustain, AFDC acts more like pump-primed leukemia. Set up for mothers without husbands, AFDC enforces a rule against "a man in the house." So the father who earns too little, or loses his job, can help his family best by bugging out. If he comes back, or a prospective new husband is seen around the house, the money must be cut off.

You can imagine the slum woman's rage at caseworkers who "peep under the bed looking for men's underwear." AFDC makes it prudent to call your child a bastard and blocks a divorcee's effort to recruit a man to head the family. One mother of six, going on seven, has adapted to the official system. She insists upon being called "Miss."

But few adapt completely, even to the ban against working, and a little freedom is in sight. A drop of Friedman's negative-tax thinking seeped through Congress and into the latest welfare law. An AFDC mother will not get to keep 33 percent of any wage she earns. So the lowest income group will no longer be taxed more than 66 percent. That's progress. In the positive-tax brackets, however, such steep disincentives are reserved for the very rich and energetic.

The paradox is clear. Our nation decided long ago that if we fail to give people a chance at a productive role, then we do owe them a living. But the dole reinforces the helplessness that trapped most recipients into welfare. Under its stern rules, only those proud enough to fight back are apt to be ambitious enough to break out.

Some such spirit is now boiling up, abetted by a pair of trouble-loving white radicals, a black chemist and squads of formidable ladies. Richard Cloward and Frances Piven, a brawny professor and a chic researcher, operate in Harlem out of Columbia University's School of Social Work. They discovered three years ago that many of the poor are too timid to apply for welfare, and those who do are often afraid to demand the full amount due them and their children.

Because of tight budgets in most states, Cloward estimated, welfare administrators actually pay out about half as much money as the poor could legally claim. The budget-balancing techniques range from terror in Mississippi to camera-clicking spies in Washington, to routine incompetence in most cities. The standard tales of welfare cheats are, literally, less than half the truth.

Cloward-Piven laid out a strategy of deliberate disruption. By organizing welfare clients to demand full rights (or more) and recruit other clients, they would overload the welfare bureaucracy, break it and bring on, they hoped, a guaranteed income. This strategy could—and of late seems likely to—make the cumbersome caseworker system more costly than NIP will be.

Searching for a man to put muscle into their plan, they found George Wiley, 37, a soft-spoken giant who had barely missed being elected national chief of CORE. Wiley, a Cornell Ph.D., used his personal savings from industrial-chemistry research to start NWRO, the National Welfare Rights Organization. Slowly, at first in New York and now in 26 states, he found the ghetto fire-

brands, AFDC mothers. More than half the AFDC recipients are Negro.

Wiley's mothers started herding groups of disappointed claimants into local welfare centers. They cited laws and rules better than caseworkers, demanded instant action. "We generally pack a little lunch," says Mrs. Beulah Sanders, sturdy chairman of the New York NWRO. "If the administrator don't give satisfaction, we settle down to spend the night." Her city's welfare rolls, doubled to 800,000 since 1963, are now rising faster than ever. Welfare officials tend to cave in, if possible, before reporters arrive, and quick victories rouse the timid to fight.

Wiley's big break came last fall at congressional hearings on the new welfare bill. Sen. Russell Long of Louisiana, beset by NWRO ladies, called them "Brood Mares." They put the title on like a new hat. "Well," said one, "the Brood Mares are going to stampepe."

The new House Bill 12080 provided that if an AFDC mother refuses to leave her children to attend job-training, caseworkers have the authority to take away her children and farm them out to foster homes. That provision helped convert private shame into public indignation. NWRO's national membership broke the 6,000 mark. The Brood Mares in many cities planned Mother's Day protests against welfare offices this May 12, signed up with Martin Luther King's Washington demonstrators. The first asphalt-roots organization had found its battle cry: "Don't take our children away!"

Curiously, 12080, now law, is well-intended. Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee, coauthor of the bill, has been gouging the welfare establishment for years, trying to make it help people up into self-supporting jobs. He might as well try to eat peas with a kitchen knife. Social workers make poor job-replacement experts. And, except for the 33 percent earning incentive he wrote in, the new bill leans heavily on brute force. "Yes, it is coercive—but only when the state decides that a person is an appropriate candidate for training and work," Mills told the House.

There's the rub. To free-enterpriser Friedman, state coercion is the least effective instrument of a capitalist society. For one thing, it works only on scared subjects. "We are getting two kinds of people: those who are free, and those who are wards of the state and must do what the state says," says Friedman. "On the Negative Income Tax, some would choose not to try. That is part of the loss you take; but the proportion, I believe, would be small and would decline."

We will soon find out. On a \$4 million line of credit from OEO's anti-poverty larder, 800 poor and near-poor in New Jersey are being picked to receive the first NIP's for the next three years. The Ford Foundation is petty-cashing an expansion of the experiments. Squads of economists are checking the lucky guinea-pig people, eager to find out if the free dough inhibits whatever impulse they have to work. Unlike the experts, I'm betting that the average guinea pig will strive harder, not less, and boost earned income by 15 to 20 percent. It's the post-affluent, not the never-had-its, who deliberately cop out of the rat race. There's nothing like the first taste of money and freedom to whet the appetite for more.

This is precisely the outcome that Theobald fears. He feels betrayed by OEO's "failure to take advice." And therein lies the irony of the five-year debate over income guarantees. Theobald's plan, meant to pull people out of jobs—and thus, I think, freeze them forever in a lower caste—has been turned around and fitted to the opposite purpose: luring, not forcing, the underemployed into more productive roles and better lives. The Jersey NIP's are even called WIP's: Wage Incentive Payments.

Prepared to follow up, Poverty Warrior Jim Lyday of OEO has drafted a national

proposal that will cost \$2 billion the first year, not the \$6 to \$33 billion often talked about. Not radical, not reactionary, it would simply replace AFDC in half the states, and invite the other half to add their own NIP supplements to the Federal payment.

"No, it's not enough to meet the need," admits Lyday. "But it erodes the base of poverty transfer from generation to generation. This begins to make real the promise of America."

You may feel, as I felt for years, that there is something inherently wrong, perhaps devilish, about Federal guarantee of income. This fear looks silly, however, when you see that we have such an income floor promised in welfare—and delivered in a way that perverts its benign purpose.

The case for the Negative Income Tax is compelling. The steady buildup of evidence as well as argument, especially from the implacably genial Dr. Friedman, makes the role of the holdout tedious. The Friedman NIP is distinctly different from the rigid subsidy systems of the past. It weaves public policy with the flexible means of private life, gives elbowroom for Americans to make their own choices and brings us all together—none left out—for the annual liturgy around Form 1040.

But one reservation remains. Though it may breach the bureaucratic wall around the ghetto, an income-support plan is neither a revolution nor an all-purpose cure. Without the efforts of churches, communities and business, the test of the times will be flunked. Government cannot absolve the larger society from its direct duty, nor can a subsidy check in the mail take the place of a real job, at a decent wage, in a society that will allow you to make your place.

Impression on Southern Africa

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, people who have visited Africa firsthand seem far more understanding and tolerant of the problems of Africa than the guided victims of the egalitarian theorist.

In fact, most African travelers agree that patience and sympathy are needed far more than threats and reprisals—that is, if our foreign policy objective is designed to help rather than hinder the people.

I include a paper entitled, "The Dark Continent Is in Need of Patience and Sympathy," by Dr. James F. Bishop of Davenport, Iowa, giving his impressions of Africa following my remarks:

THE DARK CONTINENT IS IN NEED OF PATIENCE AND SYMPATHY
(By James F. Bishop, M.D.)

I was privileged to join an American newspapermen's study mission to Africa, this past summer, because Mr. Henry Hook a co-publisher of the Davenport Times-Democrat, is a friend and neighbor of mine. Another non-newsman who attached himself to the entourage is Dr. Jay Houlahan, of Mason City. He wrote a letter to Mr. Hook which sounded so wistful that he was invited to go, too. There were 12 in the group, including representatives of newspapers in Arkansas, Nebraska, Mississippi, Ohio, Connecticut, and Iowa, and the two Iowa medicos who represented nothing but their own curiosity.

We gathered in New York City on July 21 for briefings by the Big Bwana, our tour di-

rector, and by representatives of the various nations which we were to visit. After Lufthansa had softened us up by means of a farewell party, its aircraft lugged us over to Frankfurt and then on to Africa. It was August 10 when Lufthansa brought us back up across the dark continent and over to New York City, and there it left us to cope with the airline strike as best we could.

With complete justice it might be said that three weeks is hardly long enough to create an expert on the vast and complex land that is Africa. Yet, our newspaper study mission had certain privileges and advantages not open to the usual tourist. We asked questions, listened carefully, and persistently picked brains from Nairobi to Cape Town.

Three different types of nations were there for us to see: the newly-independent and black controlled Kenya and Zambia, a remnant of a colonial empire in Mozambique, and two nations governed by white minorities Rhodesia and the Republic of South Africa. In each, citizens and officials alike tried, with apparent sincerity, to answer our questions and help us to know the formidable problems which beset them. There was, in each country, an almost desperate anxiety to be understood.

Our time in Kenya was short, because of a mixup in airline reservations. We did, though, tour Nairobi, its capital and watched its black citizens obviously enjoying their parks which possibly, in the not too distant past, had been denied them. To keep our schedule, it was necessary to charter two small twin engine airplanes and fly 1,150 miles across the bleak and deserted bush country to Lusaka, capital of Zambia.

Here we found a modern city with a broad boulevard flanked by up to date buildings. There were substantial-looking banks, busy supermarkets, apartments, automobile dealers, and all the other trappings of today. As we watched, the impressive figure of President Kenneth Kaunda emerged from a building to enter his car, stopping a minute to wave a white handkerchief at his people who waited for him. They waved back, silently and without any sign of a contrived demonstration.

AMERICANS TWITTED

In the crowd near me was a citizen of Israel, a member of an agricultural mission come to help the Zambians with their farms. He twitted me a little, saying they brought no money, as Americans are prone to do, but came only with service. He was not quite fair, however, for our Ambassador Robert C. Good told us that American help to Zambia has been largely in service marked by community planning and teaching in their schools.

Each year, 55-60 Zambians come to America to school, mostly in agriculture. The ambassador invited us to a reception in his home where we met many Zambian officials. They were obviously intelligent, eager, and full of enthusiastic plans for their country.

They were, also, slightly touchy, self-conscious, and perhaps a bit immature. There is much to do in Zambia for they had only 100 college graduates and 1,000 high school graduates at the time of independence in 1964.

Rhodesia was next. Here was the nation so much in the news because of its declaration of independence and because of the retaliation against it by Britain and her friends—including the United States. We found courteous and speedy treatment in customs as we landed at Salisbury.

We were late for dinner at Melkle's Hotel but were promptly fed. There were no horns sprouting from the foreheads of these friendly, vigorous people—they might well have been Americans. Salisbury might well have been Minneapolis. They are about the same size, have the same modern buildings and businesses, and the same car-filled streets. Because of the sanctions, there was gas

rationing in Rhodesia but it was not severe or crippling.

SEGREGATED TOWNSHIP

We visited a Township, an area of segregation in which 80,000 Africans live and found the houses, while not luxurious, stouter and drier than grass huts. There were fine, modern schools with large playgrounds, a big gymnasium and recreation center, and a swimming pool. It was on Saturday and the people were not working but were milling around at all those pursuits necessary on a day off. One could only be reminded of the efforts of our own South, some years ago, to provide separate but equal facilities.

All Rhodesians have an equal chance at education and are encouraged to go as high as they can, regardless of color. All can qualify to vote by satisfying rather modest educational and economic requirements. The Africans are represented in the Rhodesian Parliament for we attended a session and saw them sitting there.

Any African who can pay for it can take a room or have dinner at Meikle's Hotel or anywhere else he wishes and is not denied because of his color. He may take any position in government for which he can qualify by education.

Rhodesia has been termed a police state yet it has an opposition party whose headquarters are plainly marked on a prominent street. There are 6,000 policemen, two-thirds of whom are African, and none of whom are armed. Per unit of population it has fewer policemen than Britain. The Europeans in Rhodesia pay 98 per cent of the tax revenue of the government, a large part of which goes to improve the living and educational facilities of the Africans.

Perhaps some terms need clarification. Any white person, be his origin British, Dutch, American, or any other is a European. The Negro is an African. Those whose origins lie in India are, logically enough, called Indians. South Africa has still another group called Coloured—descendants of Hottentots, Bushmen, and slaves brought over from the Dutch East Indies.

A PART OF PORTUGAL

Rhodesia's neighbor to the east is Mozambique, once called Portuguese East Africa but now stated to be a province of Portugal. This arrangement is condemned by some as a ploy to escape the stigma of colonialism. Be that as it may, all its inhabitants, regardless of color, are considered to be Portuguese and all have equal rights.

Each citizen qualifies to vote by paying a very modest amount of taxes each year, this sum not being considered in any way a poll tax. Its capital, Lorenzo Marques, is modern and busy and boasts a new university filled with promise. Foreign investment is welcomed and favorably treated while settlers are sought for the 75,000 acre Limpopo River development with its irrigation and specialized villages.

To the south and west of Mozambique is the Republic of South Africa, the giant of southern Africa, Maligned because of its apartheid—apartness—policy, it too seeks understanding but, understood or not, forges doggedly ahead on the course it deems best.

The first Dutch settlers arrived there in 1652 and, strangely enough, encountered no Negroes for the black tribes were still moving down from the north and had not yet reached the southern coast. The only natives were the Hottentots and the Bushmen, both extremely primitive. The arrival of the British precipitated conflict which is now history. The Europeans accommodated to each other and the nation now has two official languages, English and Afrikaans, the latter a modification of Dutch. There are now some 17,000,000 people in South Africa of whom about 3,000,000 are white, 500,000 Indians, the same number of Coloured, and the rest Africans.

"BANTU" MEANS AFRICAN

The word Bantu—meaning, roughly, the people—does not identify a certain tribe but rather refers to all Africans. There are nine separate Bantu nations in South Africa, each with its own tribal customs and numerous dialects. They have nothing in common except the color of their skins and have always found their greatest delight in trying to decimate each other. Even today, members of different tribes cannot be put to work on the same farm or mine for each will be logical prey for the silent knife of the other.

The principle of apartheid sets each major group apart from the others. The African has large areas which are his and a European may not live or set up a business there. The Indians have their own assigned areas where they must live, some in \$75,000-\$80,000 homes for they are successful traders and businessmen.

The government improves the lot of the African with homes which he may rent very reasonably or, possibly, buy. The apartheid, however, is the law of the land and there is no official provision for change. Privately, officials and citizens alike agree that nothing ever stays the same and change is inevitable but now is not the time for it.

The African cannot vote in South Africa and there is no present provision for him ever to gain the right. He is encouraged to go to school, as far as he can, but the resulting benefits are not well defined.

GOLD MINE UNDER CITY

Johannesburg, the largest city, is big, bustling, and modern—and built over a gold mine. It is earnestly stated that with initiative, dexterity—and a good map—one can walk for 70 miles in tunnels beneath this city. It is built on the highveld, 6,000 feet above sea level and its one million people enjoy a benign climate. Cape Town, 800 miles to the south on the coast, is the legislative capital and there we attended a session of Parliament. We were impressed by the speech of one member who was eloquent, obviously articulate, apparently well informed—and utterly unintelligible. He was speaking in Afrikaans.

Central and southern Africa are rich in natural resources. Zambia is the second largest producer of copper in the world; South Africa has a 600 year reserve of coal. Through the southern third of the continent there are gold, asbestos, chrome, high grade iron ore, and potential hydro-electric power beyond the considerable amount now produced.

Agriculture is productive and growing with corn, cotton, rice, tropical fruits, citrus fruits, cattle, and sheep so that the land can feed itself. So far, there is no oil and this must be brought in as crude or refined products. Because of lack of oil, railroads are run by steam or coal-generated electricity and gasoline for cars is rather expensive.

This rich, vast, and restless land is trying to get on with its growth and development but is tormented by problems that sometimes seem unsolvable. Some of these, perhaps of their own making, are compounded by the meddling of others. The meddlers include the Communists who make all the mischief they can by bringing in arms and propaganda; by pitting African against African as well as African against European.

Chinese and North Koreans have been especially diligent in their efforts to foment unrest although the Russians are not shirking their tasks. The Rhodesians and South Africans are polite about it but they feel the United States is meddling too, by joining the British in the sanctions and making other righteous noises about "one man, one vote" and majority government.

MAKING GOOD PROGRESS

Zambia and Kenya have African governments and seem to be proceeding well thus far. They have retained European advisers

and technicians of various kinds who appear to be dedicated to teaching the Africans greater skills. There are utilities, stores, transport systems, and other facilities among the fine buildings in their cities.

One does wonder how much of all this is still riding on the momentum of British organization. Some troubles are already appearing in both countries and, in the copper belt of Zambia, Africans are unhappy and agitating for the well paying jobs the Europeans hold even though the Africans are not yet qualified to fill them. In Kenya a week or two ago, President Kenyatta's police, in a dark of night raid, plucked up five opposition leaders—all active in labor affairs—and put them in the pokey. They were still there when we left Africa.

All members of our Study Mission strove mightily to learn about the people in the uneasy land for, in them, lay the key to the difficulties.

The Europeans, many of whose ancestors had come to Africa two centuries or more ago, consider Africa their home and they have known no other. Their intellect, initiative, money, and organization have developed Africa. Without them, Africa would still be the land of bushmen, cannibals, straw huts, and primitive life it was for all the centuries before the Europeans came. The coal, gold, diamonds, chrome, and other wealth would still lie undisturbed in the ground. The roads and railroads would be undreamed-of instead of steadily marching across the landscape.

EUROPEAN CONTRIBUTION

The African would still be living only his span of thirty-odd years instead of finding, in public and personal health measures, a longer and more nearly disease-free life. The European feels he has built these things and he does not intend to let them go but rather wishes to pass them on to his children. His government, if somewhat authoritarian, is stable and he looks with misgivings to the north—to Nigeria, Ghana, the Congo—with their chaos, murders, destruction, and recurring military coups since the advent of native control.

He does not wish to leave the land that is his home and he is afraid it is not yet time to relinquish control. He is distressed by the criticism directed at him from other parts of the world, from those he considered his friends, and he wishes earnestly that his side be known.

The African has his aspirations too. He sees about him better homes than his grass or mud hut and he wants them. He has access now to stouter houses than he had before but they are not as good as those of his European neighbors, in many instances. It is better to ride his bicycle now than to walk as he used to but it would be still nicer to have a car. And so it goes. Things are better for him than they were but he is impatient and wants more, faster.

He seems happy and carefree yet, at least some of his number must resent being carried in crowded trains from their work to their segregated township. While we were in Johannesburg, one of these trains was wrecked, killing four Africans and injuring more than a score of others. The rest erupted into a violent riot, trying—and nearly succeeding—to stone to death the engineer and setting fire to their train and another. This response to one mishap was far too exaggerated to be pure emotionalism and certainly bespoke the release of dangerously pent-up hostilities.

The Africans are considered by many to be a faceless, homogeneous mass, all alike and willfully held in bondage by white masters. If only they could be released they could step forth and suddenly, by some strange and instant magic, become skilled machinists, able lawyers, compassionate clergymen, talented physicians, wise judges and legislators. They would promptly join

together and work in peaceful harmony for the common good and welfare of their country. This is a pleasant dream but today it would be a nightmare.

LITTLE IN COMMON

In the Republic of South Africa there are nine Bantu nations with absolutely nothing in common except the color of their skins. Each has its own language and many dialects, unintelligible to all the others. Each has its own tribes, customs, chiefs, and an overweening suspicion and hostility toward all the rest. Witchcraft and superstitious taboos often guide their actions. Wives are bought and then may be returned later with a refund as unsatisfactory merchandise. One fellow was so fond of his mother that he bought her from his father as his own wife.

To hope, today, to weld all these superstitious, hostile, and diverse peoples into one self-governing nation is the height of wishful thinking. The sophisticated and civilized nations of Europe have tried for a thousand years to live together in peace. The periodic marching armies and shifting boundaries testify to their inability to do so. Yet they have among themselves far more in common than do the tribes of Africa. What is true in the Republic of South Africa is equally true in Rhodesia and Mozambique. The turmoil and distress in the new nations of northern Africa bear witness to the same problems.

The nations we visited are trying earnestly to bring order to their dilemmas. Mozambique has declared a multiracial nationality with citizenship for all while Rhodesia bribes its children with candy to come to school. Both ask only a very modest degree of educational and economic responsibility of those who are to share in the important matter of government.

NEED PATIENCE, SYMPATHY

South Africa is officially more inflexible in its apartness but privately recognizes change must come. In each country, responsible African leaders—not the radical and sometimes subversive elements—are helping in the steady ascent of their people. Perhaps, thus far, the pace has been too slow to satisfy the so-called liberals in the world. Perhaps the solutions offered are not perfect but seldom, in the field of human endeavor, does one find perfection.

One can only hope that wise and moderate counsel will prevail on both sides and that white and black will find somewhere the strength and patience to endure the tensions that beset them. One hopes that the people of Africa will resist those who seek change through the violence and ugliness of revolution and will work for the peaceful transition of evolution. Toward this vast and tormented continent, one's strongest emotion is, not impatience and carping criticism, but sympathy, deep and abiding.

POSTSCRIPT

Our journey home began in Johannesburg. We flew up the west coast of Africa and landed, after midnight, at Lagos, the capital of Nigeria. There had been an exacerbation of political turmoil in that country, and we were confined to our plane. Two African soldiers came aboard and gave us all the beady, suspicious eye. They then searched behind all of the doors—for what, we never learned. A distinguished-looking African and his striking and modish wife came aboard, and all the way north to Europe I could not escape a gnawing anxiety that perhaps he was a fleeing politician into whose luggage some ill-wisher had tucked a bomb. We were undisturbed, however, and duly arrived in Frankfurt.

The names of several North American cities appear on the accompanying maps of southern Africa on which I have traced our route. Those names are placed the same distances south of the Equator that the cities they designate lie north of it. For example,

the placement of the name "Atlanta" shows that Cape Town is approximately the same distance south of the Equator that Atlanta, Georgia, is north of it. Thus winter, as we experienced it in South Africa, was by no means frigid. Flowers were blooming in profusion, and though nighttime temperatures at Cape Town were in the 40's, everywhere the daytime temperatures were between 65° and 70° F.

The Place To Go Is Idaho

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, U.S. News & World Report this week contains an excellent article on the many small- and medium-sized cities in the Nation which remain unaffected by the deterioration and blight which has so sadly afflicted the largest of our cities.

One of these medium-sized cities is Boise, the capital of Idaho, and one of the most pleasant places to live in this country. Quoting one of Boise's leading citizens, R. V. Hansberger, president of Boise Cascade Corp., the U.S. News & World Report article correctly points up the fact that Boise is a city where human values assume a more important aspect than in larger cities where congestion and blight combine to discourage many residents.

Boise and other smaller cities throughout the country are the models we should turn to for the pattern of the future. Encouraged by progressive leadership such as that displayed by Mr. Hansberger, they are planning now in order that they may continue to offer the best in urban living in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHERE IT'S STILL PLEASANT IN THE UNITED STATES

(NOTE.—In recent days, as violence flared in U.S. cities, the world lost sight of the real America. Outside teeming urban areas, most Americans live peacefully, in quiet, orderly communities. An increasing number of U.S. leaders say it is time to quit piling people into cities and to start spreading out in this spacious land.)

So many people in high places are wringing their hands over the problems of U.S. cities that the real picture of America is becoming more and more distorted.

The fact is that the great majority of Americans live in communities where it is safe to walk the streets at night, where one can enjoy life and trust his neighbors, where schools are not deteriorating, where traffic is not snarled endlessly, where air is breathable, where race war is not threatened, and where there is no talk of burning down the community.

If those who are stewing so much about the problems of the cities would take time to look around America, they would see a land with elbow room to spare. A fight across this country from Atlantic to Pacific reveals vast open areas that are beautiful and unspoiled.

This view of America is borne out by facts. The 30 U.S. cities with population of more than a million in their metropolitan areas hold 38 percent of the country's population.

These cities occupy only 3 percent of the land in the continental U.S. between the two oceans, even when much wide-open space within their urban areas is included.

EASING FEAR AND FRUSTRATION

If big-city dwellers would drop down off the superhighways that carry them from one megalopolis to another, they would find thousands of communities where the quality of life is in sharp contrast to the fears and frustrations of big-city living. In these communities removed from the teeming urban areas, crimes of violence are the exception rather than the subject of daily headlines as in big-city newspapers.

Yet much of the nation's money and brains are devoted to stop-gap solutions of problems in megalopolis while the possibility of spreading population more evenly across a spacious countryside gets relatively little attention.

Billions flow from the U.S. Treasury to rebuild center cities, aid metropolitan schools, boost welfare benefits. Some mayors and big-city Congressmen talk in all seriousness of spending a trillion dollars on the cities over the next decade. That would mean outlays at the rate of 100 billion dollars a year—most of it from the Federal Government.

Thus far, heavy spending on U.S. cities seems only to have brought a greater and greater concentration of unemployable people into their crowded confines. At the rate of 500,000 to 600,000 a year they come, many of them completely unprepared for a useful role in big-city life. New slums spring up as fast as the old ones can be rooted out, or faster.

Now, a growing number of leaders in government and in private business are saying that it is time to try a different approach to urban problems. One of these is the highly regarded planner, Constantinos A. Doxiadis, who says: "I have not yet seen any city in the world where responsible officials can claim that the situation tomorrow will be better than it is today." Mr. Doxiadis suggests:

"Perhaps the cause lies in this very fact that we are pouring resources into the cities. The solution may lie in exactly the opposite direction, that of using resources outside the cities. When we have an organism suffering from great pressures, should we add pressures to it?"

An Administration official who takes a similar view is Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture. He warns that "there must be alternatives to big-city suburban living, or the pressure of people against resources and services in the megalopolis of the future will simply break it down."

A number of leading U.S. businessmen, too, have come to the view that there is really no valid reason why business and industry must concentrate into a few sprawling, ill-planned, congested, air-polluted urban areas.

These leaders point out that communication now is nearly instantaneous between any two points in the U.S. Jet planes can put businessmen any place they need to go in a matter of no more than five hours, even if it is from one coast to the other, and between many points the flying time is a matter of minutes. Superhighways knit the country together, providing efficient ground transportation.

America, it is pointed out, is a country where you can have a warm climate or a cold climate, seashore or lakeshore, coastal region or desert, or, as one corporation president declares, "mountains in your back yard."

The executive who feels his company is better off for its back-yard view of mountains is R. V. Hansberger, president of Boise Cascade Corporation. Over the past decade, his firm has expanded into nationwide operations but steadfastly maintains its headquarters in Boise, Ida., a small city with a

metropolitan-area population of less than 100,000. Says Mr. Hansberger:

"When people have to fight each other off subways in order to get home, and fight each other to get back on in the morning, human values and human beings just aren't very important. But when you have to travel sometimes many miles before you see another person, he's more important when you find him. This is why I believe that human values assume a more important aspect where the people are spread thinner, as they are here in Idaho."

Does Boise Cascade have trouble attracting topnotch people to its small-city headquarters? Mr. Hansberger answers:

"We find that the great majority of people tend to favor living in the smaller community—provided it isn't too small. This attitude is even more noticeable as the tensions and the frustrations of the big cities have grown in recent years. When we go after a man, we bring him—and often his wife—out here to see what we have to offer and how we live."

"We're about 40 minutes from a fine ski resort, and only about 10 minutes from water skiing in the summer. We can catch fish all around the place, and hunt, and camp and ride. It's just a very wholesome place for young families, and older families, too, for that matter."

"We don't have many Negroes or other minority groups in the community. We expect to have more in the future. Enough of us are aware of the problems that have built up in other cities that we hope—by planning now—to be able to do a better job of living in peace with one another. Our firm and others are hiring Negroes and expect to hire more in the future."

BUSINESS AT A DISTANCE

As for handling communications and travel, Mr. Hansberger explains:

"We've had little trouble compensating for the fact that Boise is a bit remote. There are two airlines that provide good jet service. And, to give our people more flexibility in moving back and forth between our operating units, we have a small fleet of aircraft that are used rather heavily. We have the latest in communications equipment, including computers in a number of points around the country wired together—talking to each other. And I'm sure the day is coming when we'll be using closed-circuit TV for conferences between two or more headquarters."

Even in communities much smaller than Boise, many firms are finding that manufacturing activities can be highly successful. W. B. Murphy, president of the Campbell Soup Company, which has been putting new plants outside of big metropolitan areas for the past 15 years, says this of his company's experience:

"A lot of firms have a blind spot in that they think you have to be in a big city to get electricians or mechanics. We have found that you can take farmers—men who can fix a pump or repair a tractor—and train them to be first-class mechanics. After all, a farmer has to be a millwright, a jack of all trades."

"At Paris, Tex., we took a green force and trained it to handle some of the fastest metal-working machines. These machines were can-body makers and aluminum presses. Others were intricate electrical devices such as electronic sorting machines and automatic controls and computers. When the people are through work there for the day, they can be on the golf course in eight minutes, or back on the farms where many of them still grow crops and raise livestock in their spare time."

"We have one plant in Tecumseh, Neb., employing 750 people. This is a town of only 1,500, but we have no trouble drawing workers from the surrounding countryside. In rural areas, where traffic is no problem, you can draw a work force from a radius of 35 to 40 miles."

A NUDGE BY GOVERNMENT

Another industry executive who reports advantages of decentralizing operations is David Packard, chairman of the board of Hewlett-Packard Company, which has headquarters in Palo Alto, Calif.

"I think that the U.S. Government might give some thought to providing incentives to encourage decentralization," says Mr. Packard. "I am not sure how effective it would be, but it is worth a try. Certainly, the things they are doing to solve city problems don't seem to be working."

Hewlett-Packard, in recent years, has located two manufacturing plants on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains in Colorado—one at Colorado Springs, a city of around 100,000, some 70 miles south of Denver, and the other at Loveland, a town of around 15,000 about the same distance north of Denver.

"Our experience has been very satisfactory," says Mr. Packard. "We have no difficulty attracting top-level talent to the Colorado locations. A few people feel out of the swim, so to speak, at Loveland, but most greatly enjoy the skiing, hunting, fishing and other recreational opportunities in the areas. Actually, the Loveland plant has great *esprit de corps*, and is one of the happiest situations anywhere in the company."

Summing up, Mr. Packard says:

"Some firms feel they must be right in the heart of things, or they seem to feel out of touch. But if my viewpoint prevails, Hewlett-Packard will never locate either a plant or offices in the central part of a large city."

One example of the way in which modern communication has all but done away with the problems of living and working outside of metropolitan areas is seen in this area of Colorado. Hewlett-Packard is one of seven firms in the State taking advantage of a plan called "SURGE" to offer college-credit courses—some at the graduate level—to its employees.

"SURGE" is sponsored by the Colorado State University at Fort Collins. Video tape is used to record engineering courses as they are taught in the classrooms on campus. The tapes are then distributed to the seven firms where they can be screened on closed-circuit television at times convenient for the employees.

A point stressed again and again by those with experience both in big cities and in the countryside is that people function more efficiently when they are not beset by the frustration of megalopolis. Says Leonard C. Yaseen, chairman of the board of the Fantus Company, a Dunn & Bradstreet subsidiary with a nationwide plant-location service:

"The small-town boy outdistances the big-city boy every time. This is not necessarily a matter of union vs. nonunion plants. It is a matter of attitude toward work in big cities vs. that in smaller towns where people are used to tackling a day's work for a day's pay."

Mr. Yaseen gives this specific example:

"We have one client with a plant in a big city and a new one in a small community. Both plants have the same machinery and both make the same product. All employees are on a piecework basis. But the plant in the country outproduces the one in the city by one third. Why? The answer is that in the city you have a built-in attitude of job protection—don't produce too much, because it might hurt Joe who is a slow worker."

PROBLEM-SOLVING AT LUNCH

In Mr. Yaseen's view:

"The problems of the cities are not being solved. The planners are falling on their faces. So we are going to continue to have congestion, high taxes, high distribution costs, expensive utilities, heavy freight charges, and masses of unskilled job seekers."

"By comparison, the problems of small towns are easily corrected. For example, sup-

pose you need a new street to gain access to your plant site. In a big city, it might take years to get through the red tape. In a small town, you can often get the matter taken care of by talking to a few people over lunch." Agriculture Secretary Freeman, who keeps hammering away at the advantages of America's wide-open spaces, recently told the American Institute of Planners:

"Outside the standard metropolitan statistical areas [as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau], there are some 300 identifiable nonmetropolitan complexes made up of primarily farming, recreation and other 'open' country dotted here and there with villages and small towns where people live and trade and are tied together by small cities that are growing and moving forward."

Of these 300 areas, which are scattered all across the U.S., Mr. Freeman said:

"I believe there is more fertile ground for domestic peace and tranquility in these areas than in the cities. There is not the crowding. Not the pressure of one people against another. Not the indifference and impersonality. Not the deep-running bitterness you find in so many of our cities."

The fact of the matter is that towns and cities of 10,000 to 100,000 are shown by official Census Bureau data to be the fastest-growing population centers in America.

As just one example of what is happening all across America, take a look at Burlington, in the northwestern corner of Vermont. Here you find the type of appeal that is attracting business, industry and people.

Burlington's setting on the shores of Lake Champlain, with the Green Mountains rising to the east, is a natural attraction. The growing popularity of skiing and other winter sports has turned the long Vermont winters into an asset as far as many people are concerned.

Like many small cities, Burlington had been considered remote. Development of an interstate highway has lowered that obstacle to development. So have jet airliners that bring Boston and New York City within an hour's flying time.

Here, as elsewhere, the presence of a college—the University of Vermont—has drawn the attention of industry. As a matter of fact, the great majority of U.S. colleges are in smaller communities. An official of the U.S. Office of Education estimates that at least 2,000 of the nation's 2,200 four-year colleges are outside large urban areas.

With all its attractions, Burlington has been growing fast. Population of the city and its bedroom communities in Chittenden County, now around 85,000, has shot up by nearly 40 percent in little more than a decade. All this is in sharp contrast to Burlington's situation before the city fathers got together to form the Greater Burlington Industrial Corporation in 1954. This agency began to promote the city's attractions, established an industrial site at nearby Essex Junction and put up a building on speculation that some industry would move in. In 1957, International Business Machines, one of the big U.S. companies that have decentralized operations into many parts of the U.S., took a lease on the building and began operations with a payroll of 500.

A year later, IBM was so happy with its Vermont facility that the company bought the building and site and began to expand. In 1964, this plant became a prime producer for IBM's 360 computer system. There now are 3,100 on the company payroll and expansion to 3,700 is planned by mid-1969.

REVERSING THE TREND TO MEGALOPOLIS

The IBM operation has had a multiplier effect throughout that part of Vermont as smaller manufacturers have expanded to handle subcontracts for the bigger firms. At the same time, other space-age industries have discovered the advantages and the attractions of this New England community.

The publisher of the "Burlington Free Press," J. Warren McClure, says this of his city's growth:

"I think the basic reason is megalopolis. People are trying to get away from the congested urban areas in this day and age when they want to enjoy life more. We are giving them that opportunity."

Figures compiled by Agriculture Department officials indicate that the migration from countryside to megalopolis in the U.S. finally has begun to slow. In the first half of this decade, growth of population in counties outside of metropolitan areas was at twice the rate of the 1950s.

From 1962 through 1968, the number of new jobs in small cities and in the countryside increased at a rate higher than the national average and was double that for the 1950s in the small cities and the countryside.

This, in the opinion of many of the nation's leaders, is a hopeful sign for America's future. Mr. Hansberger, the president of Boise Cascade, puts it in these terms:

"I was talking to a man who has seen a great deal of this country in his lifetime and one of the points he made that I can't forget is that there are a great many successful people on Wall Street, and in big corporations, who started out on a farm or in a small community. He said this trend to urbanization is bad for the nation because it is drying up the source of discipline that has helped to make this country's industry what it is. We think that, by keeping our people in an area like Boise, close to nature, that we are helping our children develop a good deal of the discipline that will help them and the country in the years ahead."

An aide to Agriculture Secretary Freeman, Assistant Secretary John A. Baker, stated the problem this way in testimony before President Johnson's riot commission on Nov. 2, 1967:

"For each 10 boys now growing up on a farm, only one can find a decent livelihood as a farmer in the years ahead . . . We can either provide jobs for these nine boys in rural America, or they will be in our cities tomorrow burning down our buildings because we have been unable to develop a better rural-urban balance of economic opportunities and population patterns."

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the East Side News is one of the Nation's distinguished weekly papers. It serves a large and heterogeneous audience on the East Side of New York City. Like all decent Americans, Mr. Abraham Schlacht, publisher of the East Side News, was deeply pained by the recent assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King. Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD Mr. Schlacht's compassionate editorial on Dr. King:

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.: A CHAMPION OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND NONVIOLENCE
(By Abraham Schlacht)

American hearts are filled with sorrow over the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a man who gave his all to the service of his fellow-man.

He was in essence a rare champion who had stood ready to die for the things he believed in.

That such a good man whose feelings overflowed with tenderness and compassion

should have perished in the manner in which he did truly defies common understanding.

No assassin's bullet can eradicate the heritage he has bequeathed to the nation and to the world.

Millions of people everywhere who had followed his turbulent career perceive now more than ever that the course he had valiantly pursued was the right one, the only one, for any people or nation to accept as the solution for social, economic or political ills.

It is indeed regrettable that our country we love so much was slow in accepting his principles of non-violence and civil rights.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was an extraordinary personality, a great American, a great crusader for human brotherhood, a Nobel Prize winner, a great advocate of high spiritual values, who preferred to be called simply "a major drummer in the march for social justice."

Evils, whatever their ugly disguises, were inherently repugnant to his natural concepts of thinking.

From early childhood, he had resented and resisted every species of oppression and discrimination.

He had always felt that his people with whom he had been reared had been callously mistreated, exploited, and trodden upon.

Until the time of his assassination, he had lifted his clarion voice for the American people to stop and listen that his race demanded common justice and common equality.

It is deadfully unfortunate that our nation has waited so long in coming to its senses following his tragic death.

We fervently pray that the search for freedom, of which he was a true exemplar, will proceed irresistibly forward, for we sense within our bosoms a new wave of understanding which is sweeping in all majesty across the heart-strings of our land.

This change affords new zest and hope for America's future.

In the name of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the American people must close ranks and help erase the injustices of our disturbed society which have long been festering and which have wrought so much hardship and tears.

The Congress of the United States, as well as all state and local Legislatures, must respond to the crisis forthwith with all necessary measures to assure proper recognition and protection for his long-suffering people.

Let us, then, hallow his memory for the many things he consistently strove and exemplified, in his protest marches, in his sermons, in his public addresses, and in his numerous writings.

Let us, therefore, erect appropriate memorials, whatever their form or nature, in the nation's capital and in the principal cities of our land.

Only in this manner can his life's work be perpetuated, and future generations will recall and contemplate the intellectual and moral grandeur of this man, and the wisdom of his sublime teachings.

Schuyler Colfax Honored

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, March 23 marked the anniversary of the birth of an outstanding and prominent Hoosier, Schuyler Colfax. This remarkable man, a journalist by profession, rose through years of dedicated public service in In-

diana to the speakership of the House of Representatives and eventually to the Vice-Presidency of the United States.

Journalism and politics were not the full scope of Schuyler Colfax's many activities. In addition, he was an active member of the Odd Fellows fraternity and has been credited with the single-handed creation of the Rebekah Degree of Odd Fellowship.

Mr. President, a recent issue of the International Rebekah News contains an excellent tribute written in commemoration of this outstanding American. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the International Rebekah News, March 1968]

A BIOGRAPHY OF SCHUYLER COLFAX, FOUNDER OF THE REBEKAH DEGREE

The date of March 23 marks the anniversary of the birth of the man responsible for his untiring efforts in organizing and establishing the Rebekah Degree. Originally established for wives, and later for mothers, daughters and sisters of Odd Fellows, and still later for ladies of good character interested in joining hands with Odd Fellows in helping to make this world a better place in which to live.

Schuyler Colfax was born New York City on March 23, 1823, several months after the death of his father. In 1834 his mother was married to George W. Matthews. At the age of 10, Schuyler Colfax left school and started work in his stepfather's store. Later the family moved to Indiana settling at New Carlisle in St. Joseph County. He continued as a clerk and during his spare time took up the study of journalism which enabled him to contribute articles to the county paper.

After his step-father retired from business, Colfax took up the study of law. When Mr. Matthews was elected county auditor and moved to South Bend, Indiana, Schuyler was appointed deputy, which office he held for eight years.

He still continued his work in journalism. In 1845, with a partner, purchased the South Bend Free Press, changing its name to St. Joseph Valley Register, which became the most influential paper in that part of Indiana.

Schuyler Colfax was a born leader. In 1842 he was active in organizing a temperance society in South Bend and about the same time reported the proceedings of the State Senate for the Indianapolis Journal. He held many responsible positions, serving as secretary of the Chicago Harbor and River convention in 1847 and of the Whig convention in Baltimore in 1848. The next year he was elected a member of the convention to revise the constitution of the state of Indiana.

He was elected to Congress in 1854 and was re-elected continuously up to 1868. During the years of service in the House he served as chairman of many important committees and introduced many reforms. He was elected Speaker of the House in 1863 and was twice re-elected and gained the plaudits of both parties by his skill as a presiding officer; often under very trying circumstances as his tenure as Speaker was the latter years of the war between the States, and the Reconstruction period that immediately followed.

In May, 1868, the Republican National convention meeting in Chicago nominated Schuyler Colfax on the first ballot as the vice president candidate with General U. S. Grant. The Republican ticket being successful in the November election, he became Vice President and thus President of the Senate on March 4, 1869, the only man to preside

over both Houses of Congress until Vice President Jack Garner in the 1930's.

His later years were spent in retirement in his home at South Bend, Indiana and in delivering public lectures. Several of his speeches are preserved among collections of the world's finest orations. At his death which resulted from a heart attack, public honors were paid to his memory both in Congress and in Indiana.

Here are some of the details of the life of Bro. Colfax, Fraternalist.

He was initiated into South Bend Subordinate Lodge No. 29 February 18, 1846, and soon after became a member of the Encampment branch. He rose steadily in the ranks and became Representative to the Grand Lodge of the United States now the Sovereign Grand Lodge where his merit and abilities soon brought him recognition. His services in the Sovereign Body were marked by industry and enthusiasm, he being placed on many important committees.

At the session of 1850, as chairman of the Committee on Legislation, he had the opportunity offered him by which he became famous as the author of the Rebekah Degree. The committee rendered an adverse report on the proposed establishment of such a degree, but Bro. Colfax submitted a minority report favoring it and such was his eloquence and the manifest merit of the idea that his minority report was accepted, and he was appointed the chairman of a committee to prepare a Ritual. Our Rebekah Ritual of today follows very closely his work as shown in the original ritual he almost singlehandedly prepared. Thus, at the 1851 session of the Sovereign Grand Lodge, his efforts were approved and the Rebekah Degree of Odd Fellowship came into official being.

Bro. Colfax never lost his interest in the work of Odd Fellowship, nor in the degree which he helped to create. To him is credited the compilation of the Rebekah Ritual, and it should be the aim of all officers of Rebekah lodges to present this beautiful degree in the most impressive manner humanly possible.

Bro. Colfax remained faithful to Odd Fellowship throughout his life. It was on a business trip in January, 1885, at Mankato, Minnesota, he expired in the depot of that city shortly after arriving. He was identified by the local Odd Fellows and taken by them to the home of a physician where the body lay in state for several hours and then sent to his home in South Bend with an escort of Odd Fellows.

EXCERPT ON SCHUYLER COLFAX FROM "SCHUYLER COLFAX: THE CHANGING FORTUNES OF A POLITICAL IDOL"

"In the fall of 1851 Schuyler Colfax was engaged in another activity outside the journalistic field. Having been an active member of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows for some years, a connection which likely aided him politically, he became a leading spirit in establishing the Degree of Rebekah, the ladies' auxiliary of the Order. At the session of the Grand Lodge of the United States in Cincinnati, 1850, Colfax was appointed chairman of a committee to consider the matter. He previously had suggested the idea of a ladies' degree. A majority of the committee was opposed, but the Grand Lodge adopted the minority report which he made. In the words of one writer, the degree 'was suggested and originated by Schuyler Colfax . . . by whom also it was written.' Brother Colfax deserves, as he has received, the sincere thanks of the Fraternity, for this ornament to the building which our fathers framed." The above is an excerpt from the biography "Schuyler Colfax—The Changing Fortunes of a Political Idol" by Willard H. Smith and published by the Indiana Historical Bureau.

Resolution Memorializing the Congress To Pass Legislation To Establish a National Cemetery in Rhode Island

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in all of New England, which has almost 1½ million veterans, there is no national cemetery, while in the South Atlantic region, which has a little over 2½ million veterans, there are 24 national cemeteries or one cemetery for every 124,000 veterans. Because of this glaring inequity and the great contributions made by the veterans from Rhode Island, I introduced a bill in the 89th Congress for the establishment of a national cemetery in Rhode Island.

I am very pleased to note that the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island has passed a resolution expressing their support of this legislation, H.R. 5649. I will include this resolution, memorializing the Congress to pass my bill, H.R. 5649, in the RECORD following my remarks.

Let me also take this opportunity to remind the Members of this body that this inequity has existed for much too great a time to permit any further delay in taking action on this matter. While too much time has been allowed to pass concerning this inequity, very little time remains in which to act in this 90th Congress. Let us now act expeditiously and favorably on this matter.

The resolution referred to follows:

RESOLUTION S. 620

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass H.R. 5649, a bill to establish a national cemetery in Gloucester, R.I.

Whereas, Congressman Fernand St Germain, United States Representative in Congress, First District, Rhode Island, has introduced H.R. 5649, a bill to establish a national cemetery in Rhode Island; and

Whereas, Rhode Island, one of the most densely populated states in the country, has no national burial facilities; and

Whereas, Adequate and proper burial facilities for Rhode Island's honored veterans are badly needed and earnestly desired; and

Whereas, In every other region of the country there are at least four national cemeteries, but in New England there are none; and

Whereas, It is grossly unfair that the New England area which gave birth to this nation and particularly Rhode Island, the first of the original American colonies to formally renounce allegiance to Great Britain, remains without a national cemetery; and

Whereas, The historically rich State of Rhode Island, which has contributed so much to the greatness of this nation, should be permitted a national cemetery within its boundaries; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the general assembly does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to pass H.R. 5649, a bill to establish a national cemetery in Gloucester, Rhode Island; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in the congress of the United

States in the hope that they will give this matter their personal attention.

Attest:

AUGUST P. LA FRANCE,
Secretary of State.

Arson Continues in District of Columbia

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article entitled "Arson Probed in Seven More Fires," published in today's Washington Evening Star.

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

ARSON PROBED IN SEVEN MORE FIRES: TWO ARE ARRESTED IN LOOTING INCIDENT

Seven fires of suspicious origin, most of them relatively minor and in areas hit by rioting more than two weeks ago, were reported in Washington last night.

District arson squad investigators, probing 16 such blazes since Sunday, were preparing a report this morning for Public Safety Director Patrick V. Murphy on which of the fires will be classified as arson cases.

At the scene of a minor fire at National Capital Housing Authority storage garage in Southwest Washington, District police apprehended a 13-year-old boy and were seeking two other juveniles. Another 13-year-old was charged Monday in connection with two earlier arson cases elsewhere in the city.

TEAR GAS HOLDUP

As the rash of suspicious fires broke out again last night, police said five holdup men tossed a tear gas canister into a 7-Eleven store at 4660 Nichols Ave. SW after ordering customers at gunpoint into the rear of the store and taking \$150 from the cash register and safe. Firemen brought an exhaust fan to the scene of the 9:25 p.m. holdup to clear the tear gas from the store.

Police reported only one confirmed instance of looting yesterday, at Murphy's variety store in the 3200 block of 14th Street NW. Police, aided by a canine corps dog, made two arrests at the scene.

The first of last night's suspicious fires was reported at 6:57 p.m. at Hoffman's Used Furniture Store, 2447 18th St., NW., where fire officials estimated damage to the building at \$300, plus minor damage to contents. The fire spread from trash in a storage room to some gas meters, igniting gas and spreading the fire to parts of the first floor.

At 8:09 p.m., a dozen pieces of fire equipment responded to an alarm at Levin's Sales Exchange, a pawn shop at 1303 H St. NE, that had been looted during the rioting. Damage to building and its contents was estimated at \$2,000 by fire officials.

CHURCH STORE FIRE

Five minutes after that alarm, firemen put out a blaze involving furniture and clothing at the rear of the St. Vincent de Paul Society store at 1346 U St. NW. Total damage was estimated at \$600.

At 8:57 p.m., fire caused an estimated \$1,000 damage at the rear of a previously burned and unoccupied High's dairy store at 332 H St. NE, fire officials said.

The housing authority storage garage fire, at 1338 First St. SW, occurred at 9:28 p.m. and damage to the garage and building material was estimated at \$200. Police believe the boy who was arrested and his companions

poured kerosene from a construction lantern on some closet shelving in the garage, then put a match to it.

A vacant brick home at 1330 Farragut St. NW was burned out by fire about 10 p.m. Firemen fought the blaze in the two-story house for half an hour before it was brought under control.

NEIGHBOR SNUFFS BLAZE

Officials said a rear door at a television shop at 326 Kennedy St. NW was discovered burning about 10:30 p.m. by a neighbor who put it out without fire department help.

The incident at the Murphy's store on 14th Street NW occurred about 1:30 yesterday afternoon, police said. Believing they saw unauthorized persons in the basement of the store—which still reeked of tear gas—police entered and arrested James A. Gibbs, 28, and Willis Swain, 27, both of the 1400 block of Park Road NW.

Police said Swain was bitten on the right wrist and arm by a Canine Corps dog. Swain was treated at D.C. General Hospital, they said.

Peaceful Nuclear Proliferation

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, made an excellent and timely address at a meeting of the South Carolina-Georgia Nuclear Council and the Joint Council of Engineering and Scientific Societies of the Central Savannah River Area on April 15 in Augusta, Ga.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the Savannah River plant in Aiken County in my congressional district. We are pleased over the great feeling of optimism there about the future role of the atom for peaceful uses among the Atomic Energy Commission personnel and the dedicated personnel of the great Du Pont Co. which operates the Savannah River plant.

The Columbia State, of Columbia, S.C., one of the South's great and outstanding newspapers, carried a splendid editorial tribute to Dr. Seaborg on April 18. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and to the people of our country:

PEACEFUL PROLIFERATION

Its primary function is still the production of materials for nuclear weapons. But the Atomic Energy Commission's Savannah River Plant near Aiken is involved also in peaceful uses of the atom and, for this reason, is increasingly important to the industrial development of South Carolina and the Southeast.

In his address Monday night in Augusta, AEC Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg referred to "peaceful nuclear proliferation." He noted, by way of example, that the capacity of nuclear power stations in the South Carolina-Georgia area alone soon will exceed the existing production capacity of all such power plants in the United States.

Nationwide, nuclear power stations now have a combined capacity of 2,800,000 kilowatts. By 1975, South Carolina and Georgia will have a 4,000,000 kilowatt capacity.

Dr. Seaborg looks toward the day, not too distant perhaps, when giant, nuclear-powered industrial complexes will spring up wherever nuclear power is produced. These complexes might be compared to the atom itself, with each power producer forming a

nucleus around which are grouped industrial satellites.

The Du Pont Company, which operates the AEC's Savannah River Plant, furnishes an illustration of how rapidly events may move in the field of atomic energy. Its Savannah River Laboratory has required five years to produce only 10 pounds (almost the entire world output) of curium-244, potentially one of the most important radioisotopes. With the anticipated proliferation of nuclear power plants, however, Du Pont scientists ultimately may produce this isotope by the ton.

The far-reaching potential of Dr. Seaborg's peaceful proliferation is difficult to comprehend and equally difficult to exaggerate. We stand on the threshold of a new era—a Nuclear Age and, quite possibly, a Golden Age as well. When this new day dawns, a large part of the credit will go to Dr. Seaborg's commission, the South Carolina-Georgia Nuclear Council and others who are engaged in converting a grim destroyer into a benefactor of mankind.

Airport Crisis

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this Nation faces an airport dilemma of huge proportions, as I have said many times in the past year. Last August the Aviation Subcommittee held hearings to determine the scope of the problem, and in January of this year the subcommittee issued an interim report on the subject. One of the principal conclusions of that report was that a national program to finance airport construction is essential, and must go forward soon if we are to be prepared for the crush of air traffic which lies ahead.

What we need now are practical and constructive proposals from government and from the aviation industry so that we may initiate such a program as soon as possible. Mr. Stuart G. Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association of America, in a recent speech outlined a new proposal for airport financing that has the support of the scheduled airlines.

I commend the airline industry for its efforts in attempting to meet this problem head on. I urge the other segments of the aviation industry to come up with constructive proposals also. Time is short. The airport problem is a national problem which must be cured and cured soon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Tipton's address before the Cleveland Traffic Club on April 24, 1968, outlining the airport proposal.

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

AIR TRANSPORTATION IN THE NEXT DECADE

It is a pleasure to be here today, to again have the opportunity of meeting with some of the men responsible for the growth of this great industrial city, and to discuss the growth, the problems and the exciting future of air transportation.

It has been nearly 10 years since I last spoke in Cleveland. Back in August, 1959, I spoke before your Rotary Club on the sub-

ject "Cleveland, A Progressive City in the Air Age".

At that time, I discussed the very successful "partnership for progress" between the airlines and Cleveland. This partnership has continued through what is called the "jet age" and I am sure will continue into the foreseeable future of supersonic and hypersonic transport.

What I would like to do today is to review the progress made by your city, and by the airlines, in the last 10 years. Then, I plan to look ahead for the next decade and tell you some of the opportunities, and the problems, that will be ahead for both the city—and air transportation.

But first, let us take a quick look backward and see how close the history of aviation and Cleveland has been over the years.

Cleveland Hopkins Airport, today one of the largest municipal airports in the world, was opened in July 1, 1925, at a time when there were only a handful of airports.

Less than a year later, the United States scheduled airline system, as we know it today, was born when a Ford Tri-Motor lumbered into Cleveland from Detroit with a handful of letters—the first flight of a private contractor under America's first air mail act.

The first air traffic control tower in the nation was opened in 1929 and in that same year—in Cleveland—the first automatic pilot was used on a plane.

By the end of World War II, Cleveland was being served by five certificated scheduled airlines. Today there are eight operating 180 flights daily out of Cleveland Hopkins Airport. Most of the flights are jet-operated.

Today more than 6,000 passengers a day enplane at Cleveland Hopkins Airport—in 1967 that meant more than 2,222,000 passengers, an increase of 222 per cent in 10 years!

Future growth will probably exceed the phenomenal growth of the past 10 years.

Later this year, the nation's first high speed airport-to-downtown rapid transit system will open. With it, downtown Cleveland will be only 20 minutes away from the airport. Such a system may be the solution to the airport access problem and, for this reason, the eyes of the transportation world are focused on the project. And when the system opens for business, I hope it will get the whoop-te-doo it deserves.

The "shape" of the future also includes world travel. Ten years ago, Cleveland became a true international seaport with the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Only a few weeks ago, the CAB examiner in the important Transpacific case named Cleveland as a mainland terminal for direct service to Hawaii and the Far East. Cleveland is also being considered as a terminal in the Transatlantic cargo case.

In anticipation of the growth in traffic that is bound to come, a group of airline and civic leaders with a strong touch of vision are now meeting once a month to discuss plans for a new airport to serve the planes of the future—the new subsonic jet designs and the supersonic transports.

The growth of air transportation has not, of course, been limited to Cleveland. The past 10 years have been years of spectacular growth for the airline industry.

This is the 10th year of what airline people call the Civil Jet Age and over that period traffic has gone up 135.7 per cent, from 56 million passengers in 1958 to more than 132 million last year. While the United States is growing by about 7,000 citizens a day, the airlines are adding more than 40,000 passengers a day.

In 1959, new capital spending by the airlines was a small factor in the economy. Today, air transport is the seventh largest industry in the country in volume of capital expenditures. This year alone, the airlines will take delivery of almost two aircraft every working day of the year at an average

cost of \$6.5 million per plane. Another way to look at this is to put this in terms of new plants. The average price of a typical new factory is about one-half million dollars. The airlines are building 12 new factories every day.

In just the last four years, the U.S. scheduled airlines bought 219 freighter jets at a cost of \$1.6 billion—an investment that has produced a vastly improved freight transport system in terms of speed, capacity and service. The result: shippers—for the first time in meaningful numbers and with regular cargoes—are discovering air freight.

In the last 10 years, the airlines have become the number one form of public transportation between cities. In 1958, the airlines accounted for about 35 per cent of all public inter-city traffic. Today, that figure is about 66 per cent and still on the rise.

All of this growth has been accompanied by improved passenger services and lower fares. In the past five years, average airline fares have dropped 13.2 per cent while the cost of living has increased more than seven per cent.

Yes, the airlines today are far and away the fastest growing major industry in the country. But what about tomorrow? And next year? And the years beyond that?

The answers are, I think, exciting. The best is yet to come. As Charles F. Kettering, inventive genius of General Motors once said, "Human ingenuity is boundless. It is nonsense to think we have reached any limit of mechanical progress."

Kettering was right but predicting the future can be a risky business. For example, a 1937 study of some note totally missed not only the computer, but atomic energy, antibiotics, radar and jet propulsion. Yet, nearly all of these had been around in principle, waiting for development.

Herman Kahn in his book *The Year 2000*, says that in 1957 it would have been impossible to convince a "scientifically knowledgeable audience that a Polaris submarine missile system could have been produced in a decade. Nevertheless, by 1967 no less than 41 Polaris submarines were operational, meaning that six major, seemingly insurmountable problems had been solved.

Without venturing into the unknown decades ahead, however, let us take a look at what is already possible with present day airline technology. In fact, what the airlines already have on the drawing boards.

In the next 10 years, three entirely new and different types of aircraft will be introduced. By the end of next year, jets with a capacity of 350 to 450 passengers will be in operation. Around 1972, the tri-jet will come on the scene. And scheduled for 1975 are the SST's. Supersonic aircraft, flying at speeds of 2,200 miles an hour will cross the Atlantic in an hour-and-a-half and add new dimensions to travel growth.

In terms of equipment, we are on the brink of the most exciting era in air travel history. In terms of traffic, the path is clear and continues upward:

By 1975, the airlines will be flying 330 million passengers, more than three times today's level.

By 1972, the airlines will be flying 10 billion ton miles of cargo, three times today's level.

These figures will give you some idea of the magnitude of growth and the technological progress that lies ahead. Obviously, growth is an asset on the ledger. But this growth causes serious pressures on the air transport system.

To meet this growth, the airlines have committed themselves to an unprecedented capital expenditure program. In the five-year period 1968-1972, the 12 major U.S. airlines will spend more than \$10.5 billion. The industry as a whole will spend several billion dollars more in the next decade for flight and ground equipment and operating property.

But there are other pressures. The growing traffic has to be handled, reservations must be made, baggage must be located and tickets must be issued.

As a start on the baggage problem, the airlines are developing a multi-million dollar automatic baggage system which will completely automate and speed up the delivery of baggage to the passenger and between airlines. The system will take luggage from planes and by means of "memory units" keyed to respond to passenger baggage claim checks, will send the luggage within three minutes on a high-speed track to any of dozens of locations around the airport and its parking lots. The need for such a system was vividly demonstrated when one airline's first stretched DC-8 flight landed at Miami and disgorged 535 pieces of luggage. The Boeing 747 will carry twice as many pieces.

The airlines are also in the process of developing an automatic ticketing system which passengers can operate themselves and which will provide tickets and confirmed reservations in 80 percent less time than it takes today. For example, if technology can match our ambition in the early 1970s, a passenger may go to a shopping center and insert a plastic credit card in a vending machine, press a button to see if there is a seat on tomorrow's flight to Chicago, and if the answer is affirmative, punch another button and have a ticket drop into his hands—confirmed, recorded and ready to use.

One of the key elements of the aviation system which needs immediate expansion is the air traffic control system. The Federal government owns and operates the system and is entirely responsible for it. Last summer, President Johnson called upon the Department of Transportation to come forward with a program which will improve and expand the airways system. The aviation industry hopes that the department will come forward soon because the en route delays to both passenger and airline are expensive and are mounting. Air traffic control is a priority item and government should get on with the job with all deliberate speed.

Forty years ago, the government took on the job of running the air traffic control system. It is their responsibility to operate that system just as it is their responsibility to deliver the mail. Because so much is dependent upon the air traffic control system, there should be no temporizing at this point.

The pressures of growth have other aspects, of course. Clearly air transportation cannot expand unless airports expand along with all the other elements of aviation. Most people today take the speed, convenience and reliability of air travel for granted. For businessmen on the move, air travel is a vital part of life. But unless the problems of airport congestion are solved, the assets of air travel may disappear. Right now, there is hardly a commercial airliner in the country that does not get delayed at least once a day at an airport.

The problem is evident. The entire airport structure also stands in need of immediate expansion. The Secretary of Transportation, Alan Boyd, estimates that this improvement program will cost some \$6 billion.

The growth in air transport is obvious. The expansions and improvements required are just as obvious. A great infusion of capital is needed to allow for the expansion. A large part of the funds will be derived from airport users, primarily air carriers and their passengers. A portion will come from airport earnings, especially from large hub airports such as Cleveland's Hopkins Airport, which are successful, going concerns.

But where does the rest come from? The big bulge? That is the problem we must solve soon. There is a definite limit to what the airlines can do. Our earnings are already in a squeeze. On one side the cost of labor

and materials is up, and on the other, the yield realized from the passenger and the shipper is down. And, on top of the squeeze, is the very real need to pay for the billions of dollars of new aircraft that have been ordered to meet the requirements of the seventies.

With this in mind, the airline industry has come up with a proposal that it feels will fill the demand for the capital bulge the airport expansion program so sorely needs.

The proposal calls for the establishment—by the Congress—of an Airport Development Trust Fund, similar to the present Highway Trust Fund. It would be set up within the Treasury of the United States and would be administered by the Secretary of Transportation.

The Trust Fund would be maintained from the proceeds of a 2 per cent tax on airline passengers within the United States. For passengers departing the United States to foreign points there would be a flat fee of \$2 per trip.

This fund would then set about in a very meaningful way to expand the airport system. Both the big, air carrier airports—such as Cleveland's Hopkins—as well as the smaller ones—such as Burke Lakefront—would be eligible for financial assistance. The smaller airfields—such as Burke—serve a vital purpose as reliever airports; that is, they relieve the major airports of the general aviation traffic, which does not need to land there, giving Cleveland and other major cities a much better overall pattern of air service. To the extent that smaller airports are opened by public agencies, and are reliever airports, they would be eligible for financial assistance.

Eligible projects—for which financing would be provided—include the construction, alteration and improvement of airfield facilities.

The financial assistance would take the form of paying up to 75 per cent of the debt service costs of airport bond issues. It would also provide for short term loans for planning, land acquisition and for the start of construction on urgently needed projects pending approval of a long term program of financial aid.

It is a good proposal and one which we hope will be adopted as soon as possible. It is clear that there must be Federal leadership if we are to have an airport system designed to meet the nation's demands for air transportation of the next decade.

The proposal meets three major tests of a truly national airport program: (1) it provides capital funding without dipping into the general treasury, (2) it is available to all communities served by airlines which meet the few, simple requirements, (3) it aids the major users of the airports, commercial air carriers and general aviation alike.

I had said at the outset that I would talk about the next 10 years. Very briefly and, very generally, I have done so. I have pointed out that we need ample, efficient flying equipment. That is the airline responsibility and we are meeting it with a multi-billion dollar investment of our own.

We must have a good airway traffic control system and I pointed out that this is the responsibility of the Federal government. All of aviation hopes that the government will come forward soon with a solution.

I have talked about airports and said that the responsibility is shared with the local government, the users and the Federal government, whose concern it is to have a national system.

I have pointed out a way in which the Federal government and the airport operator can co-operate in the development of an airport system which will meet the requirements of the next decade. The program is vitally important. We must not let it wait.

A Time for Strong Leadership

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, Nishna Valley High School in Hastings, Iowa, recently conducted its National Honor Society initiation and induction. It was my pleasure to be present for this occasion, and to hear an address by Mrs. Bertha Thorson, a very talented and respected member of the faculty of this fine school.

At a time when America is crying for leadership, I felt the remarks made by Mrs. Thorson were particularly appropriate. They come from a dedicated teacher who has shown by example what leadership means, and the success and talent of her students show this influence—under her guidance numerous honors have been bestowed upon Nishna Valley High School.

I commend to my congressional colleagues Bertha Thorson's remarks on the need for strong and effective leadership in our society:

To be asked to speak with you this evening made me very happy. When this organization was established in our school in 1960 and we received our charter, five people assisted in setting up the Constitution and establishing a ritual to be used for the purpose of evaluating new members and installing probationary members into full membership. I was pleased to be among those chosen five, and I have served until this year as co-sponsor of this organization. It is still close to my heart.

The people present here on this platform know that it was not easy to become a member of this organization. Lack of scholastic attainment has kept many otherwise deserving people from membership. Lack of achievement in the fields of citizenship, leadership, and service or any one of these qualities has kept good scholars from membership. Membership in any organization which keeps its standards high is a prized possession. One places little value on anything which can be had for the taking. The torch which is the emblem of the National Honor Society is indeed well chosen. Today when mediocrity seems to be taking over the world, achievement needs to hold aloft its torch to light the world to a new era of hope and accomplishment.

In thinking of the four principles of the National Honor Society, it was hard to choose among them for a topic around which to build an address.

No one knows better the value of citizenship than the person who has lost it.

No one appreciates service more than a person badly in need of help.

No one appreciates scholarship more than the student who gets that long-awaited letter from the college of his choice telling him that he has been accepted as a student.

However it seems to me, that none of these qualities could be brought to the peak of achievement without the quality of leadership.

One must have some of the qualities of leadership to be a good citizen; no deed of service is ever done without a leader to give direction and planning, and everyone knows you must have qualities of leadership to want to excel scholastically. The mediocre are always too ready to pull down to their level the student who does not possess self-direction.

The qualities of leadership fostered by this organization are needed sorely by our country. When America became a nation after 1776, it seems that every colony was blessed

with a multiplicity of great leaders. It was not so much a question of where to find a leader as it was to choose one from many candidates of the finest quality. In today's presidential race it seems to me that those dropping from the race will leave those willing to continue without any competition in the primaries. Our economy is based upon the competitive system. Even Nature believes that the survival of the fittest is the surest means that the species shall continue strong and enduring. It is certainly not to the credit of our nation that no one remains to do battle with the candidates and prove the mettle of these survivors so we may be sure that our leadership is strong and is willing to fight to maintain their leadership. It seems to me that when the going gets tough, too many are only too willing to turn tail and seek cover.

Life in colonial America was harsh, and it was tough and go as to whether this experiment in government of the people, by the people were not to perish from this earth. The struggle honed the metal of its patriots to a fine edge and surely as I said before it produced a ratio of quality of leadership to the number of people being led that we have not seen since. Therefore, it would seem that life today is too soft, too plastic, to produce the high quality of leadership so necessary to this changing world.

We look with appreciation and a sense of awe at little Israel and the fight she is making to preserve her identity and integrity in the face of the jealousy of her less ambitious neighbors. We take renewed hope from watching this tiny nation fight—and win—with an intestinal fortitude which reminds us of our own pioneer ancestry, an ancestry which reminds us that America too fought against established privilege for the freedom which until their day had been little more than a dream of oppressed mankind. Now, in a day when too many people insult and abuse this very freedom and go unpunished, we should take renewed devotion toward the preservation of this commodity for which the Israelites are willing to shed their life's blood to preserve. No burning of draft cards, no demonstrations, no hippie movements, no Malcolm X's, no Rap Browns, among these people! Even their women bear arms and fight alongside their men so great is the determination of these people to preserve their country—a country they had not had for centuries. Left to the prey of any nation seeking a scapegoat, these Israeli nationals know the value of a nation and a diplomatic service to preserve and protect their rights when they are far from home in a unfriendly land. How else do you think a Hitler could visit such wholesale destruction upon a people unless they had no native land to protect their rights. Such brave cowards as Hitler like to pick on people who have no defense and no defenders.

These objects of God's wrath, these Israelites, became wanderers without a homeland when their leadership broke down and corruption and materialism destroyed their spiritual leadership. One thing, however, God promised them—any nation persecuting these, his chosen people, should be destroyed. You students of history, can you refute the fact that wherever the Jews have been persecuted that this nation has not fallen? Now, when at long last, they have a country, can you imagine them in less than two hundred years in the future ceasing to prize this dear-bought land? Well, I surmise, neither could Washington, Jefferson, Adams, and even John Hancock foresee the people of today who do not prize our freedom. This is one time when if these patriots could have seen the freedom bought with patriot blood being destroyed on a bonfire of burning draft cards they might have been unwilling to make the initial effort that gave us this land in the first place.

When you think of the hidden kingdom of the Mafia underworld, when you think of the Negro demonstrators, does it ever occur to you that the ancestors of these people did not fight in the Revolution? They remind me of the kid who eats only the icing off the cake, it's too much trouble and effort to chew the cake. But to translate a Swedish motto I have at home on a wall plaque in my kitchen: better coarse cake, than *nothing* to chew . . . and if we ignore these people who would destroy the fabric of the freedom and the government we so dearly bought in the past *nothing* is what we are going to have to chew—and sooner than we think!!!

In "Our Town" Thornton Wilder says through the character of the stage manager that every child born into this world is Nature's attempt to make a perfect human being. I would like to paraphrase that by saying that every student who comes into the National Honor Society is this organization's attempt to make a perfect leader for this beloved country of ours. It is meant to foster all that is good, discourage all that is weak, and strengthen the will to use the God-given powers they have inherited from their forebears to make this world a better place in which to live and never to cease in this attempt no matter where their future lives may lead them.

The torch has literally and figuratively been passed. Carry it proudly, carry it high, and never, never let it be extinguished in the dust of indifference.

Recalls Ernie Pyle

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, 23 years ago this month we lost a great American, Ernie Pyle. In a recent letter to the editor of the Cleveland Press, Mr. N. R. Calvo, commissioner of soldiers relief, Cuyahoga County, Cleveland, Ohio, recalls Ernie Pyle and how he was beloved by the men in uniform as well as the people back home to whom he reported the fighting.

Mr. Calvo is, himself, a U.S. Army veteran of World War II, commander of American Legion Post No. 74, Cleveland, Ohio, member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, life member of the Disabled American Veterans, and life member of the AMVETS. I believe my colleagues will be interested in his letter about Ernie Pyle, which follows:

RECALLS ERNIE PYLE

As American lives continue being lost in Southeast Asia, I think it fitting at this time to reflect on an American lost 23 years ago on Apr. 18, 1945. I refer to Ernie Pyle.

He was one of our greatest war correspondents; he was responsible in World War II for combat infantry and medics receiving an extra \$10 a month in pay; he was responsible for the wearing of overseas bars on the left sleeve of uniforms. He was beloved by the men in combat, as well as the people back home to whom he reported the fighting.

I could not say any better words than those of President Harry S. Truman, stating "no man in this war has so well told the story of the American fighting men as American fighting men wanted it told. He deserves the gratitude of all his countrymen."

Perhaps that is why, 23 years later, so many visit Punchbowl, the 112-acre National Memorial Cemetery on the Island of Oahu,

in the State of Hawaii and Ernie Pyle's grave. They daily place flower leis beside the plain granite marker. In a way, Pyle is still the link between the American war dead of World War II and the free men and women who come to Punchbowl's long rows of graves.

N. R. CALVO.

I Voted "No" on Open Housing

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in answer to a letter from a constituent who questioned my vote against the open housing bill, I wrote to him as follows:

In your zeal for open housing you would seem to advocate taking away the rights of many to redistribute them to the few. Describe this as human rights for the few, if you will, but the law has always been, in our country, that property owners have *personal rights* in property regardless. To me, that's pretty important and taking any of them away is no light matter.

This response was predicated upon a basic principle which I referred to on April 10, the day of decision:

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the landmark decision of *Shelley v. Kraemer*, 334 U.S. 1 (1948), the U.S. Supreme Court established the criteria that racially restrictive covenants on land are not enforceable if there is a willing buyer and a willing seller. The question then became one of exercising the right established. The issue before the House today on H.R. 2516 is whether this principle will be abandoned, thereby jeopardizing the basic common law concept of property rights. The decision should emphatically be in the negative.

Earlier, on April 8—when many of our cities were still reeling from the onslaught of arsonists and looters—I had voiced utmost concern over the ominous developments and expressed my sincere belief that *reason* requires *discipline* and that those who hope for problems to be solved with legislation and money, hope in vain:

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the chaos in our land—where will it end? That is the question on almost every mature American's tongue. What can be done about it? What should be done about it? Of course, there are many deep-seated ills in our society which require patient and unrelenting treatment. A great host of our problems stem from a serious deficit of spiritual and moral values, the lack of parental training and influence, and a permissive and indulgent philosophy which is alien to the American spirit. Those who believe that many of our most pressing problems can be solved by legislation and money hope in vain.

But the immediate crisis calls for decisiveness and action. Wishful thinking and hesitation will solve nothing. In fact these weaknesses have contributed much to the present grave and ugly situation.

If governmental authorities do not consistently act with determination to keep order and respect, this entire country—consisting overwhelmingly of peace-loving, law-abiding citizens, black and white, rich and poor—will be subjected to more acute tension, intensified risks, and terrible harm.

The point has been reached when we must—we must for everyone's sake—meet recklessness with resolve, and lawlessness

with authority. We must not avoid this responsibility nor abdicate this trust.

A permanent cure for the sickness which infects our Nation should be sought; but if emergency treatment calls for the use of a straitjacket, we must not be afraid to use it. The patient must not be allowed to harm himself and infect others because we are too tenderhearted to restrain, isolate, or treat him.

God give us the wisdom and the will to do our duty.

Those who have advocated civil disobedience have truly "sown the wind and they are reaping the whirlwind"—I could see it in the smoke beyond the Capitol from my office during that dreadful week and weekend. Just as no man should be beneath the law, no man can be above it. And neither open housing nor the still-planned Washington siege will heal our land.

Olympic Double Standard

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I brought to the attention of the House what I consider a double standard in this year's Olympic games.

South Africa has been barred because a number of Afro-Asian nations and the Soviet Union disapprove of South Africa's domestic politics.

I pointed out yesterday that the Soviet Union has conducted what amounts to a war of genocide against Russia's Jews. I said that if internal political considerations determine South Africa's eligibility, they should also determine Russia's and that Russia should therefore be barred from the Olympics.

Today I have sent a cablegram to Avery Brundage, president of the International Olympic Committee, calling either for reinstatement of the IOC's original invitation to South Africa or for expulsion of Russia from the 1968 Olympics.

I am including the text of my cablegram at this point:

TEXT OF CABLEGRAM FROM CONGRESSMAN JACK McDONALD TO MR. AVERY BRUNDAGE, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE, LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND

In view of Olympic Committee action against South Africa, I strongly urge that Soviet Russia be barred from the Mexico City games because of its long record of brutal physical and spiritual persecution of the Jews.

Politics, as you have said, should have no part in the management of the Olympics. However, when politics becomes involved, the same rules should apply to all. It is a matter of common knowledge and of history that the Soviet Union has for years been carrying out a systematic campaign against people of the Jewish religion in order to destroy the Jewish heritage. This persecution has been manifested in action Jewish religious training, cultural life and communal living. Russia's actions against the Russian Jewish population amount to a war of genocide designed to eradicate all vestiges of Jewish religion and culture. It is incon-

ceivable to me that the International Olympic Committee could act against one nation without acting against another that has committed crimes of such enormity against its own people.

On Tuesday, I addressed the United States House of Representatives on this matter. I therefore call on the Olympic Committee either to reinstate its invitation to the Republic of South Africa or to exclude the Soviet Union for its barbaric treatment of Russian Jews.

JACK McDONALD,
Member of Congress.

Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women Commend Senator Hugh Scott

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, each year women contribute more and more to the governmental and political processes of our Nation. Often they are inspired and encouraged by National, State, and local leaders. Because of outstanding efforts to achieve this worthy goal I commend the Republican leaders of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, particularly Senator HUGH SCOTT.

Of 20 delegates-at-large and alternates-at-large selected in Pennsylvania to the Republican National Convention, four are women. Yesterday, on April 23, Pennsylvania Primary Day, the 54 remaining delegates-at-large were elected and I am pleased to report that a proportionate number elected at the ballot box were women.

Senator SCOTT, a former Republican national chairman and U.S. Congressman for 25 years, has always supported representation by women in State and national affairs. In recognition of his efforts, the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women drew a resolution in his appreciation.

I place the council's resolution into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE HONORABLE HUGH SCOTT, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Whereas, the Honorable Hugh Scott, United States Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, recently exhibited his appreciation and respect for the efforts expended in behalf of the Republican Party by Republican women and in particular by members of the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women, by exercising the influence of his office in support of the nomination and election of the following named women:

Miss Sarah Ann Stauffer to be Delegate-at-Large to the 1968 Republican National Convention. Miss Stauffer is our Pennsylvania National Committeewoman.

Mrs. Peter K. Honaman, Republican State Vice-chairman, to be Delegate-at-Large to the 1968 Republican National Convention.

Mrs. George J. Thack, President Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women, to be Delegate-at-Large to the 1968 Republican National Convention.

Mrs. Raymond T. Russell, Secretary Republican State Committee, to be Alternate Delegate-at-Large to the 1968 Republican National Convention.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Board of Directors of the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women in regular meeting assembled, does hereby express to the Honorable Hugh Scott, United States Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the sincere gratitude and appreciation of the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women for the nomination and election of the above named women as Delegates-at-Large and Alternate Delegate-at-Large to the 1968 Republican National Convention.

Teachers-in-Politics Weekend

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, April 5 marked the beginning of Teachers-in-Politics Weekend and I am very much pleased to have this opportunity to acknowledge and pay tribute to our teachers and educators for their far-reaching contributions in and out of the classrooms.

I am pleased to note that this highly dedicated profession can boast a 90 percent voting record in the 1964 presidential election and a very large percentage of them were highly active in the 1964 and 1966 campaigns.

Teachers have recognized government's ever-increasing influence on our daily lives, and many educators are participating in local and State governments, where they have made excellent contributions.

I heartily welcome and commend them and look forward to having them actively participate on the Federal level, and especially commend them for their objectives to achieve better educational benefits for all of our youth, which I so wholeheartedly share with them and many interested Americans.

I have long recognized the need for teacher participation, particularly in view of the high percentage of our budget which is being spent on education, and believe our educators render a real, valuable service in sharing with us their wealth of ideas and intimate knowledge of the needs and aspirations of our youth.

No profession is better prepared, more knowledgeable, more dedicated to the educational problems of our society than the teaching profession. And no profession or calling is better equipped or motivated than teachers to grapple with and solve these problems. Their leadership in this field is indispensable; the country needs and appreciates it.

I look forward to their participation, and hope that it will, not only give them a better understanding of the functions and duties of government and help to foster student interest and understanding, but afford us in the public service the opportunity to learn from them.

We have entrusted to our teacher-citizens the responsibility of teaching the principles of free men and women and free government, and I believe that

with their active participation we can look forward to better school systems, better communities, better States and a stronger, better educated and better informed Nation.

I proudly associate myself with these high aims and enhanced services of our great teaching profession. I look forward to working with its members and its groups in continuing my own participation and labors, with their valued counsel and assistance, in moving forward toward the high goals in education and national betterment that we share in common.

A Stirring Eulogy

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on Sunday afternoon, April 7, 1968, Rabbi Frederic A. Doppelt, of the Achduth Vesholom Synagogue, in Fort Wayne, Ind., delivered an address in tribute to and in memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. It was only fitting that Rabbi Doppelt, an outstanding and compassionate community leader, be called upon to speak at the communitywide memorial march and service on the day of prayer proclaimed by President Johnson.

Rabbi Doppelt's remarks, reflecting the true spirit of brotherhood, express the hope that all of us will join hands and hearts in resurrecting Dr. King's dreams and ideals. I ask unanimous consent that this thought-provoking address be printed in the RECORD.

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

IN TRIBUTE AND MEMORY: MARTIN LUTHER KING

By mere length of time, his span on earth was only a mere handbreadth in the vastness of the universe. But when measured by the greatness of his soul and deeds, the life of Martin Luther King was a holy moment in the conscience of humanity which will abide as a living force unto all eternity.

This holy moment was snuffed out at a time when we of the House of Israel are approaching our glorious Festival of Passover and the world of Christendom is approaching its most sacred observance of Easter. We must never forget this singular time of his death because there was so much of both Passover and Easter in his life.

Like Moses of yore, Martin Luther King labored tirelessly and fearlessly to liberate the Negro from the bondage shackling him in our times and in our land, and he did wondrous things for his people and all of us in these United States; and like him too, he died before entering the Promised Land of freedom. Now he is free at last; and through his life all of us shall be free at last.

For at Easter time the message of Christianity proclaims the glad tidings that he need not remain dead and buried. Let us only join hands and hearts and roll away the stone from his tomb, and let there be a resurrection of his dreams and ideals. That holy moment in the conscience of humanity which lived in our midst as Martin Luther King will abide among us and work through us for the good of all of us. Amen!

The Atom and the Sea

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the ocean is the largest single geographical feature on earth. The exploration and utilization of this body is a most exciting and challenging new frontier, scientifically, economically, and politically.

The State of Florida, in general, and the city of Miami, in particular, with many natural advantages, have become champions in this new and urgently important field of oceanography. Both educationally and commercially Miami is competing aggressively to become the ocean science capital of the United States.

The above quotation is taken from a fine talk delivered at the seventh annual meeting of the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board on April 1, 1968. The speaker was my very distinguished colleague from Tennessee, the Honorable WILLIAM R. ANDERSON. Representative ANDERSON'S talk, "The Atom and the Sea" is particularly memorable in view of his former career as the first captain of the first nuclear submarine, the *Nautilus*.

I am most anxious to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives this informative and interesting speech:

THE ATOM AND THE SEA

(Address of Representative WILLIAM R. ANDERSON to the seventh annual meeting of the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board, Hot Springs, Ark., April 1, 1968)

It will be written of us—the Americans of the mid-20th Century—that by our scientific, political and economic commitments of these decades, we have decreed that man shall engage in whole new magnitudes of enterprise, in the sea, in the reaches beyond Earth, and in the minute worlds of atomic structure. The explorations upon which we have embarked—into the oceans of Earth and the vast cosmos beyond—dwarf all previous exploratory ventures of man. They will require tools, vehicles, motive power and environmental protection of a radically new nature. It is no coincidence that the new ventures are initiated in concert with the accelerating development of nuclear technology.

The three great scientific enterprises have been intertwined from the beginning—they enrich, stimulate, support and interpollinate each other. The three draw upon the same computer and systems-management technologies. Many of our most powerful and dynamic corporate creators are engaged in all three enterprises simultaneously. The three great scientific thrusts combined to produce the world's most advanced weapons system—the Polaris submarine missile system. Far more homely, but in some ways more promising, is a small new oceanographic study platform. An undersea radio isotope generator powers the anchored platform at its bobs unmanned in the open sea, beaming scientific oceanic data to Nimbus B weather satellites.

The space venture began, in many respects, as an out-growth of a quest for nuclear weapons delivery vehicles. The interrelationship of atomic technology and the space program is already well known and there is little that I could add by further discussion. But our Nation's oceanic undertaking is newer,

less well known, and I believe, a far more economically productive enterprise. The applications of nuclear power in our marine affairs will be enormous, various and profitable to all concerned.

Let me speak briefly of the seas and our purposes with them. The world ocean is the largest single geographical feature of our planet. It amounts to 324 million cubic miles of water which is in constant and complex motion from the surface to the greatest depths. Its great currents move immense quantities of heat from one part of the world to another; the very fact of the ocean moderates climates from the equator to the poles.

Topographically, the ocean's basic features are the continental shelves extending nominally to a depth of 600 feet, the continental slopes which plunge sharply to depths of 8,000 to 12,000 feet, and the outer reaches, the depth of which ranges generally from 12,000 to 16,000 feet. The deep ocean floor is variously characterized by broad plains, individual seamounts (some higher than Everest), the world's longest and most rugged mountain ranges, and deep trenches, one of which—the Marianas Trench—slices down to seven miles.

Chemically, the ocean contains in solution and/or in suspension virtually every element occurring naturally on Earth. The normal ocean (if there is such a thing) contains about 34 parts per thousand by weight of dissolved salts. This makes a fine electrolyte and a highly corrosive fluid, which is one of the main problems the ocean engineer faces. High pressures in the ocean's depths and high mechanical forces from the ocean in motion are others.

Biologically, the ocean is the most densely populated environment on Earth.

Consider that whatever level of social, political, technological and industrial order we have achieved, indeed whatever we have wrought, is the result mainly of our efforts in exploring and utilizing the physical assets of the less than a third of our planet's surface which is dry land.

Throughout history the ocean has been a chancy source of food, a highway for trade, a battleground, and a source of pleasure and recreation. But a new day is upon us. We have discovered that the ocean bears on our day-to-day living in ways we never suspected. It is potentially the largest resource of food for our exploding population, the largest resource of minerals with which to support the world's industries, the largest resource of energy, and, of course, it is the largest supply of water. It is mankind's largest dumping ground for the wastes of cities, and its strategic military values are becoming crucial.

Today there is no scientific or engineering discipline that is not, or will not soon be, applied in the ocean. Already the social and political sciences are becoming involved, and because of the ocean's growing economic and international significance, it presents a challenge such as the law has seldom encountered. It is a whole new world for the insurance underwriter. In fact, there is scarcely a thing we do in our land environment that we will not soon seek to do in the ocean.

It is worth noting that the National Oceanography Association, now two years old, has 650 corporate members. Within the past decade over 300 of the largest United States corporations have entered the marine research and development field. There are this year half a hundred international bodies concerned with one or another aspect of oceanography. The first university degree in oceanography was granted just over 35 years ago; today 64 universities offer curricula in the field, and a year and a half ago the Government initiated a well funded Sea-Grant College program. For us here in the South with two sea coasts and a vital eco-

nomical relationship with the ocean, it is of interest that Miami is competing aggressively to become the Ocean Science Capitol of the United States. That city alone houses 130 ocean-oriented corporations and several area colleges featuring strong oceanography and marine engineering specialties.

There is nothing in this accelerating interest in the sea that is of a temporary, mystical or voguish nature. The reasons man turns to the sea are soundly economic and military in nature. On the economic side, population growth is of such magnitude that already it outstrips man's ability to derive sufficient food from the soil. Simultaneously, the galloping growth of his industries is depleting known reserves of critical raw materials—both mineral and energy resources—to a point where, in many cases, exhaustion is both predictable and imminent.

If demands exceed landborn resources, these new technologies enable man to exploit the sea. While rising demand squeezes traditional supplies and pushes their prices up, a rapidly developing technology is pushing down the cost of working oceanic resources. Whenever these rising price and lowering cost curves cross, man turns to the sea. This happened several centuries ago with food, sponges, red coral, pearls and salt evaporated from seawater. More recently it has happened with petroleum, sulfur, magnesium, iodine, fluorine, coal, iron ore, tin, calcium carbonate, sand, gravel and others. We have to do here with the natural relationship of need technology and human capability. We are going to sea—the least known and harshest of all our terrestrial environments—and the nuclear community is deeply involved and critically needed.

The applications of nuclear energy in this Nation's growing oceanic enterprise are tremendously various. In general however, they can be divided into four major categories.

First, we propose vast exploratory and exploitative works undersea. The ocean is an environment in which conventional fuels cannot be used unless supplied with cumbersome, dangerous, and quickly exhausted supplies of oxygen. The conventional fuels themselves present serious handling difficulties in the conditions of motion, pressure, corrosion and buoyance prevailing under sea. Nuclear engines have already proved ideal as motive and generating power sources in military submarines. Sound, conservative oceanographic engineers tell us that undersea tourist aquatels, manned laboratories and mining and processing facilities are only a decade or less in the future. Nuclear power sources will be a must.

A small nuclear submarine for science, the NR-1, has already been launched. It will operate at a depth of 1,000 feet and utilize mechanical arms. Planned, later versions of this device will operate 20,000 feet down. These vessels will observe and track fish migration, investigate earthquake faults, drill sea floor cores for mining and structural purposes, and analyze subsurface currents.

Of very great importance is the utility of the small isotope generator. Applications are already numerous. In use are isotope powered underwater sound beacons for navigation, useful in the open ocean, as markers for narrow channels, oil well heads, storage facilities, mineral deposits at submarine disaster locations, and for many other purposes.

The A.E.C. Division of Isotopes Development encourages the development of oceanographic instrumentation. This comparatively young enterprise has already produced isotope-powered current meters, chemical analyzers, and geological sample scanners.

An Isotope engine developing four electrical kilowatts of shaft horsepower is under development for small research craft, unmanned oceanographic and acoustic drones, fish collecting devices and anti-submarine warfare purposes.

Under testing is a cold water diving suit in which the aquanaut is kept warm by water heated by thallium isotopes.

A second major area of nuclear application to oceanic affairs lies in the raw earth-moving power of nuclear explosions. The west coasts of Africa, South America and Australia have tremendous need of harbors which nature has not provided. There are canals and waterways to be made which would vastly increase human commerce and well-being.

In 1960 the chairman of the board of a large U.S. corporation made a fundamental policy decision for his company: Since the greatest critical need of man in the next decade would be fresh water, his company would begin working to produce large volumes of fresh water—including the development of methods for desalting seawater. His pioneering analysis proved to be prophetic.

In primitive living conditions a minimum of five gallons of water per day per person suffices, and millions of people today still must scoop this amount up from shallow pools or foul streams; some must haul it long distances.

But technological societies place an increasingly heavy burden upon resources that must provide water not only for drinking but also for sanitation, irrigation, production of power, and countless industrial operations.

Huge quantities of fresh water are needed by industry. For instance it takes 240,000 gallons of water to produce one ton of acetate, and 660,000 gallons to make one ton of synthetic rubber. From 75 to 100 billion gallons per day are required in the United States for irrigation alone. It takes 37 gallons of water to make one slice of bread, 3,750 gallons to produce one pound of beef, and 200,000 gallons to grow one ton of alfalfa.

For all these needs in the United States we presently require about 390 billion gallons of fresh water per day, or about 2,000 gallons per person. Moreover, water use is growing at the rate of 25,000 gallons per minute. So it is with good reason that even a water-rich country like ours views its future water needs and supplies with some anxiety. With the prospect of scores of other Nations following our pattern of mushrooming water use, it is clear that we must turn to the fabulous reservoir of the sea, and to nuclear energy for the processing.

The way is being opened now—technologically and economically—by the Bolsa Island Project in Orange County, California.

The project will consist of a sea water desalting plant with an initial capacity of 50 million gallons a day, and an ultimate capacity of 150 million gallons and nuclear power generating facilities with a total capacity of about 1,800 megawatts. The desalting plant will be by far the largest in the world and it will be the first large commercial water plant to use nuclear energy. When completed, it will supply enough water for a population of 750,000. The power plant will be one of the largest of its kind in the world and will meet the needs of nearly 2,000,000 people.

The total cost will be \$444 million based on 1965 prices.

The raw economic and technological forces have decreed that this is just the beginning.

The fourth nuclear application to our maritime affairs is that of ship propulsion. Here we have pioneered, we have opened a naval era as we once did with steam power; here we must not allow others to exploit our inventiveness ahead of us as we did with steam. The need for action is urgent and immediate.

We now have 929 ships in the active fleet of which 61% are now over 20 years old, requiring frequent repair and refurbishment to sustain sub-modern levels of performance. In short we have a partly remodeled remnant of the great battle fleet assembled for World War II.

In so far as there exists a global military equilibrium, unstable though it may be, it

consists on the one hand, of a preponderance of communist conventional and nuclear land-power on the vast Eurasian continent-opposed on the other hand by a far flung maritime alliance of rimlands and islands with its principal power emanating from the North American continent. The 41 Nation alliance system centered economically and militarily on the United States includes only three non-maritime members; *the whole thing hangs together by sea power*. Indeed, the United States cannot bring conventional military force to bear abroad on a large scale except by sea, and it is the use of sea power that has made her effectively the only global power. It is noteworthy in this regard that the decisive points of American military response to communist challenge—Greece, Turkey, Korea, Taiwan, Germany, Lebanon, Cuba, Congo, Santo Domingo, Viet Nam and Thailand are all at the water's edge; all were commitments of military force that could not be contemplated without certainty of naval supremacy.

The point of most crucial importance here is that if the present balance of world power is to be maintained, the forces opposing communist expansion clearly must retain that oceanic supremacy upon which their alliances were originally built. A balance of sea power with the Soviets would assure an extreme imbalance of world power.

Our Allies such as Britain, France and Japan which have traditionally kept strong naval forces are in a nadir of their sea power—in fact, these fleets are now operating only as instruments of local interest and as auxiliaries of the United States Navy. And, as has recently been brought to the public eye by our most respected journals, the communist forces are mounting a powerful military and political challenge to allied oceanic supremacy.

It is at this point that our battle fleet is overtaken by age, events and new technology.

The requirement is for new, flexible, high speed naval combat and land-war-support units, essentially capable of sustained, global operation without foreign bases, without the vulnerable, tell-tale tethers of the presently necessary tanker trains, possessing the generating power to operate the most sophisticated electronic surveillance, guidance and defensive devices.

In short we require the truly revolutionary advantages of nuclear naval forces.

By this I do not mean conventional ships merely fitted with nuclear power plants, nor naval task forces possessing one or two nuclear units, but limited in performance by essential non-nuclear units. I am talking about a new generation of naval instruments designed for and around nuclear propulsion manned by a complement of trained nuclear seamen, and enjoying the range of tactics and strategy permitted by the capabilities of nuclear propulsion.

We start with a nuclear technology in its infancy which yields a mobile naval fighting unit at least 20 per cent more effective, but only 3 to 6 per cent more expensive than that provided by oil power technology at its maturity. There is simply no further justification for delay.

Within the past year it appears that the Defense Department finally got the message. We are moving ahead with funding for three new nuclear-powered carriers and six other combat vessels. We can reasonably expect a sharp acceleration in the coming years.

Our merchant marine is in far worse shape than our Navy. Since 1951 the world merchant fleet grew by 62% while U.S. merchant marine shipping dropped 26%. With U.S. ocean borne trade now amounting to over \$36 billion yearly, U.S. shipping is carrying only 7.2% of it. Aside from security considerations, this amounts to a very heavy balance of payments outflow for shipping services.

Both the President and Congress have evidenced decisive concern this year.

The economic realities dictate the way in which we can revitalize our merchant marine and make it competitive. The new American merchant ship must be capital and technology intensive, lightly manned, very large, very fast, quickly turned around, and capable of a sustained, high ratio of at-sea to in-ports time. In short it must be highly automated, containerized, and of a size and speed—30 knots cruising speed at least—that make nuclear power the most feasible motive source.

We have broken the ice with regard to labor arrangements, public acceptance and port accommodations with the Savannah. It has been costly. We have also learned much in the ship's experimental operation that will improve the design and mechanics of future nuclear commercial vessels. Germany is already profiting by these lessons in her large nuclear powered ore carrier, the *Otto-Han*. Japan will be building her first nuclear cargo vessel soon. But we still retain a tremendous technological edge. We must not fritter it away.

Ten years ago the world's first central nuclear power station went into operation at Shippingport, Pennsylvania. In 1967 there were 15 operating central nuclear power stations with commitments placed for 61 more. In little over a decade we have gone from one nuclear submarine to almost 80 and in a very real sense we have just discovered the ocean. The South is richly endowed with both nuclear engineering and development resources—and oceanic experience and enterprises. It is no accident that Oak Ridge has just won a \$100,000 contract from A.E.C. to become the single central marine nuclear power technology repository for the Nation. By all means, let us fully exploit and contribute to the tremendously promising and powerfully growing new field of oceanic nuclear development.

The "Pueblo" Incident

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been 92 days since the Navy intelligence ship *Pueblo* with 83 Americans aboard was captured by the North Koreans on the high seas in an outrageous act of piracy. Ship and crew are still being held.

The Communists are issuing statements continuously concerning alleged "confessions" by the *Pueblo's* crew. We do not know how these statements are purportedly being wrung out of our military men. The American people can read and hear Communist propaganda every day. Yet our own Government remains silent. None of us can find out what efforts, if any, are being made to get back our ship and men.

Many concerned residents of my congressional district have written me expressing their indignation. In order that the President might know just how the people of the country feel about our Government's secrecy and inactivity, I am forwarding the letters to the White House.

It is lamentable that the Communists are being handed the opportunity to

propagandize the world through the weakness of the U.S. Government's approach to the *Pueblo* crisis. Our intelligence codes have been compromised. A fifth-rate nation has barbarously seized one of our military vessels—supposedly representing the military might of what the Defense Department likes to call the strongest Nation on earth. Yet nothing has been done.

I call upon the President to make a report to the public on just what is being done to set these men free and bring back our ship. It is obvious that, if negotiations are underway, they have not been fruitful. To allow this action to go unpunished and unrighted will just encourage other outrages against our people and equipment.

It is time to tell the American people the truth about the *Pueblo*, Mr. President.

Anarchy or the Rule of Law: A Simple Choice

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the rising crime rate in this country over the past several years has been cause for grave concern to all of us in public life and the events of recent weeks give us further cause for such concern.

Mayor Daley's "shoot and maim" approach on the one extreme is countered by the insistence that the problem will go away if the police turn their backs on it. Neither approach will solve the problem. There is only one way to gain respect for the rule of law and that is to enforce the law.

What an imbalance of justice that thousands of prisoners in our penitentiaries are there because they put a torch to a building and yet our police are to execute arsonists without trial under the Daley technique or under the liberal concept, to overlook the crime during its perpetration.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to have respect for the law it must be enforced to its own full measure, or we have anarchy. I am reminded of a letter in my files which I received last November, which I am impelled to submit for the RECORD with the permission of the writer, but respecting his anonymity. My correspondent writes as follows:

HON. JAMES GROVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The latest statistics that are found in the daily newspapers in regard to crime in America is astonishing to say the least. The way crime is spreading, it will be no time before it will be impossible to be safe even in such places as previously "unmarred" towns in this country. The non-sense reasoning that goes into the programs of handling the criminal element makes no sense at all. Hardened criminals of all kinds are let free because of some loop-hole in the law, police officers are being made to look like some sort of a blood-thirsty monster bent on destroying society by attempting to en-

force the law, which was supposedly his calling in the first place. It looks as though the police cannot even save the average person from himself, let alone a hardened criminal. The only real deterrent that a criminal really feared has been all but taken out of our society completely: the death penalty. Schools (public and private alike) are now appealing to the "goodness" in the students so that they can prevent riots and general disobedience, instead of using a punitive measure known to have controlled thousands of rebellious students over the years in years past, namely a sound thrashing. The neighborhood theaters are becoming, very rapidly, dumping grounds for filth movies, perversion of the worst kind, so called "adult" films, films that even a hardened pornographer would admit was good for the pornography business. Motorcycle gangs roam the streets terrorizing the citizenry; rape and mugging, holdups, burglaries, assaults are so common that most of them never are reported by the news media. In New York City alone the latest statistics show over 100,000 robberies of various nature and 1,700 rape cases, and that is for the first nine months of 1967! This is a national disgrace.

I am the father of five children, 3 boys and 2 girls. Never in the past has been my wife or I so fearful of their well-being as we have been in the latest few years and that fear is ever increasing. Fortunately, my oldest children are the 3 boys, one in the Air Force, one going into the Air Force, and the third still in high school. They have been models of good citizens, well-behaved children and obedient to us as parents and to God as their creator. My 2 girls now are my chief concern, one being 16 and the other 13. We live in a very nice neighborhood, but even here, the fear is high with our neighbors as well as us. When will we be a target? Is anyone safe at all? Believe me, Mr. Grover, I am definitely not a man driven to easy fears. I have been through too much in my life to fear very many things. But I do fear the insatiable growth of crime, dope addiction, and in general the destruction of the very heart of our society—our youth. Is this all part of a Communist plot to destroy us by destroying our very seeds for tomorrow's world? Is it a massive plot by the big syndicates to engulf us all in a society that is made up of mindless, disobedient beings without conscience to react to their whims and to pay endless tribute to them? Just what is it?

Of course there is a solution, I believe that part of the solution is being formulated by the latest development in the case of the young girl that was nailed to a tree down in Florida. Governor Kirk had the great courage to have these abominations (the perpetrators of the deed) tracked down and taken back to Florida to face justice. This is what it takes to turn the tide the other way. America cries out for men of courage in public office to seize the initiative from the criminal element and smash their activities in the hardest way possible, to have these misfits publicly displayed as Governor Kirk did through the news media (if I had my say, they would face a public flogging post), and to punish them to the fullest extent of the law, and if that law has been watered down by the professional social workers and psychologists who favor the "humane" treatment of criminals, then that law should be amended to incorporate measures to have the "punishment fit the crime".

In short, we need men of good moral character who think of America and the future of America before their own desires, men who will turn the tide of this flood before it surely engulfs us all. It is my opinion that men in your position as our elected representatives can do this by uniting together to bring about a solution and a rapid one to stave off this cancer. After all, it is for your protection as any one else. Perhaps you may have already sponsored a bill of this type, or one of

your colleagues may have. I know from past experience in getting acquainted with your record that you have sponsored many fine bills designed to help support the American traditions, and the general well-being of citizenry as a whole. I would be very interested to know if such a bill, and I don't mean the one the administration proposes as that is rotten with loopholes, such a bill that will really demonstrate to the criminal that the great Congress of the United States means business.

I love America dearly, as I am sure that you and the other members of the Congress surely do. To stand by and see the things happening that tear out the very soul of this great country that so many died for, is really heart-breaking. There are countless thousands, perhaps millions that feel the same way I do. People look for leadership, they want a man to give them the moral strength and example of purpose that many of our former great leaders demonstrated during perilous times of the past. I am more than convinced that we are facing the most crucial period in the history of this country. The public is sick of the type of leadership that has been demonstrated by recent leaders and want more than the small handout of information that is given them in regard to wars, spending programs that send millions (even billions) down rat holes with little to no regard to who will pay for these things in the years yet to come. No I am not a prophet of doom, but it would take a pretty shortsighted individual to not see that we are heading toward the brink of disaster.

Please do not think that I am without hope. As long as there are men such as yourself that are willing to serve in the way you do, we can have hope. It is just that real steps must be taken. If there is any way I can serve you in any capacity as a layman, I am at your call.

I am enclosing a picture of my oldest son. I hope you don't mind me taking this liberty, but I just want you to see the kind of man that is among the thousands of other good Americans that are willing to serve their country when called upon. My other son leaves for the Air Force on the 7th of December, 1967, with the same firm attitude that he is willing to serve. I think that if more publicity were given the youngsters that serve their country willingly in silence, rather than to the "hippie" type with their unshaven, dirty countenances spread all over the press, we would have at least taken one good step forward toward decency.

It is with a humble heart that I thank God that I live in a country that the right to communicate with one's elected representative still remains open to him.

With best wishes for your continued success and health, and may God bless you and your family, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

A CONCERNED CONSTITUENT.

Secretaries Week

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BROYHILL. of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity today, set aside as Secretaries Day, to congratulate the National Secretaries Association and its member organizations throughout our Nation, on the celebration of their 17th consecutive Secretaries Week, April 21 through April 27.

Secretaries Week was originated in 1952 by the National Secretaries Associa-

tion in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Commerce. It was always meant to be shared by all secretaries, regardless of their membership in the organization, but this year's observance marks the first time that men, who have recently become eligible for membership under association bylaws changes, will join in NSA chapter Secretaries Week activities. These projects include seminars, workshops, study groups, and participation in career days in cooperation with local school systems.

The theme for Secretaries Week, "Better Secretaries Mean Better Business," underscores one of the basic reasons that Secretaries Week was established; to serve as a reminder to secretaries of their responsibilities to their employers and to their profession. It also serves to bring recognition to secretaries for the vital role they play in business, industry, education, government, and the professions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to congratulate all secretaries, and to pay special tribute to my own devoted staff, on this very important day.

An Affluent Society of Bankrupts

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, among the many newly publicized rights we now find a guaranteed right to go bankrupt.

Some of the public may feel the creditors—the merchants and like—are to blame for making credit so easy. Few have taken the time to analyze who pays for the stampede to bankruptcy—the buying public, of course. The bankrupt's loss is just added to overhead and the unwary public picks up the bill.

Then, of course, TV plays its educational role by teaching everyone to live equally—with the successful Joneses—whether they can afford it or not.

But who would believe that the once straight-laced, free enterprise publication known as the Wall Street Journal would turn into a bankrupt promotional manual. With a front-page explanation of the bankruptcy proceedings and praise at the use of Federal funds—taxpayers' dollars—used to subsidize bankruptcy.

Now, if only we could extend bankruptcy to beating Federal income taxes. Some may soon ask, Why discriminate against private enterprise and for Government programs?

Mr. Speaker, I include the front-page article of the Wall Street Journal for April 16, as follows:

BANKRUPTCY BOOM: MORE PEOPLE PETITION TO HAVE DEBTS ERASED AS SOCIAL STIGMA FADES—BOB LANG AND SAMUEL W. GET NEW START AFTER YEARS OF EXCESSIVE BORROWING—SURPRISED AT HOW EASY IT IS

(By Everett Groseclose)

NEW YORK.—To the old-fashioned moralist, bankruptcy meant ruin and disgrace. But to a growing number of today's Americans, it means something quite different.

To Robert S. Lang it means, among other things, the ability to buy his wife a \$220

washing machine and his son a \$4 toy racing car. He couldn't afford them a few months ago; payments on the debts he had run up to rent and elaborately furnish a new apartment in a high-rise building were swallowing nearly all the \$10,000 a year he earns in a city civil service post and a part-time taxi driving job. Before bankruptcy he says, "I wasn't getting any of my check. Now, I'm getting it all."

To Samuel W., a Puerto Rican ghetto dweller, bankruptcy means nothing less than the saving of his life. Deeply in debt after years of borrowing to stretch his \$5,000 annual earnings, unable any longer to arrange new loans to pay off his old ones, and about to lose his warehouse job because his boss was tired of being hounded by his creditors, he was seriously considering suicide a few months ago. "Before I took bankruptcy, I was in a hole and it was getting deeper all the time," he says. "But now I can start living again."

BOOM IN PERSONAL BUST

If these cases aren't entirely typical, it's only because there are too many personal bankruptcies these days for any to be typical. The 191,729 in the year ended last June 30 were up 9% from the previous year, triple the number 10 years earlier and 18 times as many as were recorded 20 years earlier. Moreover, most experts believe liabilities in personal bankruptcies now equal or exceed those in business bankruptcies, which once were far greater. "It's at least a 50-50 thing," contends an official in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

A handful of these bankruptcies are begun by creditors who petition to have a debtor—generally a once-substantial businessman—forced to sell his possessions and pay what debts he can before all his assets vanish. But the overwhelming majority of bankruptcies voluntarily petition Federal courts (all bankruptcies are governed by Federal law) to declare them unable to pay and wipe out their debts.

Why are there so many more of them in a period of unprecedented general prosperity? At first there would seem to be as many answers as there are bankruptcies. The bankrupts come from all income levels and all occupations: housewives, secretaries, salesmen, dentists, lawyers all show up in court records. The immediate circumstances that triggered their petitions are equally diverse. Marital troubles, garnishment of wages, financially devastating illness and uninsured accidents all play important roles, and many small businessmen file for personal bankruptcy after their firms go bust.

LESS SOCIAL STIGMA

But there are some common denominators. One, most authorities—and many bankrupts—agree, is a weakening of the belief that debts should be paid no matter what the sacrifice, and a consequent lessening of the social stigma that once was attached to bankruptcy. "These days, bankruptcy doesn't mean a thing to the average guy," contends Robert Dolphin Jr., an economist at Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio, who has written extensively on the subject.

Some evidence: Relatively few bankrupts file under Chapter 13 of the Federal Bankruptcy Act, which provides court supervision of a debtor's finances and an extended period, usually three years, to settle his debts. "Most bankrupts hesitate to commit themselves to the very extensive supervision that goes along with Chapter 13," says Herbert Jacob, a political scientist at Harvard who recently studied the social attitudes of 454 bankrupts in Wisconsin.

Instead, the usual petitioner chooses "straight bankruptcy"—a proceeding in which his debts are cancelled after his property, if any, is sold. This might seem a drastic procedure to the home-owner, who would have to sell his house, his car and all but

his "essential" furniture. But to the person whose only major "asset" is his job, it can be relatively painless.

Bob Lang, for one, conceivably could have paid his \$9,869 debts over a three-year period under a Chapter 13 proceeding. But he chose straight bankruptcy, and disclaims any worry about what it might do to the social standing he once considered ultra-important (it was in part a quest for status that led him to attempt to maintain a high-rent, lavishly decorated apartment). "I don't give a damn any more," he says. "I'm not going to worry about my name."

Another thread winding through most bankruptcy proceedings is the ready availability of credit, even in periods of supposedly tight money, to almost anyone who has a steady job—and the temptation it presents to both the well-off Bob Langs and the struggling Sam W's to borrow until they are in debt deeper than they ever intended.

For Bob, credit appeared as the springboard to the Good Life. He hadn't thought about it until a color TV set in a neighborhood store caught his eye a few years ago. Applying for a loan to buy it, he found that his civil-service status, promising job security for the 20 years until his retirement, made lenders eager to sign him up. From then on, he says, "I was like a drug addict, except that I was a buying addict."

After buying the TV, Bob decided on a more impressive home. In early 1968 he moved his family out of a modest two-bedroom walkup that rented for \$150 a month into a three-bedroom unit in a new apartment tower renting for \$50 a month more. He signed a three-year lease and borrowed \$500 from Neighborhood Finance Co. for moving expenses.

A better home requires better furniture. So Bob bought \$1,200 worth, including a king-size bedroom suite, from R. H. Macy & Co., on a down payment he recalls as \$100. Not content, he signed a few days later for another \$1,500 of furniture from Gimbel Bros. Inc.

About the same time came a 1960 Rambler bought on a \$750 loan from Seaboard Finance Co. By then Bob was short of cash. But no matter; an \$800 personal loan from Bankers Trust Co. not only covered miscellaneous expenses but helped meet some of the payments on the other loans.

For a while. Before he realized it, says Bob, "I was paying out 90% of my check and living on 10%." He began falling behind, and after 10 months' occupancy concluded his dream home wasn't so great; he didn't get along with some of the people who were moving into the building.

The Langs retrenched to a one-bedroom place where Bob and his wife sleep in the living room—on huge sofas, bought for the high-rise apartment, that look startlingly out of place in their newly modest surroundings. But it was too late. Creditors were howling. And now they included the landlord of the high-rise, who held a lease still calling for \$3,253 in further rent payments.

A ROUTINE ACT

"I had seen small businessmen go bankrupt and then come back," says Bob. "I kept thinking it must be a routine act." And indeed, he had only to walk around the corner, up a flight of stairs and into a lawyer's office, where he filled out the necessary forms in two hours. Cost: \$300, including a \$50 filing fee.

For Sam, the ghetto-dwelling warehouseman, the road to bankruptcy was much longer but less complicated. For him, credit was simply a way to stretch his earnings to buy food for his wife and five children, meet occasional medical bills and cover other expenses that always seemed to rise faster than his pay. For instance, he says, his rent has increased to \$83 a month from \$39 over the 17 years he has been borrowing.

Sam began by borrowing from friends, but quickly graduated to finance companies.

Then he fell, like Bob Lang—but much more heavily—into a classic trap: Taking out new loans to pay off old ones, or, as he puts it, "a borrowing from Peter to pay off Paul."

The first "Paul" was Family Finance Corp., from which Sam says he obtained over 20 successive loans between 1951 and 1958. Then he fell behind, and the company demanded payment in full. Enter the first "Peter"—Domestic Finance Corp., which loaned Sam enough to pay off Family Finance with a little to spare. "The extra money was just to get me back on my feet," Sam says.

The new loan did more than that—temporarily. By paying off Family Finance, Sam restored his credit rating; he found he could not only borrow more money from that firm but patronize other finance companies besides. On a surprising scale, too; by the time he finally filed for bankruptcy, he owed \$3,460.

Sam at one point made a half-hearted attempt to consolidate his debts through a loan from First National City bank. But he could never get ahead enough to begin whittling down the total. "I just bounced from one (lender) to the other for a long time," he says. "I was always in hock up to my ears."

Sam nevertheless says he always intended to pay, and he might still be struggling to do so if a kidney ailment hadn't put him in bed for three months late on 1966. When he got back to his plastics warehouse, he found that Domestic Finance, which held a note for \$952, had obtained a garnishment on his wages. That nettled his boss, and when the other creditors began calling too "my boss just told me to go home until I could get it straightened out," he says.

A PRIEST'S REACTION

As a last resort before suicide, Sam went to his priest. "I told him everything and he covered up his head with his hands and said, 'Oh, my God,'" Sam recalls.

The priest gave Sam some pocket money and sent him to Mobilization for Youth Inc., an experimental self-help agency funded by the Federal Government. There, after only preliminary consultation with a staff lawyer, Sam decided on bankruptcy.

Relief from creditors was immediate—as it was for Bob Lang and is for nearly all bankrupts. A court cannot reject a petition for bankruptcy unless it finds the petition fraudulent—because the petitioner is concealing assets, for example. In that case, the petitioner not only is denied bankruptcy, he becomes liable to criminal prosecution. But in the usual case, a man becomes bankrupt "the day he files that petition—on the hour and minute," says a court source.

The later proceedings usually are cut-and-dried too. After a petition is filed, a court referee notifies the bankrupt's creditors. If the man has assets, the referee will arrange a meeting or series of meetings at which the creditors decide on how they will split up the proceeds from the sale of those assets. The creditors also are given a chance to object, at a hearing, to the cancellation of their debts; they may do so if they believe the bankrupt has not dealt honestly with them.

Frequently, however, there are no such complications—as in Bob Lang's case. His petition listed no assets beyond the household furniture the courts let a bankrupt keep (he had sold his car for \$50). And his creditors didn't even bother to show up at his hearing.

Bob was jittery when he saw "a whole courtroom full of people," but discovered to his relief that "they were all there working on other cases." When his case was called, the proceedings lasted less than half an hour. The referee, he says, simply showed him his petition and asked "if I had read and signed and understood it, I affirmed everything" and that was that; he walked out of court with nine debts totaling \$9,869 cancelled and free to spend his pay any way he chose—even to begin accumulating new assets immediately.

"In a way I was surprised at how easy everything was," he says.

Sam's hearing took a bit longer; Family Finance challenged the writing off of a loan, claiming that Sam hadn't informed them of the extent of his other debts when he signed the note. Even so, Sam found the proceedings far different from the nightmare visions of hours of grilling over his finances that he says had him "scared to death for a week" before his hearing. His lawyer, Michael S. Kelsner from Mobilization for Youth, told the judge Sam had made no intentional misstatement, but had signed a blank form that his wife later filled out. The judge decided the case in Sam's favor. The whole affair took an hour and a half.

TEMPTATION STILL

Both men are enjoying their new lives, with cash to spend for the first time in years; Sam says his family now is "eating steak three and four times a week, instead of beans and potatoes." Both he and Bob Lang also vow to have no more to do with credit—"now that I've broken the habit," says Bob.

But the temptation, if it is now being resisted, is still there—for Bob and many others. Many lenders, it's true, shy away from bankrupts. But others actually seek them out—knowing that they cannot legally file again for bankruptcy for six years, and so have no way of escaping garnishment of wages or other collection attempts.

Bob firmly believes he could "go down tomorrow and get all the credit I wanted—I just have a feeling." And Sam doesn't have to theorize. He hands a visitor a letter he got after his bankruptcy from Thrift Furniture Co., informing him, in raised gilt letters, that he had been "selected" as an "AAA-1 Honor Roll Customer" entitled to buy "up to \$100" worth of goods "with no down payment."

Jerry Tannenbaum, president of Thrift Furniture, says Sam's letter was one in a mailing of about 15,000 recently sent out. "Obviously, we weren't aware that he was bankrupt," says Mr. Tannenbaum. He adds that if Sam came into his store to make a credit purchase of more than about \$50, "we would go through our regular credit check and his bankruptcy would show up."

WILL BANKRUPTCY MARCHES BE NEXT FORM OF PROTEST?

Bankruptcy as a form of social protest hasn't yet caught on. But there are those who see it as the next step in confrontations between the poor and the economic power structure.

"If every poor person who is being gouged would file (for) bankruptcy it would be more devastating than any riot you ever say," declares Julius S. Hobson, who heads Associated Community Teams, a Washington civil rights group. For seven months he has been trying to organize "mass bankruptcy marches" of the poor into court to file petitions.

Mr. Hobson admits he not only has failed to organize marches, but has inspired only about 25 people to file individual petitions; to the poor the idea "sounds like an Alice in Wonderland thing and they just don't believe it," he says. But he intends to keep trying, and similar programs are being urged by civil rights and antipoverty groups in New York and some other cities.

Secretaries Week, 1968

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, today, April 24, is Secretaries Day. Since 1952, the National Secretaries Association, In-

ternational, has sponsored this day as part of Secretaries Week, celebrated during the last week in April. The purpose of this observance is to recognize the vital work performed by secretaries in business, government, and the professions, and also to remind secretaries of their responsibilities to their employers and to their calling.

The National Secretaries Association, established in 1942, was founded to promote the educational and professional standards of secretaries. Today, there are more than 24,000 members in 565 chapters. Each year, the organization selects the "International Boss of the Year" and the "Secretary of the Year," and organizes seminars, workshops, special projects, and other functions in observance of Secretaries Week.

Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the House to this week, which honors the many dedicated professional secretaries. They deserve our congratulations and our thanks.

Hope for Peace in Cyprus

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for many years the situation in Cyprus has teetered on the edge of catastrophe. Just last November, differences between the Greek and Turkish population raised fears of renewed warfare. President Johnson sent Cyrus Vance to serve as a mediator when Turkey threatened to invade the Cyprus Republic. Mr. Vance was successful. Recent actions by President Makarios have eased tensions to a point where negotiations are underway to resolve disputes.

It is therefore gratifying to read, in the New York Times of April 15, a report that relations have improved between the Greek majority and the Turkish minority on the island, at least in some areas. There is now hope that differences between the two populations can be resolved so peace can once again prevail on that troubled island.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

CYPRIOTE GROUPS COEXIST AT FAIR—ETHNIC TURK PLAYS CARDS WITH GREEK NEIGHBORS

(By Eric Pace)

MORPHOU, CYPRUS, April 14—'Twas the feast of St. Mamas, the day of the annual Morphine Fair, and twangy Greek music filled the cafe where Hassan Mustafa, his mustache carefully clipped for the occasion, played a long and riotous card game with his Greek Cypriote friends.

"I am amusing myself," the 74-year-old Mr. Mustafa observed, flexing his mustache with a smile. "I was born here, and I like this place."

Mr. Mustafa, an orange grower, was among dozens of Moslem Turkish Cypriots who mixed amiably with throngs of ethnic Greek farmers at the fair, which honors the Greek Cypriote saint.

Prosperous farm villages around this town, which is 23 miles northwest of Nicosia, are overwhelmingly Greek—as is Cyprus as a whole—but the fact that hundreds of Turkish Cypriotes coexist tranquilly in the area gives hope that this Mediterranean island's ethnic troubles can one day be resolved.

HOPE FOR FUTURE SEEN

Peter Loizos, a social anthropologist doing field work on Cyprus for the London School of Economics, said that "the way the Turkish minorities keep living in these villages shows that restraint and trust can go a long way."

A Briton of Greek Cypriote extraction, Mr. Loizos said, "if the political climate cools off, there's no inherent sociological reason why the rest of the island can't return to mixed community life."

The current "troubles," as Cypriotes refer to them, began in 1963, when violence broke out between Greek and Turkish Cypriotes. The latter represent 20 per cent of the population of 620,000. Cyprus became independent of Britain in 1960.

About 20,000 Turkish Cypriotes fled from their villages when the Greek Cypriotes moved in to control them in 1963. Nearly all took refuge in all-Turkish communities or in Nicosia's Turkish quarter, which was fenced off from the rest of the city and until recently sealed off by police roadblocks.

ROADBLOCKS LIFTED

Last month, the roadblocks were lifted by the island's all-Greek Cypriote Government as a conciliatory gesture. The Government hopes to start negotiations soon toward linking the two communities politically. The Greek and Turkish Cypriotes have been engaged in periodic skirmishing over the last four years despite the efforts of a United Nations peacekeeping force.

The Greek Cypriote police kept watch over Morphou's teeming streets today but Mr. Mustafa and the other Turkish Cypriotes moved about in peace.

Quilts and mattresses made by Turkish Cypriotes were on sale in the courtyard of the church of St. Mamas although the people who sewed them stayed away.

Down the road, Mustafa Salih, a Turkish Cypriote farmer from Aya Irini, an ethnically mixed village nine miles from here, hawked disks of yellow cheese, intoning in Greek "kala halumnia," or good cheese. With the proceeds from his wares, he bought a record of songs in Greek.

WOMEN IN TURKISH STYLES

Swarthy from the sun, Turkish Cypriote workmen like Ali Hassan were virtually indistinguishable from the Greek Cypriotes. But their women, who wore Turkish-style fringed kerchiefs, gave them away.

"I'm very satisfied here," Mr. Hassan boomed to a Greek Cypriote interpreter as he strolled past the market stalls, where toy pistols and portraits of President Makarios hung.

According to Greek Cypriotes in Morphou, the last major violence in this area was in 1964 when Greek Cypriotes shot up a Turkish Cypriote roadblock on a highway west of here.

Since then, they say, calm has prevailed, although Turkish Cypriotes in Nicosia contend that Greek Cypriotes have stolen oranges from Turkish Cypriote orchards near the town.

One minor Greek Cypriote official, who owns an orange orchard here, said that Turkish Cypriote women "work in my orchard, and they try hard not to harm the trees when they pick the fruit."

"They work well—just like Greek Cypriotes," he added.

The "Pueblo": How Long, Mr. President?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 93d day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

Our Machine Is Dented

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the civil strife that we have just witnessed throughout our Nation, the American people have been subjected to a spate of self-righteous oratory about the need to preserve civil order at any cost. This concern for orderly progress is commendable; I only wish that it were accompanied more by concern about the fundamental causes of that strife.

As a white American, I must admit that I cannot fully comprehend the social barbarity that black Americans are forced to endure daily, even in the year 1968. White Americans will probably never reach any complete understanding since we learn of black degradation only through the verbal testimony of some Negroes. If our knowledge and understanding of the frustration, despair, and rage in our ghettos is limited, we must acknowledge a grave responsibility to give our full attention to those black Americans who can reach us with their words.

Dick Gregory has shown us that he can communicate with white America. In an address before Yale College's senior class dinner last winter, he tells it very much like it is, and in exceptionally moving terms. His address, which was reprinted in the Washington Post on April 14, 1968, and which deserves our closest attention, follows:

GREGORY REMEMBERS SELMA

(By Dick Gregory)

(NOTE.—The following is excerpted from Gregory's address to a Yale senior class dinner in the middle of his 32-day fast protesting the Vietnam war. The comedian began with a joke about his wife's cooking, then held the 800 seniors transfixed for an hour and a half. He was given a five-minute ovation at the end of his speech. The excerpts are reprinted from the Yale Alumni Magazine.)

I am not here to impress you tonight, only to inform you, and when we walk out of here I could care less about what you think of me. I have the one consolation of knowing that whenever we wake up—this year, next year, 20 years from now—you will always be able to say, Brother Greg didn't lie to us.

As far as I am concerned, the No. 1 problem confronting this country today is not the problem of air pollution, but the problem of moral pollution. You young kids who are going out to face the world immediately, you are going to have to face this problem like no Americans have ever had to face it.

Don't get me wrong, I am not here asking you to do a damn thing for colored folks; please understand, I am not asking you to do no favors for me. I couldn't give a damn less what you do with your life, but I am saying you had better understand what's going on to protect your own self, because older folks, black and white, have used up all the lies and all the tricks.

Now you are going to have to deal with this problem. And by that I don't mean solve it, but you'll have to understand it. You will have to become a little more honest than we have been, and even if you wanted to solve the problem, we are going to have to stop passing the buck and become totally honest,

and realize that America is the No. 1 racist country on the face of this earth, bar none.

Now, a lot of times when a black man says that, white folks get up tight. Well, if anybody get up tight just now, that's the racism in your own head. I did not say American white folks were the No. 1 racists on the face of the earth, I said America; and one day when we realize that black and white folks in this country are Americans, then maybe when you hear that statement you will realize that means black folks and white folks.

I don't know why this white society is so frightened to realize that colored folks are racists. Why not? We learned it from you. And we have watched you for 400 years.

YOUR SWEATY HAND

You should have been with us when we had to integrate the schools down South, going around to black folks' houses the whole months of July and August when most folks are on their vacation and making some extra money, convincing those black folks that we need their kids to integrate the schools.

The white folks are saying, "We don't want to integrate the schools," they're saying, "The schools are integrated and no colored folks will show." And so you finally get 12 families that are going to let you send their kids. You get out of bed and go to the headquarters, but you find that you haven't got 12 kids, you've got eight—four of them copped out overnight. So you go and you pick up your kids. I know, I was there.

It's a hell of a thing to go and pick up a 5-year-old kid, put him in the car, and you don't know if you are going to live or die that day. But you realize that all 5-year-old kids act the same, he acts the same way you were acting your first day in school—talking about playing in the sand and talking about chalking.

And then he asks you, "Where's mommy and daddy?" And you lie to him, you say they, well they'll pick you up one day.

And you pull up to the school and you see the policemen barricading it, and the sheriff says, "Where you going, nigger?" and you say, "I'm going to school," and he says, "You can't bring that damn car in here," and you park the car and you get out and you're walking down the street with a 5-year-old black hand in the palm of your hand and you're kind of embarrassed because the 5-year-old hand is steady and yours is shaking. The inside of your hand is soaking wet from sweat and none of it's that 5-year-old kid's, it's all yours, because about 50 feet away—where you've got to walk up those stairs and get into school—you see something and you know what it means.

A BRICK IN THE MOUTH

You're not only being attacked by the mob, but by the police, and the first thing you know you land in the gutter with that cracker's foot on your chest and a double-barreled shotgun on your throat saying, "Move, nigger, and I'll kill you," and you're scared, man, you're scared to death.

Then you realize today is your turn to die, and you stop being so scared and you start relating with reality and you look around and you see the FBI taking pictures that will never show. You know what I'm talking about, don't you?

Then you remember that there's a 5-year-old hand missing out of your hand, and as you lie there in the gutter with that rifle at your throat you turn your head to try to find that 5-year-old kid, and you find him just in time to see a brick hit him right in the mouth.

Now, let me talk to you peace people for a minute, and Lord knows, I love you, but you run around demonstrating about napalm and atomic fire—you've never lived till you see a brick hit a 5-year-old kid in the mouth, and then see how the kid can't even react

like a five-year-old kid should react after being hurt. He can't run to the adults because they're spitting on him and kicking at him.

Then they snatch you out of the gutter and put you in the wagon; the last sight you see is a white mother lean over that little kid and spit on him and stomp at him, but filled with so much hate she misses.

That evening you get out of jail on bond—only to find that you've got to get out of town because that black father that you convinced when you showed him the article in the New York Times where the President says he's not going to put up with non-sense—law and order are going to prevail this September—that black father you convinced that nobody is going to harm his kid, that someone was going to protect him, that's the one that when he looked at his 5-year-old kid's mouth hit with that brick, he got his double-barreled shotgun and he's been at SNCC headquarters all day looking for you. He's going to kill you because you promised; he ain't going to kill them crackers, he's going to kill you—sc now you get out of town.

THE HUNGRY MIND

That's what Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown have been through for six years, when you didn't even know there was a movement. They don't give a damn about what you think now, because they know damn good and well, baby, if you went through the same treatment they went through, half of you would have committed suicide and the other half would be burning this damn country down to the ground.

Today in America, black folks have a full stomach but a hungry mind, and a hungry mind will not tolerate the things that an empty stomach did. Empty stomachs deal on smell, and hungry minds deal on sound, and all at once this country doesn't sound right to us any more, whether you like it or not.

We don't want to hear about progress. We know who has made progress in this country. When white Americans came to this country, they came here as individuals; they say white folks started off plus five. When black folks came to this country, we came in slave shackles, we say we started off minus five.

Now, let's balance it up today. White folks are still plus five and black folks are plus four. We moved nine digits to your none. You don't even qualify to judge progress in this country.

A SLAVE'S PRAYER

I've got six black babies at home, and every time my old lady gets pregnant I realize how much progress we've made. Every time I look at my old lady's black belly getting big, I see nothing but progress, because I remember that just 100 years ago in the slave tent when that black pregnant slave woman stepped up to her black slave man and said, "Honey, I'm pregnant," those two black slaves fell on their knees and prayed to their God that their unborn baby would be born deformed. You try making that prayer one day just for kicks and see how you feel.

They had enough wisdom, though, when they get on their knees and prayed to God: "Please let this baby be born with a limb missing or a hump in his back or maladjusted, Lord, because we are dealing with such a vicious red-necked cracker that if this baby is maladjusted he'll never be sold."

And one day she rushed back up to her man with tears of joy saying "Look honey, the Lord's answered our prayers, does his head look funny, I think he's going to be maladjusted." And those two black people fell back on their knees, praying tears of joy to their God thanking him for a maladjusted baby, a baby that could never be sold into slavery.

Well, I've got six black babies at home that me and my old lady never had to pray for nothing, let alone a maladjusted baby.

That's all the progress we're going to give you.

How many of you read where Henry Ford 3½ weeks ago hired 6000 Negroes? Any of you read that in the paper? Did you also read that they didn't have to take the tests when they hired them?

Now, you know for 25 years the sociologists in this country and all over the world have been telling America that it is the test they give that keeps us out of work. Don't ask me about caviar on a test when you have kept me in a damn ghetto all my life.

The top educators could not get this country to knock out the tests, but Henry Ford, head of one of the largest corporations in the world, hired 6000 niggers in two days, and why do you think he hired them—because of non-violence? You damn right know it wasn't. The fire got too close to the Ford plant. Don't scorch the Mustangs, baby.

You all are running around talking about how much riots hurt. Man, do you realize how long it would have taken us under peaceful channels to have 6000 black folk hired?

AN ALIEN TONGUE

The Puerto Ricans had a riot in Chicago two summers ago and everybody ran around saying riots hurt. That's because you are so dumb and ignorant you don't even know what's going on in this country. We explained to you the Puerto Rican situation in Chicago for ten years.

The Puerto Ricans said give us some Puerto Rican cops, which is a legitimate gripe—how would you like living in a community that spoke nothing but Spanish dealing with a police department that understood nothing but English and, Lord knows, we don't pay the police enough to understand that. How would you like it, you and your loved ones living in a community that spoke one language and the cop, your helper, spoke another one?

Here, four years ago in Chicago, two Puerto Ricans, patriots I guess you would call them, saw two of their Puerto Rican brothers sticking up a white filling station and they rushed around the corner like good citizens are supposed to do to report it to two white detectives. But because they spoke Spanish, the white detectives thought they were being attacked and shot one of them in the back and beat the other one unconscious. All they were doing was trying to save my brother sticking up your brother.

How would you like living in a community that spoke Spanish and you come home one day and there's your loved one lying on the floor, scalded halfway to death because the hot water tank blew up on her, and you rush out to get help and start speaking Spanish to an English-understanding cop? Maybe then you would understand some of the problems these people are talking about while you are so damn busy living up on your end of town. You want your town segregated, you better check and find out what that polecat's going through or you're going to be in trouble.

Every year they go down and say we need Puerto Rican cops and the city fathers say, now, wait, the law of Chicago says in order to be a cop in Chicago you must be 5 feet 9 inches tall. When you have laws like that, you don't need to have anything against Puerto Ricans.

So for some unknown reason, the summer of '66, the Puerto Ricans came out on the street and tore up that city for three days—I don't want anybody telling riots hurt—I guess what nobody told you is the third day they lowered the standard two inches. I am just damn glad the Puerto Ricans didn't throw bricks in Chicago for 75 days, man. Two inches for every three days, man, we would have had little short midgets on the Chicago police force.

A MELLOWING KICK

You see, America ain't nothing but a cigarette machine now: you can't communicate with her.

You know if you're running through the airport and put 40 cents in the cigarette machine, pull it and you don't get cigarettes, that's a funny feeling when you can't talk to that machine. You go up to the ticket counter and you say, "Look, I just put my money in the cigarette machine," and the girl says, "Look, I work for TWA, I just write tickets, I have nothing to do with that machine." You sa-, "Well, look miss, somebody tell me." She says, "Well, look, go back and look at the little mirror there, you see yourself and there's a little message to tell you what to do if you blow your dough."

And you go back and there it is. "Welcome to Hartford, Connecticut. In case of problems with this machine, call Giddings Jones, Kansas City, Missouri." Now you hear the last call for your flight and you stand there looking at that cigarette machine that you can't relate with and that's got your 40 cents and your flight's leaving, so you do the normal thing—you kick that machine—pow.

You don't get no money, but you see that old dent in it and you feel pretty good. You go on down there and get your plane feeling, well, you feel mellow. Let me tell you something, when you kick that machine, if that machine had kicked you back, you would have canceled your flight and taken that damn machine outside and torn it up in little pieces.

Now, let's see if this is funny. America is a cigarette machine to us. We didn't put 40 cents in it to get something that was going to make us sick. We put 400 years of our lives in that machine, baby, to get something that was going to make us well, and, we didn't get nothing, man, and we went to every ticket counter and they kept sending us to Kansas City, so in the form of Detroit, Watts and Chicago we kicked that machine and in the form of the National Guard and the police that machine kicked us back, and we're going to do the same thing you would. We say, cancel the flight, we're going to break this machine up in little bitty pieces, that's what we say.

THE TRUE SLAVERY

A free man is nothing but a man with no fears. If a man fears me living in his neighborhood, eating in his restaurants, dating his daughter, going to his schools, he's my slave whether he wants to be one or not. And he's more my slave than my ancestors ever were to his, because when my forefathers broke that chain off the black ankle and split to Canada, they were free.

Once you become enslaved in your head, you never get free. A white cracker from America can go to Moscow, Russia, man, and see a nigger with a white woman, and he goes crazy because he takes his enslavement with him all over the world.

I go all over, but this is the first time I've talked to a group where 98 per cent is fixing to be dumped into the system, and that's why I feel it's so extremely important.

I'm very bitter, and I'm very angry. I don't hate America. I don't go for "isms." I imagine if I was born in Russia, I'd probably be fighting just as hard to clean Russia up, but this is my home and I don't intend to go anywhere.

But I do see all the mistakes that we left on you, and I hope that you will rectify them. It's a hell of a thing to ask you, but I hope you will for the benefit of the whole world, because the Constitution of the United States is a good piece of paper.

No one has ever made it work right yet, and I say, let's do make it right. We might decide to tear it up after we do it, but let's first make it right.

What Would Teddy Do?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, in these times when America, the world's most powerful country, has firmly established herself as a "paper tiger" nation, it is refreshing to hear a voice crying out against concession and compromise.

The Guthrie Center Times, a weekly newspaper published in Iowa's Seventh District, has reminded its readers in an editorial what America used to be like under the "walk softly and carry a big stick" policy of President Theodore Roosevelt.

Using the strength of Teddy Roosevelt as an example, the editorial points out the weakness of America today and suggests that a change is long overdue. The editorial follows:

WHAT WOULD TEDDY DO?

People under the age of 50 cannot recall Teddy Roosevelt as president. In history he is given credit for being a man with a mind of his own, a man who guided the country through international intrigue and domestic misunderstanding with a policy based on "walk softly and carry a big stick."

What would Teddy Roosevelt do if he were alive today? It is interesting to speculate about this because Uncle Sam has had to do some mighty soft walking lately but it seems to lack a big stick.

Take the case of the ship, Pueblo, now in North Korea's possession around 2½ months. Threats have come out of that little country stipulating what the USA must do—or else.

Take North Vietnam. During a truce period (Tet) the Viet Cong and North Vietnam struck the most savage blows of the war—in fact, the worst in almost three decades of war in that area. Losses in life for Americans were not so heavy but material loss will go into the hundreds of millions.

Take protestors for civil rights. They ignore the rights of others as they demand rights for themselves. In some cases they have indicated that they cannot be depriving others of rights since some of the rights of others are unlawful.

Consider the collegians who demand that visits of armed forces and munitions recruiters to campuses be stopped. They are belligerent in their claims that such people have no right recruiting college men and women—in other words, they would deprive those who desire to serve, the right to hear about what the armed forces and the legitimate industries of this nation have to offer.

How about those loudmouths who get up when prominent speakers are to talk and create such disturbances the speaker finally gives up? The protests are against what the scheduled speaker has to say, therefore they would deny him the right to say it.

Then there's our "friend" in France, General DeGaulle. How would Teddy deal with him? We have a notion the general would be told to start putting up some of the money France owes the US or shut his face.

We like to think if Teddy had been around Cuba might still be "on limits" for American tourists, a free and happy nation instead of one under rigid control of Communist bosses.

There are all sorts of conceptions of what Teddy might do, if he were just available. However, once you mention such a thought someone is sure to come up with the fact

that Teddy lived in a different age and what was once done can no longer be done. To that we say: Times might change but it's doubtful if Teddy would.

Besides, with all the troubles we have as a world power, isn't it just possible that with strong leadership such as Teddy provided we might have fewer problems today if his type of man had continued to hold office? Don't tell us we would be in any deeper than we are now with our present policy!

Well, there is no Teddy Roosevelt and there are problems. Perhaps somewhere in the political pot that is bubbling over there is a man who will be elected who will act like the President of the strongest nation on earth, act with a firm conviction if the right of this country to do what it sees as the right and build up confidence of his own people and people of other lands in this government of ours.

As it is, we are despised where we have helped much. Our efforts to cater to the whims of every little two-bit nation right up to the other world power have led us deeper and deeper into involved situations from which we are finding it difficult to escape.

Teddy, we miss you. Since you can't come back, however, it may be necessary to borrow a few ideas from you. It is possible you marched to a different cadence than the one leaders hear today—and it's also possible the leaders today are listening to the wrong cadence.

Surely a change is worth considering. We don't need our communist-line agitators stirring up a lot of trouble and we don't need to handle them with kid gloves. The rights they demand for themselves are being sought through channels which would deprive the rest of us some of our rights.—C.E.G.

W. Marvin Watson, Postmaster General

HON. RICHARD WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I learned with great pleasure of the enthusiastic and unanimous approval which the U.S. Senate gave to the appointment of my longtime friend and fellow Texan, W. Marvin Watson, to the position of Postmaster General.

I had known Marvin Watson in Texas, and knew of the high regard in which he was held throughout the State. When I came to Congress 3 years ago, it was a source of strength to me, as a new Congressman, to know that this able and conscientious public servant was a right hand man to the President. I am sure a great many of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, have found that relations between the President and the Congress were made smoother and more pleasant because of the work of Marvin Watson.

The Post Office Department touches the lives of more people than does any other department of Government. It is a part of our daily lives, and W. Marvin Watson is the right man to head such a department. With the interest of the people at heart, with confidence in the future of our Nation, and with the ability to work with others to accomplish his high purposes, W. Marvin Watson will justify our faith and confidence, and will be one of the great Postmasters General of our history.

I wish him every success.

Financial Disclosure, 1967

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, with the hope that the recently approved House ethics code will be strengthened to provide for an open disclosure of the sources and the full amount of each Member's yearly income, I am again this year voluntarily submitting to the public a statement of my personal finances. I think the voters would benefit if all candidates for Congress in the 39th District of New York would make open financial disclosures for 1967.

THE 1967 FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD D. McCARTHY

As of December 31, 1967, my assets consist mainly of two homes one in Buffalo and one in Bethesda, Maryland. I estimate my equity in these at \$16,000.

My personal property consists of a 1965 Ford automobile, miscellaneous personal property including furniture and clothing with a total value of \$12,000. In addition, I have cash and other family assets of \$8,000.

Aside from mortgage debts on both homes, I have no major outstanding indebtedness. All gifts valued over \$8.00 were returned. I have no other business except that of 39th District Representative. During 1967, I took no trips outside the United States at government expense.

My income in 1967 was as follows:

Salary	\$30,000
Rent from home in Buffalo.....	1,410
Articles written for publication....	535
Total	\$31,945

Itemized listing of expenses incurred in the conduct of Congressional duties which were not paid by the federal government:

Travel:	
To, from, and within the 39th District	\$2,005.57
Round trip to Vietnam.....	1,851.40
Total travel.....	3,856.97
Buffalo office equipment expenses.....	400.50
Washington office expenses.....	368.64

Printing:	
"Washington Report" mailed to every household in the district	772.00
Guide for visitors, "What To Do With Children in Washington"	446.00
News reprints.....	119.44
Total printing.....	1,337.44

Subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals	423.84
TV films, recording, and photography	62.00
Dues	52.50
Tickets for political dinners, luncheons, and program patrons expenses	1,117.26
Miscellaneous (small contributions, flowers, and so forth)....	387.72
Total expenses.....	8,006.87

No member of my family serves on my paid Congressional staff.

Members of Congress receive annual allowances for stationery, stamps, telephone, telegraph and for their Washington and home offices. They are also reimbursed for one trip to and from their home districts for each month that Congress is in session

plus one round trip at the beginning of each session. However, for me, and I assume I'm like most members in this respect, the allowances are not sufficient to cover expenses actually incurred.

My 1967 taxes (Federal, State of New York, City of Buffalo, Erie County and Montgomery County, Md.) totaled \$4,912.70.

Congressman Shriver Delivers the Principal Address at Christening of the U.S.S. "Wichita" (AOR-1)

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague and good friend from the Sunflower State, the Honorable GARNER E. SHRIVER, of Kansas, recently delivered the principal address at the christening of a very important new naval vessel, the U.S.S. *Wichita* (AOR-1).

The ceremony took place March 16 at the Quincy Yard, General Dynamics Corp., Quincy, Mass., one of the Nation's great shipbuilding facilities.

The choice of Congressman SHRIVER as principal speaker was especially appropriate, inasmuch as he bears impressive and important credentials as a long-time representative to both State and Federal legislative bodies from the distinguished city for which the new ship is named.

Moreover, Congressman SHRIVER has an abiding interest in the U.S. Navy, stemming from his distinguished World War II service as both an enlisted man and an officer.

The new *Wichita*, a replenishment fleet oiler, is the first of a new class of Navy supply ship. She is 659 feet long, will displace 37,360 tons when fully loaded, will be capable of 20-knot speeds and will carry a crew of 389.

Congressman SHRIVER, in his remarks, aptly describes the importance of the new *Wichita* to our fleet, and it is my pleasure to include them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LAUNCHING ADDRESS U.S.S. "WICHITA" (AOR-1)

(By GARNER E. SHRIVER, Member of Congress, Fourth Congressional District of Kansas, Quincy Yard, General Dynamics Corp., Quincy, Mass., March 16, 1968)

We are here today to launch into a career of valuable service with the United States Navy this important ship the U.S.S. *Wichita*. It is the second ship to bear the name, *Wichita*, and like its predecessor, I am confident this great ship will distinguish herself in the service of the Navy and our great country.

The new *Wichita* is the lead of a class of new replenishment oilers which will provide "one stop" replenishment service to the United States fleet. Here at Quincy you are building six of these supply ships, and we are proud that the *Wichita* is the first to be launched.

To you, the workers and builders of this General Dynamics shipyard, I say "Well Done." Today's ship requires highly skilled workmanship, and that is what has gone into the building of the *Wichita*. I am sure each of you feels a personal sense of satisfaction as you see the results of your labor—and you

can be proud of what you are doing in behalf of the freedom and security of America.

It is highly appropriate that Mrs. Mary Lou Yeager is sponsor of this ship. She represents a distinguished Navy family with deep roots in the State of Kansas. Mrs. Yeager is the wife of Lieutenant Howard B. Yeager who currently is on duty with the Naval Supply Systems Command in Washington. Her father-in-law was the late Vice Admiral Howard A. Yeager, who had a distinguished naval career of 39 years. Admiral Yeager and his wife, Mary Jean Bailey, were both native Kansans. They lost their lives in a tragic fire in their quarters at Great Lakes, Illinois, a year ago this week. We know that Mary Lou Yeager will give *Wichita* the spirit, the heart, the integrity and the grace every good ship must have.

It is a high honor for me to participate in this colorful and historic launching ceremony for several reasons.

First, it brings back the memories of my years of military service in World War II as a naval officer with the United States fleet in the Pacific. Of course, I still carry a warm spot in my heart for the Navy. Like many servicemen during those war years, I had time to reflect upon what I would do with my life when Peace was restored. It was during that time that I charted for myself a course which has resulted in a career of 20 years in the public service.

Second, I am proud to be here today because *Wichita* is my hometown, and it is an important part of the 4th Congressional District of Kansas, the District I represent in the United States Congress.

Wichita is the largest city in Kansas with a population of over 280,000 people. It has long played a vital role in the defense of our country. Although *Wichita* is almost at the center of the largest wheat-growing state in the nation, it is the "Detroit of the aviation industry". During World War II, 10 percent of all warplanes for the nation were built in *Wichita*. Today, it continues to build planes, helicopters and other weapons for the war in Vietnam—but it also manufactures business and commercial aircraft which are known around the world.

The good people of *Wichita* are proud and pleased that this fine ship will carry around the world the name of their City which is already known the world around.

I know that Commissioner Walt Keeler, who is here as the official representative of the City of *Wichita* and City Commission, shares in these sentiments of pride and pleasure. His presence in Quincy demonstrates the genuine interest of the people of *Wichita* in this great ship.

Most of all, I am honored to be here today because we are to witness the launching of a fine new ship which is much needed by our Navy, and which will bear the proud name of a distinguished Navy cruiser that gallantly served our country from 1935 to 1947. The first *Wichita* earned 13 battle stars and other awards during operations in World War II.

She was decommissioned on February 3, 1947, after long and faithful service. The name of *Wichita* was stricken from the Navy Register on March 1, 1959. It was not forgotten. Today, nine years later it returns to the list as this modern supply ship. It is capable of providing one-stop replenishment for destroyers through either modern transfer-at-sea techniques or helicopters operating from their landing-launching platforms.

The *Wichita* will supply the fleet with fuel and furnish other needed provisions including torpedoes and guided missiles.

How appropriate it is that she will bring the fuel which is so vital to fleet operation. I am confident the *Wichita* will carry some of this petroleum from Kansas which is the seventh largest oil-producing state in the nation. And a good portion of that industry is headquartered in the City of *Wichita*.

Yes, the U.S.S. *Wichita* will help give our fleet the mobility and flexibility which is so essential, and the means for sustained naval action whenever and wherever needed.

Once again America is involved in a difficult and costly war far away from our shores. We all hope and pray for a successful and early conclusion to the war in Viet Nam.

Meanwhile, until peace is restored again, we are learning that even though we live in a nuclear age, we must at all times be prepared for conventional warfare on land, on sea and in the air. We are learning that missiles are not an effective substitute for either ships, airplanes or the infantryman.

Our experiences in Viet Nam also tell us that we cannot afford to settle for a second class Navy or a second class Merchant Marine. In spite of the great increase in military airlift capacity in recent years, only two percent of the materials needed in Vietnam go by air. The other 98% goes by sea.

There are certainly valid economic, political and military reasons for America to maintain superiority of the seas. There also is the effort of the Soviet Union to establish itself as a world sea power in a real sense. We have witnessed the Soviet capability to sustain a major effort half way around the world in Cuba. And, there is evidence of a strong Soviet naval presence in the Middle East.

The preservation of our freedom and security requires seapower—and there is a growing recognition of this among many members of the Congress. Here at General Dynamics you know the needs and you are helping to meet them.

History tells us—and the present state of the world underscores it—that the realization of our hopes for peace, security and freedom will be imperiled unless through adequate measures for the national defense, we continue to provide the shield behind which democracy and free enterprise can flourish irrespective of any present or future military threat to our nation's security.

Freedom today does not come cheaply or easily. It never has in our country's history. The protective shield behind which we live and prosper is expensive.

Americans have demonstrated throughout our history they are willing to make the necessary sacrifices and pay the price for the freedoms we all enjoy.

This new, fast working ship, the *Wichita*, will soon be a part of America's shield of freedom and security on the high seas. We hope and pray that she will serve in an era of world peace.

Congratulations again to General Dynamics Corporation and all the men and women who built this ship so well. We congratulate the United States Navy on the forthcoming acquisition of a new and important unit which will take its place in the armada of free men. And I congratulate the future complement of officers and enlisted men who will serve with pride on this new ship.

I know that we all join in wishing for this ship, the U.S.S. *Wichita*, smooth sailing and happy and successful voyages in behalf of our wonderful America.

Baltimore Marine Dies at Khesanh

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, L. Cpl. Eugene M. Johnson, Jr., a young Marine from Baltimore, Md., was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this fine

young man, and to honor his memory, by including the following article in the RECORD:

CITY MARINE CORPORAL DIES WHILE PATROLLING KHESANH

A 19-year-old Marine from Baltimore was killed while on patrol in Khesanh, South Vietnam, the Department of Defense reported yesterday.

He was Lance Cpl. Eugene M. Johnson, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene M. Johnson, Sr., of 520 North Fulton avenue.

Corporal Johnson was killed April 7 by a missile wound in the head, according to his mother, Mrs. Mary E. Johnson.

She said he wrote in a letter dated April 3 that he had just arrived at the base and was waiting to be sent out on a mission.

A June, 1966 graduate of City College, Corporal Johnson enlisted in the Marine Corps in August, 1966. He was sent to Vietnam last November.

In addition to his parents, he is survived by two brothers, Ronald E. and Jeffrey Johnson; a sister Miss Michelle Johnson, and his maternal grandmother, Mrs. Geneva Holman, all of Baltimore.

The Price of Silver

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, since July 14, when the Government ceased selling silver at the monetary price of \$1.29 per ounce, the silver market has been the victim of widespread speculation. The New York price for the white metal has fluctuated violently from a low of \$1.65 to a high of \$2.39 per ounce; today, the price is \$2.29. This has caused price increases for products having silver as their basic raw material. These additional costs have been a burden on the taxpaying consumer because he has had to bear the brunt of the price increases.

A degree of stability was apparent in the market after the Government began sales on a competitive-bid basis. Unfortunately, this stability was short lived as the monetary crisis began to build up last fall. Since then, the speculator has dominated the market; this condition continues even today.

The recent announcement by the Treasury that the Government has begun melting the .900 fine silver subsidiary coins could again bring stability to the market. In its April 18 issue, the American Metal Market carried a fine article by its editors, Michael C. Jensen. This article is based on an interview with Mr. John B. Stevens, president of the Silver Users Association and executive vice president of the International Silver Co., the largest consumer of silver in the manufacture of silverware. International Silver Co. is an outstanding business concern, and I am glad the company is in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the question of the extremely high price of silver is of concern to every taxpaying consumer since everyone in some degree uses this important metal, whether in his photographic products, electrical appliances, dental and medical supplies, silverware and jewelry, or in the many other items which require silver in their manufac-

ture. I, therefore, place the American Metal Market article in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that my colleagues and other interested parties may read a very clear and concise analysis of the silver situation:

[From American Metal Market, Apr. 18, 1968]
TREASURY MELTING OF SILVER COULD MEAN STABLE PRICES

(By Michael C. Jensen)

MERIDEN, CONN.—Within a year and a half it is conceivable that the price of silver could drop to \$1.65 an ounce and stabilize there.

That is one conclusion the president of the Silver Users Assn. draws from the announcement that the Treasury has begun melting down silver coins at a fairly rapid rate.

John B. Stevens, who is also executive vice president of the International Silver Co., agrees that there could be many a slip between now and 1970. And, obviously, as a large commercial user of silver, it would be in his interest for the price to come down from its present high level of over \$2.20 an ounce.

All this notwithstanding, however, the arithmetic of Mr. Stevens' argument seems sound.

Here's how he postulates the possible price drop:

The key to the supply-demand equation is the enormous amount of silver in private hands in the form of dimes, quarters and half dollars. Until the Treasury allows private holders to melt down this silver and sell it at market prices, it will stay off the market.

On the other hand, when private owners are allowed to melt it down, it will hit the market and allow prices to drop.

When will this happen? Probably not until the silver is needed, says Mr. Stevens, and that won't be until the government begins to run out of its stockpile of silver which it has been regularly depleting by weekly sales through the GSA program.

So it should be easy to figure out when the shortage of government silver will begin, shouldn't it? Just take note of the size of the weekly sales and extrapolate to the total amount of government stockpile.

But, it isn't that easy. For one thing, the government has been making its own collection of dimes, quarters and half dollars in preparation for melting them down. And this silver will presumably be available for sales to users. It's been known for some time that the government was planning to melt these coins, but now melting has started. Already there have been about one million ounces melted, and the Treasury is working up to a melting rate of two million ounces a week.

Since it is known that the Treasury already had about 246 million ounces of silver in coinage, and plans to have 250 million ounces by June 30; and since its other holdings include 265 million ounces (that's 100 million ounces above the stockpile requirement of 165 million ounces), a little simple arithmetic shows that there will be a total of about 350 million ounces available for disposal.

Not all of this can be sold, however, since some must be reserved for new coins—about 15 million ounces yearly. Since silver sales by the government have been running about two million ounces weekly, it doesn't take a slide rule to see that in three years, the government could be just about out of silver except for its stockpile. These figures flow easily from Mr. Stevens, but his key to the year and a half from now price drop is that the silver users would like to see the government lift the private melting restrictions at least a year and a half before Treasury silver hits rock bottom. That would be in the fall of 1970. So much for timing.

Where does the \$1.65 price come from? Simple, says Mr. Stevens. It's the value of the

silver content of the coins as the amount of silver is valued by the face value of the coin (plus a few added costs). In other words, a stack of coins with one ounce of silver content, is worth just about \$1.65 after all the necessary steps have been taken to make that silver usable. Here are some figures: The actual silver content is \$1.38 per ounce. Add two to three percent for loss of silver through wear on the coin. That gives you about \$1.42. Add twelve cents to collect, sort and pack the coins. That makes \$1.54. Then add another five cents for smelting. That brings it up to \$1.59. Finally, plug in five to 10 cents for profit and you get a total of \$1.64 to \$1.69. Like many silver users, Mr. Stevens thinks speculators are keeping the silver price at its high level, and there is plenty of the metal around.

"There doesn't seem to be a shortage of supply as long as the government continues its stockpile sale," he says.

However, he cautions that the price of silver hasn't come close to becoming stabilized.

"And I can visualize it going higher temporarily," he said, "under the pressure of speculation. The greatest reservoir of silver is in the subsidiary coinage. There's over one billion ounces reclaimable there," he asserted.

Some silver observers caution that a lifting of the ban on private melting won't automatically be a panacea to silver users. They warn that much of this subsidiary coinage is falling into the hands of a relatively few large speculators who would be able to feed it into the market slowly, thus preventing any sharp fall in the price. Mr. Stevens acknowledges this possibility, but thinks it is overstated. And he looks hopefully toward 1970.

Secretaries Week

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the 17th annual observance of Secretaries Week, sponsored by the National Secretaries Association, International, will be April 21 to 27 1968, with Wednesday, April 24, highlighted as Secretaries Day. In the April issue of the Secretary, the official monthly magazine of NSA, several famous people were queried to get their honest opinions of secretaries for this occasion.

From the White House, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's statement reflects empathy for the secretarial profession. The First Lady wrote:

Although I have never been a practicing secretary, the shorthand course that I took in college always has been helpful to me. Typing and shorthand are useful tools for anyone, and knowing how valuable they can be, I have urged my daughters to perfect these skills.

When I first met my husband, he was serving as secretary to a congressman. Later when he was a member of Congress and serving in the Pacific during World War II, the responsibility for running his office fell to me. I learned to appreciate the good, thoughtful letter and the value of a dedicated and talented staff. Over the years, we have been fortunate in having secretaries of great ability and imagination. How appropriate that we set aside Secretaries Week to honor the resourceful and energetic members of this profession. I salute these young women on their vital contribution to business and government.

Eugene McCarthy Stood Up for Labor

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Machinist includes an insightful analysis of the position that Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY has consistently taken in behalf of labor. This article expresses a great deal about MCCARTHY the man, as well as his approach to an issue that continues to be important in our society, and I am sure it will be of interest to many. I insert this article into the RECORD today, as follows:

[From the Machinist, Apr. 25, 1968]

EUGENE MCCARTHY STOOD UP FOR LABOR

In August, 1966, as pressure was building in Congress to break the great airline strike U.S. Sen. Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota tried to stem the anti-union tide.

He arranged for some of his colleagues to meet in the Senate Office Building late one afternoon to hear the union side of the dispute directly from IAM representatives.

On the Senate floor, he warned that Congressional strikebreaking proposals were hurting chances for a settlement.

"If, for another week or so, we stopped what we are doing, and let the airlines and the Machinists get together, they would come to their own settlement," he told the Senate.

McCarthy's pleas failed to carry the Senate. But his prediction came true a few days later. The House of Representatives temporarily removed the strikebreaking threat and gave the parties a chance to reach their own settlement.

Eugene McCarthy began fighting on labor's side in 1947 as a supporter of Hubert Humphrey, then Mayor of Minneapolis and leader of Minnesota's unique Democratic-Farmer-Labor (DFL) Party.

A soft-spoken college professor of economics, McCarthy had no previous experience in partisan politics. Nevertheless, he became a DFL candidate for Congress and won the seat from an incumbent Republican.

McCarthy has been winning elections ever since.

His current race for the Democratic Presidential nomination is based largely on his opposition to the war in Vietnam. He calls the war "morally indefensible" and "against the national interest."

Although many trade union members will disagree vigorously with his Vietnam position, they will find little disagreement with his labor record in Congress.

MCCARTHY AS CONGRESSMAN

McCarthy served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1949 to 1958. On 56 key issues compiled by THE MACHINIST during those ten years, McCarthy voted "Right" from labor's point of view all 56 times.

Though he authorized few major bills in the House, McCarthy worked consistently to improve unemployment compensation and to better the conditions of imported Mexican farm laborers.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, he pressed for changes in the nation's tax laws, seeking to make them fairer to wage earners and family farmers. McCarthy was an early sponsor of a proposal to close tax loopholes for the rich while raising personal income tax exemption.

Soon after he arrived in Washington, McCarthy became a leader of Democratic liberals in the House. He organized them into

a group known jokingly as McCarthy's Marauders, but more formally as the Democratic Study Group. The group remains active today on behalf of liberal causes.

MCCARTHY AS SENATOR

In 1958, McCarthy moved to the U.S. Senate after challenging and upsetting Republican U.S. Sen. Edward Thyne. In the ten years since, THE MACHINIST has listed 50 key Senate votes.

McCarthy voted "Right" from labor's viewpoint on 41 of these votes and "Wrong" twice. He was absent for seven of the key votes.

One of McCarthy's principal campaigns in the Senate has been to update the federal-state unemployment insurance system. His bills have sought to raise both the amount and the duration of benefits, to extend coverage to millions now excluded and to set new federal standards. His latest proposal, introduced last fall, also would end the arbitrary denial of unemployment compensation to employees involved in labor-management disputes.

McCarthy has been a leader over the years in efforts to repeal Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, the section that encourages states to prohibit the union shop and make the open shop compulsory.

Speaking on the Senate floor during the 1966 debate, McCarthy strongly defended the union shop:

"If both sides agree that a union shop is beneficial to the operations of the business and that it is helpful in solving disputes and securing a better relationship, why should state law be permitted to intrude and tell both management and labor, The law forbids you to bargain and reach agreement on this point?"

McCarthy spoke eloquently, asking repeal of Section 14(b) "in the interest of better labor-management relations, in the interest of consistency of law and primarily in the interest of fairness." But the repeal campaign, like others before it, died, the victim of a Senate filibuster.

McCarthy has long been famous, not only for his eloquence, but also for his wit. In 1960, when his Presidential ambitions first came to the surface, he touched himself as a likely Presidential prospect because "I'm twice as liberal as Humphrey, twice as bright as Symington and twice as Catholic as Kennedy."

Nowadays, on the Presidential stump, McCarthy uses wit more sparingly.

"It is a lot easier to be funny when the opposition is in power," he told a reporter recently. "Also, the times are different and the issues are changed. Vietnam is such a somber subject."

Committee on Banking and Currency Hearing Schedule

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency met today in executive session and decided to hold hearings on various bills now pending before the committee.

It was decided, in anticipation of legislation forthcoming on the International Monetary Fund's special drawing rights proposal, that hearings would be held on this legislation beginning May 1 through May 3 if necessary.

The committee also decided that hearings would be held on H.R. 16064, a bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to the scope of the audit by the General Accounting Office, on May 6 and 7.

Mr. Speaker, this statement should serve as formal notice to anyone wishing to testify on this legislation to please contact in writing the House Committee on Banking and Currency if they desire to be heard on the above subjects.

Lyndon B. Johnson: The Consumer's President

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, an article, in the April 15 edition of the New York Times describes the work that Mr. David Schoenfeld is doing to promote the establishment of consumer education courses throughout the country from kindergarten through the university level. Mr. Schoenfeld's official title is Director for Consumer Education of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests. Miss Betty Furness is Chairman of the Committee. Without building up a big bureaucratic staff, Mr. Schoenfeld has been traveling around the country persuading and convincing schools and other organizations that consumer education is a vital part of preparing people to deal with the modern world. This one little activity is symbolic of the fact that President Johnson, working with the Congress, has done more for the consumer than any President in history. The consumer in America is in for a new day in the years ahead. The 89th and the 90th Congresses can take a bow for this, and so can President Johnson. In order that all Members may read of this interesting new approach to consumer problems, I insert the article in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1968]
U.S. AIDE TEACHES CONSUMER LORE—HE HELPS MISS FURNESS TO PROMOTE EDUCATION
(By John D. Morris)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—Betty Furness, President Johnson's special assistant for consumer affairs, is relying largely on a brawny, brainy former college wrestler to develop and direct an expanded consumer education program for her office.

David Schoenfeld, 44 years old, six feet tall and weighing 215 pounds, has been on the job since Jan. 1 and hopes to have the program well under way within a few months.

So far, he has spent most of his time touring the country and making sales talks to educators, businessmen and other community and state leaders.

"Basically," he explained in an interview, "my job is to promote consumer education."

One of his main goals, he explained, is to promote the establishment of consumer education courses "from kindergarten through the university level."

CITES FAVORABLE REACTION

Another, with equal priority, is for schools and other community organizations to pro-

vide consumer education for adults, with special emphasis on teaching low-income and elderly persons.

The reaction to his sales talks, he said, has been "100 per cent favorable." Surprisingly, he added, he has sometimes found businessmen to be more interested than educators.

"The intelligent, ethical businessman wants an educated consumer," he remarked.

Mr. Schoenfeld's official title is director for consumer education of the President's committee on consumer interests. Miss Furness is chairman of the Cabinet-level committee, which functions something like a board of directors for Federal consumer activities.

His abbreviated definition of consumer education is "the preparation of the individual for the art of everyday living so that he gets maximum utilization and satisfaction from his income."

MULTITUDE OF SUBJECTS

This covers a multitude of subjects from buying food, clothing and other necessities to combating fraud and deception. Budgeting and money managing, purchasing and maintaining an automobile, renting an apartment, buying a house and determining the cost and value or shortcomings of consumer credit are among the many other topics.

Mr. Schoenfeld, teacher of economics and consumer education at Lincoln High School, Yonkers, N.Y., for the last six years, was a part-time consultant to Miss Furness and her predecessor, Mrs. Esther Peterson, for three years before taking his present full-time job. Miss Furness succeeded Mrs. Peterson last May.

At Lincoln High School in 1962, Mr. Schoenfeld set up what Mrs. Peterson and others have described as a model consumer education program. A novel aspect of the now thriving program is the blending of practical consumer matters into courses in standard subjects.

For example, a mathematics class may work on problems of credit, interest rates and banking. Or an English class may analyze the meaning and nuances of words used in commercial advertisements.

Aside from continuing his promotional travel, Mr. Schoenfeld plans to establish his office as "sort of a clearing house" for information on consumer education.

COMPILES BIBLIOGRAPHY

He is now working with the American Library Association on a comprehensive bibliography of books and other teaching materials. He also plans to establish guidelines for courses and curricula in schools and universities and for adult education programs.

He said he expected to cooperate with labor unions, the United States Office of Education, the Office of Economic Opportunity and various other public and private groups.

Sales, rentals and exchanges of books and other teaching materials such as film strips and charts are some of the cooperative ideas he has in mind.

At present, his staff consists of a program assistant, Mrs. Olinda Brown, and a secretary, Mrs. Helen B. Johnson. He has the authority to hire four more professional assistants and hopes to do so by July at the latest.

Mr. Schoenfeld was a member of the intramural wrestling team at Brooklyn College, where he earned a bachelor of arts degree in economics. Friends report that he also excels in archery, swimming, fishing and bridge.

He holds a master of business administration degree from the University of Southern California and has done further post-graduate work at Manhattan College, City College of New York and New York University. He was born in New York City, is married and has four children.

Anti-Semitic Actions in Poland

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of concern has been expressed over the antisemitic statements and activities of the Communist dictatorship in Poland.

In order to set the record perfectly clear, so that we understand that anti-Semitism is a tool of the Communist government and does not reflect the feeling of the people of Poland, I insert into the RECORD the statement unanimously adopted by the board of directors of the Polish National Alliance, the largest Polish fraternal organization in which it vigorously condemns the anti-Semitic activities of the Communist dictatorship in Poland. The president of the Polish National Alliance, Mr. Aloysius Mazewski, emphasized in releasing the document that the "anti-Semitic outbursts in the Communist press and governing circles in Poland is an attempted coverup for ideological, social, and economic bankruptcy of the Marxist-Leninist system."

The statement reads as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE REGARDING ANTI-SEMITIC ACTIONS OF COMMUNISTS IN POLAND

At a meeting held Friday, April 19, the Board of Directors of the Polish National Alliance adopted the following statement in appraisal of anti-Semitic declarations and actions of the Communist dictatorship in Poland:

1. It is our considered opinion that the anti-Semitic, or more precisely, "anti-Zionist" actions of the Gomulka regime stems from the Communist Party's attempt to cover up the bankruptcy of the economic, socio-political, and cultural sophistries contained in the Marxist-Leninist system.

It also is the result of the communist regime's subservience to the Moscow directive ordering the Warsaw communist regime to give unqualified support to the Arab states in the Near East crisis, contrary to the preponderant sympathy of the Polish people for the State of Israel. To justify the political and economic support extended to the Arabs, the communist regime of Poland felt compelled to invent an anti-Semitic issue.

2. These communist anti-Semitic outbursts have been precipitated last March by thousands of college and university students who demonstrated for freedom of speech. The fact that these demands were made by Polish youth born, raised and educated under the communist system, was a telling blow against red tyranny and contributed to the growing uneasiness and frustrations of the red regime in Warsaw.

Thus, in a sense, the current anti-Semitic action in Poland should be reduced in reality to anti-Semitism within the Communist Party which represents an infinitesimal portion of Poland's population. (In a nation of 32 million people, the Communist Party has less than a million members, the majority of whom are either bureaucrats without any loyalty, seeking advancement, or opportunists of a lesser breed.)

3. We call to the attention of our American journalists, commentators, and historians the fact that referring to Poland as "the land of traditional anti-Semitism" in their appraisal of current events in Warsaw, is unfair and unfounded.

Since the Statute of Wislica of 1347, Poland has provided a haven for Jews persecuted and tyrannized in other European countries throughout the centuries.

When over three million Jews in pre-war Poland enjoyed complete protection of law, tolerance, full freedom of higher education and opportunities, access to professional positions and comparatively high prosperity, the allusions to "traditional anti-Semitism in Poland" sound hollow and attest to anti-Polish prejudices or misinformation.

Approximately 100,000 Jews were saved by the Poles during the German reign of terror and genocide in Poland, when giving aid and comfort to the Jews meant summary executions.

Eloquent symbol of Poles' aid and compassion toward their Jewish compatriots, is presented today in Jerusalem by trees planted along the Avenue of the Righteous. Each tree is permanently marked with a plaque bearing the name of the person who in the years of the Jewish tragedy extended a helping hand to the Jews facing annihilation; each rescuer's nationality is memorialized on these plaques, and the most frequent word that appears on them is "Poland."

Could these acts of brotherly love and compassion on the part of the Poles, and of recognition and appreciation on the part of Israel, be construed as "traditional anti-Semitism" in Poland?

4. The anti-Semitism rampant within the ruling Communist Party in Poland does not reflect the tolerance and historical ties that bind the Poles and the Jews in the bond of mutual respect and understanding. It speaks, rather, of the power struggle among the communists and their sympathizers and gives eloquent testimony to the ideological and economic failure of Communism and its blind intolerance of civil freedom and democratic processes.

We take note, that his statement is being issued on the very day when the whole civilized world pays homage to some five million Jews exterminated during World War II by Nazi Germany.

Paying homage to the Jews martyred by the Nazis we also salute tens of thousands of Poles who disregarded their personal safety in coming to the assistance of their brethren, and millions of Poles who died in German concentration camps and the battles for freedom and dignity of man.

ALOYSIUS A. MAZEWSKI,
President P.N.A.

ADOLF K. PACHUCKI,
National Secretary P.N.A.

WALTER L. DWORAKOWSKI,
Censor for Supervisory Council P.N.A.

Rubber Capital of the World

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, Akron has justifiably been called the rubber capital of the world. The founders of the rubber industry chose well, for here they found not only the physical advantages but the skilled manpower that has maintained the leadership that has retained for Akron the supremacy in this important industrial field.

This great industry has brought the Akron community other advantages besides financial rewards. The top of the crop of industry-minded young men were attracted to this burgeoning industry.

The rubber industry has been ever mindful of the future and trained these

young men so that one day they could assume the executive leadership of these great companies. The far-seeing founders of these manufacturing organizations had a great love for the Akron community and instilled these same feelings in their young executives.

Today those former young executives are the leaders of these companies and join with all of us in promoting the welfare of the Akron community.

The present chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the B. F. Goodrich Co., J. Ward Keener, is a fine example of this great policy. He started with this great company over 30 years ago as research analyst and progressed through the years until he reached his present position.

Mr. Keener, nationally recognized as one of America's greatest industrialists, has devoted a great share of his time to governmental and civic affairs. Today he is a member of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy and also serves as a member of the Balance-of-Payments Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Commerce. He also has recently been appointed to the board of directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.

J. Ward Keener serves our Akron community well. He has joined with his fellow Akron industrialists in working to make Akron an ever better community. We are particularly indebted to him for the financial assistance that he has given to the 404-acre Opportunity Park. Eventually this great project will be worth over \$200 million and will give employment to over 15,000 people.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are indeed grateful to J. Ward Keener for the many benefits that he has brought us.

Just this month, Nation's Business, the country's oldest and largest business magazine, issued a special edition entitled "200 Years of Business Leadership." In this edition, they had asked Mr. Keener to prepare a story on the future of the rubber industry. I am certain that Mr. Keener's views will be of interest to my colleagues. The Nation's Business article follows:

FUTURE OF INDUSTRIES—RUBBER
(By J. Ward Keener, chairman, the B. F. Goodrich Co.)

"Ceiling unlimited—visibility fair" is an apt way to describe the opportunities for continuing growth in the rubber, plastics and chemical industries.

Because these materials and the products made from them are basic to many of our leading industries—automotive, transportation, construction, appliances—their success is closely linked to the progress of our nation's economy.

The major markets we serve and the industries of which we serve and the industries of which we are a part have been growing about 50 per cent faster than the United States total domestic activity, and we believe this relative rate of growth will be maintained through the foreseeable future.

We are optimistic about the long-term outlook for the nation's economic growth, with gross national product reaching \$1 trillion in the next few years and about \$1.3 trillion in 1975.

The demand for rubber will continue to increase. In the United States, even as our population grows, the per capita consumption of rubber will rise. Ten years ago, our

nation consumed nearly 21 pounds of rubber for each man, woman and child. Today the rate is over 23 pounds. In 1975 we expect it to be between 26 and 27 pounds per person.

This means that total new rubber consumption will increase from about 2.4 million long tons in 1968 to about 3.1 million in 1975. Of this, about 81 per cent will be synthetic rubber, compared with about 76.5 per cent today.

Plastics and chemicals will grow at an even faster rate. Our current forecasts indicate the use of vinyl plastic materials increasing at a rate of 10 to 12 per cent a year, nearly doubling the 1967 production of more than two billion pounds by 1975.

The horizon is clouded, however, by serious problems which must be met and managed over the next few years.

The specter of a huge federal budget growing out of irresponsible fiscal policies casts a shadow over the entire business and economic scene.

If we are successfully to meet the balance of payments problem, we must slice through the fog of government-imposed stop-gap restrictions, encourage direct investment abroad and curb the government's appetite for spending abroad.

Businessmen are confronted with labor union unrest, rapidly rising labor costs, tax increases, high interest rates and pressures on profit margins.

Consumers are facing further increases in the cost of living, higher taxes of all kinds and another rise in their payments on social security.

Possible strikes in major industries, developments in the Viet Nam War and the ultimate size of the 1968 federal deficit will play major roles in shaping the pattern of economic activity in the months to come.

But the long-term outlook continues to be up with the ceiling unlimited.

Escalation at National Airport

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, a story recently appeared in the Washington Post which indicated that one or more airlines are considering a proposal to expand National Airport by extending its main runway into the Potomac River. The purpose of this expansion, according to the article, is to allow the airport to accommodate the massive jumbojets and airbuses now in the development stage.

The Federal Aviation Administration, which must approve such plans, has been opposed to such plans in the past. I approve their judgment in this respect, and have written to urge that they consider this proposal in the light of these remarks.

I for one have serious reservations about such a proposal. Anyone who lives in the metropolitan area is already painfully aware of the problems created by the existence of jets at National Airport today. The noise problem is substantial and obvious; the air pollution caused by jets landing and leaving is visible and smellable, and the water in the Potomac is contaminated by the same source. What would be the effects of the proposed runway expansion and increased jet operations we can only imagine. And this is the source of my problem with these plans—we have no way of know-

ing what the total effect of this proposal would be. I am prepared to give generous odds to anyone who wants to bet that serious consideration has been given to the long-range effects of such a program upon the ecology of the region—animal, plant, and human.

The congestion at National Airport is already incredible. The airport facilities are presently being expanded by the airlines, and the effects of this expansion will no doubt ultimately result in greater use of the terminal and more congestion. The last thing that is needed is to begin to bring in two to four times as many passengers per plane as are now arriving. For the airlines this may be good business—for the consumer-passenger, it is not.

I am not recommending at this time that National be closed to jets. I do feel, however, that any expenditure of funds authorized or made now by the Federal Government on Metropolitan Washington air service be devoted to the development of an adequate rapid transit system which will permit Dulles to operate at something approaching the capacity for which it was built, rather than for increasing traffic at National. If Dulles were adequately available, the need for jet operation at National would diminish, perhaps even disappear. This, it seems to me, is the responsible action to take—not to create a massive capital investment in the expansion of jet facilities at National which will make it that much harder to justify the transition to Dulles when the proper time arrives.

If the airlines are so anxious to spend money on facilities which will justify their use of larger and faster jets, let them spend the money on the rapid transit system—a facility which will permit them to continue operations without hazard or adverse environmental impact upon those who are forced to live in the core of the city.

How many other cities are forced to endure jet operations within 2 miles of their business centers? How many other governments have their daily operations interrupted regularly by the scream of aircraft rising over their heads? Why us?

The kind of step that the airlines are contemplating should be very carefully considered before anything further is done. I would be the last person to speak out against imaginative and forceful action being taken, but I do feel that we should first have some idea where it is that we are going.

The Washington Post carried an editorial on this subject on April 18 which is highly relevant and cogent. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

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

NIGHTMARE AT NATIONAL

An airport is more than just a place at which airplanes can land, and it is long past time for the airlines to begin to act as if they recognize this. Yet, some airline proposed in a recent secret meeting that National Airport be expanded so that it could accommodate the next generation of jets, ignoring all the facts of airport life except

convenience. The idea is so out of keeping with what ought to happen to National that if the other airlines do not squelch it promptly the Federal Aviation Administration must.

The thought of the 490-passenger jumbojets and the 250-passenger airbuses lumbering over residential areas, plopping onto a ledge of concrete built out into the Potomac River, and disgorging hordes of people into an already overcrowded area can best be described as a nightmare. The only reason for such an idea ever surfacing is that some airlines don't want to face up to the fact that the future of air travel here is inevitably linked to Dulles Airport. The sooner that fact is accepted, the quicker solutions can be found to the problems that flow from it.

Instead of proposing to increase the noise level over the Potomac and the congestion at an airport where congestion is already a major problem, the airlines ought to be talking about speeding up and reducing the cost of transportation between Dulles and downtown, setting up helicopter service, building a downtown terminal to handle the passenger flow, establishing suburban terminals to spread the passenger load, and selling the relative convenience of Dulles when it is compared to airports in other major cities. But airlines have not been noted for their ingenuity in solving the problems of passengers. Indeed, one of the outrageous proposals thrown out at a recent airline meeting was to eliminate the mobile lounges at Dulles and, like all the other major airports, require that passengers scamper down miles of corridors to reach their airplanes.

Someday, perhaps, airlines will begin to think of passengers as people, not pack animals, and of airports as important factors in an urban community, not just isolated stage coach stops. When that happens, it may occur to them that airports ought to be friendly neighbors, concerned about the total impact they make on life in a city.

Key Interest Rates at Highest Level in 100 Years

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a number of key interest rates are currently at their highest level in 100 years, since the time of the Civil War. Many of them are higher than the credit crunch in the late summer and fall of 1966. If the current rate of inflation continues, interest rates may well go higher. The combination of inflation and high interest rates has as its chief victims the lower income groups as well as important industries such as farming and home construction. This country needs healthy economic growth, which inflation and increasing interest rates undermine.

So that the Members might see the extent of the current interest rate situation, I am placing several interest rate tables—published in "Historical Statistics of the United States" put out by the Commerce Department—in the RECORD.

KEY INTEREST RATES

The highs of each series for which late March data is available are shown in parentheses. As can be seen, half are at their highs and the other half are relatively close to the previous high.

BOND YIELDS AND INTEREST RATES: 1960 TO 1968
[Percent per annum]

Period	U.S. Government security yields			High-grade municipal bonds (Standard & Poor's) ⁴	Corporate bonds (Moody's)		Prime commercial paper, 4 to 6 months	FHA new home mortgage yields ⁵
	3-month Treasury bills ¹	3- to 5-year issues ²	Taxable bonds ³		Aaa	Baa		
1960	2.928	3.99	4.02	3.73	4.41	5.19	3.85	6.16
1961	2.378	3.60	3.90	3.46	4.35	5.08	2.97	5.78
1962	2.778	3.57	3.95	3.18	4.33	5.02	3.26	5.60
1963	3.157	3.72	4.00	3.23	4.26	4.86	3.55	5.46
1964	3.549	4.06	4.15	3.22	4.40	4.83	3.97	5.45
1965	3.954	4.22	4.21	3.27	4.49	4.87	4.38	5.46
1966	4.881	5.16	4.65	3.82	5.13	5.67	5.55	6.29
1966—March	4.626	4.94	4.63	3.72	4.92	5.32	5.21	-----
April	4.611	4.86	4.55	3.59	4.96	5.41	5.38	-----
May	4.642	4.94	4.57	3.68	4.98	5.48	5.39	-----
June	4.539	5.01	4.63	3.77	5.07	5.58	5.51	6.32
July	4.855	5.22	4.75	3.94	5.16	5.68	5.63	6.45
August	4.932	5.58	4.80	4.17	5.31	5.83	5.85	6.51
September	5.356	5.62	4.79	4.11	5.49	6.09	5.89	6.58
October	(5.387)	5.38	4.70	3.97	5.41	6.10	6.00	6.63
November	5.344	5.43	4.74	3.93	5.35	6.13	6.00	-----
December	5.007	5.07	4.65	3.83	5.39	6.18	6.00	6.81
1967—January	4.759	4.71	4.40	3.58	5.20	5.97	5.73	6.77
February	4.554	4.73	4.47	3.56	5.03	5.82	5.38	6.62
March	4.288	4.52	4.45	3.60	5.13	5.85	5.24	6.46
April	3.852	4.46	4.51	3.66	5.11	5.83	4.83	6.35
May	3.640	4.68	4.76	3.92	5.24	5.96	4.67	6.29
June	3.480	4.96	4.86	3.99	5.44	6.15	4.65	6.44
July	4.308	5.17	4.86	4.05	5.58	6.26	4.92	6.51
August	4.275	5.28	4.95	4.03	5.62	6.33	5.00	6.53
September	4.451	5.40	4.99	4.15	5.65	6.40	5.00	6.60
October	4.588	5.52	5.19	4.31	5.82	6.52	5.07	6.63
November	4.762	5.73	(5.44)	4.36	6.07	6.72	5.28	6.65
December	5.012	5.72	5.36	4.49	6.19	(6.93)	5.56	6.77
1968 January	5.081	5.53	5.18	4.36	6.17	6.84	5.60	6.81
Week ended:								
1968—Jan. 13	5.080	5.48	5.12	4.35	(6.20)	6.86	5.63	-----
Jan. 20	5.072	5.52	5.18	4.34	6.14	6.79	5.63	-----
Jan. 27	5.068	5.55	5.20	4.30	6.12	6.80	5.60	-----
Feb. 3	4.846	5.54	5.15	4.23	6.12	6.80	5.50	-----
Feb. 10	4.957	5.61	5.17	4.30	6.11	6.80	5.50	-----
Feb. 17	5.040	5.56	*5.13	4.36	*6.10	6.79	*5.50	-----
Mar. 29	5.13	(5.79)	5.41	(4.61)	6.19	(6.93)	(5.75)	-----

¹ Rate on new issues within period.
² Selected note and bond issues.
³ April 1953 to date, bonds due or callable 10 years and after.
⁴ Weekly data are Wednesday figures.
⁵ Data for first of the month, based on the maximum permissible interest rate (6 percent beginning October 1966) and 30-year mortgages paid in 15 years.

*Not charted.
 Sources: Treasury Department, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Federal Housing Administration, Standard & Poor's Corporation, and Moody's Investors Service.

SERIES N 185-187.—SHORT-TERM INTEREST RATES—OPEN-MARKET RATES IN NEW YORK CITY: 1890 TO 1945

[Percent per annum]

YEAR	Stock exchange time loans, 90 days ¹	Prime commercial paper, 4 to 6 months ¹	Stock exchange renewal call loans ²	YEAR	Stock exchange time loans, 90 days ¹	Prime commercial paper, 4 to 6 months ¹	Stock exchange renewal call loans ²
	185	186	187		185	186	187
1945	1.25	0.75	1.00	1917	4.62	5.07	3.43
1944	1.25	.73	1.00	1916	3.25	3.84	2.62
1943	1.25	.69	1.00	1915	2.85	4.01	1.92
1942	1.25	.66	1.00	1914	4.37	5.47	3.43
1941	1.25	.54	1.00	1913	4.64	6.20	3.22
1940	1.25	.56	1.00	1912	4.16	5.41	3.52
1939	1.25	.59	1.00	1911	3.22	4.75	2.57
1938	1.25	.81	1.00	1910	4.03	5.72	2.98
1937	1.25	.94	1.00	1909	3.26	4.67	2.71
1936	1.16	.75	.91	1908	3.24	5.00	1.92
1935	.56	.76	.56	1907	6.49	16.66	7.01
1934	.90	1.02	1.00	1906	5.71	6.25	6.54
1933	1.11	1.73	1.16	1905	3.82	5.18	4.44
1932	1.87	2.73	2.05	1904	3.10	5.14	1.78
1931	2.15	2.64	1.74	1903	4.84	6.16	3.71
1930	3.26	3.59	2.94	1902	5.05	5.81	5.15
1929	7.75	5.85	7.61	1901	4.24	5.40	4.00
1928	5.86	4.85	6.04	1900	3.94	5.71	2.94
1927	4.35	4.11	4.06	1899	4.19	5.50	5.08
1926	4.60	4.34	4.50	1898	3.31	5.34	2.18
1925	4.23	4.02	4.18	1897	2.68	4.72	1.75
1924	3.64	3.98	3.08	1896	4.83	7.02	4.28
1923	5.14	5.07	4.86	1895	2.82	5.80	1.88
1922	4.53	4.52	4.29	1894	2.30	5.22	1.07
1921	6.15	6.62	5.97	1893	5.08	7.64	4.57
1920	8.06	7.50	7.74	1892	4.80	5.40	3.08
1919	5.83	5.37	6.32	1891	4.83	6.48	3.42
1918	5.90	6.02	5.28	1890	5.31	6.91	5.84

¹ Averages of weekly prevailing rates.
² Averages of daily quotations.

³ Includes one or more interpolated items.

Model Cities

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the crucial problems confronting this country today is what can be done to cure the blight and decay of vital sections of our central cities.

A giant step forward toward solving this problem was enactment of the Model Cities Act, of which Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, and I were coauthors.

This act has aroused hope in cities from coast to coast that, at long last, it will be possible to mount a unified attack on the total problems of some endangered neighborhoods.

This hope is running high, among other communities, in my home city of Cleveland.

Cleveland failed to qualify for model cities planning assistance last year, but has now renewed its application. I am hopeful that the new application will receive the approval of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I would like to present the text of an eloquent editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which excellently expresses the model city situation as it pertains to Cleveland, and also contains a final paragraph which sums up the choice confronting every city in the country.

The editorial, which appeared in the Plain Dealer of April 16, 1968, reads as follows:

MODEL CITIES, SECOND ROUND

Yesterday came the deadline for cities applying for model cities grants in the second round.

Last year Cleveland's application went in late. This time Cleveland made it under the wire. That is one improvement over last year's performance, when Cleveland failed to win a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Another improvement: This time Cleveland's application contains an ingredient which HUD has indicated is virtually essential. That ingredient is "resident involvement."

The new Cleveland proposal starts with a "Constitutional Convention" at which residents of the model neighborhood area themselves will select their own policy spokesmen to sit in on the planning.

And still another improvement is embodied in the new proposal. Last year the area designated for a model was fuzzy and too general. This time the area is sharper. It is from E. 55th to E. 79th Street, from Superior Avenue N.E. to Kingsbury Run or Kinsman Road S.E.

Cleveland has many more reasons to hope it will win a grant this time. HUD has shown itself better disposed toward Cleveland since Mayor Carl B. Stokes took office and Mayor Stokes has fielded a more representative team to prepare and to deliver the application to HUD's regional office in Chicago.

The one-year grant asked for is \$396,663. Funds from Cleveland's school board, the city and other sources will bring that up to \$507,233.

Planned, coordinated improvement should prove a better way of salvaging neighborhoods than a patchquilt of programs, each doing a fraction of the job.

Ingredient: Cooperation—A Story of Voluntary School Consolidation

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, because this is both a time when our educational needs are increasing and the urgency of fiscal responsibility calls for frugality, the Congress will find interesting an article published in the April edition of the Arkansas Journal of Education. Based on material supplied by Mrs. Dorothy Cooper and Mrs. Imogene Holmes, the article outlines the expanded educational opportunities now available to all the high school students of Cross County, Ark.

Entitled "Ingredient: Cooperation" the article pertains to the new Cross County High School serving Vanndale, Hickory Ridge, and Cherry Valley, where Arkansas taxpayers are getting more educational mileage out of their millage.

The article follows:

INGREDIENT: COOPERATION—A STORY OF VOLUNTARY SCHOOL CONSOLIDATION

(NOTE.—Story prepared from material submitted by Mrs. Dorothy Cooper and Mrs. Imogene Holmes, co-sponsors of the annual for Cross County High School.)

When the new Cross County High School held open house last fall, 1500 guests from the community toured the new school building. Parents of the children who had formerly attended school in Cherry Valley, Hickory Ridge, and Vanndale visited classrooms that offered a wide range of educational opportunities not available to them before consolidation of the three districts.

In this building they found a foreign language laboratory, art room, agriculture room, band room, music room, mathematics laboratory, home economics room and outside a football stadium. These facilities witness the addition of courses in advanced mathematics, geometry, business math, home economics I, II, and III and French I. The curriculum is further enriched by courses in biology, bookkeeping, driver education, speech and band. These new courses are offered in addition to the basic English, algebra, general science, civics, world history, American history, geography, agriculture, physical education and courses in chemistry, typing, shorthand and general business.

In addition to new facilities, the school enjoys an improved science laboratory, an expanded library, an adequate cafeteria with modern kitchen equipment, and a large gymnasium to accommodate an expanded athletic program as well as a complete physical education program.

The new Cross County High School employs eight more teachers than in the three separate schools before consolidation. A total of 27 professional staff members work under the leadership of Superintendent Grover Cooper and high school principal Jack Holmes. The elementary schools in the district are supervised by John Dunsworthy, formerly at Cherry Valley School. Professional leaders of the school give credit to the Cross County Board of Education for their devotion and foresight in improving educational opportunity for the youth of the community.

Members of the staff feel that the most significant improvement of opportunity lies in the increased curriculum offering. Teachers are able to teach in their certified field. All teachers in the system are teaching in the field for which they are trained. The high school has a full time principal without other

duties to perform and the district has the services of a full time elementary supervisor. The school enjoys the benefits of a full time guidance counseling program and complete facilities to carry on the program of studies. For the first time they are able to offer a physical education program for every child.

No less important than these additions, the teachers say, "We have not only added extras to our curriculum, but we have also expanded our basic programs." *Ingredient-cooperation* is working for the benefit of several hundred girls and boys at Cross County High School.

How Do You Keep Federal Agencies Honest?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for quite a few of us here in Congress the idea of Federal intervention or control automatically conjures up a carload of misgivings. These fears are not unfounded, for year after year cases of Federal abuse of power and waste of taxpayers' dollars recur with monotonous regularity. This is not to say that all Federal officials are ogres, because I believe the vast majority of them try sincerely to do a creditable job. Tending to the Federal store is a vastly important job, and encouraging qualified people to enter Federal service should be our day-to-day goal.

However, one can appreciate the necessity for congressional oversight over Federal agencies when one of these agencies assumes powers never delegated to it by Congress. It would appear that some officials allow the weight of the Federal club to intoxicate them with unrestricted power. The day might well come when Congress, in instituting a new Federal agency, will automatically penalize with a jail term those officials who willfully abuse citizens and organizations by an unlawful use of their Federal authority.

Take the case, for instance, of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which Congress created in 1965. According to Senator PAUL FANNIN in an article in the March 1968 issue of *Nation's Business* the EEOC is guilty of "misuse of power, violation of the spirit and letter of the law, disruption of labor-management-union relationships."

Like Senator FANNIN, I certainly believe there is a need for equal employment opportunities for the disadvantaged. This is not the issue here. The question is how far can a Federal agency be allowed to deviate from its true function in usurping and wielding ungranted powers.

I include the article entitled, "Does Washington Force Racial Bias?" by Senator PAUL FANNIN, in the *RECORD* at this point:

DOES WASHINGTON FORCE RACIAL BIAS: THE EEOC ALREADY WIELDS UNPRECEDENTED POWERS OVER BUSINESS AND, LAWMAKER WARNS, NOW WANTS STILL MORE

(By PAUL FANNIN, U.S. Senator from Arizona)

Jimmy Lee never got his promotion. His skin is the wrong color. Jimmy had to stand

aside and let someone less qualified be promoted in his place because the federal government threatened to cancel contracts with his employer unless someone of another race got Jimmy's job.

Jimmy Lee is white.

His case is not uncommon—not since the advent of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The names here are changed to protect the individuals, but the circumstances and details are shockingly real.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission came into being in mid-1965 as a result of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The five-man Commission was created to prevent unlawful employment practices. Instead it has undermined some of the most basic relationships between employer and employee. Now it seeks more power of enforcement to spread its influence even wider. I don't think it can be trusted with more authority.

EEOC's record is clear: Misuse of power, violation of the spirit and letter of the law, disruption of labor-management-union relationships. Let me be plain. I'm not against equal employment opportunities. I'm against granting EEOC, or anyone else, arbitrary powers over workmen and their jobs.

So-called civil rights groups have wrapped themselves around this EEOC issue to the extent that any discussion of the problem immediately brings forth the cry of "racist."

To my mind there is no more basic right than that of a man to provide for himself and those he loves with the smallest interference possible from government. That's what is involved in this issue.

I am disturbed that the EEOC has associated itself with extremist groups. One of the EEOC's former consultants (Timothy L. Jenkins) bills himself as a member of the staff of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee—an associate of H. Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael.

If this is the kind of person insuring equality of employment opportunities—then I want to be very careful about granting any additional powers.

The Commission got off to a rather shaky start under the chairmanship of Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. who assured me, and other members of the Senate Labor Committee, that he would devote his full time and resources to the job. He wrote a letter to Senator Javits of New York stating that he had asked specifically for a two-year appointment, taking him beyond June 1, 1967, so as to allay any fears Senators Javits and Winston Prouty might have that he would quit to go pollicking.

"I will have to leave the day-to-day political activity to such eminent practitioners of the art as you, Congressman Lindsay and Governor Rockefeller," Roosevelt said.

Ten months later he quit to run for the governorship of New York. It was a bad beginning.

PICKING A TARGET

During its first year of operations the EEOC singled out the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co. as a likely target for its maiden effort. The company is located in the South. A defense contractor—the nation's sole supplier of capital ships—it had a well-developed program of apprentice training.

Jimmy Lee and other old hands at the shipyard heard news that the EEOC boys were knocking on doors, soliciting complaints about the company. They didn't think much of it. Of the 22,000 employees, 41 said they were willing to complain. It later narrowed down to only four. Armed with this "evidence," EEOC notified the company it was in violation of the Civil Rights Act and sat down to negotiate an agreement to stop the alleged discrimination.

Because it is a defense supplier, Newport News had already signed an agreement to

take "affirmative action" in eliminating discrimination.

Soon the full array of federal power was focused on one company.

The Department of Justice notified the company it was holding up a pending case awaiting outcome of the negotiations.

The Office of Federal Contract Compliance under the Department of Labor notified the company all its defense contracts would be suspended pending the outcome of the talks.

The Defense Department was made a party to, and inspector of, the enforcement proceedings.

Small wonder that Newport News Shipbuilding "voluntarily" agreed to the compact which Commission spokesmen called a "landmark" case and a "model" for future agreements.

Jimmy Lee was soon to find out that his career in the shipyard, despite the fact that he belonged to a union, was out of his hands. He had exchanged the quiet of the southwest Virginia hills for the roar and excitement of heavy industry and progressed right out of high school through the shipyard's training program. He thought he was ready to go somewhere. He was next in line for promotion to quartermaster. But he had reckoned without the EEOC.

SETTING BLACK AGAINST WHITE

The agreement between EEOC and the company substituted favoritism as a goal. And in the words of one veteran welder, "did everything possible to set black against white."

Jimmy found that a preferential promotion list had been created with 100 Negroes on it. This list had to be exhausted before he could be promoted. Any exceptions to the order of placement had to be cleared with the Commission.

Jimmy got mad.

Others got mad, too. One of Jimmy's friends who had gone through the apprentice school with him says, "They've ruined the school. It used to be there were more boys wanting to get in than they could take—boys who couldn't go to college, but wanted more training. Now they've lowered the requirements so much the teachers are quitting. They've converted the dormitory space back to offices and are having trouble getting enough to fill out the class."

Bone-cracking violence erupted at the main gate of the yard last summer and a score of people were injured. What caused these passionate outbursts in a placid town where the shipyard had operated for 81 years without disturbance?

Listen to these words in the EEOC agreement pertaining to enrollment in the apprentice school:

"The ratio of Negro to white apprentices in any given year should approach the ratio . . . of Negro to whites in the labor area."

And this about promotions:

"Vacancies will be filled by qualified Negro employees."

And this about training opportunities:

"Employees in predominantly Negro departments shall be given the first opportunity to enter training programs in which they are qualified to enter."

Do you wonder that Jimmy Lee and his white friends got mad?

One of the first to protest the agreement was the union representing the 22,000 employees. Their position in employee representation had been entirely preempted.

Co-managers of the independent union, one a white and the other a Negro, have both been very critical of the EEOC's action.

At one time the union threatened to sue the Labor Department unless it set the record straight on the number of raises and promotions. The Labor Department claimed 3,890. The union and the company both contend raises amounted to about 155 as a result

of the agreement, and 250 Negroes put on preferential promotion lists.

"Any time the Secretary of Labor will claim 3,890 promotions under an agreement that actually produced 155," said one of the union leaders, "I've got a lot of reservations about whether he should be Secretary of Labor."

The unions have a right to be upset about extending the powers of EEOC. The pattern of agreements emanating from the EEOC offices generally bears these four stipulations directly relating to union interests:

WOULD YOU FLY IN THIS ROCKET?

First, most of the EEOC agreements call for abolition of job seniority arrangements in labor agreements. They generally take plant seniority as the only nondiscriminatory yardstick. The practical effect is that a sweeper, for example, who has been in the plant a long time, must be promoted to the next supervisory opening in the rocket assembly shop, regardless of his training or job preparedness.

The commission attitude is, "You must try him, even if he isn't trained."

How would you like a trip to the moon on one of those rockets?

Second, special treatment must be given to Negro employees who are found to be unqualified in their training or advancement.

Third, the EEOC generally calls for an end to all testing. It makes no difference if it is related to the job—the test must be "culturally validated." Ask any sociologist if you can culturally validate a test with less than a 100-man sample equally divided as to race and job experience.

Fourth, and most important to unions, the agreements usually call for a unilateral change in any union contract which is in conflict with any of the above proposals.

POSES LEGAL PROBLEM

This creates a nice legal question.

Does an employer have the right to break one law (the Taft-Hartley protections of collective bargaining agreements) and subject himself to NLRB action in order to obey the orders of the EEOC?

One company tells me it spends over \$1 million a year just trying to be in compliance with the multitude of often contradicting decrees handed down by government anti-discrimination agencies.

One federal agency, in existence by executive order, is taking a completely dictatorial attitude with defense contractors. It is the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC) which hands down ironclad regulations to those doing business with the government.

The really frightening thing here is the lack of Congressional restraint upon their operations, plus the fact that there is no appeal from an OFCC ruling. All this is even more fantastic when considered in the light of what the law actually says the Commission may and may not do.

Congress debated loud and long on the question of having an EEOC in the first place. There are plenty of statements on both sides of the aisle where both supporters and detractors agreed on things the law would not do.

Everyone agreed that setting employment quotas is not the right way to go about eliminating discrimination. Languages specifically prohibited hiring or firing, promoting or holding back, just on the basis of race to fill out a percentage quota. Yet practically every agreement coming out of EEOC has some mention of the local area's Negro population and relates the employer's performance to that quota.

Setting quotas, while probably the most frequent violation the EEOC commits, is not its only sin. Congresswoman Martha Griffiths of Michigan spoke out plainly on the floor of the House after the EEOC had been in operation for about a year.

She roundly castigated the Commission for failing to enforce the antidiscrimination provisions in regard to sex and said:

"These EEOC officials are completely out of step with the President, the rest of the Administration, the courts and, indeed, the country as a whole."

She charged the executive director of the Commission with saying the sex provision of title VII was a "fluke" and "conceived out of wedlock." Mrs. Griffiths reminded the Commission that "they took an oath to uphold the law—not just the part of it that they are interested in."

You can get a better idea of the haphazard, hot-eyed approach to the law taken by representatives of the Commission if you'll follow this chain of events that occurred during an actual case. Names, places and dates have been changed.

HOW EEOC OPERATES

Joseph Bedford operates a small manufacturing concern in the Midwest. He was on vacation last June when Jefferson Rank, a Negro, came in to ask about a job. So far as can be determined, he received courteous treatment from the receptionist in the personnel department, was told there were no openings at present either for employees or trainees, but offered an employment application to fill out and leave if he cared to. He didn't.

Now it's February and Mr. Bedford gets a call from his receptionist that a Mr. Sperlin of the EEOC is waiting to see him. He meets Mr. Sperlin and is promptly served a charge of discrimination dated the day before. It is signed by Jefferson Rank and sworn to before Mr. Sperlin. It's the first time Joe knows he's been charged with an unfair discrimination practice alleged to have happened last June.

Upon request he shows Mr. Sperlin around the plant and lets him talk to the personnel people. The manufacturer finds out he should be keeping records of applications, terminations, promotions, raises and the like for 180 days. He'd been throwing them away after 90 days. So far that's the only EEOC regulation he's been found negligent in. However, even if he had been keeping records for the stipulated time, Jefferson's application would not have been on file, since almost 270 days have passed.

Mr. Sperlin asks Negro employees if they are treated the same as white employees. He asks if the canteen areas or restrooms are segregated. Asks if personnel like working for their supervisor and Mr. Bedford. When they say, "Yes," he says, "Oh, that's too bad. I like to find people who aren't happy in their jobs."

Mr. Bedford contains himself. Mr. Sperlin leaves saying he has found nothing wrong except the record-keeping time limit. Joe Bedford sighs.

Seven and a half weeks later he gets an EEOC decision. It finds an unfair employment practice occurred in June, the charge filed in September and served on him in February.

The Commission is squeezing the law a bit. A three-month limitation on making a charge is written into the law. It's supposed to be signed and worn to. So the Commission says under questioning from Mr. Bedford's attorney (by now he's decided he needs one) that they've "adopted" the attitude that a written complaint fulfills the requirements of the law even though it was not sworn to. Just like that—change the law.

A couple of months go by before an EEOC conciliator makes contact and arranges a meeting. Now it's a little over a year since Jefferson Rank first entered the manufacturer's reception room.

Mr. Bedford and his attorney face the conciliator. Most of the agreement he wants Joe Bedford to sign is standard civil rights language—but there are some real stunners.

THE LIST OF DEMANDS

EEOC wants Mr. Bedford to hire Jefferson Rank as a trainee and pay him minimum wage back pay from the time of his alleged application.

EEOC wants him to employ, train and accept the applications of the next 75 Negroes referred to him by a civil rights organization. The figure is determined by taking the percentage of Joe's work force that's Negro and comparing it with an (inflated) percentage of the area's Negro population in the labor market.

EEOC wants Joe Bedford to agree to hire Negroes for the next five white-collar jobs. And he must upgrade at least three Negroes to supervisory positions within three months of the agreement.

On top of this, for two years Mr. Bedford has to report, quarterly, to the Commission everything he's doing that pertains to both his white and Negro workers. He can't promote anybody who is not a Negro unless he gets prior EEOC approval. All refusals of Negroes to take higher jobs must be documented in writing and sent to the Commission.

Mr. Bedford and his attorney managed to trim some of the rough edges off these demands, but he signed an agreement—even though he had done nothing wrong. The plant is located in a town that has lots of militant civil rights activity and he decided he didn't want pickets pounding on his door.

Whether Mr. Bedford got off lucky or not, we don't know. If proponents of additional enforcement teeth for the EEOC get their way, he probably did.

Reasonable negotiations would be harder to come by. The Commission will get the power to enforce its decisions based on "evidence" which it chooses to credit.

Could the same thing happen to you as an employer, or employee?

It not only could—it probably will.

Under the proposed setup for EEOC, the practical effect would be presumptions of guilt. An examiner's "evidence" is deemed to be conclusive. You'll have to prove yourself innocent. The roles of policeman and judge are combined, and a single EEOC employee could conceivably issue his own cease and desist orders.

We've probably made a mistake in describing EEOC desired enforcement powers as "NLRB-like." The National Labor Relations Board has an independent General Counsel who must apply to the courts for authority to issue cease and desist orders. Under the new setup, EEOC appeal procedures would be practically useless. The NLRB was originally set up along the lines proposed for the EEOC. The ensuing mess was atrocious and the present limitations on the NLRB were devised.

Granting cease and desist powers to the EEOC, as the present legislative proposal would do, will deprive you of your day in court. The Commission may find you in violation, issue an order for you to cease and desist.

No testimony need be taken. No independent investigation to establish "substantial evidence" of violation need be conducted. The full power of the Commission may be delegated to a single Commissioner, or even to an individual employee.

This amazing concentration of power is without precedent.

The Commission has made much of the plans it has for submitting all types of job employment "patterns"—quotas on a large scale—to the computer. Already it has held a fishing expedition down South into the textile industry and received criticism from conservative and liberal alike.

The EEOC trotted out the familiar percentage figures again and flogged the industry, causing the liberally oriented *Charlotte Observer* to comment editorially:

"If the larger purpose was actually to get

something accomplished about equalizing employment in textiles, we are persuaded this was not the best way to go about it."

TRIAL BY HEADLINES

EEOC's public forum in New York in January, headed by Chairman C. L. Alexander, produced much more heat (and headlines) than light.

Blue-chip corporations were disdainfully put under the public microscope and, of course, found lacking as EEOC denunciations about "tokenism" and other catch phrases flew through the air.

At one point Mr. Alexander asked the president of one of our major airlines how many pilots were Negro. When told that only one out of 420 stationed in New York was, the EEOC spokesman demanded, "Are you satisfied with that?"

I would like to ask that Commissioner if he would care to fly on a plane in which the crew had been selected by race rather than ability? I'll take my flight crews promoted on the basis of skill.

The discouraging thing is that, even for those who have no civil rights ax to grind and would genuinely seek to live up to the Commission's wishes, it becomes impossible under the present approach, for the rules are changed so often.

If you get your total work force in balance with some particular percentage figure, then you find your managerial staff is out of line. Should you get that taken care of, the base of your percentage population figure is changed to make your quota still higher. It's a game nobody wins.

Let there be no mistake, I am for equal employment opportunity. But in substituting favoritism, we are not correcting anything.

Thomas Jefferson said, "All men are created equal." We cannot then come along with legislation and make some men more equal than others.

THE OUTLOOK

What is our legislative situation now? Senator Clark of Pennsylvania has introduced a bill that would give broad enforcement powers to the EEOC or an individual employee of the Commission. Basically these would be the same type powers residing in the National Labor Relations Board, with only limited appeal.

The bill is cosponsored by Senator Javits of New York. It is before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on which I serve.

It is almost impossible to keep the bill from seeing floor action, unless the public really expresses itself to the Congress.

If people become aware of the strong influence that militant elements will have over their businesses and their jobs should this bill pass—then we can muster the strength to stop its extension.

Otherwise we are forging another link in the chain that can ultimately enslave this republic.

Representative Walter S. Baring, of Nevada, Announces Result of Questionnaire

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I have just tabulated the results of a questionnaire that I sent to 77,000 Nevadans. I am proud to report that I received slightly greater than 12 percent return.

In addition to the numerous notations written in on the questionnaire itself, I

received close to 1,000 letters in which my constituents gave additional comments and opinions.

Rather than use percentages, the re-

sults of my questionnaire show the actual vote count.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will find the results of how the people in

the State of Nevada feel most interesting, as they are based on a statewide poll rather than an individual district.

The questionnaire follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE

	Yes	No	No opinion		Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you approve of the President's Vietnam policy?	1,175	7,400	437	11. Do you support the proposed travel tax?	2,488	6,189	335
2. Do you favor stepping up bombing attacks in North Vietnam?	5,965	2,265	782	12. Do you favor proposed Federal guaranteed annual income regardless of whether recipient works or is capable of working?	463	8,096	453
3. Do you favor a bombing halt?	1,825	6,346	841	13. Which authority do you believe should have the prime responsibility in carrying out and designing programs to combat crime in cities:			
4. Do you favor pulling out of the Vietnam war?	3,048	5,245	719	Local authorities	6,305		
5. Do you favor keep fighting to get negotiated peace?	4,546	3,407	1,059	State authorities	3,730		
6. Do you favor military steps necessary to close Haiphong?	6,040	1,794	1,178	Federal authorities	1,349		
7. Do you favor an all-out attack on North Vietnam?	5,184	2,881	947	14. Do you favor wiretapping in the investigation of organized crime?	6,204	2,181	627
8. Do you approve the Government's handling of the U.S.S. Pueblo seizure?	993	7,531	488	(Optional—Sex: Male, 5,263; female, 2,736. Party preference: Democratic, 3,425; Republican, 3,673; Independent, 1,131.)			
9. Do you favor promoting trade with Russia and its satellites?	2,287	6,292	433				
10. Do you support the proposed 10-percent surcharge tax?	1,275	7,377	360				

A Poignant Reminder of the First Forgotten Americans

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, America is facing up to the challenge of a great country by taking time to examine the weaknesses of our structure. In our great race to build this prosperous and powerful country, it was convenient to forget the faults of our character. Now, when our national character is at stake, we cannot ignore the numerous contradictions of the philosophy to which we credit our strength, our belief in the freedom of man.

Not without pain can we read history's documentation of our treatment of the American Indian—and we are prone to rationalize that the fate of a free nation demanded some sacrifice.

The following letter to the editor of the Maine Sunday Telegram serves to remind us of an obligation which yet remains unfulfilled. Never before have I read such a poignant reminder of the injustice inflicted upon these forgotten Americans. In hopes that it will arouse the heartstrings of understanding lying dormant in yet too many Americans, I commend this letter to the attention of my colleagues. Then, may we get on with the task of repairing, rather than rationalizing, the weaknesses in the structure of the American dream. America's future depends upon it.

The letter follows:

AMERICA IS BURNING

Our beloved country is aflame. Aflame with the fire of hate and violence. What has happened to a land—given by God—and once so serene and beautiful? Beauty no longer exists. Beauty is marred by fires burning in our cities. It is marred by the minds of men who advocate racism and marred by leaderless minorities who lash out with violence as a final desperate alternative.

This great land taken by force from my people is now immersed in an internal strife of its own doing. The American Indian of today looks and watches the beloved land of his birth with pain and great sorrow. Our Fathers fought valiantly against the first intruders of another land. They fought

but finally yielded to overwhelming tactics and superior arms. Over the years, some of us accepted the ways of life of the new and dominating society. Yet there are some of us who never will accept nor ever find the heart to forgive for injustices inflicted against us.

And today, America burns. Its very "conscience" burns and shows. And we can only look with great pity.

PETER A. MITCHELL,
Passamaquoddy Tribe,
Pleasant Point Reservation.

Olympics Become Political Games

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that the International Olympics Committee has replaced sports with politics—a youth meeting for competitive ideology instead of competitive athletics—South Africa is again forced into leadership of the free world.

The South Africans now have no choice but to host games for the sons and daughters of the free world.

If the Olympics are now lowered to the programed wishes of Communist and tribal states, those of the free world interested first in sports are entitled to a free men's Olympics to protect our youth from exploitation by the Communist subsidiaries of its athletes.

To any interested in a free people's Olympics in South Africa, why not wire Mr. Frank Braun, president of the South African Olympic Games Association at Johannesburg, South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I include the UPI release from Lausanne, Switzerland, following my comments:

NEW VOTE VIRTUALLY ASSURES BAN OF SOUTH AFRICA FROM OLYMPICS

LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND.—World pressure brought upon the International Olympic Committee has virtually eliminated South Africa from appearing in the 1968 Olympic Games at Mexico City next October.

The nine-man executive board of the IOC voted Sunday to recommend the exclusion and it was certain the 36 votes necessary to legalize the proposal would be collected with ease.

More than 40 countries, including Russia, have gone on record as saying they would boycott the games if South Africa was allowed to compete.

The executive's decision was unanimous, despite the dismay expressed by IOC President Avery Brundage of Chicago, who had campaigned for South Africa's inclusion and arrived in Lausanne from a visit to Johannesburg last week.

Two South Africans, swimmer Karan Muir and sprinter Paul Nash, will suffer most from Sunday's decision. On current world form, they were thought to have excellent chances to win medals.

EXPRESSES SHOCK

In Johannesburg, Frank Braun, president of the South African Olympic Games Association, expressed shock at the executive's decision but said he still thought his country's chances in a re-vote were "good, but obviously not as good as last time. We still will find in the outcome that we have lots of friends."

Braun said that he wasn't sure of the details of the meeting but that if another vote is taken "it will be a shocking miscarriage of justice and will turn the IOC into a laughing stock."

"This means every time countries opposing South Africa in the IOC don't like something, they just have to shout."

South Africa's loss could be America's gain. World record sprinter Tommy Smith now may reconsider his decision not to participate. He was one of several Negro athletes who had announced they would boycott the games in protest of South Africa's inclusion.

AFRICAN HAPPY

The happiest man in Lausanne was Jean-Claude Ganga, secretary general of the Supreme Council for African Sport. He had made a determined bid to have South Africa excluded and he shook delegates' hands and expressed his thanks on behalf of "all Africa."

The IOC trouble started shortly after a decision was reached Feb. 15 at Grenoble to readmit South Africa to the games following her suspension in 1963. The Afro-Asian nations threatened to boycott Mexico City.

No sooner were the Winter Games concluded than the Supreme Council of African Sports met at Congo Brazzaville and unanimously elected to boycott the games. The movement gathered strength, especially after the Russians joined the outburst.

MEXICO DISTURBED

Mexico also was disturbed, since the games promised to be the smallest on record after the host nation had invested millions of dollars in building new stadiums and other necessary equipment.

This led to General Jose De Clark Flores, IOC vice president, and Ramirez Vasquez,

head of the organizing committee, to visit Chicago last month and persuade Brundage to call an emergency session of the board.

Among the executives, the Mexicans received firm support from Russia's Constantin Andrianov and Italy's Giorgio De Stefani. The rule book appeared the greatest ally with De Stefani, a lawyer by profession, making the best use of it.

There was all manner of speculation as the nine men sat in secret session for two days at the 18th century Chateau De Vidy by the shores of Lake Geneva.

It came as a surprise when it was announced that the decision to keep South Africa out was unanimous because it was thought the three English-speaking members—Brundage, Lord Exeter of Britain and Lord Killanin of Ireland—would side with South Africa.

The following cable, signed by Brundage, was sent to the 71 voting members of the IOC, who only a few weeks ago had agreed to South Africa's participation:

"In view of all the information on the international climate received by the executive board at this meeting, it is unanimously of the opinion that it would be most unwise for a South African team to participate in the Games of the XIX Olympiade—therefore the executive board strongly recommends that you endorse this unanimous proposal to withdraw its invitation to these games. This postal vote is submitted under rule No. 20. Please reply immediately by cable to IOC Lausanne."

All the replies were expected to reach Lausanne within 10 days, when South Africa officially would be out of the games.

South Africa, which had given assurances she would send a mixed team to Mexico aboard the same aircraft and in the same uniform, now must wait until 1970 to show whether she will ever be allowed back into the movement.

POLITICAL DECISION

Brundage maintained the decision was a political one, despite his insistence of the past few weeks that "the Olympic movement is concerned only with sports and not politics." He said he was personally sorry.

Gen. Clark said, "I am very happy with the decision. I am sure it will unite even further all of the IOC."

Ramirez paid tribute to Gen. Clark's work, to the IOC and Brundage, who he described as "a friend of Mexico."

Andriano was only "partially satisfied" with the decision, while Lord Exeter admitted "the political situation swayed."

Mass Exodus by Farmers Continues

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the agricultural problem of low net income still plagues the Nation. While the amount of money that we spend for food continues upward, farmers receive only a minute share of this increase. As a consequence, many farmers are trying to move to other occupations.

A group of cooperative leaders in the western part of the Sixth Congressional District have recently compiled a listing of those farm auctions as advertised in five newspapers between the period of January 12 and April 1, 1968.

This list consists of 110 farm auctions

CXIV—666—Part 8

and is the largest number of such auctions known for this period of time for this area.

Pace Magazine Covers the Jim Jones Story

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the enterprising and refreshing monthly, Pace, has just gone to press with its June edition, and a feature story deals with the outstanding career in public service of James R. Jones, 28-year-old Deputy Special Assistant to President Johnson.

The Jim Jones story is well known to all Oklahomans, who are proud of his dedication and achievements in public service.

I believe the Pace article, as written by Editor Robert J. Fleming, will be interesting reading for all. The full text follows:

JIM JONES OF THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Robert J. Fleming)

(NOTE.—At Pace press time the White House announced that Jim Jones had been named special assistant and appointments secretary to the President.)

It is 8:25 a.m. All is quiet in the press lounge in the West Wing of the White House. An Andrew Weyth painting of a makeshift wooden cross in open countryside looks down on empty green leather chairs. No correspondents are yet on the scene and at the end of the room the Stewart portrait of George Washington, flanked by the Stars and Stripes and the Presidential flag, seems strangely lonely.

Along the corridor connecting the West Wing with the White House proper, in the third office from the President, sunlight filters through the high window. Soft piped music comes from a brown box on the sill. Eight framed photographs are on the wall. A young man features in most. The inscription on one reads: "To Jim Jones—with appreciation for his diligence, competence and loyalty." It is handwritten and signed "Lyndon Johnson."

"Mr. Jones' office . . . Mr. Jones' office . . ." chants Donna Moloney, 23, an attractive brunette, as she picks up the first of the day's phone calls that will probably add up to 200 by nightfall.

A young man of medium height strides into the room, his hand outstretched. "Hello, I'm Jim Jones," he says with a smile. The workday of the 28-year-old deputy special assistant to the President has begun.

Jones is impeccably dressed. His black tie is monogrammed JRJ. Seated in a high-backed leather swivel chair, wearing round horn-rimmed spectacles, he confronts a large file of papers. A miniature wise old owl watches from the desk penholder set.

After tackling the immediate issues presented by the papers, Jones turns to the list of phone calls steadily being compiled. Every incoming call is noted on phone sheets. Jim picks them up in a steady stream between his own priority outgoing calls. The process could be likened to a fast ping-pong game. . . . "OK Donna, on the first page I'll take everybody except Avery and Grant."

"Hi, Governor. How are you? Are you going to be in town this week? I was thinking of Friday. Could you come in and visit with the Boss? . . . Friday, 5:30."

A man comes in with two pink telex messages. Jim looks them over, hands them to Donna. "Get these to the President by special messenger."

Some of the papers on the desk carry a red tab. "This means 'in a hurry to get an answer,'" he explains.

As he shuffles files Jones mumbles under his breath, "More paper goes through here . . . We should invest in a paper factory."

. . . "What? . . . That's fine but I don't think the Senator ought to dictate to us on whom we will appoint where."

An older man comes in with an armful of papers. A fast exchange takes place and he's gone as quickly as he came. "That was Bill Hopkins. He has been executive secretary to every President since Herbert Hoover. That's 32 years."

For a moment the telephone is quiet. "Can we visit between calls?" Jones asks.

"Yes, I'd be glad to tell how I came to the White House."

The phone interrupts again. "Mr. Meany, did Secretary Rusk get in touch with you? The President hasn't any time today. But if it's one of those things that's a must you're always welcome. . . . He'd like you to discuss it with Mr. Rusk first, though."

Each day Jones must go over the President's schedule, move his calendar along, work up scenarios, notify official visitors, provide briefing information, and, as Jim puts it, "make sure all the pieces fall together on anything the President does." He coordinates with Marvin Watson, special assistant to the President, whom Jones aided until named to his present post by the President last January 18.

Jim has accompanied President Johnson on all foreign trips since 1965 except for the funeral of Chancellor Konard Adenauer of West Germany. In October 1965 he made preparations in Mexico City for the President's first trip out of the U.S. Last December the Presidential party attended the funeral of Australia's Prime Minister Harold Holt, visited Thailand, stopped in Vietnam, refused in Pakistan and was received by the Pope at the Vatican. "All in 112 hours," Jim remembers.

Mementos of these trips have a special place in his one-bedroom apartment located in the southwest area of Washington in the same ultramodern building where Vice President Hubert Humphrey lives. Gifts include a silver box from the King of Thailand and two medals from the Pope which are specially treasured by Jones, who is a Catholic.

Framed photographs of Jim with the President decorate the walls. In his bedroom hangs a glass case displaying ten pens used in signing legislation passed by the 89th Congress, 1965-66. "The Boss" had handed them to him.

Souvenirs of his last trip to Puerto Rico are a suntan and the memory of a game of golf with the President "where I broke 100 for the first time, playing way over my head."

Jones travels regularly to the Texas White House where he is in charge of the President's office. He breakfasts at 6:30 a.m. in the ranch-house kitchen. At 7:15 he goes to the President's bedroom with overnight cables from Washington, special pouches and memos. Watson normally remains in Washington while Jim is with "The Boss" at the LBJ ranch.

It was in Texas that Jones got his first big test in speech writing. "He tossed the State of the Union message at me. I had no expertise, no real experience. We funneled the President's thoughts to Washington and their views came back to the President. The final drafting started on Sunday, January 14, and we finished Wednesday, the 17th. Four days of refining, honing and fitting in ideas, working with the President and Cabinet officers. I was tremendously grateful he would show that confidence in me."

Jones' two secretaries, Donna Moloney and

Sally Snyder, 24, worked with him on the State of the Union address. Recounts Donna. "We usually kept at it until 11:30 p.m. and we had chances to go to the President's office." Framed copies of photographs taken of the girls during the speech assembling hang above their desks. They are inscribed with a personal salutation from the President.

In Washington "an early night" for Jim means going home at 7:30 p.m. He alternates with Marvin Watson in staying late to prepare the President's night reading, a substantial pile of material for the Chief Executive to review before going to bed or in the early morning. "The President really wants to know what's going on," Jim points out. The night reading is assembled from carefully culled items, submitted by White House assistants, Cabinet and Agency officials. It could and does include some personal letters from ordinary citizens, newspaper clippings, magazine articles and memos. "But," says Jim, "if you put anything in a memo you had better be darned sure it is right. The President has a passion for correct facts. I've had a speed-reading course and I don't think he has. Yet he can read and comprehend a memo and discover whether there's a mistake in it faster than anyone I've known."

Jones thinks the President is often misunderstood. He sees his boss as a family man and a father. "It's hard for me to make a separation between this and his official life. I think of him as a human being."

"If you speak in superlatives, people call you a yes-man. But you can't work for someone you don't respect. He has that peculiar habit of tossing challenges to you. You seldom do the same thing twice.

"It's not that you don't tell a President he is wrong. You can make suggestions and present alternatives. Yes-men don't last long. The President loses confidence in them.

"He has to make very lonely decisions. You would like to help, but he has to do it."

The road that took Jim Jones to the White House began in Muskogee, Okla., where he was born on May 5, 1939. His father's family was Irish. His mother's parents came from Germany. Jones credits much of his success to his early upbringing. "I came from a relatively poor family but Mother had stern resolve and determination. My father, being Irish, was more of a dreamer. When I got a B in school, he would tell me I was capable of an A."

Today Jim's 73-year-old father is retired from his job as a clerk at the Muskogee post office and has started his own catering business. His mother works at the Veterans Administration regional office. A brother Joseph P. Jones, 35, is an engineer with Douglas in Los Angeles. His sister, 36, has eight children and is married to a carpenter in Muskogee.

Jim's first great love was journalism. At 5, he started a paper for kids in the community. "The first advertisement came from the grocery store where I bought my bubble gum."

When he was 11, his parents took him to an American Legion-sponsored dinner. The after-dinner speaker was Ed Edmondson who was then Muskogee county attorney. "Everyone pretty well knew he would run for Congress on the Democratic ticket," Jim recalls. "Afterwards, I went up and introduced myself. I told him I was active in sports, knew most of the kids in town, and would he like to hire me for his campaign?" Edmondson took him on at \$15 a week. His first chore was to deliver messages by bike, hire kids to put up campaign signs and speak for Edmondson on a radio program.

At 15, Jones got into the newspaper business as a high school correspondent for the Muskogee *Morning News* which was then the second paper in town. They were losing money. The higher salaried reporters were

laid off and Jim became sports and wire-service editor.

Not long after, he covered his first murder. It was a Saturday night. An old man had been shot in the face by his wife at Goose Neck Bend, not far out of town. She had pulled the trigger at point-blank range and Jim was the first reporter on the scene.

The same evening down at the hospital Jim had another taste of tragedy. A man had lost his wife and 2-year-old daughter in a highway collision. A second child was in critical condition in the emergency operating room. Vividly recalling the circumstances, Jim says, "At 15 I had to give solace and what comfort I could to a man twice my age. The story which I phoned in a few minutes later was a scoop."

Jones was exposed to raw life working with the *Morning News* and it laid the foundation for a future in politics and a perspective on life.

"At an impressionable age I saw society from the country-club set to the poor Negro living on the north side of town. I was able to see that all was not perfect with the 'high' and that all was not wrong with the 'low.' I had to put ideas on paper and get to the heart of the issue. Some awfully good newspapermen trained me and I became acquainted with key politicians."

In 1956 Jones was elected Governor of Oklahoma Boys State. Following the appointment, John Criswell, city editor of the Muskogee *Phoenix*, wired him a job offer. The *Morning News* collapsed and he found he was the only staffer hired by the *Phoenix*. "I learned newspapering politics from John Criswell," says Jones. Criswell is now treasurer of the Democratic National Committee.

It is now 12:30 and Sally Snyder is on the job with Donna. The tempo is increasing. Sally handles incoming calls on the extra four-line telephone. Donna takes the paperwork which Jim steadily gives her as he operates his own 39-button phone console and makes notes.

"Hello, is the Congressman in? Jim Jones at the White House calling."

"The Immigration Department says the visa is coming through soon for that family to enter."

Jones grabs a word with Donna. "I should get up to the Hill today but I don't know if I have the time.

"Send a letter to Sheriff Bill Hauck of Bexar County, Texas—'The President wanted you to have this autographed picture.'"

Sally comes from Freeburg, Pa. "I think the population is about 500," she laughs. She was 17 when she arrived in Washington and got her first job with the FBI. Last year a friend told her Jones was looking for another secretary. "Yes, you could call us executive secretaries but we're really 'Girl Fridays.' Jim keeps both of us running. We enjoy watching him work. He's a dynamo."

Donna graduated from Marymount College, Arlington, Va., where she took a liberal arts secretarial course. Her husband is special assistant to the treasurer of the Democratic National Committee. "I don't think anything else would ever satisfy me if I had to leave the White House," she admits.

Both girls have gone on Presidential trips to assist Jones. "We type up the President's itineraries, head-table guest lists, etc. There are lots of 'crash projects.' Everything has to be done instantly."

The lively strains of *Alexander's Ragtime Band* are coming from the Raymer loud-speaker on the windowsill.

"He has decided to visit the meeting of the National Council for the Aging at the Marriott. We had better get a man over there."

"Add to my telephone list Frank Melvin; reference—transferring elk from Yellowstone National Park to New Mexico."

"Oh, my gosh," remembers Jim. "I still have to pay my taxes."

"Sir, could you hold just a minute?" Sally asks a caller as the pace increases.

Jones suddenly flushes red. "Well, that's out," he barks into the phone. "We never do that for anybody..."

The color fades away as he tells the next caller, "As far as I know you're the only reporter the Ambassador is seeing. Glad it worked out."

Picking up the phone again, Jim inquires, "Is 'he' gone? This is Jim."

There is a lull. "Shall we visit awhile?" he suggests.

Why does he dub his boss "him" in conversation? "Because coming from Oklahoma and being kind of young you might get the idea I'm a name-dropper."

How much authority does Jones have as deputy special assistant to the President and what are his guidelines?

"You learn a little, after a while, of what he wants. Your work is strictly to be an extra eye, ear or arm. I don't create any power structure of my own.

"But sometimes when you call up and ask someone to do something they don't know if it was your idea or your great-aunt's or the President's. In any case they can't afford to discount that it might come from the President.

"With power you've got to exercise a great deal of caution and responsibility. What I do should be a reflection of the President, to complement what he is doing."

The schedule for the next day has to be lined up. Jones dictates:

"11:15 a.m.: videotaping of Red Cross speech in the Fish Room.

"11:30 a.m.: signing of the Transportation Bill in the Cabinet Room.

"12:30 p.m.: John Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, to discuss personnel matters.

"1:00 p.m.: Senator Thurston Morton. Should this be 'on the record'?

"5:00 p.m.: Sargeant Shriver, 'off the record.'

"7:00 p.m.: House Committee Chairman, 'off the record.'

"7:30 p.m.: Radio and Television correspondents' dinner. The President has been invited for 'a drop-in visit.'

"OK, let's prepare scenarios (procedural outlines drawn up for each White House public ceremony).

"11:30 a.m.:

Guests arrive in Cabinet Room. President arrives, proceeds to podium.

President speaks, etc."

He picks up a large file of papers and shakes them into place. "I've got to try and take all this back-up and work it into a schedule for next week.

"You try to know everything that's going on in the news at the particular time and make the President's schedule as timely as possible." Jones points out that the President naturally confers with a lot of people off the record but it's important to have on-the-record occasions.

"Take John Macy, for example. He's always newsworthy because when he sees the President it usually results in appointments which are news."

The phone buzzes again. Jim leans back and grins. "I want to check about those clubs we used last Sunday in Puerto Rico. What kind of business could we do? I've never had new clubs in my life. They're really nice."

Jones turns to Donna and changes the subject abruptly. "Write thank-you letters to my hosts at the Democratic luncheon in Tulsa (there were eight). 'Hope we'll have a constant dialogue.'" Donna takes it from there.

"Tell Colonel Albright to edit the off-record voice tapes of the President so he can go over them. I've got to go up front," says Jim as he walks over to the President's office.

From his earliest days in Muskogee, Jones has been a tiger for work. At high school he was president of his class, played baseball, tennis and was on the debating team. He worked a 30- to 50-hour week for the *Phoenix* as well as carrying a disc jockey show at WBIX. He had a *Tulsa World* paper route but "I finally got a bit run-down and had to give it up."

Jones attended the University of Oklahoma at Norman from 1957 to 1961 and obtained his BA in journalism. While on campus he was president of five organizations and joined the Lambda Chi Alpha fraternity. He produced a State Capitol radio program, represented the *Tulsa World*, free-lanced for several magazines, was assistant to Harold Keith, sports director for the University, and was sports writer and part-time desk man for the *Oklahoma City Oklahoman*.

In the summer of 1961 his old boss, now Congressman Ed Edmondson, asked Jim to come to Washington to be his legislative assistant. Evenings he attended law school at Georgetown University and in June 1964 graduated with an LL.B. A second lieutenant in the Army Reserve, he was told to report for active duty in November.

During the summer months of 1964 Jones volunteered his services to the Democratic National Committee. He was asked to head up advanced planning for the Lady Bird Special campaign train which was to tour eight southern states in four days. While handling the train arrangements he met Mrs. Johnson and attracted the attention of her press secretary, Liz Carpenter, and others in the party.

In November 1964, Jim went on active duty at Ft. Benning, Ga., where he volunteered for a Vietnam assignment. During that time Liz Carpenter sent a note to Jack Valenti, then Presidential assistant, saying Jones might be a good man "to have on board" at the White House. Later, while attending a specialist school at Ft. Holabird, Md., Jim received a phone call: "The White House is calling. It is Marvin Watson." He wanted to see Jim.

He went up to Washington where Watson, who had succeeded Valenti, asked him if he would like to come to work in the White House. Jim replied, "It would be challenging. I couldn't think of anything better."

At the White House he was assigned to the military aide's office and completed his two-year military service requirement as assistant to Watson. In November 1966, he officially became staff assistant to Watson and held that post until his appointment as deputy special assistant to the President in January of this year.

Jones works a six-day week. Sunday he keeps to himself. "I don't answer phone calls except from the President or Marvin Watson—only priority conversations."

He keeps three bicycles in the basement and with friends often rides 15 to 20 miles along the C and O tow path. Last summer Jones could sometimes be seen riding his bike through one of the large Negro sections of the town. He wanted quietly to find out people's problems at first hand and on several occasions joined a pickup baseball game.

"You have to be very careful with your private life in this job. You suddenly are not just Jim Jones, private citizen, anymore. Everything you do is open to the public."

Often in mid-afternoon Jones will suddenly leave his desk and head for the back door of the White House. "It feels good to get out in the fresh air and walk around the block." Passersby are unaware that this fast-moving young man from Muskogee, Okla., is a top Presidential aide.

Back in his office he is again on the telephone. "Is it as victorious as they claim?" he asks an unknown caller. "How do they explain it?"

"... Have we got an analysis of Gavin's report in the Saturday Evening Post?"

Jim is ticking off names on a list. "Calls I've still got to get to. But we'll deal with

them later. Let's go to the Hill and see Ed Edmondson."

En route back to his office Jim does some talking about politics. "Every decision a politician makes is on a 'gut' issue and the results are there for everybody to see. In politics you can't camouflage mistakes like you might in a company board room or a law office."

Jim stays late. He moves in and out of Marvin Watson's office where the President's night reading is being prepared. Sally handles the phone through the evening but the call list is pretty well cleaned up.

Outside in the West Lounge all is quiet. The pressmen have gone and even young Abraham Lincoln, seated on a log with his gun and his dog in the form of a small statue, looks relieved.

At 9:45 p.m. a White House car is waiting at the door for Jim. The black Mercury turns into Pennsylvania Avenue. "Car 26 headed for the Southwest section of town," whispers the chauffeur into a mike.

Jim says nothing. Finally as the car passes the Washington Monument, he observes, "It's been a heavy day. It's hard to think much . . . I'll get home and put my feet up and watch the Jonathan Winters show. You know, I think the majority of college students are more interested in doing something for their fellow man they they were 20 years ago."

"We have a responsibility to be participants rather than spectators. I know answers are not easy all the time but hope is there. I have a deep commitment to Government service. I expect to go back to Oklahoma to practice law . . . at least for a while."

The car is moving now along the Potomac. It is a moonlit night and Jim will be home in a few moments.

"You know," he says, "there are thousands who could do this job better than I. That is why I have to work twice as hard."

At Jim's home the phone keeps ringing until late into the night and the Jonathan Winters show goes unwatched.

Remarks of Reed Larson, Executive Vice President, National Right To Work Committee

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Extensions of Remarks the text of an address by Reed Larson, executive vice president, National Right To Work Committee, Washington, D.C., at the Oakland Lions Club meeting at the Hotel Leamington in Oakland, Calif., on March 27, 1968:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY REED LARSON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Back in the early 16th Century, the Spanish Conquistadores bestowed the name California on an imaginary island near the earthly paradise told about in a romance of chivalry written by Montalvo in 1510.

I am here today to tell you that neither California, nor any of our other states will remotely resemble an earthly paradise if paid union bosses complete their current scheme to force more than 11 million public employees into compulsory unionism.

How would you like to have a portion of the hard-earned money you pay in taxes turned over to the big international unions to help finance union political activities,

organizing drives, lobbying programs, six-figure salaries of some union officials, and a host of other union pet projects with which you may or may not agree?

Of course you wouldn't like it.

This is not an idle question. This situation is closer than you think—and it's bearing down on us at breakneck speed.

Union officials with the help of some politicians who receive campaign support from union treasuries are making fantastic progress in a massive, coast-to-coast, community-by-community program aimed ultimately at locking every public employee—national, state, and local—into a compulsory contract that will force 11.9 million government workers to pay dues into union treasuries in order to keep their jobs. The amount of money at stake is astronomical.

As of January, there was a total of 11 million 929 thousand public employees in this country of which 2,703,000 are Federal employees. Some simple arithmetic will quickly disclose the reasons behind the union hierarchy's attempt to collect forced tribute from public employees.

If every public employee were under compulsion to pay union dues of \$5 a month, the take would amount to \$700 million a year. Even if they paid only \$1.50 a month, the paid union bosses would rake in at least \$150 million a year.

The stakes are enormous and the union bosses are at work.

You may be saying to yourself that the fellow Larson is an alarmist, he's exaggerating, that this union grab for more power and more wealth is an impossibility—and I can understand why you might feel that way.

Most of us just see a small part of the whole picture—a bit here—a bit there—and it doesn't look so ominous.

Besides, you in California have an especially enlightened state policy in protecting state employees from compulsory unionism. The California Labor Code says state and local employees can join or not join labor organizations.

For the lawyers among us that rulling is contained in West's California Government Code Annotated, Chapter 10, Division 4, Title I, Sections 3500-3509 (1961).

But this safeguard will be facing an increasing attack by those who have a personal interest in fattening the income of union treasuries. It's happening in other states. It can happen here.

Most Americans are puzzled, frustrated, and confused by the mounting waves of strikes and even violence in disputes affecting public employees—firemen, teachers, hospital employees, garbage collectors, and many more.

Behind these disputes are a variety of issues, some of them undoubtedly involving legitimate employee grievances. But underlying much of the unrest is the agitation of paid union organizers who, now seeking new fields to conquer, are ready to syphon off dollars from the paychecks of public employees, through compulsory dues check-off on every government payroll.

Government employees do not want to be forced to join an international union. Just before I came out here this week I met with the President of the National Federation of Federal Employees, one of the oldest and most respected unions. It represents more than 30,000 U.S. Government workers and prides itself on being a completely voluntary organization. It is aware of what the international union bosses are trying to do.

He said that the organization of Federal employees by international unions will, and I quote: "handicap the legitimate and proper organizing activities of many independent unions of Federal employees which are not plagued by the quarrels which so afflict the affiliated unions."

"The introduction into the Federal service of various bare-knuckle type organizing

methods, taken from private sector unionism, has had widespread adverse effects."

He told me of beatings, distribution of scurrilous literature and name calling, all of this new to government employee unionism.

"Many members of Federal employee unions do not relish the gutter tactics, and are urging their unions to follow the high rather than the low road," this long time government employee union head concluded.

As waves of strikes began hitting public employees around the country in recent months, our organization launched a thorough study of the extent to which compulsory unionism was involved, either directly or indirectly. I can tell you that the results have even shocked us—and we thought we knew what was going on.

Here are some of the things we found, and new information flows in every day.

Just six days ago, 300 tons of garbage were piled high in the streets of Scranton, Pennsylvania, as union bosses tried to blackjack city officials into forcing all city garbage collectors into paying dues to the Machinist Union in order to work.

Just seven weeks ago the City Marshal of the little town of Berlin, in New Hampshire, was slapped down by the New Hampshire State Supreme Court when it ruled that he and two brother officers had to join the union to hold their police jobs. The population of Berlin is 17,000 and the City Marshal who knows just about everybody in town didn't think he needed a union to represent him before the city fathers. But the court ruled otherwise and now City Marshal Paul Tremblay is a compulsory member of the AFL-CIO.

We've all heard about the big garbage strike in New York City. Now Victor Gotbaum, Executive Director of the AFL-CIO union which conducted that strike has revealed his real objective. He is demanding an "Agency Fee" contract under which more than 200,000 city employees would be forced to either pay tribute to the compulsory union or face the loss of their job. This attempt is going on right now.

In upstate New York the Civil Service Employees Association was forced to go to court to break a strangle-hold imposed on them in an agreement reached last summer between Rochester City officials and the AFL-CIO. The agreement resulted in an order from the City that all present and new city employees, except those in a few selected categories, must join the union, submit to payroll check-off of union dues, and maintain their membership in the union or face dismissal.

In Michigan we discovered that right now, out of 79 municipal employee contracts, 19 are compulsory union shops, there are 9 compulsory agency shop contracts, there are 24 compulsory maintenance of membership contracts, and only 27 of the 79 contracts fully protect the right of the employee to join or not to join a union. And these are municipal employees, paid with tax dollars, and forced to use the public tax dollar to support unions which many of them do not want.

Oakland County Sheriffs in Michigan are forced to join the union or lose their jobs, so are two lady clerks who worked for the Grand Rapids Police Department until the unions stepped in. Two long-time women clerks who refused to pay compulsory dues to an AFL-CIO union they did not belong to, or the equivalent amount to a scholarship fund that benefits them not at all, were fired. The City's Civil Service Board reinstated them. Then the City Manager fired them again. Now their case will be argued in the Kent County, Michigan, Circuit Court, concerning the validity of the compulsory check-off provision of union contracts.

And don't forget, these aren't auto workers, they are school teachers, police officers, public employees, paid with public money.

Don't take my word for it. In a September 1966 interview with *U.S. News and World Report*, Jerry Wurf, president of the same American Federation of State, County, and Municipal employees asserted that "in a number of very important instances, like Michigan State University, we even got a union shop."

The questioner asked: "In what states is this happening?"

Wurf replied: "It's happening in Michigan, Wisconsin, Delaware, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island—a whole flock of states."

Later in the same interview the exchange went like this:

Questioner: "When your people went on strike, were they violating the law?"

Wurf: "Oh, yes."

Questioner: "Did they win the strike?"

Wurf: "Yes. They always do."

The danger is clear.

The failure of the union movement to gain in membership since the end of World War II has led to their shifting their targets from industrial organization to governmental organization whereby they can provide not only economic but direct political pressure.

The loser in this is, as always, the employee himself. It is ironic that in our country, a country which is dedicated to individual liberty and freedom, we are now saying that you have to pay tribute to a private organization in order to work for a public agency. Again, money in taxes is being taken from the public and paid to private organizations.

Many people find it hard to understand how under the protective civil service regulations which guarantee job protection, salaries, vacations, and pensions, union organizers are able to induce public employees into their unions. The answer is rather simple. The union officials have been successful by bringing political pressure on public administrators. Once approval is given by a public agency to organize its employees, it is a short step until supervisors are "encouraging" employees to join the unions, and then it is but a slimmer step to compulsory unionism for all. This is a vicious cycle, which if not stopped, could forge a compulsory union power strong enough to dictate the total political destiny of our nation.

And as a New York State Supreme Court Justice commented when he ruled on the jailing of the garbage strike leaders—"This is where democracy stops and anarchy begins."

The late President Kennedy recognized the danger involved in the unionization of public employees when he insisted that his Executive Order 10988 authorizing the unionization of Federal Employees, also protect the right not to join. That Order includes the following provision in Section 1-A which reads:

"Employees of the Federal government shall have, and shall be protected in the exercise of the right, freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal to form, join, and assist any employee organization or to refrain from such activity."

This section can properly be called the Federal Employees' Right to Work Law.

As long as Executive Order 10988 remains in existence compulsory unionism will not exist for Federal employees. But its days may be numbered!

Now look what's happening.

The Union bosses took a beating in 1965 when they tried to have the protective clauses of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act repealed through regular legislative processes.

They know that they can't win with the present climate in Congress. So their target has become Executive Order 10988, which indeed is an order, and independent of the will of the people.

To accomplish this a Presidential Review Committee on Labor Management Relations was appointed by President Johnson last September and chaired by Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz. We don't have to point out where Secretary Wirtz stands when it comes to forcing employees into unions. He is the Johnson

administration's most avid promoter of compulsory unionism.

The Labor Management Review Commission is instructed to prepare recommended changes in the Kennedy Order concerning unionization of Federal employees. That report is expected within a month. And most observers believe that President Johnson will immediately accept its recommendations, including concessions to compulsory unionism, and issue them as Federal policy at once. When that is accomplished it will require Congressional action or a reversal by the President himself to undo the damage, so it looks to us, and to many others, like the skids have been greased for a first big step toward forcing Federal employees to pay dues to labor unions they may not want to join.

The tip-off came on October 23rd last, when AFL-CIO President George Meany testified before the Commission and brought the compulsory unions' master plan into focus. He asked the Administration to sanction a system whereby non-union Federal employees could be forced to pay the equivalent of union dues into union treasuries. According to the wording of Meany's proposal, compulsory dues payments could be imposed on all employees in government bargaining units in which as few as ten percent of the employees had voluntarily joined the union.

And who is on the Commission to say no? Not Labor Secretary Wirtz, not Presidential Assistant Joseph Califano, Jr., a hand-picked member of Johnson's staff; not Postmaster General O'Brien, one of the President's most trusted political masterminds; not Defense Secretary and Presidential confidant Clark Clifford; maybe Chairman John Macy of the Civil Service Commission, because he knows under compulsory unionism we will have no more civil service; and just perhaps Budget Director Charles Zwick who knows that any semblance of financial responsibility disappears when the salaried union officials gain compulsory dues support.

The Commission is meeting behind closed doors these days, but every once in a while a puff of smoke comes out and a trial balloon goes up.

The message seems to say, to those wise in the ways of interpreting Washington maneuvers, that the Commission is trying to package a procompulsory unionism recommendation so that the concept gets its foot in the door of Federal policy and the President can act on compulsory union's behalf, without seeming to do so.

It appears that the Commission is casting about for the spoonful of sugar that will make the compulsory unionism medicine go down Federal employees' throats through hamstringing 10988. It may even take, observers say, a form that will require employees to "donate" a part of their salary, equivalent to union dues, to a third charity.

This in effect is a sneaky way of upholding the idea of compulsory unionism and paving the way for another bite of apple a couple of years down the line.

We think the most likely move by the Commission will be a subtle and seemingly innocuous rewording of the present policy by failing to reassert protection of the employees' "right to refrain." And the will of the people as far as compulsory unionism for Federal employees is concerned, is well-known in Washington.

Since the beginning of the present, 90th Congress, 80, count them, 80 identical or near identical bills concerning employee-management relations in the Federal Government have been introduced in the House of Representatives and one has been introduced in the Senate.

Each of these bills will destroy the present Federal policy which protects an employee's right to refrain. Congressional leaders know the bills have very little support beyond the sponsors themselves.

None of these bills has received any serious

attention from the Congress. They are all bottled up in Committee.

We see this as evidence that union officials are not at present capable of using their overt powers to influence the Congress to pass legislation aimed at compulsory unionization of Federal Employees.

So they are eyeing the back door—beaming their political power in the direction of President Kennedy's 1962 Executive Order 10988 in the hope they can destroy Federal employees' "Right to refrain" from supporting unions.

If union officials succeed in doing no more than obtaining from President Johnson a new executive order which eliminates the protection of the "Right to Refrain," they will have taken a big step towards locking Federal employees into compulsory unionism. And they will have done it the easy way with the omission of a few key words, the key words that will quietly ease the latch off the door and pave the way for the realization of the notorious ultimatum of compulsory unionism: "Pay up or get out."

But this need not happen. That's why we are sounding the alarm. We intend to alert the people of this country, and we urge you to help, so that the people will not let union officials steal the freedom of the individual through mass compulsory unionism.

We must let the voice of the American public be heard loud and clear, in town meetings, at the county level, in the State House, the Halls of Congress and yes, in the White House. It is one voice that politicians understand. We must urge that President Johnson retain that part of Executive Order 10988 which protects the Federal employees' "right to refrain" from supporting a union.

And then we must go a step further, and see that the right to refrain protection is extended to every public employee whether on State, County, or Municipal level.

Commandant Merna Addresses Daughters of American Revolution

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, one of my most outstanding constituents is Mr. James E. Merna, who is the commandant of the Prince George's County detachment of the Marine Corps League. Mr. Merna has invited strong leadership and devotion in programs designed to demonstrate to our servicemen in Vietnam, those who were injured and returned, and those who come home after serving there that we care about their sacrifice and patriotism.

Mr. Merna was honored recently to address the 77th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution. At this point in the RECORD, I insert Mr. Merna's speech and commend it to all my colleagues:

OUR MEN IN VIETNAM: THEY'RE DOING THEIR PART ON THE BATTLEFIELD, LET'S DO OURS ON THE HOMEFRONT

(Remarks of James E. Merna, New Carrollton, Md., Originator and Chairman of "Operation Appreciation" and "Operation Remembrance" before the 77th Continental Congress, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C., April 18, 1968)

President-General Mrs. Sullivan, General Nickerson, distinguished guests, and grand ladies of the Daughters of the American

Revolution. Thank you for the honor of inviting me to be with you tonight to participate in the Patriots' Night program of your 77th Continental Congress.

I have been asked by your President-General to say a few words about Operation Appreciation. I would like to address my remarks to the highlights of this program in the context of a broader subject, "Our Men in Viet Nam: They're Doing Their Part on the Battlefield, Let's Do Ours on the Homefront."

Perhaps many of you have seen or heard of an article in this month's Reader's Digest by former President Eisenhower entitled, "Let's Close Ranks on the Home Front." In this article, President Eisenhower speaks out against those critics of the war in Viet Nam, who, in defiance of both common sense and their country's best interests, preach discord and rebellion.

He asks each one of us, "What has become of our courage? What has become of our loyalty to others? What has become of a noble concept called patriotism, which in former times of crisis has carried us through to victory and peace?" My dear ladies, who amongst us ever thought that such questions would have to be asked of the most powerful and richest Nation in the world, a Nation long renowned for its reputation of sticking together when the going got rough?

I would like to make one point clear. No one has to tell the Daughters of the American Revolution anything about patriotism. You have lived it faithfully and practiced it arduously for more than three quarters of a century in the same noble spirit as your illustrious forebears. The initials "D.A.R." and the word "patriotism," as everyone knows, including Joan Baez, are synonymous. One is the sine qua non to the other. Through your resolutions and actions, the D.A.R. has always given unqualified support to the military efforts of our Nation.

I would like to cite from my personal knowledge one small though important example of home-front support and cooperation between the military and the D.A.R. Last September I had the privilege and honor to escort your President-General Mrs. William Henry Sullivan, Jr., to Bethesda Naval Hospital for a "cheer-up" visit with wounded U.S. Marines just back from the fighting in Viet Nam.

On prior occasions I had escorted to the hospital for similar visits certain other prominent personalities. One outstanding group was the Washington Redskins Football Team. Another big hit with the patients was an ex-major league baseball player named Joe Garagiola, currently a star on NBC's "Today" Show. Judy Garland was another performer who generously accepted my invitation to visit the war veterans at the hospital.

I must confess I initially had some misgivings when I first met your President-General last September as we began our tour of the wards at Bethesda Naval Hospital. I had some inner doubts only because I wasn't sure how she would be accepted by the patients. To my knowledge, Mrs. Sullivan didn't particularly know too much about the rugged game of football, no one could possibly tell funny and hilarious stories about baseball like her Scarsdale, New York neighbor Joe Garagiola, and she wasn't noted, as far as I knew, for possessing any exceptional singing and dancing talents like Miss Judy Garland.

Now you may possibly be asking yourselves, "Well just how did this visit of Mrs. Sullivan with some rugged combat-tested Marines go over?" I can best describe the encounter in a single word—magnificently! Mrs. Sullivan was an immediate hit with the Marines. They took to her right away—like a devoted son to his mother, the same as our combat servicemen did four months later when your President-General visited with them in the field and in the hospitals in Viet Nam.

You may be interested to know that as a result of Mrs. Sullivan's visit to Bethesda Naval Hospital and because of her devotion to our men in uniform and the cause for which they are serving, the doors right here in Constitution Hall have been thrown wide open to hospitalized servicemen. Many an enjoyable hour has been spent here by our recuperating servicemen from Walter Reed Hospital and Bethesda Naval Hospital attending concert performances and the like. I trust these doors shall always remain open to them.

And that, dear ladies of the D.A.R. is all that Operation Appreciation is about. It is simply a home-front support program providing aid and recreational assistance to hospitalized Viet Nam Veterans. Its purpose is to show these deserving Americans that they have not been forgotten—and that their great personal sacrifices in defense of freedom are appreciated.

Operation Appreciation began almost two years ago, in May 1966, sponsored by my General Douglas MacArthur Post, Catholic War Veterans, USA. Since that time, wounded Marines at Bethesda Naval Hospital have been treated to 42 outings and events. These have ranged from taking the patients to all of the major sports events such as baseball, football, basketball, boxing, wrestling, stock car races, tennis matches and soccer games to such diverse social events as the theatre, concerts, crab feasts, fire-house parties, society lawn parties, a Congressional Reception on Capitol Hill, and an Embassy Party.

When we take the patients on these outings, and we have had as many as 150 patients at a time, many on wheelchairs, stretchers, and the like, we don't just have them sit inanimate at a ball game or the theatre, for example. We try to make arrangements to take them behind the scenes, into the locker room after a baseball game, for instance, to meet such stars as Brooks Robinson of the Baltimore Orioles and Gil Hodges formerly with the Washington Senators. Or back stage after a performance of "Barefoot in The Park" to meet Miss Myrna Loy and the entire cast. One surgeon at the hospital remarked of Operation Appreciation, "It's better medicine for the patients than anything I could prescribe."

One of the most active supporters of our program has been one of your very own members—the wonderful Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post, in completely unheralded fashion. She's never let us down—always wanting to know how she can help.

It is imperative more than ever that each of us continue to do something constructive for our hospitalized servicemen. According to the latest Department of Defense casualty records, more than 122,000 American servicemen have been wounded in Viet Nam. More than 57,500 were wounded seriously enough to require hospital care. In 1968 alone, more than 22,000 Americans have been wounded. This is more than the total strength of an entire Marine Division.

And these are not just plain statistics. These are human beings—our fellow Americans. I visited some wounded Marines included in these statistics a week ago Sunday at the U.S. Naval Hospital in Philadelphia. I went on Ward K—the amputee ward—and talked to quite a few of them—Marines like "Butch" Joeckel, 20 years old from Colmar Manor, Maryland, who won the Bronze Star in Viet Nam but lost both legs as the result of an enemy mine, and the Ross brothers from Middletown, Connecticut—one lost an arm and an eye—the other lost a leg. One is 18 years old—the other 19.

Each of these Marines, and the hundreds and hundreds of other wounded Marines that I have met and talked to over the past two years have something in common. None of them have any regrets about what happened to them—and they have indeed paid a terribly high price. Their only regret is that they weren't able to finish their job. To this

day, they remain the strongest supporters of this Nation's commitment in Southeast Asia. What a paradox it is indeed that those of us at home who feel the heat of battle least, complain the most.

Let us not forget those who paid the supreme sacrifice. As of last month, more than 20,000 Americans have been killed in Viet Nam. The Prince Georges County Detachment of the Marine Corps League, which I am currently serving as Commandant, recently announced a program called Operation Remembrance. We are in the process of raising funds to build a Memorial in honor of all servicemen from our County, from each branch of the armed forces, who lost their lives in Viet Nam. To my knowledge, this will be the second of its kind in the Nation—the first was recently dedicated, I believe, in Springfield, Oregon.

But these 20,000 Americans came from every state in the Union—from practically every major city as well. We need outstanding organizations such as the D.A.R. with your 185,000 members strong from each of the 50 states and overseas as well, to help see to it that Memorials of some type are dedicated in honor of each of these 20,000 American heroes. They deserve nothing less.

Finally, let us not forget our men in uniform who, though they may not have been called to make the supreme sacrifice, may not have been wounded in action, may not have been decorated, but who nonetheless courageously heeded their Nation's call to duty—and served their 12 or 13 months' tour of duty in Viet Nam or wherever else their country needed them.

I am referring specifically to the average American serviceman of whom we can all be proud—the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who didn't scheme legally and illegally to dodge the draft—they didn't extend their schooling, take draft-exempt jobs, plead family hardship, remain on the farm when they otherwise wouldn't, pretend injury or mental problems, buy forged documents, burn draft cards, or desert to places like Canada or Sweden.

I suggest that we need badly another program for these returning servicemen and veterans. It might be called Operation Welcome Home. We could let them know that their Nation is proud of them—that we truly appreciate their efforts.

As General Nickerson knows only too well, today's returning servicemen do not return to the parades and brass bands that greeted him and many thousands upon their return home from World War II, or that I remember greeting us at the dock at San Francisco when we marines returned home from Korea.

No, unfortunately, as Vice President Humphrey told a VFW audience here in Washington earlier last month, "the loudest sounds you may hear are those of our democracy debating its course at home and abroad."

We need to welcome these servicemen and veterans back into our communities—to let them know that we are proud and happy to have them back with us—and we need to help them adjust to civilian life again.

One of their most important and pressing needs is employment. They need jobs. Government figures show that some 750,000 American servicemen will be released from active duty in 1968. Each of us can help by talking to these men as soon as they return—by finding out what kind of work they are interested in—and then calling their special abilities to the attention of our public officials, community leaders, employers, and friends.

At a Marine Corps League dinner dance in Arlington, Virginia Saturday night, I heard a Marine Corps General say, "If all of us at home had supported our efforts in Viet Nam in the past few years and months, this war would have been over by now." Speaking was Lieutenant General Lew Walt, the former Senior Commander of 125,000 U.S. forces in

Viet Nam, a leader like General Nickerson, both of whom are more familiar with Khe Sanh and other places in Viet Nam than we are with our own back yards. General Walt went on to say, "All we need to win is a complete backing here at home."

In conclusion, as we pay tribute tonight to the Patriots of '68, let each of us dedicate ourselves to accomplishing the ultimate for those who accomplished so much for us with so little concern for themselves.

Our men in Vietnam are doing their part on the battlefield—let us do ours on the homefront!

A Time for Unity

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the highly respected newspaper, *Newsday*, carried an editorial last week entitled "A Time for Unity." The main points of the editorial can be neatly summed up in the first two sentences:

President Johnson's dramatic renunciation of a second term and his curtailment of the bombing of North Vietnam opened the way to the current delicate contacts between Washington and Hanoi. The President's domestic critics should now give him a chance to explore this small opening toward peace.

All the President's critics have had ample opportunity to express their views on the handling of the Vietnam problem. The criticism has ranged all the way from thoughtful and responsible discussion to thoughtless and irresponsible acts. In the light of the President's completely selfless moves which resulted in the recent peace overtures, we must take a new look at what we do and say.

As the editorial states, referring to President Johnson:

He should be given the strong backing of all Americans in the days ahead as he seeks an honorable transfer of the confrontation between the two sides from the battlefield to the conference table.

I insert this thoughtful and balanced editorial in the RECORD:

A TIME FOR UNITY

President Johnson's dramatic renunciation of a second term and his curtailment of the bombing of North Vietnam opened the way to the current delicate contacts between Washington and Hanoi.

The President's domestic critics should now give him a chance to explore this small opening towards peace. He must proceed cautiously. Contacts with Hanoi are so precarious that even slight interference from parties outside the bargaining could upset the balance. Hanoi has put great emphasis on its propaganda campaign. The leaders of North Vietnam, therefore, are aware of what is being said in the U.S. This is no time for reporters who have been given guided tours of North Vietnam or other self-styled experts on the intentions of Hanoi to sound off.

The President's determination to approach these negotiations as a statesman has been amply demonstrated. He startled the nation and the world with his decision to forego a second term and to de-escalate the bombing. This is a time for such statesmanship.

We must not let the frustrations of the moment blur the significance of what is happening between Washington and Hanoi because of the President's initiative. The failure of the two sides to agree on a site for

preliminary talks looms large at the moment as a threat to the whole move toward negotiations. But the implications of these initial contacts are broad. More is involved than merely the choice of a city. Decisions made now, if they seem to reflect weakness, could affect bargaining positions later, and both sides know this. The President has acted dramatically and forcefully to bring us this far. He is now engaged in tough and extremely delicate preliminary moves. He should be given the strong backing of all Americans in the days ahead as he seeks an honorable transfer of the confrontation between the two sides from the battlefield to the conference table.

Operation Appreciation

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Operation Appreciation is a homefront support program of aid and recreation for hospitalized Vietnam veterans. The originator of that program, Mr. James Merna, commandant of the Marine Corps League, recently described Operation Appreciation and suggested a further Operation Welcome Home to help returning servicemen adjust to civilian life, at the Patriots' Night program of the Daughters of the American Revolution's 77th Continental Congress. As the father of a ranger and paratrooper who led a platoon in Vietnam and was wounded twice, I believe that this address will be of interest to all Members, and I place it in the RECORD at this time:

OUR MEN IN VIETNAM: THEY'RE DOING THEIR PART ON THE BATTLEFIELD—LET'S DO OURS ON THE HOMEFRONT

(Remarks of James E. Merna, New Carrollton, Md., originator and chairman of "Operation Appreciation" and "Operation Remembrance" before the 77th Continental Congress, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C., April 18, 1968)

President-General Mrs. Sullivan, General Nickerson, distinguished guests, and grand ladies of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Thank you for the honor of inviting me to be with you tonight to participate in the Patriots' Night program of your 77th Continental Congress.

I have been asked by your President-General to say a few words about Operation Appreciation. I would like to address my remarks to the highlights of this program in the context of a broader subject, "Our Men in Viet Nam: They're Doing Their Part on the Battlefield—Let's Do Ours on the Homefront."

Perhaps many of you have seen or heard of an article in this month's Reader's Digest by former President Eisenhower entitled, "Let's Close Ranks on the Home Front." In this article, President Eisenhower speaks out against those critics of the war in Viet Nam, who, in defiance of both common sense and their country's best interests, preach discord and rebellion.

He asks each one of us, "What has become of our courage? What has become of our loyalty to others? What has become of a noble concept called patriotism, which in former times of crisis has carried us through to victory and peace?" My dear ladies, who amongst us ever thought that such questions would have to be asked of the most powerful and

richest Nation in the world, a Nation long renowned for its reputation of sticking together when the going got rough?

I would like to make one point clear. No one has to tell the Daughters of the American Revolution anything about patriotism. You have lived it faithfully and practiced it arduously for more than three-quarters of a century in the same noble spirit as your illustrious forebearers. The initials "D.A.R." and the word "patriotism," as everyone knows, including Joan Baez, are synonymous. One is the *sine qua non* to the other. Through your resolutions and actions, the D.A.R. has always given unqualified support to the military efforts of our Nation.

I would like to cite from my personal knowledge one small though important example of home-front support and cooperation between the military and the D.A.R. Last September I had the privilege and honor to escort your President-General Mrs. William Henry Sullivan, Jr., to Bethesda Naval Hospital for a "cheer-up" visit with wounded U.S. Marines just back from the fighting in Viet Nam.

On prior occasions I had escorted to the hospital for similar visits certain other prominent personalities. One outstanding group was the Washington Redskins Football Team. Another big hit with the patients was an ex-major league baseball player named Joe Garagiola, currently a star on NBC's "Today" Show. Judy Garland was another performer who generously accepted my invitation to visit the war veterans at the hospital.

I must confess I initially had some misgivings when I first met your President-General last September as we began our tour of the wards at Bethesda Naval Hospital. I had some inner doubts only because I wasn't sure how she would be accepted by the patients. To my knowledge, Mrs. Sullivan didn't particularly know too much about the rugged game of football, no one could possibly tell funny and hilarious stories about baseball like her Scarsdale, New York neighbor Joe Garagiola, and, she wasn't noted, as far as I knew, for possessing any exceptional singing and dancing talents like Miss Judy Garland.

Now you may possibly be asking yourselves, "Well just how did this visit of Mrs. Sullivan with some rugged combat-tested Marines go over?" I can best describe the encounter in a single word—*magnificently!* Mrs. Sullivan was an immediate hit with the Marines. They took to her right away—like a devoted son to his mother, the same as our combat servicemen did four months later when your President-General visited with them in the field and in the hospitals in Viet Nam.

You may be interested to know that as a result of Mrs. Sullivan's visit to Bethesda Naval Hospital and because of her devotion to our men in uniform and the cause for which they are serving, the doors right here in Constitution Hall have been thrown wide open to hospitalized servicemen. Many an enjoyable hour has been spent here by our recuperating servicemen from Walter Reed Hospital and Bethesda Naval Hospital attending concert performances and the like. I trust these doors shall always remain open to them.

And that, dear ladies of the D.A.R. is all that Operation Appreciation is about. It is simply a home-front support program providing aid and recreational assistance to hospitalized Viet Nam Veterans. Its purpose is to show these deserving Americans that they have not been forgotten—and that their great personal sacrifices in defense of freedom are appreciated.

Operation Appreciation began almost two years ago, in May 1966, sponsored by my General Douglas MacArthur Post, Catholic War Veterans, USA. Since that time, wounded Marines at Bethesda Naval Hospital have been treated to 42 outings and events. These have ranged from taking the patients to all

of the major sports events such as baseball, football, basketball, boxing, wrestling, stock car races, tennis matches and soccer games to such diverse social events as the theatre, concerts, crab feasts, fire-house parties, society lawn parties, a Congressional Reception on Capitol Hill, and an Embassy Party.

When we take the patients on these outings, and we have had as many as 150 patients at a time, many on wheelchairs, stretchers, and the like, we don't just have them sit inanimate at a ball game or the theatre, for example. We try to make arrangements to take them behind the scenes, into the locker room after a baseball game, for instance, to meet such stars as Brooks Robinson of the Baltimore Orioles and Gil Hodges formerly with the Washington Senators. Or back stage after a performance of "Barefoot In The Park" to meet Miss Myrna Loy and the entire cast. One surgeon at the hospital remarked of Operation Appreciation, "It's better medicine for the patients than anything I could prescribe."

One of the most active supporters of our program has been one of your very own members—the wonderful Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post, in completely unheralded fashion. She's never let us down—always wanting to know how she can help.

It is imperative more than ever that each of us continue to do something constructive for our hospitalized servicemen. According to the latest Department of Defense casualty records, more than 122,000 American servicemen have been wounded in Viet Nam. More than 57,500 were wounded seriously enough to require hospital care. In 1968 alone, more than 22,000 Americans have been wounded. This is more than the total strength of an entire Marine Division.

And these are not just plain statistics. These are human beings—our fellow Americans. I visited some wounded Marines included in these statistics a week ago Sunday at the U.S. Naval Hospital in Philadelphia. I went on Ward K—the amputee ward—and talked to quite a few of them—Marines like "Butch" Joeckel, 20 years old from Colmar Manor, Maryland who won the Bronze Star in Viet Nam but lost both legs as the result of an enemy mine, and the Ross brothers from Middletown, Connecticut—one lost an arm and an eye—the other lost a leg. One is 18 years old—the other 19.

Each of these Marines, and the hundreds and hundreds of other wounded Marines that I have met and talked to over the past two years have something in common. None of them have any regrets about what happened to them—and they have indeed paid a terribly high price. Their only regret is that they weren't able to finish their job. To this day, they remain the strongest supporters of this Nation's commitment in Southeast Asia. *What a paradox it is indeed that those of us at home who feel the heat of battle least complain the most.*

Let us not forget those who paid the supreme sacrifice. As of last month, more than 20,000 Americans have been killed in Viet Nam. The Prince Georges County Detachment of the Marine Corps League, which I am currently serving as Commandant, recently announced a program called Operation Remembrance. We are in the process of raising funds to build a Memorial in honor of all servicemen from our County, from each branch of the armed forces, who lost their lives in Viet Nam. To my knowledge, this will be the second of its kind in the Nation—the first was recently dedicated, I believe, in Springfield, Oregon.

But these 20,000 Americans came from every state in the Union—from practically every major city as well. We need outstanding organizations such as the D.A.R. with your 185,000 members strong from each of the 50 states and overseas as well, to help see to it that Memorials of some type are dedicated in honor of each of these 20,000 American heroes. *They deserve nothing less.*

Finally, let us not forget our men in uniform who, though they may not have been called to make the supreme sacrifice, may not have been wounded in action, may not have been decorated, but who nonetheless courageously heeded their Nation's call to duty—and served their 12 or 13 months tour of duty in Viet Nam or wherever else their country needed them.

I am referring specifically to the average American serviceman of whom we can all be proud—the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who didn't scheme legally and illegally to dodge the draft—they didn't extend their schooling—take draft-exempt jobs—plead family hardship—remain on the farm when they otherwise wouldn't—pretend injury or mental problems—buy forged documents—burn draft cards—or desert to places like Canada or Sweden.

I suggest that we need badly another program for these returning servicemen and veterans. It might be called Operation Welcome Home. We could let them know that their Nation is proud of them—that we truly appreciate their efforts.

As General Nickerson knows only too well, today's returning servicemen do not return to the parades and brass bands that greeted him and many thousands upon their return home from World War II, or that I remember greeting us at the dock at San Francisco when we Marines returned home from Korea.

No, unfortunately, as Vice President Humphrey told a VFW audience here in Washington earlier last month, "the loudest sounds you may hear are those of our democracy debating its course at home and abroad."

We need to welcome these servicemen and veterans back into our communities—to let them know that we are proud and happy to have them back with us—and we need to help them adjust to civilian life again.

One of their most important and pressing needs is employment. They need jobs. Government figures show that some 750,000 American servicemen will be released from active duty in 1968. Each of us can help by talking to these men as soon as they return—by finding out what kind of work they are interested in—and then calling their special abilities to the attention of our public officials, community leaders, employers, and friends.

At a Marine Corps League dinner dance in Arlington, Virginia Saturday night, I heard a Marine Corps General say, "If all of us at home had supported our efforts in Viet Nam in the past few years and months, this war would have been over by now." Speaking was Lieutenant General Lew Walt, the former Senior Commander of 125,000 U.S. forces in Viet Nam, a leader like General Nickerson, both of whom are more familiar with Khe-sanh and other places in Viet Nam than we are with our own back yards. General Walt went on to say, "All we need to win is a complete backing here at home."

In conclusion, as we pay tribute tonight to the Patriots of '68, let each of us dedicate ourselves to accomplishing the ultimate for those who accomplished so much for us with so little concern for themselves.

Our men in Viet Nam are doing their part on the battlefield—let us do ours on the homefront!

Gov. Ronald Reagan Addresses Women's National Press Club

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Ronald Reagan is one of our Nation's most articulate and preceptive leaders.

As Governor of California, he is the chief executive of our largest State. The problems confronting us in California are not peculiar to California; they are the problems of America; they are mirrored 50 times within our Nation's boundaries. Governor Reagan has infused excitement and brought confidence and dedication to the function of problem solving at the State level.

This is clearly reflected in a recent talk by the Governor before the Women's National Press Club here in Washington. Governor Reagan addressed himself to the universal problem of public welfare and his efforts toward "ghetto busting." I commend his speech to every thoughtful, concerned public official in our Nation. His philosophy, his proposals, his objectives are worth the earnest consideration and examination of every citizen of every community.

I insert Governor Reagan's speech in the RECORD, as follows:

I've crossed the path of many of you a number of times during the last year along the "mashed-potato circuit." And since you all read each other, it's hardly a secret that I've been going on at great length and even greater detail about the nuts and bolts side of the government of California. And some of you who've been assigned to cover what must have seemed like the pilot and all of the reruns must think by now after listening to me on a number of occasions that California kids grow up wanting to play "bookkeeper and budget."

Now, it's true that we've devoted a great deal of time and attention to restoring fiscal stability and effecting economies to insure the solvency of our state. We've instituted modern business practices. We've reduced the number of state employees. We've eliminated unnecessary office space, and we've streamlined operations generally.

We have in fact reduced government costs by tens of millions of dollars. Not, as some have charged, because we're not responsive to the needs of the people, but precisely because we are responsive to those needs. Public officials are elected to solve problems, and when they fail to keep a hand on the cost of the nuts and bolts, the problem-solving machinery of government grinds to a halt. We've made a start in reducing both the size and cost of government, but at the same time we've made a start on some of the most vexing programs and problems confronting not only Californians but also, I'm sure, all Americans in all of the fifty states.

How can it be that our affluent society, capable of producing goods and services in the amount of some eight hundred billion dollars a year, with an unfulfilled demand for skilled workers, at the same time can add tens of thousands of people each year to the welfare rolls, until the percentage who are living on public subsistence is greater than at any time in our history, even including the days of the Great Depression?

Well, we believe that it's possible, very possible, that the approach itself to welfare as we've known it in these recent decades could have something to do with this.

In the last ten years, while our state's population was increasing 39 percent, the cost of welfare in constant dollars in California went up 247 percent. As a state, we rank third in poverty and first, in the last few years, in the amount of federal poverty funds that are assigned there. Some of us out there think that welfare has at last revealed itself to be a colossal failure, just as charity is a failure unless it makes people independent of the need for it.

As presently constituted, welfare's great flaw and weakness is that it perpetuates poverty for the recipients of welfare, institu-

tionalizes their poverty into a kind of permanent degradation. We think that it's time that we re-orient and re-direct welfare so as to stop destroying human beings and instead to start saving them.

We're trapped in a multiplicity of regulations and an administrative nightmare, imposed by federal regulations and red tape, that are an inseparable part of the federal grants and aid.

Fortunately, however, there are some loopholes. We discovered that we are permitted here and there to experiment, and so with the permission of the government in Washington, we've launched a pilot program in the area of welfare. We've taken all those multitudinous agencies that are dealing with this one particular problem and in one community, Fresno, we have put all of these programs into one. It is one coordinated effort under one director and we're going to feed the recipients of public subsistence into one end of this combined effort.

At a certain check-point, those who cannot provide for themselves, those who, whether it's through age or disability, must depend on the rest of us, will drop out of that program into this permanent subsidy to the public. We hope that in so doing and in streamlining this, we'll be able to prove that we can provide not only some of the necessities but some of the comforts that make life worth living for those unable to care for themselves.

It is ridiculous to find that there are eighteen separate categories of people on welfare. What does it matter why people are dependent if they are dependent? Our obligation is plain and simple: to provide for them, and we can do this by welfare in one considered effort.

But the rest of those people will continue on through the screening programs of job training, analysis of their problems, and eventually through job training, out the other end into private enterprise jobs. Jobs with a future. In other words, we are going to attempt to break the dependency cycle of welfare and make people independent of it. Perhaps in a year-and-a-half or two years, we will have the information to come to Washington and lay our findings before the government and ask for the flexibility to apply this on a wider basis.

We have at the same time in our state, doubled the number of physically and mentally handicapped who have been rehabilitated in the last year and placed out in useful employment.

We'll have a summer employment program for youth, aimed at the disadvantaged. It'll involve the independent sector and the local communities in a program to provide useful and gainful employment. The state government also will be involved. We've been able to make 3,000 jobs available, some are vacation replacements but many will have actual training jobs leading to permanent employment in public service.

But one problem overshadows all the others, and last night the cowardly hand of an assassin laid that problem on America's doorstep.

Whatever your opinion of Martin Luther King, whether you approved or disapproved, our nation died a little last night also.

It started dying and his murder began with our first acceptance of compromise with the law.

That compromise ranges from our indifference when some would apply the law unequally to some of our fellow citizens, to those who today, black or white, say it is up to us as individuals to decide which laws will be obeyed and which laws broken.

And it includes those in government, unless and until they have the courage to say the law will be enforced and will be enforced equally and applied to all men on an equal basis.

The time has come for all of us to make

a choice. Either we reaffirm our faith in man's ability to meet his fellow man in a spirit of good will with a determination to eliminate their differences peacefully, or we turn savage. We who are white must accept the responsibility for rendering the night-riider and his more gentlemanly ally, the friendly neighborhood bigot, impotent.

And those good, responsible people who make up the vast majority of the black community, must repudiate the bigots in their midst. Any other path leads only to the jungle, where those who are outnumbered die.

The President's Commission Report accuses us, you and me, all of us, of white racism. It's a stigma we'll live with from now on in our communities and with our fellow citizens unless we prove they're wrong.

You and I know that many of today's problems are the result of prejudice—prejudice that has divided mankind from his very beginning. We know too, that there are those today who continue to spread poison of bigotry and we can't ignore them any more than any of us should ignore those others, those millions of others who are determined, and who have been working ceaselessly over the recent years, to make sure that no American ever again will have to tell a child that that child is denied some of the blessings of this land because in some way he is different.

And that's where you and I come in. We can take an interest and we can make a difference. We can insure equal rights and equal opportunity and equal treatment for all our citizens. We can do this by becoming involved in this great problem.

During the past few weeks, I've been traveling up and down the state of California. I've been going into small meetings, without fanfare, with no press coverage, because that wasn't the purpose of the meetings. I've been quietly meeting with leaders of our minority groups in communities throughout California, and when I say leaders, I don't just necessarily mean the names that you are familiar with that appear in the public print as leaders. I mean those people who are dealing at first hand with the problem in their own neighborhood. Most of the time I've listened to their grievances, their suggestions, their hopes, and their hopelessness.

There's no standard pattern to these meetings. In some, I've met with great bitterness, and in some, I've heard suggestions and information about our own efforts to find solutions. I've learned how our educational system has failed them, how in too many instances we're passing, particularly the student from the minority area, passing the student from grade to grade simply because he's reached the end of the term and not because he's learned anything. And at the end of the line he's handed a certificate or a diploma and it's meaningless, because there's no knowledge that goes with it.

He's unable to even read the directions at the beginning of a job training program.

I've learned how our economic system has failed to extend its bounties, as it should, to all who are willing to make an honest effort. I've heard their disillusionment with government programs, promising an instant tomorrow, but designed too often with political opportunism and expediency in mind.

I've been charged, of course, with being opposed to the humanitarian goals because I've vetoed some of those poverty programs. You know, the law permits the governor to veto the programs and being totally inexperienced, I hadn't discovered that you weren't expected to, so I did. For example, in Ventura County of California, there was a program that on the face of it sounded very sound. It was to put 17 of the hard-core unemployed to work clearing the open-park lands that we have acquired. It sounds all right. But I vetoed the program when I learned that more than half of the budget was going to provide seven administrators to make sure that the seventeen got to work on time.

But that is nothing, compared to one of the programs in Chicago. Eight hundred and seventy-two thousand dollars granted to one of those political gerry-built organizations that was to teach basic reading and arithmetic to dropouts. An inquiring reporter went down after a time to see how the class was coming and he interrupted a crap game.

It was explained that it was recess and then he said, "How are we doing?" Well, take the faculty, who weren't paid an excessive amount, but who also weren't worked an excessive amount. One of them was in jail for murder, one was in jail for conspiracy to commit murder, three were out on bond awaiting trial for rape, one was out on probation for a burglary conviction. And the director said it was too soon to determine whether the program had been a success.

But these teachers were paid, in addition to their salaries, five dollars a head for each dropout they brought in, and since they were able to offer a dropout forty-five dollars a week plus a family allowance, they found that the best place to pick up an easy five dollars was at the nearest school where they were talking the kids into dropping out and coming over.

Now, this is our fault. Our willingness to accept politics as usual, our easy tolerance for wrong-doing in government, as if this is just standard practice, and we should not feel any urge to get angry. And yet, in these meetings, I found responsible, fine men and women of our minority communities, following disappointment after disappointment with a patience that is hard for us to comprehend, scrounging for contributions, trying to keep some of the more effective programs going, after some whim on the part of the government planners had cancelled or reduced them. These people, these people I met with, some of whom confessed they were threatened if they came to such a meeting, they are standing between us and those revolutionaries who believe the only answer left is the last hopeless gesture of the torch and the club.

Our meetings will continue with these people, but there will also be meetings with others, with leaders of the business community, with leaders of our labor unions, with educators, and with our own department heads in government.

Those of you who have heard me speak know that I have spoken with some pride of the personnel, the type of people who accepted appointments in our administration in California, people unlike the usual political appointees, people who have taken those jobs at a great personal sacrifice.

But you also know that I have never mentioned these people in any division, as to whether they belong to one particular group or another, or where they came from. For, in the first place, that is because I just can't help but believe that appointments should be made, neither because of, nor in spite of, race or religion or ethnic background. And, second, because I am sensitive to any appearance of grandstanding or trying to take bows for something that we should be doing just normally.

But now, after meeting with those good citizens, I think that it is time that they have a few symbols. Something to encourage them and to cling to, and I am going to tell you that my pride is even greater in the people who are working in our administration because we have the greatest number, the greatest percentage, of members of the minority communities in policy-making and executive positions in our administration than has ever been true in any administration in the history of the State of California. And we have appointed more than seventy Negroes and Americans of Mexican descent to our draft boards throughout California.

Soon after I was elected, I chose an industrialist, Chad McClellan, who mobilized private industrialists in Los Angeles to go into the Watts area two years ago, right after the

riots, to provide jobs for the hard-core unemployed in that area and I asked him to take this on a voluntary, statewide basis and he has done this.

Today, more than 20,000 industrialists in sixteen of our communities, cooperating with the job-training programs, the state and the federal governments, are actually placing the hard-core unemployed in these private enterprise jobs.

The liaison in charge of this from government's end is my Lieutenant Governor Bob Finch.

Now, I don't mean to oversimplify, but I have a belief that jobs are the most important part of this problem. Regardless of all the social problems, regardless of all the things we love to talk about, of equality or opportunity or anything else, the ghettos' walls are economic. It does no good to pass legislation as window-dressing that opens doors if the people you're opening those doors for haven't the price of admission, can't buy the ticket to get in. Of the 17,800 unemployed in the Watts area who were put into jobs by the Chad McClellan program, almost immediately 30% of them moved out of that neighborhood, proving what the walls consist of in the ghettos.

We have learned something else from these meetings. In spite of the liberal stance of too many of our labor leaders, management today is way ahead of labor with regard to solving this problem.

I know something about employment and I know after 25 years as an officer and a leader of my own union, something of the responsibility of the union to its members when there are not enough jobs to go around.

But I know also, that when less than 3% of the union membership in California comes from our minority communities, there is something wrong and that isn't good enough.

The apprenticeship programs, for instance, are slow to take those who are darker-skinned or who have Spanish surnames. I know, too, California law requires that we as a state do business with equal opportunity employers and I know that that law is going to be enforced to the letter. We are checking our own civil service regulations. We do not believe that 99.7% of California's jobs require a high school diploma.

In education, we are exploring the possibility of premium pay for the good teachers so that they will be encouraged to take on the hardest jobs where there is the greatest need for their skills. When the physical facilities are needed for youth programs, athletic programs, adult meetings, when Archie Moore, the former champion out in San Diego, has almost two hundred youngsters and he is bringing them up and teaching them self-respect and he has to do it in a little storefront, why should the schoolhouse door be closed at four in the afternoon? Why shouldn't we use those physical facilities and the playground and the meeting room for programs of this kind for the balance of the day and over the weekend and through the summer?

I'll tell you now that I heard no pleas in these meetings for forced bussing or for unnatural integration of children into schools far from their homes. Over and over again, from the people themselves, the plea was for good schooling and discipline in the schools their children are now attending, and, believe it or not, they told me they wanted more education aimed at jobs, at vocational training.

They said to me, "It just isn't true that everybody has to have a college degree to be happy."

There were points in which we were not in agreement.

I hold with government's right to enforce rules guaranteeing that those who do business with the public have an obligation to serve all of the public.

I endorse a law that bans restrictive covenants with regard to housing and I believe that that same law should apply to those who are in the business, the large-scale business of marketing tract homes.

But though I deplore and detest the evil sickness of prejudice and those who practice it, I cannot believe or bring myself to believe that we should open the door to government interference with regard to the individual's right to the disposition of his own personal property, because once that door is opened, government has been granted a right that endangers the very basis of individual freedom, the right to own and the right to possess.

There is a definite limit to what can be accomplished by law or legislation. Inevitably, and this was true in every meeting, we came to the point where the only obvious solution was the responsibility that lies with each one of us, our willingness to become personally involved, willingness to express our disapproval of those who are motivated by prejudice, even while we defend at times their legal rights to indulge in that sickness.

The industrialist must do more than write a memo encouraging the employment of Negroes. Sometimes, we have learned, a memorandum doesn't reach the shop steward or the foreman. We have discovered that if we are to continue with this program of providing jobs, the head of the company, the "top banana", must keep going down clear to the bottom every once in a while to remind them that this is his personal concern, and that it is his wish that they do something about it in each one of these plants and industries.

We have learned in government that many times the policy stops when it leaves our office and gets down to the firing line.

How do you think we feel when we have sent out the word down to our state employment offices and then we find in one of those offices that a man, an instructor, took a young Negro boy in to fill out an application and as they left, having filled it out, in one of our California offices, he asked the boy if he would put certain things down that he thought would be helpful and the boy said he forgot? "Well," he said, "Let's go back in and add them." And he went back ten minutes later and they couldn't find the application. On a hunch, he walked over to the nearest wastebasket, and they found the application.

School administrators must go out of their way to encourage, and prod, and arm-twist promising minority students, students who don't think that they have a chance of a scholarship and going to college and moving on.

It isn't enough simply to put a little notice up on the board saying that examinations for scholarships are available. They have got to take a personal interest and see that those individuals have their chance.

Yes, all of us have to spend a little less time trying to be our brother's keeper and start trying to be our brother's brother. We are embarked on such a course in California. Not because of any talk of a long, hot summer or a long, hot any-other-period of the year; this is not a crash program.

We are doing what we're doing because it is morally right to do it and it's a good thing to do.

The funny thing is, it is good from every angle. It is good business. Industry in America today needs men and women. It is crying for them to fill skilled jobs and here we have a community filled with men and women who need only the skills to fill those jobs. The alternative is to perpetuate poverty, keeping them on the dole at our expense. With jobs they become productive citizens, sharing the burden of government with the rest of us and making it easier to solve the rest of the social problems. If we can raise our minority communities to just the aver-

age level of purchasing power of the rest of the majority community, we have a potential market for our free enterprise system that is equal to or even greater than the foreign market, whose loss threatens our prosperity at this very moment. That French philosopher so often quoted by all after-luncheon and after-dinner speakers, De Tocqueville, came to this country a hundred years ago, searching for the secret of America's greatness and finally found it. He said America is great because America is good, and he said if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.

Now, I am sure that some of what I have said has sounded very strange to some of you, coming from one who has in the kindest words been termed a conservative and by some has been charged with being willing to eat his young.

It shouldn't sound so strange, though. There is a Democratic state legislator out there in California, a black American, who represents the Watts area, Bill Green. He is a liberal, and he says, "One thing California and the nation have to realize is that the black community and the conservative community are coming much closer together. Liberals tend to intellectualize the question out of existence."

Well, now, I personally deplore the use of such labels as conservative, moderate, or liberal, or any other. I prefer to think that we are coming to a realization that those who look only to government for the answers have failed for some years to recognize the great potential force for good among those who instead have placed their faith in the doctrine of the individual.

We are dealing with individuals. Each one of them—they are not a mass problem. Each one of them is unique as we are unique and each one of them is uttering the same cry. It has been uttered by mankind since the very beginning. That cry from within that wants him to be recognized as having human dignity and independence. The American dream that we have nursed for so long in this country and neglected so much lately is not that every man must be level with every other man. The American dream is that every man must be free to become whatever God intends he should become. The restoration and the perpetuation of that dream is the greatest challenge confronting every one of us today.

Reaction to President Johnson and His Decision Not To Seek Reelection

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the article that follows was written by Mike Royko of the Chicago Daily News, commenting on some of the reaction to President Johnson and his decision not to seek reelection.

It was reprinted in the Sunday magazine section of the Shawnee, Okla., News-Star on April 21 by Ross U. Porter, editor and general manager.

In times like these, when there is a great deal of emotionalism and extremism being displayed in some quarters, it is refreshing and thought provoking to see an article of this kind. I think it is worth sharing:

MAYBE HE WASN'T THE BEST, BUT WERE WE?
(By Mike Royko)

There are those who screamed with a vicarious joy when President Johnson, in that slow,

sad way of his, said he was not running again.

There were others who reacted with sullen cynicism, asking what his angle was.

The white racists said "good." The black racists said "good." The super-Hawks said "good" and the Doves said "good." And most of all the young said "good."

They were all so busy being jubilant in this strong man's terrible moment that many didn't listen to the serious thing he told them.

The President of the United States told the people of the United States that they are so divided against themselves he dares not take part in a political campaign for fear that it could get even worse.

But they answered, many of them, with one last jeer of contempt and hatred.

It figured. Unrestrained hatred has become the dominant emotion in this splintered country. Races hate, age groups hate, political extremes hate. And when they aren't hating each other, they have been turning it on L. B. J. He, more than anyone else, has felt it.

The white racists, those profoundly ignorant broads who toss eggs at school busses, blamed him for the very existence of the Negro. To them he was a nigger lover.

The black separatist could find no insult too vile to be used on him. To them he is a white racist. That he launched some of the most ambitious civil rights legislation in the nation's history means nothing in a time when black scholars say Abe Lincoln was the worst kind of bigot.

The super-Hawks complained that he wasn't killing the Viet Cong fast enough.

The Doves portrayed him as engaging in war almost for the fun of it.

And the young, that very special group, was offended by him in so many, many ways.

For one thing, he was old. They might have forgiven him that if he had at least acted young. But he acted like a harassed, tremendously busy, impatient man with an enormous responsibility. Just like their old man.

He offended them by failing to pander to them, by not fawning over them and telling them that they were the wise ones, that they had the answers, that they could guide us. He didn't tell them that because that fact was, he was the man charged with running the country, not them.

He isn't at all like Sen. Robert Kennedy. Bobby tells it like it is. He tells them how wonderfully wise and profound they are.

L.B.J. offended others by engaging in an "unjust" war. Their collective conscience rebelled against the "unjust" war. So they portrayed him as the eager murderer of babies. Just how many of these conscience tormented young men are more tormented by the thought of being routed out of bed at 5 a.m. by a drill sergeant than by the thought of a burned village, we'll never know.

And he offended many by his lack of style and wit, his sore-footed, hound-dog oratory.

So the abuse he took from all was remarkable. Presidents, like all politicians, have to take abuse. It is within the rules of the game to criticize them, to spoof them, to assail them.

But there may not have been anything in our history to compare with what has been tossed at President Johnson in the last four years.

A play that says he arranged the murder of John F. Kennedy has been a hit with the intellectuals, and those who think they are.

A somewhat popular publication of satire called the Realist printed something so obscene about him that I can't find a way to even hint at it.

High government officials were hooted down when they tried to represent the Administration point of view on campuses, those temples of free speech.

Every smart punk grabbed a sign and accused him of being in a class with Adolf Hitler or Richard Speck. The nation's nuts vowed to come to Chicago during the convention and turn it into anything from an outdoor orgy to a historic riot as their contribution to the democratic process.

He needed more personal protection than any President in history. That can't feel very good. But it was necessary. We have people who burn cities and many others who go to movies and howl with glee at the violent scenes.

If you live in a big city you see the hate that threatens it. He lived in the whole country and looked at it all. And he couldn't see a way to unite it.

Maybe he wasn't the best President we might have had.

But we sure as hell aren't the best people a President has ever had.—From the Chicago Daily News.

Los Angeles Representative Edward R. Roybal Makes His 17th Report From Washington to the Residents of California's 30th Congressional District

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important responsibilities of a Representative in Congress is to keep his constituents fully informed about his activities on their behalf in the Nation's Capital.

For that reason, I would like to include in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my 17th report from Washington to the residents of the 30th Congressional District of California.

In addition to my regular series of Reports from Washington, I have also sent out 12 special reports designed to cover all other major items of legislation considered by Congress, events of national and international significance, and particularly, those matters of immediate concern to the Metropolitan Los Angeles and southern California area.

My 17th report from Washington follows:

CONGRESSMAN ED ROYBAL, REPRESENTATIVE, 30TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA, REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION

As one of the original Congressional sponsors of the Truth-in-Lending bill, I am happy to report success in obtaining an overwhelming 382-4 vote of approval in the House for this measure to ban hidden finance charges, and to protect the Nation's private borrowers from deception and fraud by requiring loan companies, financial institutions, and retail merchants to make full disclosures of total credit costs on all cash loans, department store revolving accounts, and other forms of consumer credit and installment purchase contracts.

The strongest consumer legislation ever voted by the House, the bill is now in conference to work out differences with an earlier version passed by the Senate.

PROSPECTS FOR PEACE

We all hope and pray that President Johnson's peace initiative of limiting the bombing of North Vietnam will prove to be the key turning point toward starting meaningful

negotiations to get the conflict in Vietnam away from the battlefield, and bring it to the conference table.

Moreover, the President's surprise decision not to seek re-election, in the interest of promoting domestic unity and achieving world peace, has been recognized as a magnificent act of personal courage and self-sacrifice—unprecedented in American history.

By removing himself from the political arena, the President hopes to reduce the growing internal divisions in the country, and increase the chances of establishing the basis of a just and lasting peace with freedom in Southeast Asia.

V.A. TO RESTUDY HAZARD PARK HOSPITAL SITE

During a recent conference in my Washington Congressional office, Veterans Administrator William Driver personally agreed to order a re-examination of several alternate construction sites which I suggested as being suitable for the proposed new Hazard Park Veterans Hospital, with a view toward establishing the feasibility of relocating the hospital nearby—on other than park land.

I was delighted to receive this kind of cooperation from the VA, because I have been deeply concerned by what I consider to be a grossly discriminatory Hazard Park land exchange scheme with the City of Los Angeles, that would have deprived a low-income, high-population area of East Los Angeles of this desperately needed public park and recreation facility.

The contemplated property trade between the VA and the City would have given most of Hazard Park to the VA for use as a hospital site, in exchange for federally-owned property near affluent Westwood, in order to provide land there for development of a new West-side City park in the Bel Air/Brentwood area.

Though I am fully in favor of building the veterans hospital, I simply cannot understand the necessity of sacrificing and bartering away one of the few remaining community recreation sites still available to residents of the Hazard Park area—just to subsidize a multi-million dollar park project in West Los Angeles.

But, with united community support, I think we can win this fight to save Hazard Park!

LATIN AMERICAN NUCLEAR TEST BAN

I was honored at being selected as the House of Representatives' member of the official U.S. government delegation sent from Washington to Mexico City to witness the signing of the historic Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

In my work on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have long advocated such regional non-proliferation agreements as one of the best ways of stopping the spread of nuclear weapons throughout the world, and of reducing the terrible danger of nuclear war.

EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW

Judge Philip Newman, one of the most outstanding jurists on the Los Angeles County Municipal Court, and a member of the National Advisory Committee for the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity's legal services program, explains how this program, with the active support of such professional organizations as the American and California State Bar Associations, is making a significant contribution toward achieving the goal of equal justice before the law for every citizen.

In the highest traditions of our system of jurisprudence, the legal services program is a nationwide effort to provide all Americans with the full protection of the law.

By improving the administration of justice here at home, I believe this program can aid the cause of an orderly, lawful, and peaceful society in this country, while pro-

moting our ultimate objective of peace throughout the world.

MEDICAL RESEARCH: KEY TO BETTER HEALTH

Six-year-old Rosemary Woods, the 1968 National Cystic Fibrosis Poster Child, makes a very appealing request for our help in providing funds for urgently needed research programs to find the cause and cure of this dread childhood disease, which today claims more victims than polio, diabetes, and rheumatic fever combined.

Cystic Fibrosis Care, Research, and Training Centers have been established at the UCLA School of Medicine, and at Children's Hospital, USC Medical School. For information on how you can contribute to the fight against cystic fibrosis, contact the Greater Los Angeles Chapter of the National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, Room 303, 139 S. Beverly Drive, Beverly Hills. Phone: 275-1660.

AMERICAN CIVIL RIGHTS MARTYR

The tragic, senseless, and brutal assassination of Martin Luther King, Nobel Peace Prize Winner and world famous apostle of non-violence, has shocked the conscience of the country he loved so well.

There is little doubt that Martin Luther King will go down in American history as an honored martyr for the cause to which he had dedicated his life: the peaceful reconciliation of all the various racial and ethnic groups living together in this, our "one Nation, under God".

What he worked and, ultimately, died for, was what most Americans also want—an end to injustices as old as the nation itself, an end to poverty and ignorance and hatred, full equality of opportunity, and a meaningful share in the future of America for all her citizens.

The landmark Civil Rights Act of 1968, passed initially by the Senate on an overwhelming 71-20 vote, and then by the House with a substantial 250-171 bi-partisan majority, is, in my opinion, a positive and constructive effort to heal some of the critical divisions and conflicts that exist today—and build for ourselves and our children a better America where each person is judged as an individual, and not according to his race, or religion, or color, or creed.

Supported by both California Senators, as well as by the majority of our State's Representatives in the House, this measure includes federal protection for the exercise of a person's civil rights, strong anti-riot and related firearms control provisions, a fair housing section that eventually will cover some eighty percent of U.S. housing, and a long-overdue "Bill of Rights" for American Indians.

SERVICE ACADEMY EXAMS

I am again asking all young men from the 30th District who are interested in competing for 1969 nominations to the Air Force, Naval, Military, or Merchant Marine Academies to plan to take the U.S. Civil Service Commission's special Academy Designation Exam scheduled to be given in Los Angeles on July 9, 1968 (a make-up exam will be held later in August). For more information, contact our District office on 688-4870.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT

City Councilman Tom Bradley, a key leader in the fight to eliminate urban blight and improve conditions in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, discusses his work with the newly-formed nationwide Urban Coalition while in Washington to confer with federal officials on a variety of new programs designed to benefit residents of the country's major population centers.

Such personal interest and active cooperation from local officials is essential to the success of recent programs enacted by Congress to help meet the growing crisis in the nation's cities.

NATIONAL KIDNEY TRANSPLANT PROGRAM

I have been greatly encouraged by the strong support I've received for my bill, H.R. 14909, to establish a National Commission on transplanting human organs, and to implement a comprehensive treatment program to aid victims of chronic kidney disease.

This measure would provide a thoroughgoing review of the full range of medical, legal, social, economic, technical, and humanitarian problems—and opportunities—which the Nation faces as a result of the astoundingly rapid progress of medical science toward making transplantation of human organs, and the use of artificial organs, practical alternatives in the treatment of disease.

In addition, H.R. 14909 has been enthusiastically endorsed by the National Kidney Foundation as a major step forward in organizing a nationwide kidney care and transplant program—based on the outstanding pioneer work of leading institutions in this field, such as the UCLA and USC Medical Centers, Wadsworth Veterans Hospital, and the Los Angeles County Hospital.

MIDDLE EAST SETTLEMENT

Greeting Major General Yitzhak Rabin, new Israeli Ambassador to the United States, at a welcoming ceremony held recently in Washington.

I had previously met General Rabin, who commanded Israel's armed forces during the famous 6-day war last June, while serving as Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee Special Study Mission, which conducted an extensive survey of the Middle East only a few months before the outbreak of hostilities.

Perhaps more than anyone else, Ambassador Rabin understands the difficulty of getting discussions started to explore for agreed terms for an enduring peace in that volatile area of the world.

Student Reporters in Vietnam—IX

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, our current halting efforts to find a path toward negotiations in Vietnam makes it all the more imperative for us to be fully informed about what is going on in that unhappy land. The task of informing the American people about Vietnam is now brilliantly being done by many hundreds of journalists now in Vietnam. I am proud to say that two of these important journalists are student reporters from the Queens College Phoenix, currently in Vietnam.

The reports of Lee Dembart and Ralph Paladino have been a consistent source of enlightenment for me. Their most recent dispatches deal with such varied and important topics as Vietnamese student politics, refugees, drugs and prostitution, and American troop morale.

The articles follow:

(By Lee Dembart)

SAIGON.—In the United States, being a student leader is like being second banana at a burlesque show: the customers listen patiently, but the attraction is something else.

Not so in Vietnam. While American student bigwigs often find themselves talking to few if any of those they are supposed to lead, their Vietnamese counterparts are usually

in quite the reverse position; tremendous demands are placed on their time, energy, and thinking by fellow students who look to them for guidance on a variety of issues from the war to religion to politics to classwork to social service.

There are other differences. Student leaders here tend to be considerably older than those in the States. Because the university system allows the student to stay in school almost indefinitely, and many do to avoid the draft, it is not uncommon to see student organizations being led by people in their late 20's.

Whether age brings with it sophistication is a different matter. It is easy to be misled by the way many students here can tick off the names of secondary American officials—like Nicholas Katzenbach, Chester Bowles, and Thomas Kuchel—and compare it with how much most American students know about the Vietnamese government.

They know the names of American officials because, as one student said, "When you finish talking about the Americans in Vietnam, you have finished talking about the power in Vietnam."

Student leaders here work in a variety of organizations and interest groups that far surpass the traditional newspaper-student government complex that accounts for most of what is called student leadership on many American campuses.

They wield a tremendous amount of power and influence and tend to be exceedingly careful about using it. This in contrast to American students who have relatively little influence but insist on bandying it about on a moment's call.

Curiously, students here, unlike those in other underdeveloped countries, seem to resist the temptation to become mouthpieces for a party line. Since the party line espoused by others is usually Marxist or quasi-Marxist, and such a position would be practically a capital offense here, there is good reason for their abstinence.

During the past two weeks I have spent several afternoons and one or two evenings talking with a number of Vietnamese student leaders. Almost to a man, they prefer French to English, not only because they consider themselves better able to converse in French, but because they consider French to be the cultured language.

In fact, there is a widespread and deep feeling among educated Vietnamese that the French have an unbroken and unbreakable hold on everything that is culture. When asked about the current status of French theater or literature, for example, they respond, "And what do you Americans have that is so good?"

Despite the shifting relationship between the Vietnamese government and the students—from complete suppression as recently as two years ago to an uneasy tension now—the students preferred to speak anonymously. Even then they remained not altogether convinced that their young American questioner was what he claimed to be—a reporter for a college newspaper in New York.

Nonetheless, they spoke candidly and incisively about a variety of Vietnamese issues.

The major preoccupation, of course, is the war. "There has been war here as long as I can remember," said one 28-year-old student. "Since I was a child I remember fighting. It is no good. I want to have a family, but I don't want my children to live their lives in war."

But they recognize that ending the war is not as simple as declaring it ended and laying down the arms. One student from nearby Hau Nghia province, an area which even the American Embassy admits is VC controlled, pointed out that military action represented only the part of the iceberg above the surface.

How, he asked, was the Vietcong infrastructure to be overcome? It has, he said, a vice-like grip on rural people who know little of the Thieu-Ky government and have learned not to rely on Saigon for support.

Told that the Americans were aware of the problem and were asking the same question, he scoffed. "At night you go back to your Beverly Hills houses and we must contend with the VC," he said.

Added a young Buddhist student: "We are not sure that we know how to deal with the Communists, but we have a much better idea of how to do it than you do. They are our people."

Not all of the students adopt this approach. Since the days of Ngo Dinh Diem who started the practice, political leaders have made sure to establish or support student political groups that will remain loyal to them. Today's political leaders are no exception.

Said one member of a group generally held favorable to Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky: "The government is our only hope for national unity. It must be supported."

The view was expressed by others who are not closely tied to government leaders. They point to the relative freedom and quality of the National Assembly, the government's legislative branch, as evidence of the government's good intentions and merit.

In fact, support for the present government seems to be growing within the student community. All university students here have just completed two weeks of required military training, and while many grumbled, most viewed it as a necessary evil and went along.

And last month, following the Tet offensive, a surprisingly large number of students enlisted in the army, more than had enlisted during the entire six-month period that preceded it. True, a large part of that enlistment came as a result of the government's crackdown and threatened crackdown on student draft dodgers and the general amnesty that was declared for them if they would enlist, but most observers here consider the number significant nonetheless.

"Some of my friends who signed up with the army told me they had no choice," explained one student leader. "They said, 'If we do not support this government, our country has no future.' Maybe they are right and maybe they are wrong. At least they did something."

Anti-Americanism is quite prevalent, although usually hidden. While a good part of it is a result of the bombing and other military activity, most anti-American feeling results from smaller scale but highly personal incidents.

"Americans are very arrogant," said one of the leaders of a large Catholic student organization. "I see the GIs teasing old men in the street and pushing little children out of their way. Is that how one acts in the United States?"

Others repeated the charge, and some noted that while they understood that the Americans didn't mean to offend anyone, many Vietnamese did not. "But no one says anything because we know that the Americans are in charge here," said one student.

"The worst part of that American aid," explained another, "are the words that are written on everything you give us: 'A gift of the people of the United States.' Why do you write that everywhere?"

Talk of the American aid programs leads quickly to talk of corruption, the two concepts being inextricably linked in the minds of Vietnamese, if not in fact.

"Not all officials want to steal," said a 26-year-old Buddhist student. "But if they don't, their relatives will think there is something wrong with them. Most people think the only reason to have a job in government is for the money you can make."

Understandably, it is difficult to find a student who is a Communist. I found none, although I heard of several who were described as having "suspicious associations." None of them were willing to talk.

Many students are anti-Communist not only because it is very dangerous not to be,

but also because they truly have no love for the Communists, their methods, or their system. They are seriously frightened of a Vietcong takeover both for its short- and long-range prospects.

Its short-range prospect, they explain, would be a tremendous bloodbath in which anyone who had sided with the Americans or the Thieu-Ky government would be executed. This is a serious fear among Vietnamese students, especially the Catholics.

The long-range prospect of a Vietcong victory, they continue, would be the kind of Communist regime now controlling North Vietnam. Most student leaders who would talk about the subject at all said that while they had great respect for Ho, they had little regard for the economic, political, or social situation that now characterizes Ho's country.

Asked how they knew what was going on in the North, they refused any comment other than a smile and a cryptic, "There are ways."

For the most part they are seriously concerned about building a nation and want to get on with it as soon as possible. It is for that reason that they are both against the war and yet willing to work with the government toward ending it.

It also explains the great interest now in social welfare projects. As one student leader said, "If we are prevented from doing the job on a large scale, at least we can do it on a small scale. And there are many people who need our help."

(By Ralph Paladino)

QUANG-TRI PROVINCE.—The numbers game so successfully played with dead Viet Cong becomes an impossible task with regard to Vietnamese refugees. The dead are unquestionably dead and are not apt to go anywhere. The Vietnamese refugee may be anything or anybody, a problem compounded in a country where a system of population registration is only in a very rudimentary phase. The refugee often arrives one day and leaves the next, leaving behind only his number on a refugee count.

As a result, there is no really meaningful figure available at any one time on the numbers of refugees that exist in this refugee-filled country. The Tet offensive has destroyed so many homes and frightened so many people out of their villages and hamlets, often for only two or three days, that figures change daily as people return home, move in with relatives or simply leave for somewhere else. An American Aid official in Quang-Tri province says the figures have about the same accuracy "as a random guess in a Count-the-Jellybeans contest."

Here in the northernmost province of I Corps, the current estimate is that about 20,000 refugees have been forced from their homes in the area around the DMZ and the town of Khe Sanh by the Communist offensive there. They are being housed in the area near the city of Cam-Lo and the sprawling support base for Khe Sanh at Dong-Ha.

It is no easy task to house an influx of 20,000 new people, especially in a country where efficiency is too rare to even be expected. The entire operation has fallen by default to local American military commanders and U.S. Aid officials. Considering the scarcity of resources available for the refugees, what has been accomplished is almost a miracle. Using any other criteria than this, though, the situation is not good.

Of the roughly 20,000 refugees in this area, about 6,000 are Bru Montagnard tribesmen, and the remainder are Vietnamese. The problem of Montagnard-Vietnamese relations has been neatly solved here by setting up separate quarters for each. The great majority of the Bru live in large arm tents, squeezing as many as possible into one tent. The quarters are much less than sufficient and many of the tribesmen have to sleep in makeshift shelters or under the stars. The

Vietnamese have it a little better, but have at least begun to build their traditional houses. A general lack of building materials hampers the effort and in some cases has brought it to a standstill.

But the problem of food dwarfs even the housing problem at Cam-Lo. A week ago, 100 truckloads of supplies arrived from Quang-Tri city with shipments of tents, tin plates, bone meal, rice, salt, and bulgur (enriched) wheat. It was not nearly enough and the supplies of not-very-popular bulgur wheat are long gone. No one knows when the next convoy of supplies will arrive from the Province capital, although some are trickling in from American AID sources in the meantime. The diet of the refugees can only be termed bare subsistence, with a good percentage of even that small amount coming out of garden plots that have recently begun to bloom.

Water is a serious, though not crucial, problem. The wells are inadequate for the increased population and the river is as much as a mile away from some refugees. A pumphouse is being built, but construction has been delayed because the area in which it was being built is considered insecure. The pumphouse will probably have to be moved upriver, but until then, the river is far away.

While the area once employed most of its residents, there are now too many people and too few jobs. The only work available is usually with American forces filling and loading sandbags, crushing rock for road use, doing laundry trucked down from local military bases, or working in the area's various compounds. But even with this great deal of make-work, there are still too few jobs. Money is scarce, and so nearly all the refugees have only what is given to them by the American and Vietnamese Aid officers.

This lack of work shows itself in other ways. The people have nothing to do from day to day except lounge around, eat when they can, sleep or just smoke their banana leaf cigarettes. This is the same trait that characterizes refugee camps all over the world; a sense of apathy and unchanging boredom. A few women wash their children at the well, men sit and stare into space, some women cook, even the children's play is desultory and inactive.

When a truck arrives and needs unloading, the entire community arouses itself and comes over to help, but in a few minutes the job is done and the men wander back to their shade and their pipes.

Fortunately the health of the refugees is holding up well. Malnutrition is not yet a problem and none of the common tropical illnesses—cholera, plague, or small pox—has broken out. The medical teams that enter the villages daily have little to do except treat the usual run of bad feet, scratches, and infections.

The Saigon government promises all refugees 5,000 piastres (\$42) and a plot of land measuring at least 30 feet by 50 feet. While it has been nearly two months since Khe Sanh was evacuated, the money and land have not yet been distributed. The government estimates it will take at least three more months for the red tape to make distribution possible.

A few families have been loaned privately owned land that was not being used. Considering that most of the refugees plan to leave Cam-Lo and return home whenever conditions permit, this has proven to be a satisfactory solution to the problem of land distribution without stepping on powerful toes. But even this is not enough for the thousands of families in need of land in an area where the land is simply not available.

One small village of refugees in the area does show what can be done even with scarce resources if the people have dynamic leadership. Father Phan-Van-Co is a Catholic priest and a village chief who is himself a refugee from the North. In 1956 he and 6,000 of his parishioners left North Vietnam and settled in Danang and Quang-Tri city. Co

then settled in the DMZ. In the eight years he was there, he built six churches, four schools, and two hospitals. A number of Viet Cong attempts at his life caused him to flee to the South again.

Co is a popular and progressive leader. In the last six months he has built a small orphanage and a school (which doubles as a church on Sunday), where, with the help of three nuns, he teaches 300 of the village children in a town with 1500 residents. Co makes no secret of his pro-American sentiments. While other village leaders avoid all contact with Americans for fear of reprisal, Co visits the American compound often, and Americans are frequent guests in his small home.

The priest is a small, dark man in his middle forties who speaks both French and English though haltingly. Seldom was it necessary for him to turn to the interpreter to clear a point or grasp for an English word.

His most urgent concern at the moment is seeing that there is enough to eat for his villagers. The problem would have been already solved with the coming of the new crop, except that a defoliation accident has set the harvest back for at least three months. American planes accidentally released a small amount of defoliation chemical upwind from the village, killing most of the budding crops. Fortunately, not enough was dropped to hurt the land itself for any length of time.

Co is well versed in the fine American Army act of scrounging, and it is a result of this that the village is in such good condition. He will often hitch a ride with a military convoy to Quang-Tri city and there harass local Vietnamese officials into releasing supplies to him. A few minutes with the commander of the American motor pool, and he has enough trucks and drivers to take the goods home. In addition, he has taught the villagers (after being taught himself) how to bake bread with the sufficient stocks of flour available and how to make bulgur wheat palatable to them. And everywhere in and around the village there is something growing.

When Co was asked how much of this aid actually comes from the Vietnamese government, he only smiled a little. "There is much red tape," he says, "and they are very slow." He explains that if he is to get help from the government he must go after it himself.

"It is not that they do not want to help, they are just inefficient." (the last word after a conference with the interpreter) "Many village chiefs," he says, "do not care enough to go out and get help, they expect it to come to them. But these are my people, and Christ said 'Feed thy Sheep'."

And unlike the majority of Vietnamese leaders, Co is a good shepherd.

(By Ralph Paladino)

Every war in American history has had its illegal wares, meeting the needs of the soldier far from home. Until Vietnam the largest selling one had been prostitution. In Washington, D.C. during the Civil War, the number of prostitutes in the capital rose from 300 to over 5000, and in their time, Manila, London, Tokyo, Berlin, and Paris have served as American whorehouses.

No less is true of the Vietnamese cities today. But unique to American war experience, Vietnam has added a second illegal "vice"—marijuana or con xa as it is called in Vietnamese, ostensibly to be stamped out at every opportunity, and with the same degree of failure.

The "problem" is little discussed in official military newspapers and reports. In fact, the "problem" is probably the wrong word. The tens of thousands of American soldiers here might prefer "blessing," a few commanders, "disaster." In either case, marijuana has become as much a part of the Vietnamese war experience as prostitution has ever been in other wars, and even more so because it is not limited to the troops lucky enough to be serving in the

rear lines, to the cities, or to other off-post areas of the country. Unlike a prostitute, pot is profitable, hideable, and cheap.

Prostitution in Vietnam follows the classic pattern of prostitution in all war-torn nations, with the added problems caused by a lack of sophistication and elementary hygiene. Prices reflect not only living standards in this poor nation, but the considerable demand of 500,000 unattached males in a country of only 16 million people, and generally range from 300 piastres (about \$2.55) for a "short timer" to 1000 or more, with prices climbing for quality and quantity.

Since the Tet offensive, a severe clamp has been put into the living standards of most city prostitutes. The bars generally are closed, the curfew mostly enforced. But among both GI's and prostitutes there is no lack of ingenuity.

The bars now open early in the afternoon, often serving only soft drinks to avoid police interference, and every waitress and bar girl plies her trade. For a price, they are yours for an hour or a night. Most hotels will add the charge to your room bill, along with the added cost of a double room. But for the most part, outside of Saigon, sex has become a daytime activity in Vietnam.

A lucky or clever combat soldier can complete duty early enough in the afternoon to get downtown in time to spend a few dollars and still be back before curfew or for a 7 p.m. formation. Few GI's risk being busted by spending a night off base, especially outside of the major cities.

Whorehouses go under many disguises now that bars are declared closed (and this is enforced outside of Saigon). On the road from Fourth Division Headquarters in Pleiku, are dozens of "laundries" advertising beer and soft drinks while you wait, the signs adding such oriental Americanisms as "Laundry, cleanly nicely," or worse. Young Vietnamese girls, ranging from 16 to 30, most fairly attractive at least from roadside distance, wave to passing soldiers. Other popular fronts include car washes and small black market stores.

Many soldiers are stationed in small groups of seven or eight men guarding bridges, roads, outposts, and power lines. Here they need not even travel to the cities, for the prostitutes will come to them, with the bushes serving well as a bed. But the good prostitute is wise to exercise discretion in her dealings with these outpost soldiers, for many a pimp has looked down the barrel of a rifle while his girl served the soldiers. It is wise not to offend the American sense of fair play with outrageous prices or harsh words.

But prostitution no longer travels alone in Vietnam. The local prostitutes have in most areas become the major suppliers of marijuana and opium to the American soldier and civilian. Add to this any often frequented bar, any whorehouse, most hotels, a majority of taxi drivers, and a lot of kids, and you have a full list of American sources for drugs and marijuana in Vietnam.

The Tet offensive has hurt supply lines somewhat in the northernmost areas of the country, especially around Hue and Dong-Ha, but prices are beginning to lower rapidly, though the Vietnamese greed for American money makes it unlikely that it will drop to pre-Tet levels.

Enough marijuana for 20 good-sized cigarettes in Hue may run about \$5, in Quin Nhon as little as \$2, and in the Delta marijuana is still often given away free with a drink or a girl. Very little pot is any less than top quality, although even here an occasional crook will cut his supply with tea or tobacco.

Assessing the extent of pot usage among the soldiers here is an almost impossible task. With absolute surety, it can be said to be more extensive than most military officials will admit or perhaps are even aware of. One company of the 101st Airborne Division near Hue can boast 90 per cent participation in

its pothead program. Groups are divided by rank for discipline purposes, and in one group of seven smokers, none were below the grade of E-6 (platoon sergeant). Pot parties went on every evening, usually revolving around quiet bull sessions. When everyone became sufficiently euphoric, or occasionally, when we ran out of pot, the party ended and the lights went out.

On the line, the same unit might drop to under 20 per cent participation. There are no tents to divide off into, supplies are scarce, and no one knows for sure whether the commander is a pothead. Most of the soldiers do not feel that pot lessens their ability to battle the Viet Cong.

On the lower extreme, some base units probably don't smoke at all. Although I did not run into any, I did find some where participation was among only two or three people.

But in very few units is it the fear of being caught that prevents anyone from smoking at will. One soldier only laughed when I asked him about it. "I was in this bar and went into the back with this slope chick. Things happened and she complained to the MP's that I kicked her. I had 14 grams and a couple of joints on me." He was only busted one grade for an offense that can bring as much as three years. "My CO was a pothead, see, and he had the job of recommending punishment, so he backed me."

Few GI's are prosecuted or caught by their immediate commanders, who usually will be young lieutenants or captains not far removed from them in age or attitudes. Usually prosecution is brought about by third parties, such as MP's, postal inspectors, or higher headquarters personnel. The maximum punishment of three years at hard labor is rarely imposed, and severity of punishment depends almost entirely on the attitude of the defendant in court (if the case gets that far) and the quantity he is credited with possessing. None of the prosecutions in Vietnam have been for selling the weed. Pot is too cheap and the soldiers too generous.

The Third Marine Division's Judge Advocate's office bragged of about three convictions a month for possession, with sentences averaging just under a year. The officers in the office swore to me that smoking was rare among Marines. The Army boasts of even fewer prosecutions on the court-martial level. While convictions are in the hundreds, users probably number in the hundreds of thousands.

Why do GI's smoke? Most soldiers are moderate, though regular users. Even with the almost unlimited quantities to which they have access, they can be expected to limit themselves to four or five joints or a couple of pipefuls at a time. In the field, where the pressure is most intense, use decreases. For the line soldier, smoking marijuana is much like the needed drink at the end of a long day, a way to relax, to ignore the dirt, the heat, to make the bugs more bearable, the hard cots softer.

All over the line, the use of pot fell into the same pattern: small groups of four or five individuals in quiet bull sessions. Alcohol has taken a back seat to the weed. In some units it is difficult to find anyone who even wants a bottle of liquor (although beer is always appreciated).

The effects of widespread smoking have been felt outside of Vietnam. The Australian government considered ending "R and R" trips Sydney because of the large amount of smuggling American soldiers were doing. Instead, they are now thoroughly searched upon arrival. GI's carry the weed home in their government-shipped baggage, in their pockets, or send it home in packages. Some are caught, but most appears to get through. One ingenious GI I talked to sent himself a gift, with pot acting as the packing material. Record players have been found stuffed with it, souvenir bowls and vases filled, and even letters to mom carry it to the states.

Surprisingly, most military officers minimize the problem even as they admit its existence. "It doesn't seem to do any harm," one major told me. "These are the best behaved troops I've ever seen," a company commander said. "I haven't had to bust one man for drunkenness in the eight months we've been here."

What does disturb some commanders is the increase in the use of narcotic drugs among the troops here. Opium use was common in most of the units I visited, if not widely consumed. I saw water pipes made from hand fire extinguishers that could be returned to their racks on the walls after use, as well as dozens of commercially available pipes. Most were used exclusively for opium.

Discharges for drug addiction seem to be on the increase although no figures are available solely for Vietnam. Sticks of marijuana can be purchased which contain large quantities of opium from many of the same sources as marijuana alone. If the trend continues, a severe crackdown on the use of marijuana will be the most likely result.

It is apparent that the widespread use of marijuana in Vietnam is making it acceptable to an ever larger percentage of people, even nonsmokers, in the under-25 population. Wholesale smuggling is probably bringing the drug into areas of the United States that heretofore had little contact with it. With this increased usage, pressure on drug authorities is likely to grow greater to legalize marijuana. But, as long as prostitution has been with us in wartime, it has never been legalized. How much more likely is pot to be?

(By Ralph Paladino)

It appears that for the second time in history, the American soldier is involved in a war he does not really understand or care about.

Korea showed clearly to the military the danger of placing even the most well-trained soldier in a situation where he could be subjected to severe enemy pressure without first giving him a clear understanding of the need for his sacrifice. It is more than just fortunate that Americans here are fighting a type of war in which prisoners are a negligible quantity, for there is developing in the military the greatest crisis of confidence it has ever experienced.

Commanders at all levels would deny that American troops in Vietnam display a lack of aggressiveness, and kill ratios would probably provide enough evidence to support their denial. But even the highest ranking officers will admit a reluctance to commit American troops to battle, except when absolutely necessary. A two-star general, a graduate of the City University of New York, said: "My policy is to withdraw my troops whenever they make contact, then clobber the enemy from the air with all I can get before I send them back in." Then more quietly, "Maybe I don't get all the Charles I should, but I keep a hell of a lot more troops alive."

Other commanders have told me what happens when their casualty rates go too high. "If we're lucky, we just get our _____." It is here in the lower echelons of command, among company commanders and platoon leaders, that the war has taken its greatest toll of belief and confidence.

The Army is suffering from its largest shortage of junior officers since World War II. Commissions can be had almost for the asking. Anyone with a Masters degree can receive a direct commission, and college graduates are begged to go to Officer Candidate School. Enlisted men are almost being ordered to apply for commissions to fill the thinning ranks.

Promotions come to the young officer with almost dazzling swiftness, and any officer who chooses to serve beyond his mandatory tour can expect to become a major after as little as six years of service. An Army lieutenant can expect to make captain in less than two years, down from over three in

pre-Vietnam days. An Air Force lieutenant's time-in-grade requirement for captain is down from four and one-half to three years, and yet the Air Force still suffers from an acute shortage of new pilots.

The effects of this rapid promotion are evident in the embittered older officers who took long years to get where younger men are reaching almost immediately. Also, these promotions have given the Army a sizable cadre of immature and inexperienced field grade officers.

This new nucleus of 26-year-old majors is having an effect on the enlisted grades also, for contrary to the popular myths of rank, it is age and experience that is most respected in the Army and not rank. The day has not come when a young lieutenant or captain can safely interfere with a 30-year master sergeant without receiving a few nasty wounds himself. The effect on discipline may not yet have begun to show, but it probably will be profound on all levels of command.

Nearly all the young officers I've spoken to have expressed their desire and intent to get out of the military as soon as their mandatory tour is completed. While this would not be unusual among the ordinarily large percentage who intended that all along, it is disturbing when it comes from many officers, including West Pointers, whose original desire was a career in the U.S. Armed Forces.

Out of eleven West Point graduates I've asked about future plans, seven intend to resign as soon as their tour is over. Considering what these men went through (and one has to have an intimate knowledge of what U.S. Military Academy life is like to know what they went through), and the time and expense involved in their training, one can understand the extent of the loss both to the individual and to the Army. For at one time, 90 per cent of all West Point graduates made the military a career.

The disillusionment and disgust over the way the war must be waged does not stop with the lower-grade officers. I have heard lieutenant colonels and majors rant and rave against their superiors and the Pentagon. "I'm practically expected to ask permission every time I want to kill a gook," one Army pilot said to me. An artillery officer pointed out the base perimeter that ran past his command area. "Look at those defenses. If we had the equipment we had in Europe, a gook couldn't get within 1000 yards without being killed. Now, we wouldn't see him until he crawled under the wire."

It is almost certain knowledge among most line officers that they will not be permitted victory that permeates their thinking on war tactics and towards the troops in their command. "We get orders for a sweep," says one commander in the 82nd Airborne, "but, hell, the war might be over tomorrow. I don't want any of my men killed, especially for this _____ place. I'll be damned if I'll do any more than I have to." A platoon sergeant in the Delta, after yelling to his troops, "Sure, we make a lot of noise. The VC here don't want any part of us; if I make enough noise, maybe he'll get the hell out of the way."

There are many reasons, many seemingly legitimate, for this attitude of despair and even apathy throughout the Army, some very personal, many professional. An Army officer has very little to look forward to in his future assignments as long as the Vietnam war continues. Many men are on their third tour here, and all can expect to return after only a year in either a European or an American base. And these now rapid moves from place to place, instead of the normal three years per assignment, can play havoc with family life. "This kind of assignment is all right once in a while, but I've only been with my wife two of the last four years," said one officer. Or as one Army captain said flatly, "I won't come back."

But it is more than just the personal reason. The conviction that the people do not care what happens here is all important.

Vietnam is not a nice place to the average officer. It is dirty, hot, bug infested, and worst of all, the people miss almost no opportunity to cheat the rich soldiers. Stealing is rampant. American troops work a twelve-hour day while Vietnamese troops knock off at 4 p.m. It is not the sort of country one wishes to die defending.

Most of the American military is convinced that given a free hand they could win a military victory here in a very short time. And they are convinced that they could do it in spite of the Vietnamese army and the Vietnamese people. They are professional soldiers, at least for their time in the Army, and like all professional men, they take pride in carrying on their jobs the best way they know how. And the best way they know how is to kill the maximum number of enemy at the lowest possible cost in friendly troops.

"We can win this — war with the troops we've got now and never go near the North," one Task Force commander told me. "Give us the go ahead and I could clean out this province in a month." And whenever they say it, something makes you believe they really could.

International Conference on Human Rights

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the International Conference on Human Rights is now meeting in Tehran, Iran. One subject that would surely be within its scope is the Communist persecution of human rights wherever governments are controlled by that ideology.

I insert into the RECORD a memorandum which has been directed to the attention of the International Conference on Human Rights by the United Organizations of Women From Central and Eastern Europe, headquartered in Philadelphia, Pa.

We must recognize that total peace and freedom in the world will not be obtained until communism is totally rejected and captive peoples now suffering under Communist suppression are given the opportunity of self-determination.

The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM TO GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES ATTENDING THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN TEHRAN, IRAN, APRIL 22 TO MAY 13, 1968

The General Assembly of the United Nations adopted and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on December 10, 1948, "as a common standard on achievement for all peoples and nations." Now, twenty years later, in the International Year for Human Rights, we women, organized into associations listed below, enjoying freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want which were proclaimed as fundamental human rights essential to the dignity and worth of human persons are mindful of the plight of the more than 150 million men and women in Central and Eastern Europe whose human rights are violated in great or greater measure.

We present this Memorandum to you as a participant in the International Conference on Human Rights to be held in Tehran April 22 to May 13, 1968, to call your attention to the following violations, article by article, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Article 1. Equality in dignity and rights are denied to non-Communists in the Communist countries on the basis of social origin and birth in some, on national origin in others.

Article 2. The rights and freedoms which everyone is to be entitled to in the Declaration are denied on the basis of language, religion, political or other opinions, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Article 3. Everyone does not have the right to liberty and security of person.

Article 4. Forced labor, which is virtual slavery and servitude, exists. In all countries under the Soviet regime, women are forced to do work detrimental to their health and well-being.

Article 5. Torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment and punishment are applied to achieve totalitarian conformity.

Article 6. Everyone is not recognized as a person before the law.

Articles 7 and 8. Judges are not bound by the laws the constitutions set forth, but by ordinances and decrees of the administration and by the "peoples' democratic order" which are determined by the Communist Party, according to its requirements at any given period. There is no effective recourse for acts violating the fundamental rights of the citizen to equal protection of the law.

Articles 9 and 10. Millions of people have been subjected to arbitrary arrests, detention or deportation, deprived of equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, before being sentenced.

Article 11. Those under arbitrary arrest are presumed guilty before a secret or *monstre* trial.

Article 12. The right to privacy, in family, home or in correspondence, is constantly violated and no law exists to give protection against such interference.

Articles 13 and 14. The right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state and the right to leave any country, including their own, are denied the citizens. The right to ask asylum from persecution is considered a crime or treason.

Article 15. Nationality rights have been revoked for criticism or opposition to Communist injustices. Soviet citizenship was imposed *en masse* upon people of occupied countries without their consent.

Article 17. Properties were confiscated without remuneration, and where there was resistance to relinquishment of property, arrests, mass deportations and even deaths resulted.

Articles 18 and 19. Freedom of thought, conscience and religion, opinion and expression, as is the right to seek and receive information and ideas through mass media from non-Communist countries, are prohibited.

Article 20. While the constitution seemingly guarantees the right of assembly, in reality no organization may exist, no assembly held, unless sanctioned and controlled by the regime.

Article 21. The will of the people is not the basis of the authority of the government. Everyone is compelled to vote in these countries. But they can only vote *yes* for the Communist-selected single list of candidates. They cannot vote *no*, nor can names be written into the ballots.

Article 22. Social security is meted out very discriminately.

Article 23. Free choice of employment and just and favorable conditions of work are limited to a small privileged class. Factory and agricultural workers lack even primitive sanitary facilities; trade unions, instead of protecting workers' interests, serve the interests of the Employer State.

Article 26. Discrimination in education is the rule. Education is aimed not to promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, or racial or religious

groups, but rather to teach them hatred for all except those in the Communist sphere.

Article 27. There are restrictions on the right to participate in the cultural life of the community. The restrictions demand conforming to Party directives. Writers have been persecuted and sentenced to long terms in jail and forced labor camps because they demanded rights guaranteed in their constitutions or because of free expression of opinion and independent thinking.

Article 29. The free and full development of individual personality is restricted because of the duties imposed by the community.

Having listed the violations of these human rights, it behooves us to call attention to the fact that, although the General Assembly adopted a resolution in 1952 entitled "The Right of Peoples and Nations to Self-determination," this fundamental right, which is a prerequisite to the full enjoyment of all human rights, has been denied to the peoples under Soviet rule.

Human rights could be greatly advanced during this Human Rights Year if Member States of the United Nations would carry out the moral obligations that the Declaration imposes and ratify and implement the Covenants and other Human Rights Conventions adopted by the United Nations.

On October 26, 1966, the General Assembly of the United Nations called for the urgent consideration of ways and means of improving the capacity of the United Nations to put an end to violations of human rights wherever they occur.

We request most earnestly that the violations briefly listed above in countries of Central and Eastern Europe be considered among those to be stopped in other areas of the world.

Respectfully submitted.

Baltic Women's Council; Byelorussian American Women's Association; Council of European Women in Exile, representing women from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia; Federated Estonian Women's Clubs; Federation of Lithuanian Women's Clubs; Georgian National Alliance; Latvian Women's Association in New York; National Council of Romanian Women, New York; National Council of Women of Free Czechoslovakia; Women for Freedom, Inc.; World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations, representing Ukrainian women's organizations in Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, Venezuela and the United States; and World Union of Lithuanian Catholic Women's Organizations.

New Evidence Develops on Vietnam Picture

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, further evidence of the fearful beating taken by our enemy in Vietnam during and following the January Tet offensive has come to light, and is reported in Joseph Alsop's column which appeared this morning in the Washington Post.

I believe there has been considerable misunderstanding in this country of the price the Vietcong and North Vietnamese paid in that desperate attack—a mis-

understanding which has been encouraged by some Americans. I would like to have Mr. Alsop's column of today appear in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1968]
NEW RED ATTACK ON SAIGON WOULD UNDERLINE TET FAILURE
(By Joseph Alsop)

LAIKHE, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Reluctant enemy acknowledgement of costly defeat is now conspicuously here in III Corps, where our First Division has its stamping ground. If there is another attempt on Saigon, one can predict with reasonable confidence that the desperate character of the enterprise will actually underline the fact of past defeat.

The sickness at home is so serious that the enemy's own documents are thought to be a huge joke, if they prove our soldiers' and our allies' success in the field. Yet facts are facts, hard evidence is still hard evidence, and it is best to begin with the captured directives from the enemy's southern headquarters, COSVN, which trace the rather grisly story. The first directive was issued on Feb. 1 after a meeting of the COSVN Current Affairs Committee on the night of Jan. 31, while the Tet offensive was still officially in full swing. As this paper is both long and well-drafted, the peculiar timing makes one suspect that it had been quietly prepared pre-Tet, in expectation of failure, by southern-experienced staff officers naturally skeptical of the immensely over-ambitious plan of Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, who had no direct experience of the southern war until a few months ago.

Like all enemy documents, it accentuates the positive for the benefit of the wretched lower echelons, speaking of surging victories of all sorts. But the heart of the paper, nonetheless, is the said acknowledgement that the offensive had already failed to attain its grand objectives: The general uprising, the collapse of the South Vietnamese Army by defection and in other ways, and the occupation of the cities.

In these bitter circumstances, all enemy units were adjured to attack and attack again, at no matter what cost, until the grand objectives were finally and fully attained. The same theme ran through a second COSVN directive, issued after another Current Affairs Committee meeting, less than a week later. Attacks on U.S. units were now excluded, however, as too costly.

The third COSVN directive, dated Feb. 21, then canceled the order for further attacks on the towns and cities, as impractically dangerous. Yet, it offered no surcease to the unhappy enemy GIs, since their units were still sternly commanded "to hang in" close to the towns and cities that had been their objectives.

The result was the kind of situation that Gen. Giap's able predecessor in command, the late Gen. Nguyen Chi Thanh, had found to be militarily untenable as long as two years ago, before the retreat to the border sanctuaries began. Here in III Corps, the result was a cruelly risky situation comparable to a military subway rush, in which further heavy enemy losses were unavoidable.

Such losses were unavoidable because all the enemy units, from divisions downwards, and all the U.S. and Allied forces were angrily charging about in this Corps area in a fattish oval centered on Saigon, with a long diameter of hardly more than 50 miles. For the enemy, it was far worse than the situation two years ago before Gen. Thanh ordered the retreat to the border sanctuaries; for our forces were much stronger and the near-in-VC base areas had all been Rome-ploughed or otherwise rendered near-useless.

The inevitable consequence was the continuation through March of losses for the enemy nearly as horrifying as those suffered in February. A fair though perhaps extreme example was a battalion of the 101st Regiment of the Seventh North Vietnamese Division.

Prisoners taken towards the end of March revealed that the battalion had begun the Tet offensive with 400 men. It had lost its battalion commander, executive officer and most of its staff. It had been reduced in strength to under 50 men. And it had lost all touch with regimental headquarters since the beginning of the month. In general, Giap's Tet failure and his subsequent obstinate refusal to admit that defeat, reduced all his units in South Vietnam to near-ruinous condition; and this was by no means compensated, except in the Delta, by intensified local press gangling.

The defeat was then belatedly acknowledged, when Giap at last permitted the scramble back toward the sanctuaries on the Cambodian border. This happened in all Corps areas. In II Corps, for example, at least five of the seven regiments of the B-3 front sought their usual sanctuaries some time

ago. Here in III Corps, the historic big units—the 9th, 7th and 5th Divisions—also moved out to lick their wounds in the same manner. And yet there is still the intelligence of a new attack on Saigon noted above.

It is only three or four days' march, it must be remembered, from the suburbs to the South Vietnamese capital. If the intelligence is correct, suicide squads of sappers will work with the historic big units, above listed, who were only in a supporting role at Tet.

But if we and our allies have reasonable luck, in the event of this attack, which is highly speculative, a renewed attempt on Saigon by outfits which have already suffered so terribly will be remembered in history as an act of desperation—although God knows how it will be reported at home.

Riot Insurance

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing, today, legislation designed to assist in meeting the mounting insurance crisis in our Nation's cities. The bill would provide relief to the inner city propertyholder who now finds it increasingly more difficult to obtain regular insurance coverage—if indeed he is able to secure any protection at all. Though guaranteed reinsurance, insurance companies would be insulated from the potentially catastrophic losses that can accompany large-scale civil disorders.

This legislation encompasses the recommendations of the President's National Advisory Panel on Insurance in Riot-Affected Areas, which was chaired by the distinguished Governor of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes. Its implementation would launch a frontal attack on a serious national problem through the cooperative efforts of private insurance industry, State governments, and the Federal Government.

SENATE—Thursday, April 25, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. William G. Kalaidjian, minister, Bedford Park Congregational Church, New York, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pause and look to Thee to bless this Senate session that Thy will may be done through the Members of this distinguished body, reflecting the highest hopes for a history that belongs to Thee.

Thou hast given our country blessings beyond our greatest dreams. We have richness in material goods and richness in human and spiritual values. Yet we confess, O God, we have not lived up to all that we should be nor to all that we can become.

May the shame in our Nation's home-life; the tragedy of child abuse and neglect, where more children will die at the hands of their parents than from all other childhood diseases combined, may

this disgrace and our disregard of law that desecrates our land and disgraces our humanity, be changed.

Our Heavenly Father, we acknowledge that we have failed Thee and we have failed the blessing of freedom in our land. We have too long neglected our basic responsibilities, turning from Thee, placing secondary things first and first things last. Help us to be turned around in mind and spirit that we may abandon the lesser gods of materialism and false values, replacing them with the power of Thy love. Help our Nation to love itself more, and its people to love one another that we may fulfill our mutual destiny in Thee.

Gracious Father of our land, like Moses led his people to a new land under the new Commandments; like Christ led His people from death to life eternal in the resurrection; help this U.S. Senate to redeem the environment of our Nation in Thy spirit. Help them to lead our land out of the wilderness of the cap-

tivity of illiteracy; help them to make our Nation more than an empty togetherness as we stand by seeing the liquidation of the treasures of our Nation's soul. As Thou dost call us to a better life, as the police of America patrol and watch our cities' streets, we pray Thy protection upon them; and we pray for the liberation of the social ills of our cities that make police necessary.

May the content of our character, the possession of religious values and the development of our divine-given talents become the basis for where we live, how we live and the kind of work we perform. Bless every race, creed, and national background of the American people, O God, and to Thy glory may the U.S. Senate guide us, in the name of Him who is the Lord of life we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the