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 those who love them more, and 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, permitting decadence and indifference. Of the 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 so that we may fulfill our mutual destiny in Thee.

Gracious Father of our land, like Moses, for thousands of years You have stood in the midst of 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, if by them to lead our land out of the wilderness of the captivity 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 slums 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. give us, in the name of Hitler, who is the Lord of life we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL
Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the
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understanding which has been encouraged by some Americans. I would like to have Mr. Alsp's column of today appear in the Journal.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1968]

NEW RED ATTACK ON SAIGON WOULD UNDERLINE TET FAILURE

(BY Joseph Alsop)

LACKEE, SOUTH VIETNAM—Reluctant enemy acknowledgment of costly defeat in the current Red offensive in South Vietnam is spurring hope among military leaders that the recent Red attack on Saigon may not have been all the Marines expected. It is reported by military sources that the Saigon effort was not as serious as the enemy's own documents indicate.

The third COSVN directive, dated Feb. 21, then canceled the order for further attacks in a manner that was particularly dangerous to the enemy. Yet, it offered no successor to the unhappy enemy GIs, since their units were now too far to the rear of the border sanctuaries. It is reported that the enemy's own document is thought to be a huge joke, if they prove our soldiers' and our allies' success in the field. Yet facts are facts, and this fact, and 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 gristy story.

The first directive was issued on Feb. 1 after a meeting of the COSVN Current Affairs Committee, and it was well-drafted, the positive for the benefit of the wounded. 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 such documents, it anticipates the positive for the benefit of the wretched lower echelons, speaking of surging victories and grand objectives were finally and fully attained. Here in III Corps, the result was a cruelly risky situation comparable to a millitary/subway accident, with either heavy enemy losses being unavoidable. Such losses were unavoidable because all the enemy units, from divisions downward, and all the U.S. and Allied forces were angrily charging about in this Corps area in a fast-filled, smooth-opened center 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 nonoperational.

The inevitable consequence was the continuation through March of losses for the enemy nearly as horrifying as those suffered in February. The North, though perhaps extremely stubborn—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 obstinacy will be remembered in all his units in South Vietnam to near-run-out condition; and this was by no means compensated, except in the Delta, by intensified local press gangering.

The defeat was then belatedly acknowledged, when Giap at last permitted the scrabble back of those who were only in a supporting role at Tet. But if we and our allies have reasonable reason, in the event of this attack which is highly speculative, a renewed attempt on Saigon by outflanks 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 propertyperson 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 property owners, the insurance companies, and the Federal Government.
reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 24, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE
A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 908) designating the second Saturday in May of 1968 as National Fire Service Recognition Day, 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. 705) to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED
The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 908) designating the second Saturday in May of 1968 as National Fire Service Recognition Day, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED
The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 705) to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS
Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. 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. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and 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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS
Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.
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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. Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING
Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1077, House Concurrent Resolution 655.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The Bill Clerk. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 655) recognizing the 25th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, it is significant that the Senate is today adopting House Concurrent Resolution 655—of which I am the Senate co-sponsor together with my colleague from New York, Mr. KENNEDY—for on this date 25 years ago the world was electrified by the news of the beleaguered and practically unarmed Jews of the Warsaw ghetto fighting the whole Nazi war machine. This measure now before us expresses the sense of Congress "to recognize and acknowledge the world significance of the Warsaw ghetto uprising as a reaffirmation of the ineradicable determination to fight for freedom from oppression" and joins Congress in commemorating the 25th anniversary of the uprising.

Yet, as we mark this occasion, we feel moved also to protest a new wave of anti-Semitism in Poland. Of the once thriving Jewish community of 3,500,000 who lived in Poland before World War II, only a pitiful remnant of some 25,000—less than 1 percent of Poland's population of 33 million—remain to be buffeted by what appears to be Government-encouraged anti-Semitism.

Fortunately, to its great credit the Catholic Church, which retains considerable influence with many Poles, has opposed the new anti-Semitic campaign. And individual Poles of good conscience not only denounce the Polish Government's efforts to squeeze out of its national life its Jewish citizens. I believe it is essential for the United States to express its deep concern to the Polish Government regarding mounting incidents of anti-Semitism in that country and their dangerous implications for the future. Our Nation must register its protest according to our tradition and our history.

We who live in security and freedom must long remember and be inspired by those brave men and women of the Warsaw ghetto who, under such hopeless circumstances, died for freedom and dignity. Their resistance will remain forever a monument of light in a dark era of man's history.

I express my deep appreciation to the leadership of the House and of the Senate for allowing the concurrent resolution to be brought up today, the very day of the anniversary.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I rise in support of the concurrent resolution and wish to express my support of the sentiments expressed by my colleagues. At this time I also think it is appropriate for us to take note of recent indicators of anti-Semitism in Poland, and to encourage world opinion to protest against such practices. Transgressions of human rights require prompt action, lest they get out of hand and cause great suffering, as we have seen in our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 655) was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL
Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisel, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 12, 1968, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 234) for the relief of James W. Adams and others.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED
As in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of T. Nathan Churchill to be postmaster at Washburn, Maine, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED
A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 10. An act 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;

S. 1089. An act to authorize the use of the vessel Annie B. in the coastwise trade;

S. 3135. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the authorization of appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

H.R. 15344. An act to amend the Executive Office of the President Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE
As in executive session.

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:
BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. EASTLAND:
S. 3385. A bill for the relief of Anthony Glorioso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S. 3391. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to obligate funds for payment after the completion of the Interstate System for an immediate additional program of construction to improve the Federal-aid primary system; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EASTLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.

By Mr. MONDALE:
S. 3388. A bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act in order to provide for the mandatory inspection of all poultry and poultry products intended for human food, to provide for a mandatory inspection of the inspection and grading of eggs and egg products and for the mandatory inspection of fish and fish products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scourt when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:
S. 3386. A bill for the relief of Reeva Singh; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINTYRE:
S. 3387. A bill for the relief of Concepcion D. Navajo;
S. 3388. A bill for the relief of Ocasio Magina Diogo Ferreira;
S. 3389. A bill for the relief of Jose Rodrigues Borges;
S. 3390. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Porto Amaral and his wife, Maria Rosa Amaral; and
S. 3391. A bill for the relief of Matilde Maria Antunes Goncalves Diogo Ferrela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:
S. 3395. A bill for the relief of Ah Mee Locke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:
S. 3393. A bill for the relief of Kung Seng Hong, Lo Piu Kin, Man Ying Chi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3381—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO HIGHWAYS, TO PROVIDE IMPROVE FEDERAL AID TO PRIMARY SYSTEM

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], I introduce a bill for appropriate reference.

Mr. PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3381) to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to obligate funds for payment after the completion of the Interstate System for an immediate additional program of construction to improve the Federal-aid primary system, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 81, Public Law 89-139, required the preparation of a report by the Department of Transportation detailing our Nation's highway needs.

The 1968 national highway needs report has been transmitted to Congress by Secretary Boyd. There is also available the record of a hearing conducted by the House Committee on Public Works on January 9th. The testimony was presented by Hon. Eugene Johnson, president of the American Association of State Highway Officials. The hearing record contains the expression of the American Association of State Highway Officials regarding the absolute necessity of continuing, without interruption, the Federal-aid highway program beyond the completion of the presently authorized Interstate System.

These valuable documents deal with a subject of paramount importance to our country and to our citizens and both the report and the record deserve our attention and consideration.

The report outlines the urgency of an improvement and modernization program for our primary and secondary systems and urban needs are prominently reviewed in this document.

Based upon a continuation of the highway trust fund until our pressing highway problems are solved, the study envisions a sweeping overhaul of the primary system. It proposes dual-laned highways with limited access; others dual-laned and provided with more liberal access; some portions to consist of two-lane roadways designed for maximum safety and allowing high-speed movement.

The highway needs report states that planning has progressed sufficiently and that our contractual capacity is equal to this task. It is possible, it says, to launch this desperately needed program which will allow the Interstate System to function as a dual-laned roadway with limited access.

I am introducing a bill today which I believe will allow the States and the Federal Government, working together, to extend the partnership which has been developed over the years on the Interstate System into the next logical area of need, our primary system of highways.

I propose that the States, on their own initiative, using the best financial resources available to them, be authorized to proceed to revitalize their primary systems. To support this great endeavor I suggest that the Congress enter into a commitment with the States under which the States would receive reimbursement from the highway trust fund after the completion of the Interstate System.

A careful perusal of the several formulas used in the bill before the Committee on the Judiciary convinces me that a 75-percent Federal and 25-percent State participation would be workable and equitable.

In my judgment, this formula would not only provide the resources of the States but would strengthen our national capabilities through a continuation of the highway trust fund beyond the 1975 target date for the completion of the Interstate network.

Mr. President, I can assure you that this matter is one of vital concern to the States—that the primary road system has reached the point of crisis in many areas. I am aware of the high concern which exists today in the minds of thousands of Americans regarding our Nation's highway needs.

For a nation on wheels—a nation which must be concerned with her military, industrial, and economic welfare, with the protection of her motorists, time is an increasingly critical factor.

I believe it to be apparent to all that, while the Interstate System performs a marvelous service to a necessarily restricted sector of our national highway requirements, the primary system reaches into and serves every State and every area of our American way of life.

At the end of the next decade 75 percent of our population and 80 percent of motor vehicle registration will be found in urban centers. We will witness a 100-percent increase in miles traveled over
primary roads and a majority of this travel will be intercity movement. While vastly improved primary roads will certainly support growth and development in rural areas, it will render an invaluable service—a service we cannot be without in our rapidly growing cities.

Many more significant factors support this proposal. In the past year alone inflationary costs for highway construction have increased 4 percent and an increase of 6 percent is anticipated that—this program can be utilized against hard-core unemployment and underemployment. It would furnish many thousands of jobs for unskilled and semiskilled persons who would be afforded an opportunity to contribute to the advancement of their country and the protection of their fellow citizens.

I am convinced that the States would select this opportunity to improve their primary roads, at their own expense, anticipating reimbursement after the Interstate System is completed. This reimbursement is to be effected under terms and conditions considered to be fair and equitable by the Department of Transportation.

All of the primary construction in this program would be designed to meet the Bureau of Public Roads’ standards which would be in effect for 1975.

I should like to point out that this method of financing would be ideal in that it would not constitute any drain whatsoever on other Federal programs. All other Federal programs could proceed at full speed simultaneously with this improvement project.

The plan proposed is not a new approach nor is it without precedent. The Interstate program, in operation today, allows the States to proceed at a faster pace than that provided by the Bureau of Public Roads and in subsequent reimbursement. This method has proven to be both successful and beneficial. I see no reason whatever for it not to operate with the same degree of efficiency and economy which is the suggested primary system undertaking.

The measure which I introduce today will, of course, have to be perfected by the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate. My hope and my purpose is that we may proceed with a program which I sincerely believe will serve every segment of our society and every section of our country.

Mr. President, while my proposal is limited to the primary system, I want to emphasize that the study encompassed secondary roads as well. I suggest, strongly, that any primary program be made capable to that degree which would allow the correction of hazardous conditions on secondary roadways.

Mr. President, here is the strongest argument in favor of this proposal. Improvements of aged and aging primary roads will save the lives and maybe the suffering of millions of Americans in the decade ahead.

Casualty figures and property losses are reported annually in staggering statistics. During the first three months of 1968, 1,900,000 of our fellow citizens suffered disabling injuries, and $11 billion worth of damages was occasioned by accidents.

Does highway improvement affect these terrible figures? I should like to direct attention to an example which illustrates, with startling clarity, how safety goes hand in hand with highway improvement. Continuing study being conducted by the Bureau of Public Roads contrasts safety on the interstate system with the records on those roads which interstate highway vehicle-miles we find 135 accidents instead of 238; a reduction in injuries from 133 to 50; a decline in deaths from 9.7 to 2.8.

I submit that, while our driver improvement programs should be supported and strengthened, American motor vehicle operators can be generally categorized as safe drivers.

Further—while our automobiles, trucks and buses are being built with the finest in safety features, I believe our vehicles to be engineered and equipped for safe operation.

Where—then—is the basic weakness that kills and maims our people by the thousands?

Mr. President, I am convinced that the real villain in this tragic story is neither car nor driver—it is the narrow, outmoded, hazardous, two-lane highway. The enactment of this legislation can launch a great undertaking which will undergird our economy, add to our defenses capabilities, and, above all, curb the fearsome slaughter that haunts the highways. Upon the completion of a new primary system of advanced design, engineered for safety, the villain—the narrow, dangerous, two-lane primary highway—will disappear from the American scene.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added to the record of this subcommittee were almost unanimous in their opinion that section 315(a) would lead to less, not more, availability of broadcast time. Although there was substantial disagreement on what should be done to resolve the equal-time problem, witnesses before the subcommittee were almost unanimous in their opinion that section 315(a) of the Communications Act, any broadcaster, who makes his facilities available to any one candidate for public office, must offer equal opportunities for the use of those facilities to all candidates of that same election ticket. Only those candidates who are bona fide newscast is one or more presidential candidates and their running mates proposes. A maximum of 60 seconds of television and radio broadcast time can aid in making that essential process of informing the electorate.

Under section 315(a) of the Federal Communications Act, any broadcaster, who makes his facilities available to any one candidate for public office, must offer equal opportunities for the use of those broadcast facilities to all candidates of that same election ticket. Only those candidates who are bona fide newscasts have been exempt from this requirement. In theory, this method is expected to provide the access to broadcast exposure for political candidates. Testimony before the Senate Communications Subcommittee last year, however, indicated that, in practice, just the opposite is likely to occur.
coverage to Congress within 6 months after the campaign's conclusion. This information should be of valuable assistance in considering possible permanent revisions to section 315(a) at a later date.

Now let me emphasize, however, that a temporary suspension this year would not affect the fairness doctrine. Broadcasters would still have a definite obligation under this doctrine to make available a reasonable opportunity for the discussion of controversial issues of public importance.

Nor would my bill compel the broadcast networks to again stage presidential debates such as those held in 1960. Although it might be hoped that this would result, these decisions, including perhaps innovations with new broadcast formats yet untied, would be left to the private networks, their station affiliates and, of course, the candidates themselves once the nominating conventions have made their choices known.

What should certainly result, however, is a new discussion of essential national issues in this vital election year. My bill can help to make this possible and I urge its immediate enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3382) to suspend for the 1968 campaign the equal-time requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for nominees for the offices of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. Scott, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 3383—INTRODUCTION OF WHOLE-SOME POULTRY, EGGS, AND FISH PRODUCTS ACT OF 1968

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce today, for appropriate reference, the Wholesome Poultry, Eggs, and Fish Products Act of 1968.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3383) to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act in order to provide for mandatory inspection of all poultry and poultry products intended for human food, to provide a mandatory program for the inspection and grading of eggs and egg products, and for the mandatory inspection of fish and fish products, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Mondale, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this measure would amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to provide for mandatory inspection of all poultry and poultry products intended for human food, and provide a mandatory program for inspection of fish and fish products, and inspection and grading of eggs and egg products.

Mr. President, a quarter million or more Americans every year suffer needless disease, and even death from eating contaminated poultry, fish, and eggs.

And this quarter million is a conservative estimate, based on reported cases.

Most cases of food-born illness and death are not reported. The reports illustrate some of the dimensions of the problem: In the last 7 years, 10,609 Americans have been reported ill or dead because of diseases related to poultry, eggs, and fish. Of these cases, 7,593 were attributed to poultry, 1,466 to eggs, and 1,490 to fish.

In the same period, there were 11 reported deaths from botulism attributed to fish, two from smoked siceses, and nine from tambour, smoked whitefish, and whitefish chub.

In the last 5 years alone, 320 deaths have been associated with salmonellosis, much due to contaminated poultry, fish, and eggs.

Authorities emphasize that such statistics must be multiplied several hundred times to get any real estimate of the problem.

It has, for example, been estimated that more than 1 percent of the population becomes infected with salmonellosis from all sources, but that only 1 percent of the cases are reported to public health authorities.

Other diseases associated with poultry, eggs, and fish are caused by staphylococci, clostridium botulinum, clostridium perfringus, streptococci, shigella, infectious hepatitis, and paralytic shellfish poison.

The major cause of salmonellosis reported over the last decades has been living with domesticated animals. Animal feeds have been found heavily contaminated with salmonella. Eggs and egg products have been the principal source of reported outbreaks in the recent past.

Why does the count continue? The answer is to be found in the unsanitary practices of growers, processors, and retailers of poultry, fish, and eggs, inadequately regulated by existing Federal, State, or local programs.

According to the Public Health Service:

The accumulated knowledge strongly suggests that prevention of food borne illness from poultry, eggs, and fish requires a comprehensive system of controls throughout all intermediate steps of processing and distribution, to final preparation for serving.

No effective mechanism is available for achieving such a unified program of consumer protection that encompasses all the commercial enterprises and governmental agencies whose participation is necessary to reduce the health hazards to a practical minimum.

THE PROPOSED POULTRY AND FISH BILLS

In his consumer message, President Johnson recognized the problems existing in the poultry and fish industries. He included closing the gaps in the system of poultry inspection, and for "guarding the consumer's health against unwholesome fish." He subsequently had prepared two bills to carry out this work.

It is my feeling, however, that these measures could be strengthened.

The administration measures would include many of the provisions of the Meat Inspection Act to fish and poultry. This measure would extend immediate protection to the consumer.

Immediate authority is extended only to fish and poultry shipped in interstate commerce. Products shipped within a State may remain uninspected or inadequately inspected for 3, or in some cases 3 years before standards equal to Federal requirements would be required. The poultry measure would permit poultry exempted from Federal inspection to be shipped across State lines. It does not cover feed grains, an important source of contamination. Both bills leave out the key word "mandatory" which gave added strength to the meat inspection measure. The poultry inspection measure omits the annual review of State programs contained in the last bill to assure that once a State has been made responsible, it is, in fact, carrying out a program equal in strength to the national requirements. Advisory committees and programs fail to include both consumers and industry in the poultry bill, although the contribution of these two groups is included in the fish bill.

While the fish bill contains much more of the original intent of the meat measure, it too falls to "cover the waterfront," so to speak. Adequate inspection of fish and fish products, through all intermediate steps of processing and distribution, to final preparation for serving, is my feeling, however, that these

The bill to assure that once a State has been made responsible, it is, in fact, carrying out a program equal in strength to the national requirements. Advisory committees and programs fail to include both consumers and industry in the poultry bill, although the contribution of these two groups is included in the fish bill.

While the fish bill contains much more of the original intent of the meat measure, it too falls to "cover the waterfront," so to speak. Adequate inspection of fish and fish products, through all intermediate steps of processing and distribution, to final preparation for serving, is my feeling, however, that these
worth of poultry a year are exempted, even though these may send contaminated poultry to the consumer. And there is no rational waiting period before Federal inspectors can check intrastate plants when States do not intend to enforce inspection laws of their own. Finally, no measure yet before either House deals with the need for egg inspection.

The need for egg inspection

The fresh, unbroken hen’s egg is one of nature’s best protected raw foods. Usually, even when eggs are obtained from diseased flocks, the egg, and yolk remains intact during the incubation. The most problems begin when the shell is cracked.

In commercial processing, an occasional contaminated egg cannot always be detected, and may be mixed in with a large number of good eggs. If eggs are dirty, cracked, or otherwise mistreated, they may cause contamination.

Storage of whole eggs under warm and moist temperature favors microorganisms to penetrate the shell. Ideally, the breaking operation should allow rejection of dirty, low-weight, check eggs, and incubator rejects before they are mixed. However, this is often not the case.

The Food and Drug Administration, for example, cites case after case of the use of incubator rejects—eggs incubated at the incubator or which fail to terminate, or in which the fetus had died.

Increasing numbers of the things that we buy contain not freshly broken shell eggs, but frozen, dried, or powdered egg yolks and whites. The processing of eggs can leave much to be desired.

According to the Public Health Service, conditions in most egg processing plants allow many disease-bearing microorganisms to remain in the finished raw egg or egg products.

Unless pasteurization is used, Salmonella may remain throughout the processing operation. And even pasteurization may be inadequate, because the milk equipment adapted to egg processing may not do an adequate job.

The present inspection effort consists of food inspectors of the Federal Government. The USDA operates a continuous, voluntary inspection service. In this, they are joined by Food and Drug Administration representatives, conducting surveillance or spot check inspections as part of their overall responsibilities under existing laws. Under the USDA program, 65 percent of the total U.S. liquid and frozen egg production, and 72 percent of the dried egg production was inspected last year.

While the Food and Drug Administration does have the authority to inspect under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, its inspections are not continuous. Only 652 inspections were made in 536 plants in 1967, an average of a little over one during liquid and frozen egg production, and these on plants that shipped for interstate commerce.

Information on State programs indicates that they too are inadequate. The FDA have several laws applicable to egg products, although 36 States have general food-type sanitary laws, that cover processing of all foods, but do not specifically mention eggs. Several States have mandatory laws, and two States have a voluntary law covering egg products. There is tremendous variation, both in the content of all of these laws, and in how they are administered.

The FDA has inspected nearly 900 USDA plants, producing about 231,470,000 pounds of liquid or frozen products. While the USDA has not done a survey of the whole industry, for those plants that were inspec ted, a non-36erally inspected poultry and meat plants, evidence from my own State, and others, shows how badly a uniform, strong inspection system is needed.

I first became aware of the problem with non federally inspected broken egg processors when one of my constituents, Mr. James Kosmo, editor of the Edina Courier, brought to my attention the situation in Lonsdale, Minn. The FDA has seized 6,000 pounds of egg whites from the egg company in that town. The egg whites were found to contain Salmonella, fecal strep, and a coliform count more than 10 times that of raw sewage. The FDA report on the Lonsdale Egg Co., explained the reason for contamination: flies were reported to be feeding on empty cans that were filled with eggs: cleaning equipment that was self-contaminated from a hose left lying on the floor when it was not in use; an explosion, killing 6,000 eggs. The raw eggs ranged at a temperature of 65-67 degrees for 1 hour or more; employees taking sanitized empty cans from the floor, and stealing from the plant.

The people receiving these eggs in Iowa and Missouri were lucky they were shipped in interstate commerce, and that the FDA inspectors caught them. How do we guarantee the shipment of Salmonella to other States and within the State before these conditions were caught we will never know. For the Lonsdale plant was not under any kind of continuous inspection system.

These kinds of problems are not limited to Minnesota alone, of course. They exist across the United States.

In the spring of 1967, the Public Health Service, and local health officials, investigated the largest epidemic of salmonellosis in recent years in New York City. In one 3-week period, 14 outbreaks, with 3,646 reported cases were tallied among families who had attended bar mitzvah celebrations in the New York area. The Public Health Service estimates that the total number of persons ill ranged somewhere between 20,000 and 21,000 persons. The cause turned out to be frozen cream chiffonade dessert prepared from contaminated, unpasteurized frozen egg yolks distributed not only to New York, but throughout the Northeastern United States. The source of the problem was in the processing plant:

Eggs were automatically broken, the whites and yolks were separated, and frozen into buckets. Bits of egg shell often fell into the egg yolk and these were removed by hand, thus allowing ample opportunity for organisms on the outside of the shell to be inoculated into the yolk. . . . some amount of yolk or egg white remained present in the mixing tank for 1 hour or more of the working day, a period of seven hours . . . the egg breaking and mixing were done at room temperature. Multiple salmonella serotypes were found in the breaking equipment and in the yolk mixing and straining tanks. A great variety of salmonella serotypes were found in samples of the egg whites and frozen wastes on the freezer floor.

In the spring of 1967, the Public Health Service, and local health officials, investigated the largest epidemic of salmonellosis in recent years in New York City. In one 3-week period, 14 outbreaks, with 3,646 reported cases were tallied among families who had attended bar mitzvah celebrations in the New York area. The Public Health Service estimates that the total number of persons ill ranged somewhere between 20,000 and 21,000 persons. The cause turned out to be frozen cream chiffonade dessert prepared from contaminated, unpasteurized frozen egg yolks distributed not only to New York, but throughout the Northeastern United States. The source of the problem was in the processing plant:

Eggs were automatically broken, the whites and yolks were separated, and frozen into buckets. Bits of egg shell often fell into the egg yolk and these were removed by hand, thus allowing ample opportunity for organisms on the outside of the shell to be inoculated into the yolk. . . . some amount of yolk or egg white remained present in the mixing tank for 1 hour or more of the working day, a period of seven hours . . . the egg breaking and mixing were done at room temperature. Multiple salmonella serotypes were found in the breaking equipment and in the yolk mixing and straining tanks. A great variety of salmonella serotypes were found in samples of the egg whites and frozen wastes on the freezer floor.

The very generalized contamination of the environment, the machinery, and the employees in this processing plant for any product to be free of salmonella unless it was subsequently cooked or pasteurized.

But this did not happen, for the chiffonade was not cooked, nor were the eggs pasteurized before they were made into the dessert.

The Public Health Service report concluded:

This large outbreak resulted from the failure to control salmonella contamination at multiple points . . . 1) salmonella in the poultry feed leading to 3) salmonella in the children’s gastro intestinal tract, causing 5) salmonella in the finished bottled product; 6) salmonella in the refrigerated product of the shells of eggs; 4) use of “checkered” eggs which would be most likely to have salmonella penetration; 5) an egg breaking process which distributed the salmonella uniformly into all of the egg products and allowed for its growth; 6) mixing the unpasteurized egg yolk into the dessert product and allowing for further incubation, and 7) failure to cook the chiffonade mixture. The result was the contamination of the dessert. The outbreak might have been prevented by correction of the inadequate sanitary practices at any one of these points.

And it also pointed to the need for further uniform regulation of egg processing plants, within as well as outside States.

The FDA requires that all egg products shipped interstate be salmonella-free. The FDA and the USDA have begun a program to try and eliminate salmonella from animal feed. Such a federal regulation, however, has been held up because of the fact that the outbreak under consideration because many poultry feed given to the chickens were produced in the state in which they were used, and the egg product, frozen eggs, was not shipped interstate. The majority of the chiffonade dessert was also shipped interstate.

Here again, this is not an isolated instance. Other Public Health Service reports point to six persons infected from drinking eggnog in Illinois; an unknown number infected in Washington, D.C., from raw eggs; 268 persons ill after eating coconut cream pie with meringue in Michigan. All of these could be traced to contaminated cans from frozen egg white.

Considered eggs have caused widespread outbreaks of disease in infants because the eggs were inadequately pasteurized.

In the spring of 1964, Public Health Service investigations of an outbreak of food poisoning at a sorority dinner at the University of Utah discovered the cause to be banana-cream pie made from Salmonella-contaminated eggs. Sixty-six guests, waitresses, and kitchen employees became ill, and 10593 that they required hospitalization. Eighty-eighth cases were found at about the same time in other parts of Utah, and in Arkansas, Hawaii, Maryland, and Washington State. Three hundred and sixty-five persons were affected, and in 1965 in Washington State from Salmonella-tainted dried eggs they had received from the State surplus food program. The Public Health Service points out that the use of raw eggs in bakery goods such as eclairs, long johns, and in creamed soups repeatedly caused outbreaks of illness that have been traced back to the eggs.

And the count continues on.
The Public Health Service sums up the situation well:

The practical fact is...that conditions in most egg processing plants are as bad as they can be without inspection at all. While it takes much from the administration measures, it remedies the defects in the fish and poultry bills, and adds other provisions. It moves us toward that "uniform standards of sanitation" the Public Health Service and all of us believe is necessary to protect the well-being of the Nation.

The measure I introduce today represents an electric approach to resolving the problems not only in poultry and fish, but also in eggs. It is designed to provide for an exemption from Federal inspection. If the Secretary found evidence that the State would be able to carry out a program equal in consumer protection to the Federal inspection system, he could then work with the States. He could provide technical assistance to strengthen State programs, and supply up to 50 percent of the total cost of the inspection program. But the consumer would be protected at all times. If the Secretary found that State programs were inadequate, he would be empowered to move quickly to reassert Federal oversight. The Secretary could, of course, reexempt the State if and when the standards became sufficient again.

I think this flexible provision is essential in view of the fact that only five States now have active, mandatory poultry inspection laws, and that no State egg or fish programs are as extensive as would be required by the proposed measure. Adequate protection of the consumer cannot be achieved without uniform standards applying both to products shipped within States and across State lines.

The bill requires that mandatory programs be adopted for inspection of all poultry, fish, and eggs and their products. Exemptions are provided, but only in cases where evidence proves these to be absolutely essential. The Secretary is required to make the reasons for any additional exemptions available to the public.

The provision of the administration poultry bill making possible the shipment across State lines of inadequately inspected poultry and the egg or fish programs are as extensive as would be required by the consumer unaware that State requirements did not equal the Federal. The Federal-State inspection legend provision also is deleted. It was not in the last bill either, and raises serious problems.

My poultry title adds a provision not in the administration measures, providing for inspection of poultry feed, to protect the public from another potential problem. The fish title provides for technical and financial assistance to the fish industry to help it upgrade and modernize its operations to meet the requirements of the act, and for a more effective inspection arrangement.

The fish title also amends the administration import provisions, making them conform to the standards of the Meat Act.

My bill gives 1 year for study and development of standards for fish inspection. I do not see why we must wait for three.

Finally, my bill remedies numerous and serious gaps in the administration poultry and fish measures. Adequate inspection of vessels would be required as part of the fish program instead, rather than left to the discretion of the Secretary, as it is now. This added protection would be required to pay for administrative costs. Mr. President, the American consumer can wait no longer for adequate protection of protein products. This year in which spectacular progress is being made to prolong life through medical science seems the appropriate time to act to assure that the quality of life, the health of people, be protected as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of the legislation be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the section-by-section analysis of the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**Section 1. Amendments to the Poultry Products Inspection Act**

Section 101. Amendments.—

(1) Section 2 amends the legislative finding now in Section 2 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (PPIA) to support the provisions of the bill which affect interstate commerce.

(2) Section 3 of the PPIA is amended to delete reference to designated major con-
(3) Section 4 of the FPIA is amended to revise definitions of "commerce," "Secretary," "poultry products," "adulterated," "inspector," and "label," to delete the definitions of "official inspection mark," "wholesome," and "unwholesome," and to add numerous new definitions including "processed" and "misbranded." Definitions conform closely to those of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA). (a) The term "commerce" is amended to mean commerce within or between any State, territory, District of Columbia or within any territory not organized with a legislative body. (b) A definition of "State" (including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) is added. (c) A definition of "Territory" is added, including territories and possessions of the United States except the Canal Zone. (d) A definition of "United States" is added, covering all the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia. (e) The definition of "poultry" is extended to include domesticated birds that died otherwise than by slaughter. (f) The definition of "poultry product" is clarified and extended to include New York dressed poultry under the coverage of the Act. (g) A definition for "poultry products under FMIA, except for the phrase "capable of use as human food" quoted elsewhere in the Act. (h) The definition for "adulterated" is amended to conform to the FMIA except for non-substantive changes and other changes to make it applicable to poultry products. (i) The definition for "misbranded" is amended to conform generally to the FMIA except for changes to make it applicable to poultry products. (j) The term "Secretary" is redefined to include the Secretary of Agriculture himself as well as the Secretary of Agriculture. (k) A grammatical change is made in the definition of "person." (l) The definition of "inspector" is changed to include reference to employees or officials of a Territory, the District of Columbia, as well as of a State, or the United States. (m) A definition for the term "official mark" is added, broader than the "official inspection legend." (n) The term "official inspection legend" is substituted for "official inspection mark" in paragraph 19. (o) The terms "official certificate" and "official device" are added to conform to the FMIA. (p) and (q) There is no change in the definitions of "official establishment" or "inspection service." (r) A grammatical change is made in the definition of "container" or "package." (s) "Label" is redefined to include written, graphic, or graphic matter upon articles as well as matter upon the immediate container. The definition of "labeling" is added in conformity with the FMIA. (t) and (u) No change is made in the definition of "shipping container" and "immediate container." (v) A definition for "capable of use as human food" is added in conformity with the FMIA. (w) A definition of "processed" is added, adapted from the FMIA for poultry. (x) and (y) Definitions of "Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act," "pesticide chemical," and related terms are added identical with the definitions of FMIA. (z) (aa) "Package Broker," "renderer," and "animal food manufacturer" are added to conform to the definitions of the FMIA to make them apply to poultry. (4) Section 5 is amended to provide for the cooperation, assistance, and advice of appropriate State agencies and other departments of the Federal Government, deleting present provisions in Section 5 of the Act for designation of major consuming areas for intrastate activities. (5) Section 6 of the Act is amended to provide for the protection of the consumer from adulterated and misbranded poultry and poultry products through increasing effectiveness of the program. (a) The Secretary is authorized to enter into arrangements with State agencies, and other departments and agencies of the Federal Government to carry out the provisions of the Act. (b) The Secretary is authorized to appoint advisory committees composed of representatives of State agencies, consumers, and the poultry industry to advise him concerning means to increasing effectiveness of the program. Committees must include a majority of consumers. Notice shall be given of meetings, and minutes or transcripts kept. (c) The Secretary is authorized to develop or arrange for training programs for personnel engaged in carrying out programs under the Act, and education programs for those in industry, and other related educational activities. (d) The Secretary is authorized to use by agreement the officers, employees and facilities of any State and Federal agencies. (1) Upon application by the Governor, the Secretary is authorized to exempt from the provisions of this Act states which have State laws at least equal in scope and content to the Federal laws, as well as such other characteristics as are prescribed by the Secretary. (2) The Secretary is authorized to provide exempted States with advisory assistance, technical and laboratory assistance, training, financial, and other aid for administration of the program. The Federal contribution is not to exceed 50% of the total cost of the cooperative program, with the States providing the remaining 50%. (2) This section specifies that the State agency with which the Secretary may cooperate may include State and municipal or other subordinate government units when these are involved in activities under the Act. (4) The Secretary is authorized to terminate exemptions of States upon finding that they are failing to administer the program in conformity with the Federal laws, as well as such other characteristics as are prescribed by the Secretary. (5) Section 7 is amended editorially to conform to other amendments. (f) The definition of "poultry products," principally paragraphs 8(b) and 9(a) of the Act, which excludes authority to prevent use of containers and labeling required under the Act, is amended to conform generally to the FMIA, except for editorial changes. In paragraph 8(b) the definition closely resembles that for "pesticide products that have not been inspected.") (g) The sale of articles subject to the Act under false or misleading form or size is prohibited. The use of approved labeling and containers is authorized. A few minor provisions are in present paragraph 8(b). (h) The definition is authorized to order labeling of containers be withheld from use if there is reason to believe that they are false or misleading, and to provide for administrative hearing and judicial review. This provision is essentially the same as in paragraph 8(h) of the present Act, except that it includes authority to prevent use of containers of false or misleading form or size. (i) Section 8 is amended to delete the principal prohibition now in the Act, and substitute prohibitions like those in the FMIA. (j) Other changes to conform generally to the FMIA plus others adapted from the present FPIA, and to make necessary editorial changes. Under the revised section it would be unlawful to: (1) Slaughter or process poultry and poultry products incapable of use as human food except in compliance with the requirements of the Act. (This clarifies a prohibition now in paragraph 9(a) of the Act with respect to processing.) (2) Introduce or deliver for introduction, sell, or transport poultry or poultry products that have not been inspected. (3) Adulterate or misbrand poultry products incapable of use as human food for sale or transportation or hold for sale. (Clause 2(A) and Clause 5 replace comparable prohibitions in paragraphs 9(a) and (b), and (d) and Section 10 of the present Act with respect to mislabeled or unwhole­ somely processed poultry articles, and extends coverage into areas now void in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Clause 5(b) (3) preserves prohibitions now in paragraph 10) requiring distribution of poultry products that have not been inspected.) (4) Sell, transport, offer for sale or transportation, or hold for sale poultry or poultry products not complying with labeling require­ ment unless they have been inspected and passed. (5) Adulterate or misbrand poultry products capable of use as human food while they are being held for storage or for trans­ portation of storage held for sale. (Clause 2(A) and Clause 5 replace comparable prohibitions in paragraphs 9(a) and (b), and (d) and Section 10 of the present Act with respect to mislabeled or unwhole­ somely processed poultry articles, and extends coverage into areas now void in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Clause 5(b) (3) preserves prohibitions now in paragraph 10) requiring distribution of poultry products that have not been inspected.) (6) Use his own advantage or reveal except under certain conditions, information which was given to protection as a trade secret. (This clarifies a prohibition now in the Act prohibiting the dissemination of information protected under paragraph 9(h) of the Act.) (7), (8), (9), (10) Make, simulate, forge,
alter, counterfeit, possess, alter, detach, de-
face or destroy official marks, devices, or cer-
tificates, except as authorized by the
Secretary.
(10) Knowingly possess any of the above,
without notifying the Secretary or his rep-
resentatives, except as authorized by the
Secretary.
(11) Make false statements on certificates;
(12) Knowingly represent that an article has
been inspected and passed or exempted
when it has not.

Paragraphs 6–12 clarify and expand upon prohibitions contained in paragraphs (e) and
(f) of the Act, which contain similar
provisions, except as to false statements in
certificates.

Section 10 is amended to conform to
other amendments.

Section 11 is amended to delete the
present record requirements, and substitute
the records and other provisions of Title 11
of the FMIA.

(a) A new paragraph is added, limiting in-
spection of poultry under the Act to poultry
products intended for use as human food.
Denaturing or other identification is required
for products not for human consumption before
sale, unless declared or inspected.

(b) A new paragraph requires record-
keeping and full and correct disclosure of
business transactions by those who slaughter,
process, freeze, package, label, buy, sell, trans-
port, deliver, store, ship, import, receive or
render poultry and poultry products. In ad-
dition, meat inspectors and such slaughter-
tories would be required to give access to repre-
sentatives of the Secretary to their places of
business, books, records, documents, files, and
registers, and to take samples of their inven-
tories upon payment, whether under the Act,
or when it has been permitted by the Secretary.

(c) A new paragraph would authorize the
Secretary to require registration of persons
engaged in business as poultry or poultry
products manufacturers, animal feed
manufacturers, wholesalers or public ware-
housemen of poultry carcasses, etc., and
persons engaged in the business of selling,
de-laying or transporting or importing 4 D (dead,
dying, diseased, disabled) or parts of car-
casses of poultry that died otherwise than by
slaughter.

(d) A new paragraph would prohibit those
mentioned in (c) above from making busi-
ness transactions in accordance with the
Secretary's regulations.

(13) The Heading of Section 11 is amended
to read: "Standards for Storage and Hand-
ing: Rules and Regulations."

(14) Section 12 relating to penalties is amended
by substituting provisions adapted from
Section 501 of the Act, and paragraph (b) is re-
edited in changes in paragraph 12 (b); and
by adding as 12 (c) prohibitions and penalties
like those in Section 408 of the PPIA relating
to forcible assaults, etc. against persons
engaged in business as persons who slaughter,
process, freeze, package, label, buy, sell, trans-
port, deliver, store, ship, import, receive or
render poultry and poultry products.

(15) The heading of Section 14 is amended
to read: "Standards for Storage and Hand-
ling: Rules and Regulations."

(17) Section 18 relating to exemptions is amended
by (a) deleting the poultry pro-
ducer exemption authority now contained in
paragraph 18 (a) (1) (a more restricted ex-
emption is provided in new paragraph 18 (a) (c));
(b) deleting the exemption authority
given by the Secretary by Section 18 (a) (3) in
cases of impracticability;
(c) preserving and redesignating as para-
graph (a) (1) the exemption authority to
retail dealers now contained in paragraph
18 (a) (2); redesignating as paragraph 18 (a)
(2) the religious exemption provisions now
contained in paragraph 18 (a) (4); (d) redesignating paragraph (b) relating to suspension or termina-
tion of exemptions and adding new para-
graphs (b) (1) to (e) to the Act;
(e) exempt from inspection slaughter of poultry and
processing of poultry products in any un-
derstanding thereafter when he finds it is impractical to pro-
scribe such inspections. (This is the same as para-
grap hes 20 (c) and (d) of the FMIA except for editorial changes.)

(5) The Secretary may exclude from the inspection requirements of the Act
slaughter and processing by persons using products of
their own raising, for use by them, their
family, their nonpaying guests and em-
ployees; and custom slaughterers who do not
engage in buying or selling poultry products
for human food. (This is the same as para-
grap hes 20 (c) and (d) of the FMIA except for editorial changes.)

(6) The adulteration and misbranding provisions apply to articles exempted or ex-
cluded from the inspection requirements.

(a) A subsection states that under such
regulations as the Secretary may prescribe
Section 20 (c) of the FMIA would be
amended to conform to the Act.

(b) A new subsection states that
Section 20 (f) of the FMIA would be
amended to give the
Secretary to refuse
importation of poultry
products into
commerce. An exception is made for imports
which the cost of inspection shall be borne
by the United States.

(c) A new provision would call for judicial
reviews of orders in proceedings within para-
graphs (a) and (b).

(21) The first sentence of Section 19 is amended
to read: "Authority of Secretary To Refuse
Inspection Service."

23, 1968
a) The Secretary is authorized and di-
rected to formulate and carry out an ins-
spection and grading program for all eggs
and egg products intended for human con-
sumption, whether they are in interstate, or
foreign commerce, or travel through intra-
state commerce.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to quar-
antine, segregate, seize, or re-inspect such
products when he considers it necessary.

(c) In order to prevent the sale or trans-
portation of eggs capable of use as human
food, and to require the labeling, inspection,
re-inspection, re-segregation, or re-seizure
or destruction of such eggs, the Secretary
shall:

1. Promulgate standards and regulations
for the grading of eggs; and require all
such eggs to be graded in accordance
with such standards and regulations.

2. Promulgate regulations to prohibit
purchase, except when denatured or dechar-
acterized; and

3. Promulgate regulations to prohibit
the possession or use of such eggs by
restaurants, other food service and food
manufacturing plants.

(d) Any person who is authorized to pro-
sell eggs to consumers of incubator re-
cets, the Secretary shall notify such
in-pect hatcheries and other establishments,
to present eggs of such eggs as eggs of
human food, and to require the labeling,
inspection, re-inspection, segregation,
re-segregation, or re-seizure or destruction
of such eggs. The Secretary shall:

1. Promulgate any regulations neces-
sary to compel the sale of such eggs;
and see that such eggs are inspected;

2. Promulgate regulations to prohibit
purchase, except when denatured or dechar-
acterized;

3. Promulgate regulations to prohibit
the possession or use of such eggs by
restaurants, other food service and food
manufacturing plants;

4. No establishment processing egg prod-
ducts, for the sale of which it is nec-
sary to re-inspect or grade to establish-
ments whose

5. No provisions of this section are to con-
trary to or derogate from other con-
vention, or to suspend or modify the
States, or to or suspend or modify the
power of any State, District of Columbia,
or any other establishment, or to or suspend or modify the
power of any State, District of Columbia,
or any other establishment, to or suspend or modify the
power of any State, District of Columbia,
or any other establishment, to or suspend or modify the
power of any State, District of Columbia,
or any other establishment, to or suspend or modify the
power of any State, District of Columbia,
Section 202. Rules and Regulations: Appropriations. -Like Section 20 of the Poultry Product Inspection Act, this section provides for appropriated funds for reading and regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of the Title.

Section 222. Separability of Provisions. - As does Section 102 of this Act, this provision contains the usual saving clause concerning the validity of remaining portions of the Act should any part of it become invalid.

Section 223. Effective Date. - The Title takes effect immediately upon enactment, except that it does not become effective for eighteen months after the President signs it. No person whose applications for inspection are approved in the meantime, the voluntary inspection and grading in effect under the Agricultural Marketing Act is to continue in effect.

TITLe III. - MANDATORY INSPECTION OF FISH AND FISH PRODUCTS

Section 203. Enforcement of Findings and Purpose. - In order to protect the consuming public, avoid adverse effects on marketing of fish, and avoid losses to fishermen and processors, it is necessary to provide for mandatory inspection programs for fish and fish products, whether or not they enter into the channels of interstate or foreign commerce.

Section 302. Definitions. - The definition section is written to conform to the amended definition section of Title I, with editorial changes and definitional changes needed to make the section apply to fish and fish products.

(a) "Fish" is defined to mean any aquatic animal including amphibians or part thereof capable of use as human food.

(b) "Product" is defined to mean any product capable of use as human food which is made wholly or in part from fish or parts thereof, except those products exempted from the definition as a fish product.

(c) The terms "processed" and "processing" mean the harvesting, handling, storing, preparing, manufacturing, packing, storing, or holding of any fish or fish product.

(d) The term "fishing vessel" means watercraft involved in landing and processing fish for human consumption.

Section 303. Authorization for fish and fish product inspection; Establishment of Task Force. - (a) The Secretary is authorized to develop a comprehensive inspection program for fish and fish products.

(b) The Secretary is authorized within thirty days of enactment to convene a task force consisting of the representatives of relevant Federal agencies, the fishing industry, and other interested parties.

(c) The Task Force will, within six months, formulate a program providing for the mandatory inspection of domestic fish and fish products. The program shall include:

(1) Minimum standards or requirements for sanitation, equipment, and practices for fish handling, fish processing, and fish products that are not adulterated, misbranded, and are suitable for human consumption.

(2) Minimum standards of quality and good manufacturing processes for processing of fish, fishery products, and fish products.

(3) Continuous inspection of fish processing plants, and adequate inspection of domestic fishing vessels;

(4) Measures for assuring that imported fish products meet the standards and requirements applicable to domestic fish;

(5) The Secretary shall promulgate regulations in the Federal Register not more than six months after the date of enactment of this Title.

Section 304. Effective Date for Inspection Program. - The program shall become effective six months after the regulations are published.

Section 305. Powers for Administration and Enforcement of the Inspection Program. - The Secretary of Agriculture is given the following powers:

(a) Inspection. - The Secretary is authorized to inspect vessels, fishing vessels, and establishments, and to quarantine, segregate, seize, or inspect such products as he deems necessary. Inspectors shall have access to establishments and vessels.

(b) Sanitation, Facilities, and Practices. - This section is patterned after Section 204, Title II.

(1) Official establishments and fishing vessels to be inspected are required to operate under such practices and regulations as are established to maintain the same standards and regulations as determined after thirty days, no person shall process fish or fish products unless such a certificate is in effect. Certification is to be issued by the Secretary.

(c) Certification. - The Secretary is to issue certificates of registration, upon application by vessels and processors, and assurance that standards will be maintained. After thirty days, no person shall process fish or fish products unless such a certificate is in effect.

(d) Withdrawal, Suspension and Reinstatement of Certificates. - Withdrawal of registration is permitted for failure to pay for inspection, or to comply with any order for condemnation or detention, or where imminent hazard to the consumer might result from continuing to operate.
LIKE SECTION 222, TITLE II AND TO REMAIN IN EFFECT UNTIL THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE REST OF THE TITLE WILL REMAIN IN FORCE. THE STATUTE IS HELD INVALID, THE PROVISIONS OF WHICH APPEARS UNDER A SEPARATE HEAD- 

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS 

MR. FULBRIGHT, Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have the honor to announce that today the Senate received the following nomination:

G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Philippines.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

SERVICEMEN SHOULD BE PROTECTED AGAINST SLICK OPERATORS 

MR. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, even in Vietnam where more than 25,000 American soldiers have been killed in combat, died of wounds and also many have died from hepatitis, plague, and other jungle diseases; and more than 135,000 have become ill due to combat, yet high-ranking Army officers have permitted some of our American slicksters, unscrupulous salesmen, and smooth un­ successful operators to defraud service­ men. For example, scores of American civilians are engaged in selling stocks to servicemen most of whom have very lim­ ited credit sources. On some occasions those who pocket stock certificates are specula­ tive and of little or no real value. Un­ fortunately, in some areas officers pocket a 2-per cent commission on every sale, supposedly doing this to build up funds for the officers' or enlisted men's clubs. Such financial arrangements should not be tolerated unless fully disclosed to all personnel. A slippery automobile broker was authorized by Air Force officers in Vietnam to take orders for new and used guarantee delivery of the automobile for which the serviceman had paid to the address requested in the United States. GI's with overseas service expiring a few months after the end of hostilities, yet, after receiving the purchase price of the desired automobile, pocketed thousands of dollars and then skipped out. Those unfortunate GI's landing in San Francisco will be poorer, wiser—but still walking.

The Secretary of Defense and the generals commanding in Thailand, Vietnam, and elsewhere overseas should bar such operators or at least thoroughly investig­ ate finance companies, sales organiza­ tions and individuals seeking to separate GI's on payday from whatever is left over from the all-American dependents. Officials of the Defense Department have a definite obligation to provide protection for our officers and men serving their country overseas and in bases in this country.

A surety bond in the sum of at least $100,000 should be required to be posted for every salesman, or solicitor, so em­ ployed. This would afford some protec­ tion to our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines. Any officer permitting salesmen...
to be defrauded by ruthless shysters and unscrupulous salesmen should be court-martialed. Creditors and collectors seeking to defraud our servicemen or to compel them to part with a part of their pay to pay for purchases or debts they incurred should be barred from military bases. Soldiers serving overseas very definitely must be protected.

CIVIL DEFENSE $10 MILLION EXTRAVAGANCE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, last Thursday I denounced the fact that officials in the civil defense division in the Department of Defense had wasted millions of dollars of taxpayers' money in the mailing to millions of citizens of a silly and ridiculous "Home Survey Questionnaire." Supposedly this will enable these high-salaried bureaucrats to inform a homeowner as to how well protected he is in event of a nuclear attack. They know, or should know, as any thinking person does know, that there is no real defense against atomic missiles except for our tremendous power of immediate retaliation and offense with more powerful nuclear intercontinental ballistic missiles aimed at targets within the aggressor nation.

The fact is, that not only do they detract from our national defense effort by utterly wasting taxpayers' money, but also foster the illusion that there is such a thing as a defense against the hydrogen bomb and other deadly atomic weapons. To continue doing this is to render a disservice to all Americans except for those few civil defense characters in the Department of Defense who enjoy fancy salaries while sitting around sending messages to each other and devising costless schemes and fancy propaganda pamphlets while waiting for the bomb to drop.

It would be far better to spend this money in attempts to avert a nuclear holocaust than in absurd little schemes concocted by civil defense bureaucrats who have nothing better to do with their time than to formulate such absurdities. The Nation would be better served if the money were spent for improving homes in slum areas, for the Headstart program for underprivileged children, or any one of dozens of other projects to improve the welfare of millions of Americans.

This propaganda for fallout shelters is a relic of the era a few years ago that included ridiculous evacuation plans in event of a nuclear attack. These high-salaried civil defense bureaucrats have wasted millions of dollars on food and medical supplies in holes in the ground and in basements, termed fallout shelters, and in countless other insane and wasteful boondoggles.

Mr. President, in the Washington Post of April 22, 1968, there appeared an excellent and very thoughtful editorial entitled "Ten Million Dollar Misunderstanding," offering a critical look at this latest folly by civil defense officials. I commend this to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point as part of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 22, 1968]

TEN MILLION DOLLAR MISUNDERSTANDING

On the face of it, there is nothing objectionable in the Army's "Office of Civil Defense" asking two million Washington, Maryland, and Virginia families to fill out a "Home Survey Questionnaire." The promise is that by reporting whether your row house is an end or an inner unit, and how high your basement is, you will learn how well protected from radioactive fallout you would be in a nuclear attack. Does this not strike you as minimal prudence in our dangerous times?

The answer, regretfully, is no. The questionnaire reflects not planning and safety but bureaucratic momentum and illusion. After working through the shelter scarf of the early Kennedy years, the country concluded—wisely—that national security could not be found in your basement or in a pit in your back yard. This conclusion was registered in a Congressional-Executive decision to make the shelter program voluntary. Fallout shelters, even if effective against fallout, would not protect against blizz or fire storm. Their cost threatened to be immense, raising the cost threatened to be immense, raising the cost threatened to be immense. The Government should not be asking us how we as individuals have defused the political bombs which might explode in war, and in mutual Soviet-American relations.

Yet the Army has spent upward of $10 million on the shelter "inventory" now reaching these environs. Most homes surveyed have been in the less populous areas—although, with missiles buried, the targets are everywhere. Most of these homes have been labeled "improvable," although the Government has done nothing to "improve" them except mail back a booklet.

Concern for shelters is a relic of our fears in an earlier phase of the nuclear age. We have since come to better terms with our hydrogen bomb and other deadly atomic weapon, by signaling the enemy a decision to terrorize by signaling the enemy a decision to terrorize by signaling the enemy a decision to terrorize. In war, and in mutual Soviet-American relations.

The Nation would be better served if the Government what it has done to avert it.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will proceed 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.

EQUIPMENT INDEBTEDNESS OF WATER CARRIERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1076, S. 913.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 913) to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act relating to water carriers (49 U.S.C. 901 et seq.), as amended by—

(1) redesigning section 323 (49 U.S.C. 929) as section 324;

(2) inserting therein, immediately after section 322 (49 U.S.C. 932), the following new section:

"RECORDING OF EVIDENCE OF EQUIPMENT INDEBTEDNESS "Sec. 332. Any mortgage (except mortgages under the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, as amended), lease, equipment trust agreement, conditional sale agreement, or other instrument evidencing the mortgage, lease, conditional sale, or bailment of one or more vessels, used or intended for use in interstate commerce by a carrier, whether or not subject to this part, or any assignment of rights or interest under any such instrument, or any assignment of such instrument or assignment (including any release, discharge, or satisfaction thereof), or any instrument in evidence of the Commission, provided such instrument, assignment, supplement, or amendment is executed, acknowledged, or verified in accordance with such requirements as the Commission shall prescribe, and any such instrument or other document, when so filed with the Commission, shall constitute notice to and shall be valid and enforceable against any person including, without limitation, any purchaser from, or mortgagee, creditor, receiver, or trustee in bankruptcy of, the mortgagee, the lessee, the equipment trustor, or the conditional seller, having a vessel or vessels covered thereby, from and after the time such instrument or other document is so filed with the Commission; and such instrument or other document need not be otherwise filed, deposited, registered, or recorded under the provisions of any other law of the United States or of any State (or political subdivision thereof), territory, district, or possession thereof, respecting the recording or旮struction of such instrument or document: Provided, however, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to alter or amend the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, as amended. The Commission shall establish and maintain a system for the recording of each such instrument or document, filed pursuant to the provisions of this section, and shall cause to..."
The purposes of S. 913 is to assist the water carrier industry in the modernization of its floating equipment to better serve the public by enabling such carriers to utilize equipment trust certificate financing to take possession of such equipment. The amendment provides similar to section 5 of S. 913, would make the equipment trust certificate financing available to the water carrier industry by this proposed legislation. The proposed amendment to part III of the Interstate Commerce Act would provide for the recording with the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the same manner as equipment trust certificates of the railroads are presently recorded with that Commission, in section (2) which was added in 1957 to cover rail carrier equipment. The proposed amendment would be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amendment was agreed to en bloc.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and adopted en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amended bill is ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

PURPOSE

The purposes of S. 913 is to assist the water carrier industry in the modernization of its floating equipment to better serve the public by enabling such carriers to utilize equipment trust certificate financing to take possession of such equipment, which is leased, subleased, or conditionally sold to any water carrier to take possession of such equipment if the terms of such lease or conditional sale so provide. This provision is similar to section 5 of S. 913, which provides for similar protection to the owners of aircraft, aircraft parts, and equipment subject to the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Similar protection is also afforded the owner of railroad equipment under section 77(j) of the Bankruptcy Act, 11 U.S.C. 205(j).

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The committee is advised that the water carrier industry, having substantial capital expenditures for the replacement of obsolete towboats and barges to provide equipment which is more modern and efficient towboat and barge equipment, will be considered en bloc.

The committee is advised that the water carrier industry has substantial capital expenditures for the replacement of obsolete towboats and barges to provide equipment which is more modern and efficient towboat and barge equipment. Legislation similar to S. 913 was enacted into law on August 9, 1967.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration, including Mr. Byrd, be permitted to all documents and financial information regarding the purposes and proposed amendments of S. 913.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amended bill is ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

PURPOSE

The purposes of S. 913 is to assist the water carrier industry in the modernization of its floating equipment to better serve the public by enabling such carriers to utilize equipment trust certificate financing to take possession of such equipment, which is leased, subleased, or conditionally sold to any water carrier to take possession of such equipment if the terms of such lease or conditional sale so provide. This provision is similar to section 5 of S. 913, which provides for similar protection to the owners of aircraft, aircraft parts, and equipment subject to the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Similar protection is also afforded the owner of railroad equipment under section 77(j) of the Bankruptcy Act, 11 U.S.C. 205(j).

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The committee is advised that the water carrier industry, having substantial capital expenditures for the replacement of obsolete towboats and barges to provide equipment which is more modern and efficient towboat and barge equipment, will be considered en bloc.

The committee is advised that the water carrier industry has substantial capital expenditures for the replacement of obsolete towboats and barges to provide equipment which is more modern and efficient towboat and barge equipment. Legislation similar to S. 913 was enacted into law on August 9, 1967.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration, including Mr. Byrd, be permitted to all documents and financial information regarding the purposes and proposed amendments of S. 913.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amended bill is ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

PURPOSE

The purposes of S. 913 is to assist the water carrier industry in the modernization of its floating equipment to better serve the public by enabling such carriers to utilize equipment trust certificate financing to take possession of such equipment, which is leased, subleased, or conditionally sold to any water carrier to take possession of such equipment if the terms of such lease or conditional sale so provide. This provision is similar to section 5 of S. 913, which provides for similar protection to the owners of aircraft, aircraft parts, and equipment subject to the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Similar protection is also afforded the owner of railroad equipment under section 77(j) of the Bankruptcy Act, 11 U.S.C. 205(j).

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The committee is advised that the water carrier industry, having substantial capital expenditures for the replacement of obsolete towboats and barges to provide equipment which is more modern and efficient towboat and barge equipment, will be considered en bloc.

The committee is advised that the water carrier industry has substantial capital expenditures for the replacement of obsolete towboats and barges to provide equipment which is more modern and efficient towboat and barge equipment. Legislation similar to S. 913 was enacted into law on August 9, 1967.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration, including Mr. Byrd, be permitted to all documents and financial information regarding the purposes and proposed amendments of S. 913.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amended bill is ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

PURPOSE

The purposes of S. 913 is to assist the water carrier industry in the modernization of its floating equipment to better serve the public by enabling such carriers to utilize equipment trust certificate financing to take possession of such equipment, which is leased, subleased, or conditionally sold to any water carrier to take possession of such equipment if the terms of such lease or conditional sale so provide. This provision is similar to section 5 of S. 913, which provides for similar protection to the owners of aircraft, aircraft parts, and equipment subject to the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Similar protection is also afforded the owner of railroad equipment under section 77(j) of the Bankruptcy Act, 11 U.S.C. 205(j).

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The committee is advised that the water carrier industry, having substantial capital expenditures for the replacement of obsolete towboats and barges to provide equipment which is more modern and efficient towboat and barge equipment, will be considered en bloc.

The committee is advised that the water carrier industry has substantial capital expenditures for the replacement of obsolete towboats and barges to provide equipment which is more modern and efficient towboat and barge equipment. Legislation similar to S. 913 was enacted into law on August 9, 1967.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration, including Mr. Byrd, be permitted to all documents and financial information regarding the purposes and proposed amendments of S. 913.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amended bill is ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

PURPOSE

The purposes of S. 913 is to assist the water carrier industry in the modernization of its floating equipment to better serve the public by enabling such carriers to utilize equipment trust certificate financing to take possession of such equipment, which is leased, subleased, or conditionally sold to any water carrier to take possession of such equipment if the terms of such lease or conditional sale so provide. This provision is similar to section 5 of S. 913, which provides for similar protection to the owners of aircraft, aircraft parts, and equipment subject to the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Similar protection is also afforded the owner of railroad equipment under section 77(j) of the Bankruptcy Act, 11 U.S.C. 205(j).

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The committee is advised that the water carrier industry, having substantial capital expenditures for the replacement of obsolete towboats and barges to provide equipment which is more modern and efficient towboat and barge equipment, will be considered en bloc.

The committee is advised that the water carrier industry has substantial capital expenditures for the replacement of obsolete towboats and barges to provide equipment which is more modern and efficient towboat and barge equipment. Legislation similar to S. 913 was enacted into law on August 9, 1967.
Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

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.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON’S DECISION NOT TO RUN FOR REELECTION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. President, like most other Americans, I believe that President Johnson has demonstrated his great personal and moral qualities in his decision not to seek or accept re-election for another term as President.

In his action, the President showed to all in this great country that he is a man who is willing to subordinate or discard all personal ambition for the sake of peace and brotherhood.

He has the prayers and best wishes of his fellow countrymen, particularly as he goes on to perform the difficult task of making the peace in Southeast Asia.

In the April 14, 1968, edition of the Shreveport (La.) Times, the distinguished journalist, Raymond Moley, a man whom I respect and with whom I have discussed the exigencies of the Presidency, speaks for the country when he recommends that we "suspend cynicism and grant this man an honored departure from public life."

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Moley's recent article be printed in the Record.

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

[From the Shreveport Times, Apr. 14, 1968]

NATION OWES IT—PROUDLY

BY RAYMOND MOLEY

In all the news and comment that has followed the President's announcement of his plan to retire, very little attention has been given to the purely personal and human side of his decision. Perhaps that lack is due to the cynicism that marks our appraisal of the motives of all politicians. And because anyone who speaks demands upon those who aspire to or hold public office border on cruelty. We compel them to fulfill. To be heard in public meetings or over the airwaves but to be seen, touched, questioned unmercifully and hauled about the country like a dead whale on a flat car.

The Piece Paid

Once in office, they are persecuted by people demanding jobs and benefits far beyond the available means. They are abused and threatened by greedy supplicants for favors. Everyone is seeking something that belongs to someone else. We expect our public servants to bear the brunt of the public's mood with a small basket of loaves and fishes.

That is the normal pattern of public life. But these are not normal times. Grave issues disturb the public—perhaps more than ever been seen since the Civil War. And since power centers in the President, he would have to bear the more crushing burden in a campaign for renomination and re-election.

His choice would be great this year not by the normal cheering partisan throngs, but by angry demonstrations. And beyond that there would be the threat that if he were to come he would be recalled, face four years with a Congress dominated by a divided party and possibly by a majority that he would not command. Thus, the price of the glory of another term would be excessive, and such glory as might come from vindication at the polls would be diminished by ultimate frustration and perhaps failure at the end. Such an ordeal might damage not only Mr. Johnson's physical capability. He will be 60 in August. He has spent 57 of those years in the turmoil of Washington's high political office and honors well beyond any of his contemporaries. He is also an emotional and personal jurisdiction of the states in the management of fish and resident wildlife. This gradual usufruct of its authority has been achieved through the continuing trend toward Federal intrusion into the historic and traditional areas of state sovereignty. It is true that the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, dated December 1, 1964, which stated, in effect, that the Federal Government, has not foreclosed the right of the states in managing and regulating all fish and wildlife on Federal lands.

If the Federal Government's claim of authority over fish and resident wildlife prevails, then private landowners could confront the continuing trend toward Federal intrusion into the historic and traditional areas of state sovereignty. The authority of the states in the management of fish and resident wildlife would be destroyed. It is the firm and unqualified conviction of the Association that the ownership of land does not include the ownership of fish and wildlife as claimed by the Federal Government. Such a doctrine would have an extremely adverse and chaotic effect on the management of fish and wildlife resources in all the United States.

Since the Solicitor's opinion was issued, all efforts to resolve this controversy through agreement with the Department of the Interior have, thus far, been unsuccessful. Therefore, legislation has been introduced in the Congress of the United States to reaffirm the traditional rights of the states to the ownership, management and regulation of fish and resident wildlife.

Attempting to resolve this dispute, it should be emphasized and made abundantly clear that the International Association does not seek to change the present status of certain laws and concepts which have to do with the following:

1. Any international treaty involving the regulation of migratory birds and the time honored principle of state ownership, regulation and management of fish and resident wildlife.

2. The Rare and Endangered Species Act.

3. The Bald Eagle Act.

4. Rights of Indians and natives of Alaska to hunt and fish as established by treaties or Acts of the Congress.

5. The management of lands or control over fishing on lands owned by the Federal Government.

6. The Federal responsibility for conserving and developing fish and wildlife habitat on Federal lands.

The International Association fully subscribes to the traditional right of a landowner to manage his lands. We agree that the Federal Government has the same rights that any other landowner has under the laws of the respective states.

In summary, the International Association believes that it is imperative that the Congress take prompt action to resolve this jurisdictional controversy. The Association firmly supports the rights of the states to manage, regulate and control fish and resident wildlife on all lands, including those owned by the Federal Government, with certain exceptions. Such a declaration of national policy by the Congress would enable states and Federal advisory committees to once again unite and present the common front so vitally needed in the management of the Nation's fish and wildlife resources.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I am a co-sponsor of S. 2951 and S. 3212, both of which would clarify questions of jurisdiction over resident species of fish and wildlife. This question is rapidly coming to the head and it is my opinion that Congress should act as soon as possible to resolve it. Walter Shannon, of California, the president of the International Association of Game, Fish & Conservation Commissioners, in a statement at the 33rd North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference held in Houston, Tex., on March 13, 1968.

The purpose of the statement was to point out the following:

THE OWNERSHIP OF WILDLIFE—A JURISDICTION CONTROVERSY WHICH NEEDS TO BE CLEARED UP

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I am a co-sponsor of S. 2951 and S. 3212, both of which would clarify questions of jurisdiction over resident species of fish and wildlife. This question is rapidly coming to the head and it is my opinion that Congress should act as soon as possible to resolve it. Walter Shannon, of California, the president of the International Association of Game, Fish & Conservation Commissioners, in a statement at the 33rd North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference held in Houston, Tex., on March 13, 1968.
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Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I am a co-sponsor of S. 2951 and S. 3212, both of which would clarify questions of jurisdiction over resident species of fish and wildlife. This question is rapidly coming to the head and it is my opinion that Congress should act as soon as possible to resolve it. Walter Shannon, of California, the president of the International Association of Game, Fish & Conservation Commissioners, in a statement at the 33rd North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference held in Houston, Tex., on March 13, 1968.

The purpose of the statement was to point out the following:

THE OWNERSHIP OF WILDLIFE—A JURISDICTION CONTROVERSY WHICH NEEDS TO BE CLEARED UP

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I am a co-sponsor of S. 2951 and S. 3212, both of which would clarify questions of jurisdiction over resident species of fish and wildlife. This question is rapidly coming to the head and it is my opinion that Congress should act as soon as possible to resolve it. Walter Shannon, of California, the president of the International Association of Game, Fish & Conservation Commissioners, in a statement at the 33rd North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference held in Houston, Tex., on March 13, 1968.

The purpose of the statement was to point out the following:
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Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I am a co-sponsor of S. 2951 and S. 3212, both of which would clarify questions of jurisdiction over resident species of fish and wildlife. This question is rapidly coming to the head and it is my opinion that Congress should act as soon as possible to resolve it. Walter Shannon, of California, the president of the International Association of Game, Fish & Conservation Commissioners, in a statement at the 33rd North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference held in Houston, Tex., on March 13, 1968.

The purpose of the statement was to point out the following:

THE OWNERSHIP OF WILDLIFE—A JURISDICTION CONTROVERSY WHICH NEEDS TO BE CLEARED UP

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I am a co-sponsor of S. 2951 and S. 3212, both of which would clarify questions of jurisdiction over resident species of fish and wildlife. This question is rapidly coming to the head and it is my opinion that Congress should act as soon as possible to resolve it. Walter Shannon, of California, the president of the International Association of Game, Fish & Conservation Commissioners, in a statement at the 33rd North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference held in Houston, Tex., on March 13, 1968.
I ask unanimous consent that a news release from the Conservation News of April 1, 1968, entitled "Federation To Test in Court Test of Wildlife Ownership," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FEDERATION TO TEST IN COURT TEST OF WILDLIFE OWNERSHIP

Convinced that a recent court action in New Mexico is the most serious threat ever made to the concept of wildlife ownership, the National Wildlife Federation has announced it will intervene in support of the position taken by the National Conservation Commission. As a "friend of the court," the Federation will seek to uphold the concept that resident wild birds, fish and amphibians belong to the people," rather than to the landowner on whose land they happen to reside.

The 1st Annual District Court was initiated by the New Mexico state wildlife agency last December against Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and National Park Service. It resulted from the decision of federal employees at Carlsbad Caverns National Park who killed at least 16 deer in direct violation of park regulations. The deer were shot, poults removed, and the carcasses "left to rot" as part of a research project being conducted by a service biologist.

New Mexico game officials had offered their assistance in the study, including the issuance of necessary collecting permits and removing the carcasses for use by state facilities or charitable institutions. Federal authorities, however, refused state assistance and concluded that the laws did not apply on Federal property. They based their court defense on a law giving the Secretary of the Interior and the President the right to destroy wildlife that is detrimental to the use of the parks.

Federal District Court Judge Harriett L. May ruled March 12 in favor of the state's position. In his decision, Judge Payne said, "No showing has been made that the deer involved are detrimental to the use of the park." The defendants should be restrained and enjoined from the further killing of wildlife within the boundaries of Carlsbad Caverns National Park for the purpose of conducting a research study, unless they first secure authority for their acts by complying with state law.

State officials expect the District Court's decision will be appealed to a higher court. If and when this occurs, the Board of Directors of the National Wildlife Federation, meeting on a resolution submitted by the Michigan United Conservation Clubs, has authorized interference as a citizen's suit (friend of the court). The action would involve employment of legal counsel to prepare and submit a brief in support of the State's position.

According to Executive Director Thomas L. Kimball, the National Wildlife Federation fully agrees with a statement recently issued by the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners. In making the statement, Association President Walter M. Munroe warned: "This is another example of the continuing trend toward Federal Intrusion into the historic and traditional areas of responsibility and jurisdiction of the states in the management of land and resident wildlife. If the Federal government's claim of authority over fish and resident wildlife were to be sustained, it would be a serious blow to the confidence of state agencies and the state people that they could conceivably claim a similar right, and the time honored principle of state ownership and jurisdiction would be destroyed.

It is the firm and unequivocal conviction of this Association that the ownership of land does not and should not include ownership of fish and wildlife. Such a doctrine would have an extremely adverse and chaotic effect on the management of fish and wildlife resources in all parts of the Nation.

National Wildlife Federation's concern for the National Wildlife Federation proposes any change in the status of certain laws or concepts that the United States is a party to any international treaty involving the regulation of migratory birds; the Rare and Endangered Species Act; the federal fish and wildlife programs; the jurisdiction of the states over fish and wildlife; the ownership of fish and wildlife; and the right of the Indians and natives of Alaska to hunt and fish as established by treaties or Acts of the Congress; and the management of lands and control over wildlife by the states, has been ceded by any state to the United States; and the Federal responsibility for conserving and developing fish and wildlife habitat on Federally owned lands.

VIETNAM AND THE DOLLAR

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal is consistently outstanding in reporting the current condition of the American economy. Its coverage of our chronic balance-of-payments problem has been particularly excellent. The edition of Monday, April 22, 1968, contains a very good analysis of the problem of dollar "overspending," as the article, entitled "Vietnam and the Dollar," and written by Alfred L. Malabre, Jr., explored some of the myths and realities concerning our deficit problem. Because of the importance of the Vietnam war and financing problems facing the Congress, I commend the article to the Senate and 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 Wall Street Journal, Apr. 22, 1968]

VIETNAM AND THE DOLLAR

A Truce Would Not End U.S. Currency's Woes, Many Economists Say—The Pressure Would Ease, But Other Spending Likely to Produce New Surpluses—is the United States Doomed to Deficits?

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

Peace in Vietnam would ease pressure on the embattled dollar—but by no means end it.

That's the view of a wide variety of economists in and out of Government. The dollar will be strengthened slightly, argues the Wall Street Journal long as Uncle Sam keeps running up huge balance-of-payments deficits.

The Vietnam war, to be sure, has aggrav­ated these deficits. Initially, $6 billion of last year's $3.6 billion deficit can be traced directly to the war effort. And the war also has indirectly aggravated the payments situ­ation by adding inflationary pressure to an already booming economy—for example, by worsen­ingly distorting relative prices and real wages in many defense-related industries.

But an end to the war would bring, at best, only a moderate improvement in the balance of payments. Economists are convinced, says Gottfried Haberler, professor of international trade at Harvard: "Even if the war in Vietnam ends, I don't believe we'll see a substantial improvement in the balance-of-payments situation."

POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Such estimates reflect many considera­tions, some of the most important being political. On the political side, many analysts are convinced that any reduction in Viet­nam spending promises to avert inflation or even to reverse it. The 1968 presidential campaign for­mally opened yesterday. If the political pressure for "no more Vietnam" continues, the U.S. will have a new administration that would tend to keep spending high even if peace comes in Vietnam, says many economists, is the likeli­hood that the U.S. may be forced in any event to increase its military defense posture for strategic weaponry. Only a few days ago the Senate subcommittee on preparedness launched a new investigation into the country's nuclear strength.

In 1962, strategic-weapons spending stood at more than $4 billion, but the total has recently dipped as low as about $7 billion annually. Many authorities fear that this situation of defense has been dangerously neglected—partly because of Vietnam needs—and now urge a big increase in spending. The Administration's decision last year, for example, a dollar is supposed to equal, in the balance-of-payments system may represent only one first step, some sources say.

DOUBTS DOLLAR

On the economic side, many analysts say bluntly that the dollar has long been overvalued in terms of other currencies, and that the country's balance-of-payments deficits are due partly to the country's balance-of-payments deficit, war or no war. According to this view, an overvalued dollar tends to encourage foreign imports and causes the dollar to move elsewhere. Sooner or later, these economists maintain, that even if peace comes, the dollar will have to deal with, presumably by a move to reduce the value of the dollar in terms of other currencies. (Opinion is divided over whether other countries would readjust their own currencies so that the old relations­hips to the dollar would be retained. If other countries were to readjust their own curren­cies, the main purpose of the U.S. move—to improve the balance of payments—would be thwarted.)

A LONG-TERM VIEW

Some economists who contend that the dollar has lost its luster hold that the country's debt problems will continue to be even if peace were to come in Vietnam, often note that the U.S. balance of payments deficit in heavy debt for many years before the Vietnam war heated up. From 1950 to 1955, the deficit averaged more than $8 billion yearly; in 1956, the deficit equaled nearly $4.4 billion, and in each of the next two years, the deficit approxi­mated $3.9 billion, well above last year's moder­ate surplus of $1.2 billion.

Moreover, it is frequently observed that this record of deficits has occurred even though there has been less price inflation in the U.S. over the years than in any other major country. In a recent 10-year period, consumer prices in the U.S. rose 17%, while the corresponding increase was 30% in the United Kingdom, 39% in France, 24% in West Germany, 39% in Italy and 87% in Japan. Even if the Vietnam deficit is eliminated, says Mr. Smathers, total economic growth will be clearly and the dollar's devaluation. The dollar's sub­sequent rise in value may have been out of line for a very large reason: this is the result of a phenomenon for a large New York City bank. The multi-
There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Low Cost Housing

S. RobyMohr

It is a very exciting thing that a political party—as opposed to an ordinary nonpar­

tisan civic group or community organiza­

tion—should sponsor a seminar—just to devise ways of winning the votes of city people, but to gain a better understand­
ing of central city life and what can be done to make it more rewarding. This is, as you have heard, an historic first.

It is a great credit to those who have spon­
sored it, and to those who have given their time to come down and participate.

For one who is a perennial speech writer for political parties and office holders, it is always a little difficult to get up and give a speech oneself. Around the United States Senate there is a story about an earnest young man who came to work for a rather pompous, long-winded Senator (obviously a member of the Other Party!). For years he had worried about the right way to prepare sparkling speeches for this gentleman. He did so well that, after a while, the Senator scarcely read them before delivery.

Finally one night the young staff member, not so young anymore, and who had never been satisfied with the labor of his pre­
cursors, was working on a major speech for the Senator to give the next day. The title of the speech was "Ending the War in Viet­nam." The more he tried to word perfect it, the more the man began to dwell on the injustice of it all—no raise, no recognition, just thankless, unproductive drudgery.

Finally he decided he had had enough—
that he would wash his hands of the whole project called Pruitt-Igoe. In terms of social utility that has the capacity to rise economically to make that effort. It can bring greater self-respect and human dignity and give people the roots, the stake in the community that they yearn for.

For some people—the elderly, the handicapped, the welfare mothers without a male breadwinner, and other classes of people of this type—there is no choice but to see that their needs are met, and as much human dignity as possible salvaged. But for a large proportion of the poor—typically the co­

residents of these public-housing projects—a san­
potential for climbing out of poverty is there. Some way must be found to help them over the hump of temporary abject poverty to become prominent citizens of their own community who have the capacity to rise economically to make that effort. It can bring greater self-respect and human dignity and give people the roots, the stake in the community that they yearn for.
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ment Corporation. The company bought up the old shell houses in this run-down slum area and promptly, by using the know-how of home- 

and labor, and sold them to families from the project and the neighborhood who had, doubtless, barely known the amenities of home ownership. The point is that assembled a large rarefied group of leaders in the business world, so that it will devote a billion dollars to the social conscience of the business world. Contrary to what we have been hearing in the Republican Senators’

statement—no one has named the Independent

This includes the labor unions, churches, universities, civic organizations, professional groups, and the like, all of which play an enormously important role in the shaping of American life. Labors unions if America has for years been most effective in leading people to teach them how to handle their new responsibilities. St. Augustine has named the Independent Church. The Church has been used to help rehabitilitation of slums. In addition, Gypsum has effectively undertaken the rehabilitation of a number of slab buildings in Harlem to prove to skeptics what can be done as well as to field test their new products.

There is no company in America that has done more than United States Gypsum to dramatize how the building materials indus- try, and business in general, can invest and produce better housing for people who don’t have it today. Other building materials com- panies, such as United States Gypsum and Sibelli, are also moving on the same course.

The third type of motivation is improving the neighborhood of a company’s plant. Many manufacturing plants are located in the heart or on the fringes of slum areas, and I believe that the local community responsibility of the company to take the lead in neighborhood improvement. Clearly, the company employees may dis- cover that it is having difficulty hiring good employees because they don’t want to have them live in the slums. Or their travel makes it too hard to work. Nor do stockholders or potential inves- tors enjoy the picture of a plant surrounded by vacant buildings, old auto bodies, and broken windows.

Smith, Kline and French in Philadelphia has been one of the pioneers in working in its neighborhood. So has Warner and Swayne, the machine tool company in Cleveland. Obviously, rehabilitating their plant neigh- borhoods will not create much of an additional market for pharmaceutical or machine tool products. Yet these far sighted com- panies have supplied the necessary supplies and finances to help rehabilitate housing and provide social services to people in their neighborhoods.

These are three different ways in which business has involved itself in meeting urban problems. But aside from profit-seeking busi- ness, there is in America such a group like the civic group like the Lions Club. But once we have sold brooms and given money to the blind, the blind generally are a little better prepared to manage their lives than they were before.

Now helping blind people is certainly a legitimate object of charity. But because of their disability, there is a limit to what can be expected of them in terms of economic self-help.

When the program amounts to providing services to the poor, it often becomes what I call the Independent sector. The Independent sector must make life decent for those who have no chance of escaping from dependence on others. But we must strive to help those who do have the potential to rise to achieve that potential by teaching them to learn and to grow.

Another type of organization is a non-charity program, any project devised to provide services by people who know how to help people who don’t have it. Let’s call it a cooperative movement. This means to be helping people to understand how to pull the levers and push the buttons to make life move in the right direction. That, basically, is the self-help principle.

The fourth point of that Republican state- ment is not so radically new, but it is, none- theless, worthy of recognition. That is the
necessity for tackling housing problems and people problems together. In this country the housing people have been home builders, bankers, architects—people whose jobs have been the production and financing of dwelling units. On the other hand are the educators, the social workers, the job trainers, the people whose job it is to help people meet "people problems." Historically these two groups have a very poor record of communication and cooperation. Their attitudes are different, and when they come together there is often friction.

One good example is the relation between the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Farmers Home Administration.

Farmers Home has been a home and farm mortgage agency ever since its creation. Its job is to make mortgage loans on economically sound properties to economically responsible individuals where credit is otherwise unavailable. The OEO approach, of course, is to help people who are in dire straits economically. When these two agencies come together on a housing project for the poor, there is an obvious clash of interests.

Another example in the same field is the high rise public housing buildings that line South State Street in Chicago. Here are buildings which are structurally sound. Yet they were designed and built with very little real understanding of the emotional and psychological needs of the low-income tenants.

The result, as at Pruitt-Igoe in St. Louis (which won several architectural awards), is despair, and the furious attitude of the tenants toward what is called the concentration camp philosophy. In Chicago, the State Street project is called the "Congo Hilton," and it is not exactly a term of endearment.

Here is a twenty-story building. It is full of kids. There are no toilets on the ground floor and there aren't enough elevators and they are broken half the time. I leave it to your imagination what kind of situation this produces. The planners did not understand what life would be like for the tenants. The social workers, who understood, had nothing to do with the planning; let alone the people themselves.

These are the four principles set forth in that Republican statement. They are as sound today as they were then. They are principles whose jobs have been the production of new attacks can be mounted on the Party. The Republican Party's interest in the cities is very clear. In addition to our civic interests as citizens in meeting the problems of the cities in which we live and the classes of which the cities form such an important part, we have to recognize that the ideas expressed by the poor people of the slums are identical to the ideas the Republican Party has affirmed in platform after platform, dating all the way back to the first platform of 1856.

And we must recognize that our task is to make our Republican Party a home for those of the classes which have constituted the automatic Democratic majorities of the low income neighborhoods. We haven't done it yet. But our chance is now—our chance to show by deed that we are on the side of the people who yearn for the same things we have always had, and who deserve the same chance we had to achieve them.

This will not happen overnight. But with more events like this Metropolitan Action Seminar, and more programs involving Republicans in efforts to help poor people help themselves, it will happen. And you, who have taken the time to come here today to take part in this Seminar, are the ones who are going to make it happen.

Thank you.

USE OF FARM OPERATIONS LOSSES AS OFFSET TO OTHER INCOME

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on November 1, I introduced S. 2613, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to prohibit persons who are not bona fide farmers from using losses incurred in their farming operations as an offset to income from other sources.

On several occasions since its introduction, I have included in my remarks on this bill references to statistics compiled by the Internal Revenue Service in its study for 1965 entitled "Statistics of Individual Income Tax Returns." The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has analyzed that study and, at my request, has prepared a table which provides a further insight into this problem.

The table prepared by the joint committee shows the total net farm loss, the number of individual income tax returns on which a net farm loss was entered, and the average net farm loss per return in each of nine adjusted gross income—AGI—classes.

The most important—and obvious—fact is the persistent rise in average net farm loss as adjusted gross income increases. In addition, the table shows that in seven of the nine adjusted gross income classes there has been an increase in the last 2 years in the number of returns which claim a net farm loss. For example, in 1964 there were 17,969 loss returns filed in the $15,000 to $20,000 class, but by 1966 the number of loss returns filed in that same class rose to 21,087. Turning to the $50,000 to $1 million class, the figure has risen from 145 loss returns filed in 1964 to 193 loss returns filed in 1966 while at the same time the average loss in that category rose from about $36,700 on a figure in excess of $39 million.

Mr. President, so that other Senators will have the benefit of the table prepared by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NET FARM LOSS, NUMBER OF RETURNS AND AVERAGE NET FARM LOSS, BY AGI CLASS, TAXABLE RETURNS, 1964, 1965, AND 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGI classes (thousands)</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1966</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 to $5</td>
<td>272,910</td>
<td>$238,409</td>
<td>$1,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 to $25</td>
<td>314,346</td>
<td>349,867</td>
<td>1,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 to $50</td>
<td>70,151</td>
<td>72,499</td>
<td>1,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50 to $75</td>
<td>15,699</td>
<td>19,689</td>
<td>1,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75 to $100</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>5,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 to $150</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>5,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150 to $200</td>
<td>59,237</td>
<td>59,297</td>
<td>5,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200 to $500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>75,500</td>
<td>58,211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Greater detail available for 1966.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGI classes (thousands)</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1966</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of returns</td>
<td>$36,020</td>
<td>$15,448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net loss (thousands)</td>
<td>$281,487</td>
<td>$1,077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average loss</td>
<td>$72,641</td>
<td>$3,235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. President, so that other Senators will have the benefit of the table prepared by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NET FARM LOSS, NUMBER OF RETURNS AND AVERAGE NET FARM LOSS, BY AGI CLASS, TAXABLE RETURNS, 1964, 1965, AND 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGI classes (thousands)</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1966</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 to $5</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>$36,020</td>
<td>$15,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 to $25</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>27,468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 to $50</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>6,356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50 to $75</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>5,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75 to $100</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>5,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 to $150</td>
<td>59,237</td>
<td>59,297</td>
<td>5,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150 to $200</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>75,500</td>
<td>58,211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE STUDY OF CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, at a time when our Nation is torn by controversy and emotions are running high, we have a most sensible and calm approach outlined touching on the teaching of controversial subjects in our schools.

Dr. Howard C. Seymour, superintendent of schools in Phoenix, and a member of the committee on the study and analysis to the 28th annual convention of the National School Boards Association in Detroit, Mich. Dr. Seymour's address appears to me, although not the major emphasis to be an excellent educational matter, to be a comprehensive treatment of the subject and reasoned in its approach.

I invite particular attention to his suggestion that students should be encouraged to recognize controversy and should not be afraid of controversial subjects and, more important, that they should be encouraged to learn the sources and information from which they receive about controversial topics. Dr. Seymour is to be commended for recommending that students learn to think for themselves and form their own conclusion. His conclusion is a long way toward assuring the continuing greatness of America and I applaud every effort made in this direction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the paper entitled "The Study of Controversial Issues," presented by Dr. Howard C. Seymour in Detroit, Mich., be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE STUDY OF CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

By Dr. Howard C. Seymour, superintendent of Phoenix High School, Phoenix, Ariz., presented at the annual convention of the National School Boards Association, Detroit, Mich., April 1, 1968

The nature of controversy is such that reasonable men differ. Discussion of controversial issues must, therefore, involve points of view objectionable to some inhabitants of a free society. Free discussion of controversial issues is the heart of the democratic process. Freedom of speech and free access to information are among our most cherished traditions. It is the responsibility of American teachers to prepare students to understand the democratic processes so that they may use these processes wisely.

A major purpose of public education is to build objectivity by providing the opportunities for education in the activities of a free society. The schools do not teach controversy, but they provide opportunities for their study. A thorough discussion and evaluation of all aspects of controversial issues will help students to reach conclusion processes so that with our democratic traditions. The liberation of the mind and the cultivation of independent thought and critical inquiry should be major aspects of education.

Freedom of discussion in the classroom, whether critical or approving, helps in acquiring the habit of evaluating all aspects of controversial issues and tends ultimately to offset the impact of subversive influences. An enlightened citizenry is the foundation upon which a free society rests. The school

plays a vital role in strengthening this foundation thereby protecting and reinforcing our democratic way of life.

DEFINITION OF CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

Simply stated, a controversial issue is one about which there exists conflicting opinions. Relating this to schools involves us in at least five areas.

1. The content of the curriculum

There are those who have decided opinions with respect to what should be taught. Some positive years, the pupil's opinion is recorded and the school should be taught in the schools. There are others who are unqualifiedly opposed to it. There is need for more people to test the teaching of Social Studies, misinterpreting the term to be something related to socialism. More recently, the modern Math advocates have been roundly scored by those who would teach mathematics in the traditional manner. Some people want the schools to teach young people how to drive; others contend that the schools' primary responsibility is basic education: reading, writing, arithmetic, etc.

Certainly, the demands of society—if there is substantial agreement—should be reflected in the content of the curriculum.

2. Teaching methods

The second area of conflict is how pupils should be taught. There are those who strongly advocate the phonetic approach to reading and maintain that instantaneous recognition of whole words should not be retarded by a slower phonics approach.

Many people are aghast at what they term the "play approach" to learning. These people believe that the normal teacher is the only way by which individuals learn. Adherents of this approach believe that cold, hard application and some comfort are necessary ingredients of learning.

And so it goes.

3. Materials of instruction

The public is frequently divided with respect to instructional materials which are used in the schools. Library and textbook books are good examples. In fact, this is the area in which such terms as "book burning", censorship, and "controlled reading" are used.

4. Atmosphere within schools

Many claim that there is too much freedom in schools; that young people are not controlled. The application of rules is proper preparation for adult life. Others, on the other hand, advocate hard and fast school dress codes changing the length of boys' hair or girls' skirts. Others believe that such matters have little relationship to learning. They claim it is not the job of the schools to exercise vigilance and control over such matters.

5. Involvement in political and social issues of the day

A great deal of feeling has arisen with regard to how the school should become involved in the economic, political, and social issues of the day. On one hand, there are those who would remove all subject matter to the school, insisting that some of the problems occurring in a democratic society should be discussed in school. On the other hand, the citizens are largely from professional and management occupations sometimes resenting the time allotted to discussion of the growth of government.)

On the other hand, in a community which is largely of the laboring class or where unemployment is common, the public is to know that the labor movement was caused by the exploitation of the laboring class by big business.

Private versus public control of natural resources; federal control of education; the rights of the states versus the federal government; the control of legislatures; and more recently, in the area of war and peace, the conflict in Viet Nam; all of these are issues in which student support of highly emotionalized people on one side or the other. The mere mention of "the other side" is like waving a red flag. They are frequently, then, and the school is often caught in the middle.

The setting for controversy lies in these five areas.

In a mythical school system of 25,000 high school pupils, each pupil will attend school five days per week and be scheduled for five 50 minute periods to approximately 149 other pupils plus the teachers. This endures for three to four years.

In addition, each one of the 25,000 is subjected to the whims, desires, fancies, opinions, beliefs, experiences of 25,000 sets of parents, uncles, aunts, and grandparents. Each pupil, every day, will probably view all kinds of propaganda on television, listen to it via radio, or read it in the newspapers.

Is it any wonder that controversies arise in schools and classes?

THE SETTING

Schools are no longer isolated; in a sense they are flashboxes. What happens in our schools today is now more important to a free society than ever before. Advocates of one point of view are extremely aware of the fact that if someone can "get" to pupils in schools, he has a captive audience.

There is tendency for more people to "speak out" than ever before. Our freedom of speech has been so emphasized that even the most humble and most ignorant individual has an opinion on everything regardless of whether or not there is any factual support.

Perhaps there is something to the answer which a high school youth gave to a question the examiner asked: "What are the four freedoms?" He replied, "Freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom from religion and freedom from speech." I agree, too often there is too much "speech" and not enough critical thinking.

A second condition which seems to exist is the carelessness of people with their value systems; those who accuse without foundation have a tendency to depart from the facts, are too willing to vilify other individuals without supporting evidence, and have a careless regard for the truth.

A third condition is that the democratic process as applied to problem solving. We still make more decisions on an emotional basis than on a scientific one. We generalize on the basis of one example. Our gossipy tendency balloons one example until it becomes a fact. We also intensify in our point of view that we refuse to listen to the facts presented by the opposition.

Our position is often characterized by the following rhyme:

"On controversial issues
My position is sublime.
I always see both points of view.
The one that's wrong—and mine!"

There are a lot of squirrely and squirm people in this world, the "hit and run" special interest groups, who would hide individuals. They are the anonymous "kooks"—punitive and arrogant—who want their ends accomplished without really being involved.

Then there is the organized opposition: groups with platforms, the liberals, the conservatives, the ultra-conservatives, the high-pressured people who offer no quarter in their zeal and desire to brainwash the minds of young people.

Dr. Seymour meaningfully warns the hands of individuals who have "a bone to pick" with a school, a teacher, a textbook or an incident.

It is with these introductory remarks that I go on to the topic of this evening. We recognize controversy and should have courage enough to stand up to it.
the school board in making is possible for youngsters to come to grips with controversies without decimating education and the community while doing so.

THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE TEACHER

First and foremost—to use an old cliche—every teacher needs to know something about the caliber, interest and background of each student. The teacher needs to know where with the pupils are. It is incumbent upon him to know something of the atmosphere, the temper of the community. It is fine for him to have standards to know, shrewdly, how to crusade and when.

His responsibility is to make pupils think clearly for themselves, to teach them how to learn, how to analyze, how to judge, how to know, shrewdly, how to crusade and when.

The student has the responsibility to report accurately what happens in a classroom to his parents, to others in the school, to representatives in the community. The student should have the responsibility to respect the right of others to differ with him. He should recognize his right to separate personality from the issues being discussed. (Example: Junior Town Meeting—Jewish—Mohawk.)

The student should have the responsibility to respect the right of others to differ with him. He should recognize his right to separate personality from the issues being discussed. The saying: "The child will take his listener as far as the listener is willing to be taken." He should tell the parent what he believes the parent wants to hear. (Examples: (1) The teacher teaching the students, (2) The counselor—scholar—what fate?

THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Whether it be a principal or a superintendent, it is the duty of every administrator to keep in close touch with what is going on in the school or activities under his jurisdiction. He should make sure that teachers know and understand system policy. He must see that they are given adequate help to work in conformity with it.

In particular, it is important for him to assess, accurately and quickly, the temper of the community whether one uses the football coach's, the principal's, the teacher's, the student's, the boy and Indian phrase, "head them off at the pass"; or the military expression, "stop them at the first roadblock." It means a careful pre-examination of textbooks; a procedure for acquiring instructional materials; a procedure for unifying the procedures to handle complaints. And, it is the task of the administrator to make the community aware that just as in any way. These are the "hit and run" experts previously referred to.

The teacher and the student have the right to know what the Superintendent is doing. The right to know is a basic human right. The student's right to know what is in the school is his basic human right. The student's right to know what the Superintendent is doing must prevail in every school system, even to the extent of listing experts previously referred to.

The Superintendent, together with the Board, should take the initiative of informing the community; should have explained to the public the curriculum and the possibility of controversial issues being utilized for discussion purposes even to the extent of listing some of the controversial items. An unknowing public is often an unduly suspicious public well able to make up its own mind.

The procedure for registering a complaint should be made known to the public and repeated often enough so that those who forget and those who are newcomers are acquainted with it.

Generally speaking, if a complaint is received at the Board office, the Superintendent should relay it immediately to the Superintendent. He can do this in two ways; he can either listen to the complaint, or he can pass it on to the Superintendent, or he can urge that the complainant contact the Superintendent directly. The Superintendent should understand that the complaint is justified, the Superintendent should move promptly to correct it. (Example: "1 Sing of Olaf" by c. e. cummings)

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, then, the solution to the teaching of controversial issues and what the school system does about it in order to avoid conflict in the community is:

(1) Establishment of a written policy on the teaching of controversial issues.

(2) A cooperatively acceptable statement of the process and procedure for handling conflicts fairly when they arise.

It should be remembered that it is entirely possible that great progress in this matter has been made in this case. The Board has rendered a decision, but only after a thorough airing of the complaints. Of course, the complaint is justified, the Superintendent should move promptly to correct it. (Example: "1 Sing of Olaf" by c. e. cummings)

In setting forth policies with respect to the discussion of controversial issues in the classroom, the Board has developed a cooperative effort of research procedures and through the interchange and exchange of ideas to arrive at the development of the techniques of fair and impartial analysis and evaluation of such critical and controversial issues as may arise from time to time.

The educational achievement in the classroom may set an example for individuals and groups in the community as well as lead, generally, to intelligent and responsible decisions within the framework of a free, democratic process.

There must be enough to carry on system, a spirit of inquiry and a continued search.
for truth. Everything possible should be done to dispel any misapprehension or hypothesis and to prevent offending any group which supports unequivocally any one major party or group.

The school must not avoid controversial problems; it must not be a sterile "piller-upper" of knowledge for its own sake. It must be equipped with the tools to question and to problem solving. It must teach young people how to think, how to detect propaganda, how to square problems on the economic decision to their conscience and how to judge. This cannot be accomplished with problems about which there is no controversy.

By the same token, the school must experiment wisely, carefully, and with due regard for the welfare of our young people. Education cannot remain status quo. Schools, instead, must attempt to accelerate their efforts to help young people learn how to learn and how to assess carefully what they learn. They must consistently try new curricula and new ways of teaching.

I pray that the day will never come when all controversial material is removed from our educational process, when we are prevented by pressure groups from helping young people become self-reliant, self-sufficient, and equipped with the tools to question and to decide for themselves. This is a part of our heritage of freedom.

INCENTIVES TO SPUR OIL EXPLORATION ARE STRESSED BY BUREAU OF MINEs

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, several weeks ago, I invited the attention of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to a point made by the Bureau of Mines Director Walter Hubbard on March 22 to the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

As a part of that testimony, Director Hubbard left with the subcommittee a commodity statement on petroleum. The newspaper Oil Daily for April 5 has summarized the contents of that statement.

For the benefit of the readers of the Record who are interested in our long-range minerals and fuels policies, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, three paragraphs of the 30-page study dealing with petroleum.

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

INCENTIVES TO SPUR OIL EXPLORATION ARE STRESSED BY BUREAU OF MINES

WASHINGTON.—The Bureau of Mines in the Interior Department has convinced that the government must consider "improving the incentives" to spur increased exploratory effort to develop additional petroleum reserves in the United States.

This position is spelled out in a "commodity statement" on petroleum—one of many prepared by the BM in minerals and fuels, as of Jan. 1, 1968.

These statements were made part of a hearing before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, headed by Senator Gruening (D., Alaska), in which the bureau put it this way:

"Certainly domestic resources remain large and ample for projected demands for many years."

"The significance of this resource potential to the government depends upon the existence or absence of incentives to explore for and develop new reserves and for the investment required to economically develop and produce from domestic sources while abundant supplies are present on the world market.

"Presently, domestic exploration (drilling) has declined and established reserves are lower than they were several years ago and support to future domestic production.

"Improving the incentives for exploration, including the benefits of recent advance­ ments, demands serious concern."

The bureau said that government policies influencing the amount of domestic supply-demand relationship—such as those dealing with import controls, tax pro­ visions, regulatory provisions, leasing pol­ icy and the like—are involved in exploiting them. Such knowledge, the bureau said, is "essential for national governmental action and national policy."

Here are some of the points made by the bureau in its 30-page study dealing with petroleum:

(1) Abating pollution from fuel use is a growing challenge, in view of the need to keep down atmospheric pollution.

(2) There are potential substitutes for oil from coal, gas, shale, etc., but these must be viewed as "comparative" rather than as "competitors" of petroleum.

(3) Major oil companies are becoming "interested" in buying or selling energy, with coal companies and others with uranium interests.

"The extent to which this trend aids or inhibits the public interest deserves constant attention."

(4) The United States in 1966 continued to decline. In its reserve position among world oil producing countries. U.S. reserves in 1966 accounted for about 16% of the world total.

(5) The United States at the end of 1966 had 39.78 billion barrels in proved reserves, with Africa having 32.66 billion, Latin Amer­ ica, 25.16 billion, the Middle East, 24.64 billion, Canada, 23.84 billion, and other areas the balance.

(6) Since 1969, the 29 major oil companies have enjoyed an income in the form of production, and their operations, combined, also constitute a major part of worldwide oil consumption. In 1966, 44% of their production and 45% of their refinery runs in 1966 were accounted for by foreign oil.

(7) However, some 20 large independents are operating throughout the world and are "giving increased competition to the majors."

(8) Demand is catching up with capacity and in 1966 unused capacity existed only in a few areas, primarily Louisiana and Texas, and in these areas allowances for prorated wells went down by 25% in one state.

(9) The relative position of independent producers has declined steadily during the past ten years. The drop in economic opportuni­ ties and the ratio of producing fields to them has been relatively greater than indi­ cated by composite national figures.

(10) During imports during the past decade have been almost 50% of the gain in domestic production of liquids.

(11) Federal offshore leasing has affected exploration in the Gulf of Mexico and offshore well taxability for only 2% or 3% of total U.S. wells, and reserve "entirely out of propor­ tion to the公报.""!

(12) On the other hand, the trend toward wider spacing and pooling of small acreages for drilling, especially in Texas, more in line with those of Louisians and should result in greater exploration and de­ velopment both offshore and onshore.

(13) While the federal depletion allow­ ance reductions are possible, it is clear that tax liability for producers, state governments have extended severance and production taxes which have "largely offset the special federal treatment."

(14) Petroleum operations are taxed by federal and state authorities to the equiv­ alent of about 4.4% of gross receipts. This compares with 4.5% for all business corporations (in 1960-61).

The bureau estimated U.S. oil demand will increase by 5% by 1968, growing at an annual rate of 3.1% in the 1960-80 period, but will become a smaller percentage of total energy consumption with nu­ clear power and gas increasing their shares.

Concluding, the bureau predicted produc­ tion of domestic petroleum would rise near-term, but at steadily slower growth rates, with the reserve/production rate gradually dropping off by 1986.

Crude oil prices "may increase slightly, but probably will remain relatively stable. Natural gas liquids prices are expected to remain fairly constant and to remain below the prices of petroleums."

Federal policies will have a direct effect on supply, demand and price of domestic oils and imports and national petroleum resources.

These alternate supplies will enter the market in the '70's, but their output will not have a significant impact on oil sources on the world market in the '60's.

The "extensive" impact will increase "as the economies of the conventional petroleum industry become decreasingly less attractive."

OBSERVANCE OF "SECRETARIES WEEK," APRIL 21 TO 27, 1968

Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. President, this week, it is observed about 17 years ago by the National Secretaries Association in cooperation with the Department of Commerce. The objective is, of course, to draw public recognition to the service of all secretaries and to the contributions they make to the educational, professional, and civic growth of their communities. These observances also give secretaries a heightened awareness of their responsibilities and stature as members of a profession.

During the 17-year history of Secretaries Week, 3,901 secretaries have attained the certified professional secretaries rating of the Institute for Certifying Secretaries. One qualifies as a CPS by passing an examination administered by the institute, which is part of the National Secretaries Association. The CPS is a nationally recognised standard of secretarial proficiency.

Another department of NSA, the Future Secretaries Association, now has 274 chapters in 325 high schools and college throughout this program, experienced secretaries help business educators train students to fulfill the secretarial needs of an increasingly specialized job market.

TREMENDOUS NEEDS AHEAD FOR OIL AND GAS, MOORE DECLARES

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, in a little publicized speech to the Rocky Mountain Oil & Gas Association on March 27, Assistant Secretary of the Interior J. Cordell Moore spelled out the tremendous demand for future oil and gas.
gas supplies. In his speech, he said that domestic producers must find "at least 4.25 billion barrels of new oil each year, just to replace what we take out of the ground."

He also warned that the United States cannot be dependent on foreign sources "which might be denied us through war or political instability." I ask unanimous consent that an article, published in the Oil Daily of Monday, April 8, 1968, describing Assistant Secretary Moore's speech, be printed in the Record.

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

[From the Oil Daily, Apr. 8, 1968]

**THE WORLD'S MOST EXCLUSIVE CLUB MEETS AGAIN**

**Mr. METCALF.** Mr. President, contrary to conventional wisdom, the industry's most exclusive club is not the Senate of the United States. It is the hierarchy of the Nation's largest industry, electric power.

The investor-owned utilities do not like to have representatives of customer-owned power systems, city-owned power systems, or Government sit in on meetings of the IOU Club when the select considers matters of tremendous importance—permanently a few representatives of large public power systems will be invited in, mainly for window dressing. They are like the Negro architect says he integrated seven architectural contracts, moving around from firm to firm to present the proper integrated front when a Federal visitor came around to see that the recipient of Federal contracts did not discriminate in employment.

The IOU's started to set up the Mid-Continent Area Power Planners—APPC—under the auspices of Reclamation and municipal power systems from all initial planning. The IOU's excluded other types of power systems from the electric heating exposition. The IOU's failed to call for co-operative participants at the annual American Power Conference, at the Illinois Institute of Technology. Earlier this year the IOU's almost stuck through the Atomic Energy Commission an arrangement by which the Edison Electric Institute would head a nuclear powerplant study. This needed study of powerplant siting will be headed up by the Federal Power Commission. The Federal and private organizations, if S. 3330, introduced last week by the senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy) becomes law.

Today another meeting of the exclusive IOU Club is being held in New York, under the sponsorship of the Allegheny Power System. On the agenda is discussion of electric reliability. The Senate Commerce Committee has been hearing on S. 1934, the electric power reliability bill, strongly recommended by the administration and the Federal Power Commission. The industry will consider ways of deluding members of the Senate and House Commerce Committees into thinking that S. 1934 should not be passed.

Customer-owned and city-owned power systems asked to be included in the New York meeting. They were deliberately excluded.

The members of the best club, especially members of the Commerce Committee, will be interested in the comments of groups that sought unsuccessfully to gain even temporary admittance to the world's most exclusive club. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record a telegram from Robert D. Partridge, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, to J. Lee Rice, Jr., of the Allegheny Power System; a telegram from Robert O. Marritz, executive director and staff counsel of the Missouri Basin Systems Group representing 125 consumer-owned power systems and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation; and a statement by Fred G. Simonton, executive director of the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association.

There being no objection, the telegram and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**April 24, 1968.**

Mr. J. LEE RICE, Jr.,
Allegheny Power System, Inc.,
New York, N.Y.

Mr. President:

By any measure, the Federal Government has not been in the best of favor with the Missouri Basin Systems Group, a regional group representing a significant segment of the electric distribution network. The group I represent is composed of 125+ customer-owned and public power systems in Missouri and Kansas. The group seeks to ensure that all members of the Missouri Basin System Group, and the electric distribution network as a whole, are entitled to the same opportunities and privileges as the larger and wealthier utilities in the United States.

We are disturbed, however, over the report failure to invite the Missouri basin systems group, and other consumer-owned and state owned power systems, to attend the annual, all-American power conference. This year's meeting was held in New York City, and many of the country's leading utility executives were present to offer their views on the future of the electric power industry.

Unfortunately, the Missouri Basin Systems Group was not invited to attend this meeting. We believe that the failure to invite the Missouri Basin Systems Group is a mistake, and we urge that the group be invited to future meetings of the American Power Conference.

We also believe that the failure to invite the Missouri Basin Systems Group is a mistake because the group represents a significant segment of the electric distribution network. The group I represent is composed of 125+ customer-owned and public power systems in Missouri and Kansas. The group seeks to ensure that all members of the Missouri Basin System Group, and the electric distribution network as a whole, are entitled to the same opportunities and privileges as the larger and wealthier utilities in the United States.

We therefore urge that the Missouri Basin Systems Group be invited to future meetings of the American Power Conference.

**April 23, 1968.**

Mr. J. LEE RICE, Jr.,
Allegheny Power System, Inc.,
New York, N.Y.

As executive director of the Missouri basin systems group, I must strongly object to the exclusion of MBSG from your April 25 New York meeting concerning formation of a national electric reliability council.

MBSG is a regional group and pool of 125 consumer-owned systems in the upper mid-west, including the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. Present facilities of the group's members include the backbone 230 kv transmission grid in the region. Planned generating units of substantial size and hundreds of miles of EHV transmission line. By any standard, these bulk power facilities constitute a significant segment of the area's facilities and have a substantial effect upon the reliability of the regional system, not to say the national interconnection. As you may know, the east-west ties linking 94% of the country's generation are accomplished by these 1300 kv and by MBSG member system facilities.
If there is any question as to whether MBGSC is to be included in the pool, I would say that it is both. MBGSC's planning and operation committees conduct studies to ensure that member's plans are coordinated and that reliable sources of electric energy in the region. Pooling in the group presently involves the hydro-electric facilities of several of the thermal generating stations of the Mid-West Electric Power Cooperative.

Having learned of the exclusion of MBGSC from the New York meeting and the National Council, I telephoned Mr. Goess on April 15 and asked him to send the message that I would be available to participate in the New York meeting. Mr. Goess telephoned me on April 22 to say that Mr. Marritz had informed him that we would be allowed to participate in the New York meeting. My interest in participating in such an effort, I am disturbed by the complete failure of your group to keep us informed of its progress. Not only were we not invited to the New York meeting, held for the purpose of considering a draft agreement—were we not even informed of it, or sent a draft copy of the agreement, nor have we received any correspondence on this matter to date.

Having learned of the exclusion of MBGSC from the New York meeting and the National Council, I telephoned Mr. Goess on April 15 and asked him to send the message that I would be available to participate in the New York meeting. Mr. Goess telephoned me on April 22 to say that Mr. Marritz had informed him that we would be allowed to participate in the New York meeting. My interest in participating in such an effort, I am disturbed by the complete failure of your group to keep us informed of its progress. Not only were we not invited to the New York meeting, held for the purpose of considering a draft agreement—were we not even informed of it, or sent a draft copy of the agreement, nor have we received any correspondence on this matter to date.

Whatever the objectives of your National Council, I sincerely believe that they cannot be served by denying participating to groups such as MBGSC.

ROBERT O. MARRITT, Executive Director, and Staff Counsel, Missouri Basin Systems Group.

MIDWEST ELECTRIC CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION PROTESTS EXCLUSION FROM PROPOSED COUNCIL

DENVER, COLO., April 24.—The executive director of a consumer-owned electric association today protested "most vigorously the intentional exclusion of a major regional electric generating group in a proposed council purporting to be national in scope."

Fred G. Simonton, executive director of the Missouri Basin Systems Consumers Association, with headquarters in Denver, Colorado, said that "the Missouri Basin Systems Group, a regional group including 125 electric utilities, most of whom also belong to Mid-West Electric Consumers Association, was deliberately excluded from a meeting to be held to create a national electric reliability council."

Simonton noted that MBGSC Executive Director Robert Marritz had objected to the exclusion by telegram to J. Lee Rice, Jr., chairman of the board of Allegheny Power Systems, Inc., and chairman of the council meeting to be held in New York on April 25.

Excluded from the New York meeting of the council, called to draft an agreement among the giant power companies, are the 125 electric systems in the Missouri Basin, which make up the MBGSC—a group included in the MBGSC group to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, which markets power over the only region-wide transmission system within the United States. The group is operated by the Missouri Basin Electric Power Cooperative, which operates the nation's largest lignite-burning generating plant.

The president to Senators, high administration officials, and national electric leaders, Simonton said "it is not enough for this self-appointed group which claims itself a reliability council. If it is sincere in its efforts to prevent the massive blackout experienced in the recent past, it will seek to coordinate with all groups. The deliberate exclusion of the group, which was the key element in the test of the national East-West intertie last year, raises a question about the purport of their proposed organization. Exclusion of major coordinating groups, and regional systems, from representation on a February 19, 1968 meeting in Los Angeles will be distinctly second class."

Simonton's statement said that "if the power company-dominated proposed council is more than an organized subterfuge to avoid such legislation, it would have sought to include representatives of all power suppliers in the nation. The deliberate exclusion of such systems as the mid-west generating group presently involves the hydro-electric reliability grid."

Simonton said his organization expects to testify in favor of legislation which would accomplish the purposes sought by the legislation presently under consideration. He said that the action of the council suggests that the giant monopolistic power companies are not truly interested in coordination of all power systems for the purpose of reliability. Such a meeting of reliability could be considered by the FCC as an affront, he said.

We go to Salt Lake City Friday to tell the Senate committee of our views and of the serious need to protect the small consumer-owned electric systems, as well as to assure the giant company that they can expect reliable service at fair rates," Simonton said.

AFL-CIO REAFFIRMS COMMITMENT TO HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIARE, Mr. President, few organizations have been as unyielding and vigorous in support of the human rights conventions as the AFL-CIO. This fine organization was instrumental in developing the Forced Labor Convention and has continually urged the ratification of this and other of the human rights treaties.

In this spirit the recent AFL-CIO convention called upon all of its affiliated unions to observe the week of December 10 through 17 as Human Rights Week and the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year.

This past week the resolution, the resolu­tion was ordered to be printed in the record, as follows:

RESOLUTION 177, INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS

1968 has been designated by the United Nations as International Human Rights Year. It marks the 20th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

AFL-CIO has urged the United Nations to ratify the ILO conventions involving the field of Human Rights.

AFL-CIO expresses its solidarity with the workers, agricultural producers, and freedom-loving people everywhere in their aspiration to attain political freedom, and the fundamental human rights of which they are today deprived. We are deeply disturbed by the fact that the Communist regimes in these captive countries are subjecting labor to intense exploitation by suppressing free trade unions and denying the right to strike.

The AFL-CIO pledges its wholehearted support to all workers and other liberty-loving people now engaged in bitter struggle for basic human rights and freedom. We are unequivocally opposed to every form of dictatorship—whether it be Communist, Fascist, Falangist or of any other totalitarian hue. All totalitarian tyrannies are mortal enemies of freedom and we are determined to stand with the small wage-earners who in these captive countries are subjecting labor to intense exploitation by suppressing free trade unions and denying the right to strike.

The AFL-CIO Convention reaffirms its dedication to the ideals and aims of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We appeal to the thousands of people everywhere to advance and protect, at home and abroad, the ideals embodied in this historic Declaration.

Mr. President, the AFL-CIO Seventh Convention upon all our affiliates to observe the week of December 10 through 17 as Human Rights Week and the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year.

SBA'S CONTRIBUTION TO RECORD PROSPERITY OF NATION'S SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, for a great many years I have had a keen interest in the problems of small business. I have many friends among small business men not only of this State of Alabama, but throughout the country. I believe I understand the problems they face.

My interest in small business stems from my belief that these enterprises are perhaps the most positive force for growth that we have in our economy. That has been so in the past and it is so today.

As long as small business is prosperous, the economy will be healthy and growing. But if we allow our small businessmen to get into trouble, we are all in trouble.

I am happy to report that small business is very prosperous today. It is riding the wave of our unprecedented 7 years of steady economic growth, and I am proud of the assistance given by the Small Business Administration.

President Johnson is a good friend of small business, and his concern for the problems of small business is nowhere better demonstrated, I believe, than in the record of accomplishments of the Small Business Administration last year.

The 1967 Small Business Administra­tion increased its volume of loans by 55 percent over 1966, reaching a new high of $667.7 million.

Of that total, the agency approved $432.7 million in regular business loans.
to help 9,518 small firms. Sixty-seven percent of the loans were made with bank participation; SBA's share of these loans was $39.9 million.

SBA approved $36.9 million in economic opportunity loans to help 3,432 small businesses as part of the war on poverty.

Loans totaling $34.8 million were made to help 404 small firms forced to move because of federally aided projects in their area.

SBA was active in helping community development projects. During the year the agency approved $35.9 million in 362 loans to aid in the economic development of communities; banks and other private lenders provided $23 million. The loans financed projects of locally organized development companies.

Many disaster victims received help last year: SBA approved $89.3 million in long-term, 3-percent loans to help victims of storms, floods and other disasters repair or rebuild their homes, businesses, or replace damaged property.

Through these and other programs SBA strives to help small businessmen, making it possible for them to grow and to provide a wider range of services.

There are programs to help communities in the ghettos, in the slums. Racial and religious strife, the tension that exists between our lagging rural areas and our affluent neighbors, is not the job of religion. What people come to religion for is an ultimate metaphysical hunger, and when this hunger is not satisfied, religion declines.

The theme today is a prime example of this. The theme is that it be printed in the RECORD.
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MENTAL, DEMONSTRATION, AND PILOT PROJECTS DESIGNED TO IMPROVE THE TECHNIQUES OF OPERATING LOW-INCOME CREDIT UNIONS AND CONSUMER COUNSELING PROGRAMS AMONG THE POOR, BY PROVIDING FOR IMPROVED MEANS OF FURNISHING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE THROUGH EXPERIMENTAL, STATE-OPERATED, DEMONSTRATION AND PILOT PROJECTS AND THROUGH TRAINING PROGRAMS CARRIED OUT IN CONJUNCTION WITH APPROPRIATE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, PRIVATE NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 213 of title II of the Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1766) is amended by inserting “(1)” immediately after “(1),” and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph: “(C) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this section, and for making grants to or contracts with public or private nonprofit organizations, including credit unions, or through contracts with private organizations, for the purpose of improving techniques and demonstrating the effectiveness of specialized methods designed to promote the operation of credit unions and consumer-counseling programs among the poor, by providing for improved means of furnishing technical assistance through experimental, state-operated, demonstration and pilot projects and through training programs carried out in conjunction with appropriate departments and agencies, State and local governments, private nonprofit organizations, and other organizations.

Order of Business

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1052, S. 1401.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1401) to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

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. 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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have some morning business, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the transaction of morning business in order that I might proceed as in the morning hour, without a time limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SOMETHING FOR NOTHING

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have received a wire from the Reverend Abernathy, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.
April 23, 1968

As an important part of opening the poor people’s campaign in Washington I request a meeting with you, Senator Mansfield, and Representatives McCormack and Albert, Monday morning April 29 at 9:30. Our Washington office will confirm arrangements with you.
Respectfully,
RALPH ABERNATHY,
President, Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This telegram requests a meeting with the leaders of Congress, and I presume a similar request will be made to the President and other members of the executive branch. It, of course, involves a unique experience in the history of Congress. Mr. Abernathy plans to come to town to make his demands for various and sundry proposals, of which I am not aware, although I have some idea of what those proposals will be.

One proposal, as I understand, is to be to the effect that persons be paid $250 a month, whether he works or not—the so-called guaranteed minimum wage. There will be other proposals along that line.

As I understand those proposals, they generally will mean that those who are working will work harder so that those who are not working can rest harder, and we would then proceed to make poverty a way of life in this country. That unenjoyable, undesirable way of life for some people. That, of course, is somewhat new to some of us who thought we had been laboring in the poverty vineyard for many years.

I am sure that the distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], recalls from his boyhood the days when the Senator from Louisiana, the Honorable Huey Long, advocated on the floor of the Senate a share-the-wealth program. Senator Long wanted to tax the rich to give to the poor, and that proposal has always had a lot of appeal to me. To move to do that would be to vote yes or no, I would vote yes for my father’s program, which proposed that everything one had over $2 million would be taken and spread among the folks who had nothing, so that they might live better.

His program was criticized on occasion by some unsympathetic people. Some said that if the share-the-wealth program went into effect, it would not be long before the rich would have all the money back anyway; that they would find ways to skin the poor out of it.

My father’s response was: Maybe so. But just think how much fun the poor folks will have while all that is happening.

We have labored long for programs in Louisiana to improve the conditions of the underprivileged. The Junior Senator from Louisiana is a second-generation laborer in the vineyard of the poor. When I began my service in the Senate I was regarded as a flaming liberal. I was a strong advocate of the school lunch program in which I think one of the leaders of the great leaders. It had been my privilege to work to help put into effect the most liberal welfare program in the United States, to negotiate with Washington to obtain a maximum amount of Federal matching funds. It was my privilege to work diligently to do whatever was in my power to increase Federal matching funds to provide more adequately for the aged, the disabled, and the needy.

I must admit that some of my ideas at that time greatly shocked the senior Senator from Virginia—who was the father of the present occupant of the chair—the Honorable Harry F. Byrd, Sr. But over a period of time he became adjusted to it, so that he could vote with equanimity for the so-called radical suggestions of the Junior Senator from Louisiana, to provide a large amount of additional money to the needy, the underprivileged—the least of them all, as the Good Shepherd in the vineyard of the poor—time it even came to pass that the junior Senator from Louisiana would fight for...
some amendment to provide more money for the needy, the aged, the orphaned children. The junior Senator from Louisiana, who is the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Virginia, Mr. Harry Flood Byrd, Sr., would go to conference and fight to get the House to agree to some part of the proposed welfare check legislation. I believe these fine people that we had been able to increase their welfare checks.

Unfortunately, some of the ideas of the junior Senator from Louisiana were frustrated by the State legislature, which passed a law providing that no welfare check could be increased without an act of the legislature. Why they did that, I never quite understood. I assume it was because they wanted to take credit for that increase in Federal matching instead of our taking credit for it. It had been the thought of the junior Senator from Louisiana that we were providing $5 more for grandma's old-age pension, he could go back and say, "Look what I did for you."

But the State legislature passed a law, so that while getting the increase automatically, they would wait until the next session of the legislature. Then the legislature would pass a law providing for the increase, and would have the credit themselves. It is unfortunate.

So the struggle to see who got the credit for the increase has been waged. But the answer has always been the same so far as the State of Louisiana is concerned. We wanted to provide as liberally and as well for the aged, the needy, the underprivileged and the unfortunate as it was within our power to do.

But, Mr. President, there is one principle that we in Louisiana have never been able to get through our minds, and I suppose that possibly has caused us to be regarded as reactionaries and racists today. One has always been that a little child should be fed and well provided for, that a mother who has children to care for should be provided for if she cannot find adequate employment, and we always felt that we should provide for the disabled.

The junior Senator from Louisiana is old-fashioned, somewhat like the able statesman who occupies the majority leader's chair at this moment, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd). I have always felt that people who can work, should work. I have always felt that people who do something noble, worthwhile, and constructive about working for a living.

While, of course, we approve of leisure and recreation, we believe it has no meaning unless someone has contributed something to society for its purpose.

Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Louisiana had his way, as the chairman of the Committee on Finance, he would like to have the people do nothing, even benefited on people who inherit money, if they have never done a day's work. So, before they receive a large amount of money to fritter away on meaningless and useless things, they would have to do something constructive.

I regret very much that there has been some misunderstanding between the junior Senator from Louisiana and the group that calls itself the Welfare Mothers. Senators will recall that some time ago, while conducting a hearing with regard to the social security bill, we had a sit-in strike by an organization which is spreading across this land.

They are a little bit slow in collecting dues but they are getting plenty of members. This is a united organization of welfare clients, patterned somewhat after labor unions. Then the legislature would pass a law providing for the increase, and would have the credit themselves. It is unfortunate.

Those people came in and protested the suggestion of some of us that these people should be asked to do some work and merits which she was well justified in, because she was so talented and fruitful.

One of the problems we have had with this welfare program is where a mother should work and what her child should be fed. The State of Louisiana has always said that while I shall be glad to come back on this subject, I think that he is all right. I would be glad to look at the Senator and his group, if he thinks he is going to intimidate the junior Senator from Louisiana he is making a mistake. As far as I am concerned, it is Reverend Abernathy from Louisiana that I shall have to argue with. If I have the choice of arguing with him and his group, if he thinks he is going to intimidate the junior Senator from Louisiana he is making a mistake.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that those people who do not want to work, they want to do something else, they want to start a business, they want to do nothing, and they want to do that. They are a little bit slow in collecting dues but they are getting plenty of members. This is a united organization of welfare clients, patterned somewhat after labor unions.

One of the problems we have had with this welfare program is where a mother should work and what her child should be fed. The State of Louisiana has always said that while I shall be glad to come back on this subject, I think that he is all right. I would be glad to look at the Senator and his group, if he thinks he is going to intimidate the junior Senator from Louisiana he is making a mistake.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that those people who do not want to work, they want to do something else, they want to start a business, they want to do nothing, and they want to do that. They are a little bit slow in collecting dues but they are getting plenty of members. This is a united organization of welfare clients, patterned somewhat after labor unions.

One of the problems we have had with this welfare program is where a mother should work and what her child should be fed. The State of Louisiana has always said that while I shall be glad to come back on this subject, I think that he is all right. I would be glad to look at the Senator and his group, if he thinks he is going to intimidate the junior Senator from Louisiana he is making a mistake.

Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Louisiana had his way, as the chairman of the Committee on Finance, he would like to have the people do nothing, even benefited on people who inherit money, if they have never done a day's work. So, before they receive a large amount of money to fritter away on meaningless and useless things, they would have to do something constructive.

I regret very much that there has been some misunderstanding between the junior Senator from Louisiana and the group that calls itself the Welfare Mothers. Senators will recall that some time ago, while conducting a hearing with regard to the social security bill, we had a sit-in strike by an organization which is spreading across this land.

They are a little bit slow in collecting dues but they are getting plenty of members. This is a united organization of welfare clients, patterned somewhat after labor unions. Then the legislature would pass a law providing for the increase, and would have the credit themselves. It is unfortunate.

Those people came in and protested the suggestion of some of us that these people should be asked to do some work and merits which she was well justified in, because she was so talented and fruitful.

One of the problems we have had with this welfare program is where a mother should work and what her child should be fed. The State of Louisiana has always said that while I shall be glad to come back on this subject, I think that he is all right. I would be glad to look at the Senator and his group, if he thinks he is going to intimidate the junior Senator from Louisiana he is making a mistake. As far as I am concerned, it is Reverend Abernathy from Louisiana that I shall have to argue with. If I have the choice of arguing with him and his group, if he thinks he is going to intimidate the junior Senator from Louisiana he is making a mistake.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that those people who do not want to work, they want to do something else, they want to start a business, they want to do nothing, and they want to do that. They are a little bit slow in collecting dues but they are getting plenty of members. This is a united organization of welfare clients, patterned somewhat after labor unions.

One of the problems we have had with this welfare program is where a mother should work and what her child should be fed. The State of Louisiana has always said that while I shall be glad to come back on this subject, I think that he is all right. I would be glad to look at the Senator and his group, if he thinks he is going to intimidate the junior Senator from Louisiana he is making a mistake. As far as I am concerned, it is Reverend Abernathy from Louisiana that I shall have to argue with. If I have the choice of arguing with him and his group, if he thinks he is going to intimidate the junior Senator from Louisiana he is making a mistake.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that those people who do not want to work, they want to do something else, they want to start a business, they want to do nothing, and they want to do that. They are a little bit slow in collecting dues but they are getting plenty of members. This is a united organization of welfare clients, patterned somewhat after labor unions.

One of the problems we have had with this welfare program is where a mother should work and what her child should be fed. The State of Louisiana has always said that while I shall be glad to come back on this subject, I think that he is all right. I would be glad to look at the Senator and his group, if he thinks he is going to intimidate the junior Senator from Louisiana he is making a mistake. As far as I am concerned, it is Reverend Abernathy from Louisiana that I shall have to argue with. If I have the choice of arguing with him and his group, if he thinks he is going to intimidate the junior Senator from Louisiana he is making a mistake. As far as I am concerned, it is Reverend Abernathy from Louisiana that I shall have to argue with. If I have the choice of arguing with him and his group, if he thinks he is going to intimidate the junior Senator from Louisiana he is making a mistake.
The senators at this point stood up and did not sit down, and I have not been able to hear the statement of the junior senator from Louisiana as sounding more and more like a racist.

Mr. President, I did not say you should shoot a Negro. I did not say you should shoot a Chinaman. I did not say you should shoot a Caucasian, or a Baptist, or a Catholic, or a Protestant. All I said was that a criminal should not be permitted to get away with the kind of criminal conduct. He should be caught and stopped before he gets away, even if it is necessary to fire a rifle bullet or a pistol shot at him. That is how it has always been. It is only in these new days in this new program, that we are told criminals must not be punished, apprehended, or accept the risk that heretofore attended criminality.

So far as I am concerned, at the great success we had in Washington at a very small loss of life; there has been more loss of life somewhere else where other riots have occurred. Of course, that can be done.

Mr. President, recently I had a parallel experience in Louisiana, with no loss of life whatever.

Can Senators guess why? Because we had an old-fashioned Governor in the State of Louisiana who went on radio and television and said: I want to tell you people that I will protect your rights. You can march on your State capitol, and no one will lay a hand on you, no one will hurt you, and no one will touch you at all. But, the moment you start shooting, the moment you start breaking someone's store window, the moment you start rioting, the moment you start injuring someone, then that business is shot. I have instructed the State police to shoot quick. Whoever they must shoot will be left to lie where they fall until we have put down the riot and then we will pick up and haul them away.

What happened? We did not lose one single life. No one received a scratch. No one was hurt.

Why? Because we have an old-fashioned way of doing business in Louisiana, of telling potential rioters that if they riot they will not get away with it, they will be punished, and they will regret it.

The demonstrators demonstrated, and speeches were made. It was all done in a peaceful manner and then they all went back home where they came from.

Let me add that the Negroes were protesting on the State capitol grounds and only 5 miles away the Ku Klux Klan was holding a meeting. Yet no one was hurt because we have the kind of old-fashioned way of doing business that has proved to be successful in the past, and I am sure will prove to be successful in the future.

In other words, law and order should be preserved, and I believe it could be sustained, then those who have the responsibility of maintaining that law and order should be voted out of office.

I say that, Mr. President, as a Demo-
Washington—and it was effectively instituted—the criminal element should be warned that if they persist in robbing and committing acts of violence, they will do so at risk of life and limb. And then, if they persist, let the criminal element suffer the consequences.

The President must understand one language, and understands it well—and that is the language of force. No criminal is afraid of a gun that is not loaded or of a policeman or soldier who is under orders to let him alone.

Mr. President, I do not want to see loss of life any more than any other high official of this Government wants to see loss of life. But if the law tells them to go, they will have to go. And when they are compelled to go, the criminal element knows the law; let the warning be issued. If they fail to heed it, let them suffer the consequences.

Government has a right to survive. Law-abiding people are entitled to protection of their lives and properties.

The first duty of government is to enforce the law and preserve order. This is the first priority. If it is not to be done at last, there is no law—only anarchy. Without law, there can be no rule of reason—only tyranny.

As far as the march on Washington is concerned, that is receiving a great deal of attention by many channels. Senator Pinckney, when he was serving as Minister to the French Republic, will have been reassessed as follows:

\[
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\[
\text{Riot: The Civic Triumph School. (By Frank Getlein)}
\]

More quickly than might have been expected, the Supreme Court in Washington are being transformed into a civic triumph, roughly comparable, if not to the winning of the pennant by the lowly senators, at least to their finishing in the first division.

This considerable feat of intellectual legerdemain is the cause of a subtle shift in our rigidous standards. Formerly, riots were measured by the number of people killed and injured, the number of buildings burned down, the value of merchandise looted, the replacement cost of stores, if they can be justified and the cost of extra police, intelligence, National Guardsmen and federal troops, the cost of normal business made impossible. But if the riot produces more looters than shooters, if presumed arsonists and apparent looters are shot in the act or trying to get away, this is evidence of the reason enough for the riot. (That's a little tricky, since the cause follows the effect, but...)

Those time-hallowed measurements of riot cost accounting have been junked this year. What this new system measures, is measured solely by how many lives of alleged rioters are lost. The riot is presumed to be a success. A mere handful of his grievances, and as long as they get shot in great numbers, the riot is presumed to be a success.

Such was the case in Washington. Troops were not called in until quite late in the game and did not arrive until 24 hours had passed. The first contingents went straight to the White House, the confident in the knowledge of who runs the Army and who passes military appropriation. When they got down to the disturbed areas, they did not shoot. Nor did they employ any of the more sophisticated and pre-riot plans of riot control. They relied on their machinery of police, rule, and control, and eventually their presence did.

The riot was a success. A mere handful of people were killed and a few of the police officers involved in one of the deaths was held up for homicide. There was little bitterness on the part of looters and arsonists, such as has been noted in cities where looting and arson have been more vigorously opposed. The riot was an educational experience for police and public. It taught that you don't have to shoot arsonists and looters, as had been previously believed. You can let them go about their business and eventually they get tired.

The educationists who were cheered up by the success of the riot have also pushed on to sound educational conclusions. It is as it was learned that some thousands of people were in custody on a variety of charges and the charges, as was learned, were quite as perfectly adequate to teach every violator what he ought to know, presumably that it's easier to make off with $300 worth of goods than it is to grab $300 worth.

The second educational proposal was to waive jail sentences, with all their attendant bitterness on the part of those serving them, and to renew those people in clearing up the damage and rebuilding the lost property. They would be paid, of course, normal construction rates. The scheme has the desirable element of self-help about it that has so long been lacking in the field: First you break the windows, steal the merchandise, get caught, then you get a job building it back up again.

The obvious next step is to make the whole process of generation more humane. After the next riot, the new destruction, the hiring of the arsonists and so on. It certainly could be a key answer to the problem of jobs in the ghetto.

There is one minor flaw, but it is easily remedied. The teaching materials for the educational experience were the private property of some dozens of small businessmen, many of them uninsured, underinsured, or, now, uninsurable. They probably need education as much as the next man, but, on the other hand, they have responsibilities of their own and may well decide—especially if the decision is theirs at all—to reopen in some other neighborhood.

Therefore, in addition to rewarding the rioters for their lack of bitterness on the part of those serving them, the government should buy the ruined businesses for pre-riot prices and keep them up as permanent schools in self-improvement.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, April 25, 1968]

CRACKDOWN URGED ON INCITERS OF VIOLENCE

(Brooks S. Noyes)

The time has come to crack down on the crackpots and hard it is time to put out of circulation for as long as possible all of the individuals and organizations in this country, black and white, who are deliberately and openly inciting to violence and race warfare.

Most democratic societies in the world would tolerate the murderous activities of such outfits as the Revolutionary Action Movement, the Black Panthers or the grotesquely misnamed Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Most would have long since outlawed the hate merchants passing as Minutemen, Klanmen and American Nazis.

Tolerance of such groups is a luxury which all of these States and cities, unfortunately a former a major urban guerrilla warfare where the danger which they represent to the fabric of American society is clear and imminent. The prompt removal of their leaders from circulation would do more to cool the fever of our cities than all the appeals for law and order put together.

For example, the case for tolerating the likes of Stokely Carmichael. Within hours of the murder of Martin Luther King in Memphis, Stokely was telling his friends in Havana that the American revolution was now in full swing.

"More people," Carmichael assured his listeners, "are now beginning to plan serious—a major urban guerrilla warfare where people are going to remain in the death of King but where we can move seriously with this country to bring it to its knees.

Bluff and bluster? Perhaps. But it would be a very serious mistake to underestimate the potential of even a small group of dedicated conspirators.

The most competent officials of the government believe that under present conditions forty or fifty people in any major cities could quite easily start riots which would overwhelm the police and military forces in this country.

If the outbreaks of violence were planned and carried out simultaneously, it would be physically impossible to move troops into all the trouble areas simultaneously. And if this should happen, a number of major cities could quite literally be burned to the ground.
In fact, there is some reason to believe that the views of Dr. King and Mr. King and Mr. Carmichael and his fellow conspirators unprepared. The unexpected pretext for violence was杀人犯 available. We must vote for more or less spontaneously in a number of cities.

But Carmichael & Co. were unable to explain their stand for their own purposes. His appeal to the crowd to "get you a gun" was a ring of improvisation and mercifully went unheeded. In the course of the coming summer, during which this city will be subjected to planned demonstrations, perhaps if involving many thousands of people, amply opportunity will present itself for a more carefully prepared explosion.

If this is reason enough for preventing the planned demonstrations, it is surely all the more reason for lowering the boom now on the criminals. The same thing the city demands it, including most especially the safety of the black community, which will be the chief victim if Carmichael succeeds.

But my well-meaning friends out of business are on the books. The new District Crime Reduction Act includes an anti-riot section which provides penalties up to $10,000 and 10 years in jail for anyone who incites a riot resulting in serious bodily harm or property damage exceeding $5,000.

So far as most people are concerned, a man who urges a crowd at the onset of a riot to go home and get their guns qualifies contradict. It is still very much at large. The final decision to go home and get their guns qualifies contradiction. The Justice Department has been condoning the junior Senator from Louisiana for saying law violators ought to be shot before they are permitted to escape. I am not talking about a trivial violation. I am talking about a felony. If I had made that statement, as did the member of the Ku Klux Klan who threw a fire bomb into a Negro church to burn it down, that same member of the NAACP would have applauded me and said the junior Senator from Louisiana was showing great statesmanship.

This Senator knows what it is to take a stand and then have every member of white citizens groups and the Ku Klux Klan all around him asking that he be removed from the Senate. He knows what it is to have those who bear prejudice on the other side react against him. He knows how to get into the hands of law and order, the only way any citizen, be he black or white, or some color in between, or be a member of some other race such as the Oriental race, and the only way we can have peace and prosperity and progress in this country is to see to it that everyone obeys the law.

As the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Exum] has been heard to say so ably on the floor on occasion, when we say in this country that a citizen may decide for himself what laws he is going to obey and may decide for himself what laws he is not going to obey, that is the time of anarchy, that is the end of government as we have known it.

Mr. President, real freedom cannot exist without government. There are too many people on this planet, and certainly the time has come for us to roam around like animals in the jungle. The time has come when we must insist that every citizen obey the law. That applies to our friends Atherstas, as indeed it applies to every other citizen in this country. It applies to Stokely Carmichael, as indeed it must apply to every citizen of our country. People have asked this Senator how he can get away with it. He is living—going around the world, appearing on radio and television programs, describing this country as a bunch of assassins and murderers and criminals passing as the leaders of our Government, and indeed the country itself: putting our courageous fighting men, by his words, in a position of being pictured as murderers and assassins. And how can they say they are the voice of the people when they speak to anybody the way they speak to anybody when they speak to anybody the way they speak to anybody and that will be the end of his misfortune. It is difficult for this Senator to explain how he gets away with it. I know this: He would not be getting away with it in Louisiana. We would find a way to haul him back—going around the world, appearing on radio and television programs, describing this country as a bunch of assassins and murderers and criminals passing as the leaders of our Government, and indeed the country itself: putting our courageous fighting men, by his words, in a position of being pictured as murderers and assassins.

But the only way we can ever have peace and prosperity and progress in this country is to see to it that everyone obeys the law.
be a worthwhile person—not a mere giveaway to someone who is earning no money, but to help that person to be a useful member of society, to be one who knows how to plant a tree, how to raise a pig or what a man does who carries his own burdens and does his part to help others.

**GUN CONTROL**

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I note in today's Washington Post there is an editorial entitled "Arming for Anarchy," which condemns the National Rifle Association and others who do not agree with the National Rifle Association's position. It is a very well-written editorial, and I commend it to the Senate. It has been exhilarated in public affairs since the very beginning of things.

The NRA has advanced the argument editorially that the "armed citizen represents a potential community stabilizer." From the pages of a single edition of The Washington Post—Wednesday's issue—we have culled some instances of the contribution to a stable community of the unrestricted proliferation of firearms.

One story tells of an Alexandria coffee shop owner who grabbed an automatic pistol to repel a group of youths he suspected of vandalism—and, firing a volley of shots in his independent effort to stabilize the situation, he killed a young lad. Still another is about three men, two of them armed with community stabilizers in the form of a handgun—and about $4500 from a branch of the National Bank of Washington. And, finally, the day's grisly produce also a small item about a cashier at a local supermarket turned gunpoint—in the interest of community stabilization, of course—to turn over about $25 to a man who appeared in his cash register with a stabilizer in his hand in the early afternoon.

The proliferation of these deadly weapons—nearly all with which every hoodoo, hophead, punk, felon and amiable but indiscreet householder can get possession of them—threatens every other metropolitan center in America into a jungle where death may stalk every inch of passersby because some armless, idiot chooses to take community stabilization into his own hands.

If Congress lets the National Rifle Association's crackpots and hard-heads hoodwink it once more into thwarting effective firearms control, it ought to have the time has come to

...to plan seriously a major urban guerrilla warfare where we can begin to retaliate not only for the slain but also for the slain. The latest Harris poll on the subject shows that the American people favor the passage of Federal laws which would put tight controls on the sale of the latest handgun—a category that makes up 25 per cent of the sales. It's time to give that majority some attention.

**RIOTS AND THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON**

Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. President, the uninducted of the vital functions of the U.S. Government in the Nation's Capital is being seriously threatened by the actions of a handful of self-appointed "leaders of the poor." These disciples of lawlessness and civil disorder are in the process of reducing the hopes of the poor and downtrodden in our society that the way to get what they want is to stage a mass "camp in" or "sit in" in our Nation's Capital—the object being to disrupt the work of Congress and thus blackmail Congress and the President into acceding to any and all of their demands no matter how outrageous or unworkable some of them may be.

Mr. President, what these people are not being told is that Congress is made up of intelligent and honorable men who are not about to be bludgeoned into submission to the demands of anyone. This Senator, for one, has voted and will consistently for programs designed to end the blight of the underprivileged. But, Mr. President, I will never bow to threats, intimidation, or blackmail.

I commend to Senators an article on this subject in today's Washington Evening Star written by Col. Henry Fordham. I agree with Mr. Noyes that "tolerance of such groups is a luxury which the United States can no longer afford." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

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

**CRACKPOT CRUSADE LOOKS FOR INNOCENTS OF VIOLENCE**

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

The time has come to crack down on the crackpots and hard-heads. It is time to put out of circulation for as long as possible all of the individuals and organizations in this country, black and white, who are deliberately and openly inciting to violence and race riots.

Few democratic societies in the world would tolerate the murderous activities of such outcasts as the Revolutionary Action Movement, the Black Liberation Army, the so-called American Indian Movement, and the Black Panthers. These and similarly misguided Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Most would have long since labeled them as Minutemen, Klansmen and American Nazis.

There are some groups that fish for innocents to hurl cakes of violence. The United States can no longer afford that danger which they represent to the fabric of American society is clear and imminent. The removal of such a threat was taken in the late nineteen-sixties, but it would do more to cool the fever of our cities than all the appeals for law and order.

Consider, for example, the case for tolerating the likes of Stokely Carmichael. Within hours of the murder of Martin Luther King in Memphis, Stokely was telling his friends in Havana that the American revolution was now in full swing.

"More people," Carmichael assured his listeners, "are now beginning to plan seriously a major urban guerrilla warfare where we can begin to retaliate not only for the slain, but also for the slain. The latest Harris poll on the subject shows that the American people favor the passage of Federal laws which would put tight controls on the latest handgun—a category that makes up 25 per cent of the sales. It's time to give that majority some attention.

But if and bluster? Perhaps. But it would be a very serious mistake to underestimate the potential of even a small group of dedicated conspirators.

The most competent officials of the government believe that under present conditions a few dozen men in as many major cities could quite easily start riots which would overwhelm the police and many forces presently available for riot control.

If the outbreaks of violence were planned and directed by our society, it would be physically impossible to move troops into all the trouble areas simultaneously. And if this should happen, a number of major cities could quite literally be burned to the ground.

In fact, there is some reason to believe that the shooting of Dr. King caught Carmichael and his fellow conspirators unprepared. The unexpected press for violence and chaos made the situation worse and virtually caused Carmichael and his friends to break out more or less spontaneously in a number of cities.

But Carmichael & Co. were unable to exploit this outbreak of the inside job. The appeal to the crowd to "get you a gun" had a ring of improvisation and mercifully was not as clearly defined. As a matter of fact, Stokely was nowhere in evidence in Washington. Stokely was nowhere in evidence.

Yet very surely there will be a next time.
The recent riot demonstrated once again how little relationship there is between the demand for an outbreak and the motivation of those who take part in it. In the course of the coming summer, during which this city will be subjected to planned demonstrations, perhaps involving many thousands of people, ample opportunity will present itself for a more carefully prepared explosion.

If this is reason enough for preventing the incitement of people it is, it is surely all the more reason for lowering the boom now on Stokely and his friends. The safety of the city is now clearly, as never before, the safety of the black community, which will be the chief victim if Carmichael succeeds.

Last year in New York, 12 members of RAM were arrested for plotting the assassination of Boy Wilkins, the head of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Today, the assassination of whole cities is being plotted, and virtually nothing is being done about it.

The laws to put Stokely and his friends out of business are on the books. The new Districts Crime Reduction Act includes an amendment providing for a maximum fine of $10,000 and 10 years in jail for anyone who incites a riot resulting in serious bodily harm or property damage exceeding $5,000.

Police should arrest a man who urges a crowd at the outset of a riot to go home and get their guns to consolidate under the provisions of this law. But though the Justice Department has been investigating Carmichael's case for weeks, he is still free. For a large, the final decision rests with Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who would be well advised to stop pussyfooting and crack down before it is too late.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Senate to a recent debate in Congress during which the futility of the racist policy is discussed. Mr. Ralph de Toledano lays particular stress on the fact that this policy must rest for stirring up much of the hatred and lawlessness in our cities.

In the case of the major riot--

Mr. de Toledano notes--there is sufficient evidence to show that many thousands of people are responsible for the riots, and the blame must rest for stirring up much of the hatred and lawlessness in our cities.

In the case of the major riots--

Mr. de Toledano notes--there is sufficient evidence to show that many thousands of people are responsible for the riots, and the blame must rest for stirring up much of the hatred and lawlessness in our cities.

Whatever excuses can be made for the looters and the arsonists, they certainly do not apply to those who cold-bloodedly exploit Negro misery and Negro frustration for what can only be described as acute subversion.

As one Member of Congress, I personally feel that the rank and file of working people in this country will probably suffer if a tax measure is passed as a result of a Senate floor amendment, as was the case with the surtax. The reason I say that is, in all probability, if Congress were to pass a revenue measure it would probably be amended by both the House Finance Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. President, I am sure you know that members of the tax-writing committees do not like to continue to the House and have a big tax increase unless there were some better control over spending than there is at the present time. Precisely what that control should be is something that the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, of course, is not in a position to dictate for himself. He must consult with others who have responsibility in that area. In particular, he must consult with the Finance Committee and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives. When those gentlemen get together and decide what they can agree upon, then the conference should be settled in fair order.

So the prolonged delay of this conference report is not a matter of the conference playing a game of blindman's bluff; it is merely that the Senate Representatives want to make sure that the Representatives agree to a Senate position until the House is in a position to agree, among its own Members, on a position that it can sustain.

We are now in a period of judgment, will probably be resolved sometime during the next 10 days, perhaps during the next week. And when the Members of the House of Representatives resolve it, in turn, the Senate will have to vote on the revenue measure, will be ironed out in a great hurry.

As one Member of Congress, I personally feel that the rank and file of working people in this country will probably suffer if a tax measure is passed as a result of a Senate floor amendment, as was the case with the surtax. The reason I say that is, in all probability, if Congress were to pass a revenue measure it would probably be amended by both the Finance Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

As one Senator, I personally hope that the members of the Ways and Means Committee decide to initiate a revenue measure themselves and send it to us. The Senate has acted, and I would support the view of the Senate even though I had a contrary view in the beginning. Unanimously the Senate has printed in the Record an article entitled "Settling of Johnson-Mills Fiscal Feud Makes Tax Rise Nearly Inevitable," written by Messrs. Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, and published in today's Washington Post.

Mr. President, some people have misunderstood what was delaying the conclusion of the conference report on the revenue measure which passed the Senate some time ago. The logjam, may I say, is not exactly as it was, it is not the problem to what the House of Representatives wants to do about a revenue measure, or about a limit on spending. The press has widely publicized the fact that Governor Phil侄es, of Arkansas, has indicated that he would oppose any sort of tax bill unless there were some effective control over spending.

That makes reasonable sense. The Senator from Iowa was chairman of the Committee on Finance, certainly

knows that members of the tax-writing committees do not like to continue to the House, but that tax increase unless there were some better control over spending than there is at the present time. Precisely what that control should be is something that the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, of course, is not in a position to dictate for himself. He must consult with others who have responsibility in that area. In particular, he must consult with the Finance Committee and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives.

When those gentlemen get together and decide what they can agree upon, then the conference should be settled in fairly short order. So the prolonged delay of this conference report is not a matter of the conference playing a game of blindman's bluff; it is merely that the Senate Representatives want to make sure that the Representatives agree to a Senate position until the House is in a position to agree, among its own Members, on a position that it can sustain.

Mr. President, I am sure you know that members of the tax-writing committees do not like to continue to the House and have a big tax increase unless there were some better control over spending than there is at the present time. Precisely what that control should be is something that the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, of course, is not in a position to dictate for himself. He must consult with others who have responsibility in that area. In particular, he must consult with the Finance Committee and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives. When those gentlemen get together and decide what they can agree upon, then the conference should be settled in fairly short order. So the prolonged delay of this conference report is not a matter of the conference playing a game of blindman's bluff; it is merely that the Senate Representatives want to make sure that the Representatives agree to a Senate position until the House is in a position to agree, among its own Members, on a position that it can sustain.

We are now in a period of judgment, will probably be resolved sometime during the next 10 days, perhaps during the next week. And when the Members of the House of Representatives resolve it, in turn, the Senate will have to vote on the revenue measure, will be ironed out in a great hurry.

As one Member of Congress, I personally feel that the rank and file of working people in this country will probably suffer if a tax measure is passed as a result of a Senate floor amendment, as was the case with the surtax. The reason I say that is, in all probability, if Congress were to pass a revenue measure it would probably be amended by both the Finance Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

As one Senator, I personally hope that the members of the Ways and Means Committee decide to initiate a revenue measure themselves and send it to us. The Senate has acted, and I would support the view of the Senate even though I had a contrary view in the beginning. Unanimously the Senate has printed in the Record an article entitled "Settling of Johnson-Mills Fiscal Feud Makes Tax Rise Nearly Inevitable," written by Messrs. Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, and published in today's Washington Post of today, April 25, 1968.

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

COLLINS RACIAL AGITATORS: SAYS RIOT INCITERS Plundered the Negroes for Real Issues

(By Ralph de Toledano)

It is an article of faith among some liberals that the recent riots were purely spontaneous—the result of long-standing Negro grief with no possible connection with the pogroms among the young people. This, of course, is what the Kerner commission reported.

We are about to have been fully im
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Whatever excuses can be made for the looters and the arsonists, they certainly do not apply to those who cold-bloodedly exploit Negro misery and Negro frustration for what can only be described as acute subversion.
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ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there are no further statements to be made at this time, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will 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.

AMENDMENT OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays the Senate out of order, and the Senate now proceeds to the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (S. 1401) to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I wish to propose a unanimous-consent agreement governing the pending amendment to the bill last considered.

I ask unanimous consent that, on Monday next, debate on amendment No. 704, proposed by the senior Senator from Louisiana, be limited to 2 hours, 1 hour to be controlled by the junior Senator from Louisiana and 1 hour by the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the junior Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the right to object—and I shall not object—should we accept the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I see no objection. The time on the amendment is disposed of.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am willing to consider the amendment if the Senator from Louisiana will agree to it.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I wish to propose a unanimous-consent agreement governing the pending amendment to the bill last considered.

I ask unanimous consent that, on Monday next, debate on amendment No. 704, proposed by the senior Senator from Louisiana, be limited to 2 hours, 1 hour to be controlled by the junior Senator from Louisiana and 1 hour by the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the junior Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the right to object—and I shall not object—should we accept the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I see no objection. The time on the amendment is disposed of.
follow bear some relationship to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

I have an amendment that is of vital importance to my State, and I am in the process of trying to negotiate an understanding with the Senate committee. But do not forget that the Federal Government owns more than 50 percent of my State of Oregon, and I am not inclined to go along with giving to the Secretary of the Interior blanket authority to exchange Federal property in my State at his discretion without Congress passing judgment on each exchange, because the subject of exchange has been a matter of political scandal in my State.

I came to the Senate on the basis of a Department of Interior scandal in my State involving a land exchange. I shall discuss in some detail, I understand. However, I do not wish to ask for a vote on my amendment until we have disposed of the Ellender amendment. Before we adjourn today, I would like to offer my amendment and to make a brief statement so that Senators will know the problem in my State, as I see it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Louisiana, concerning the vote on the Ellender amendment on Monday, on the time limitation stated?

The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

That effective on Monday, April 29, 1968, at the conclusion of the routine morning business, further debate on the amendment by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] to S. 1401, to amend Title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes, including the amendment to Title I of the National Forest Service Permit Bill, shall be counted as having been equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to state briefly and very succinctly the logic of the Ellender amendment which I think is a very fine amendment and an amendment to which the Senate should agree.

With the Ellender amendment the bill before the Senate would be a very fine bill. It authorizes more than $1 billion for recreational and park purposes. I think that is a fine idea.

There is no doubt that the senior Senator from Louisiana, who is a ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations—and I am sure one day will likely be the chairman of that committee—would like to have this money. But other funds are necessary and desirable based on priorities for a recreational and park program.

Therefore, without the Ellender amendment, the argument of those who favor S. 1401 is that Congress has been too niggardly in appropriating money for parks and recreation and, therefore, we should take a great national asset, the entire Outer Continental Shelf, and dedicate it to national parks and recreational purposes. The Senator from Louisiana thinks there is no place for dedication of any national asset. The burden of that argument would be that if these rioters were to burn down Washington the money could not be used for law enforcement before the needs of national parks are satisfied.

The burden of the argument is that when there is found a desirable program where Congress has been so shortsighted that it is given no money. If some great national asset should be dedicated to assure that in the future Congress, if it were shortsighted, would have to leave the money there and not appro­ priate it placed on the table. For example, when we debated the tidelands bill, some Senators suggested there should be a dedication of all oil resources and other resources of the Outer Continental Shelf to education. It could be said that they should be dedicated to science, recreation, research, development, and all sorts of things. However, as a practical matter, Congress has resisted earmarking funds except where it felt the public would be better satisfied supporting a program if the revenues to be extracted from the public were dedicated to that purpose.

For instance, when we debated the highway bill, some Senators suggested that every dollar of a magnificent highway system, which is still being built, and the other phase being the revenue measure. The tax was paid into the highway trust fund. A tax was paid on gasoline so that people could pay money and see the highway built and realize why they were paying the tax.

Mr. President, there is no connection between the Outer Continental Shelf and recreation. That being the case, to place recreation above all other functions of the National Government, and to put money for that purpose over priorities for everything else is not logical and does not make good sense.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. At best, earmarking is clumsy, inflexible, and an unwieldy procedure. Earmarking assigns arbitrarily a priority which may in many instances be less important than other priorities. Furthermore, whether it is justified in the case of the highway trust fund. However, this was an undertaking so vast that the Congress, in its wisdom, concluded that it should be on a pay-as-you-go basis and it was largely in response to this appeal that the Senate unanimously accepted the additional highway user tax.

As I understand the pending proposal, no new revenue is proposed. It would be merely an earmarking of an existing asset; or revenue for a purpose which, insofar as these funds are concerned, would have priority over all things else.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is the objection that the senior Senator from Louisiana has made about this proposal. All we are saying is: let the revenue go into the Treasury and let Congress, in its wisdom, assign whatever priority it wishes.

To take the attitude that Congress has been too niggardly and that, therefore, there must be a dedication of great natural resources, is to suggest that a program with a low priority should beheeveth the highest priority of all.

I have said, and my colleague has said, that we are happy to give the authorization that is being requested. If there is justification whatever vote we would be happy to vote for the appropriation, and I would be happy to vote for an appropriation, but to earmark a great national resource for recreation does not make common sense.

Mr. GORE. It would give recreation a priority over national defense.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That it would do.

Mr. GORE. It would give recreation a priority over education.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That it would do.

Mr. GORE. Over hospitalization.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That it would do.

Mr. GORE. Over social security.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That it would do.

Mr. GORE. Over welfare.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That it would do. And over law enforcement; over everything.

In order to pursue the same procedure, we could pursue it to earmark moneys to less essential programs. For instance, there could be a situation where, if rioters were to come here to burn down Washington, the law enforcement could not be paid for because the money had been earmarked for programs that carried a higher priority, although Congress, in the past, had not assigned such priority to them. In my judgment, the precedent would be horrible if, every time a committee said, "Look here"—suppose it is not the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs whose pet project it is recreation, but suppose it is the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and that committee says, "Look here, the old cotton farmer is not doing well so let us earmark all the money from the income tax for the cotton farmer."

Then here comes the March on Washington and they want a poverty program. I do not quite understand what they have in mind, but I believe all this has to do with the negative income theory, they want...
$3,000 a year whether they work or not. Of course, if they make some money, then that will be deducted from the $3,000.

Suppose someone says, "My goodness, we have to get the march on Washington over here, and I know that the people don't let us give them what they demand." That is what some will suggest, I suppose.

Then someone will contend that we should dedicate all our income taxes to the poverty program or to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedicating all our income taxes to the negative income proposal, so that we will be taxing the people who work hard for a living to take care of those who do not, and the first thing we know we will be dedi-
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the Outer Continental Shelf by the land and water conservation fund. In this way we will help erase the backlog of acquisition and development needs being faced by our cities and towns, our counties, our municipalities, and our State and our States. We will also, by providing a minimum level of financing for the fund, begin to catch up with park and recreation acquisition projects authorized by the Federal and State governments and faced with a cost of at least $350 million in this account. This cumulative price will continue to rise, because of the continuous escalation of recreation land prices. We can eliminate this problem if the Board of Outdoor Recreation report last year.

The land and water conservation fund has been particularly helpful in Pennsylvania. Under the fund, 50-50 matching grants are appropriated by the General Assembly and provided by the U.S. Department of Interior. They are the political subdivisions for outdoor recreation planning, acquisition and development projects. Among the Pennsylvania State planning projects alone. We have many other outstanding State and local projects which are awaiting financing so that we can continue our momentum in this field.

Mr. President, as a cosponsor, I support S. 1401 as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is a sound approach to a pressing domestic problem. Mr. President, as a member of the Pennsylvania State Planning Board, I am fully conscious of the value of the land and water conservation fund in helping my Commonwealth acquire for the enjoyment of our residents and guests for parks and recreational land. In 1966, the board approved an interim statewide outdoor recreation plan, which is the product of a comprehensive study of the State and the land and water conservation fund. The board is now engaged in a 3-year effort to prepare a comprehensive outdoor recreation plan to enable the Governor to condition the State's Federal and State programs concerning recreation. This plan will be an integral part of the overall State development plan for Pennsylvania which the board expects to have ready by 1970.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent statement of the activities of the Pennsylvania State Planning Board, together with three attachments thereto, be printed in the Record. I also ask unanimous consent that a statement in support of S. 1401 by Pennsylvania's able and distinguished secretary of forests and waters, Dr. Maurice K. Godsell, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT BY IRVING HAND, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AT THE BUDGET HEARING, HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, PENNSYLVANIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY, APRIL 1, 1968

My name is Irving Hand. I appear before you as Executive Director of the Pennsylvania State Planning Board.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE PLANNING BOARD

The State Planning Board consists of 90 members. Fifteen members of the Board are appointed by the Governor for four-year terms. Five members serve in an ex officio capacity by virtue of their respective official position: the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Banking and Securities, the Secretary of Community Affairs, the Secretary of Forests and Waters and the Secretary of Highways. A list of the members of the Board accompanies this statement.

When I joined the staff as Executive Director, in November 1964, it was with the urging of the Board that state planning become a highly qualified professional resource for the Commonwealth, functioning as a part of the Government, in an advisory capacity, offering knowledgeable judgment to those who make the decisions concerning the future of Pennsylvania.

This we have been attempting to do and the staff has been organized accordingly.

The State Planning Division, formally identified as the Research Division, is concerned with population and economic research and the preparation of a comprehensive State Development Plan. Within that framework, its current responsibilities include the evaluation of public and private development projects with particular reference to Appalachian Pennsylvania and planning for state Appalachian needs. We have decided to separate the board's responsibilities by working closely with the Secretary of Commerce, through whom the Commonwealth is represented on the thirteen-state Appalachian Regional Commission. The Planning Board's staff serves in research, policy advice, project review and coordination, and, since 1966, the State planning椀паs the Appalachian Pennsylvania Plan for Development, which will deal with 52 of the 67 counties in the State, between the geographic area, and over 50 percent of its people, will be a significant step in the preparation of the State Plan.

The Advance Planning Division emphasizes multi-county regional planning as important to the formulation and fulfillment of State policy, and, now in its second year of compilation of the reconnaissance of each of the thirteen State Planning Regions in 1965 and 1966, there followed the establishment of regional planning agencies in several of these areas, the recognition of groupings of these Regions into Local Development Districts in meeting the Federal requirements for Appalachian and Economic Development Assistance program and project funding, and most recently, with the new Regional Development Act of 1966 and the review and briefing capacity with respect to: Where is the Commonwealth going? 2. What efforts do we use to get there—means? How do we apply our resources in that regard—Priorities? In this respect, the State Planning Program is concerned to do to enhance the Program-Planning-Budgeting System now being projected for the Commonwealth State planning process. It will be used in gaining that objective. The Board and staff are ready to reexamine any aspect of this Program in the interest of the fullest possible support of the PPBS effort.

BUDGET REQUEST

There are no new programs in this Budget Request. We are continuing with those activities which have been determined to be useful and about which I have commented in describing our staff. We are seeking to gain a fuller measure of Federal augmentation and to begin leveling off as to State appropriations. To consolidate the staff we have put together over the past three years as a well organized working team. For the fiscal year 1968-69, major attention will be given to:

1. The preparation of the 1969-70 Capital Program
2. Continued work on the Statewide Outdoor Recreation Plan and the continued eligiblity of the Commonwealth for funding of projects from several Federal sources.
3. Continued activities in the utilization of the Appalachian Program in Pennsylvania, including the development of the Appalachian Plan for Development with the participation of each of the seven multi-county Local Development Districts and the respective State agency concerned with particular programs.
4. Carrying forward with comprehensive and coordinated water resources planning for the Commonwealth effort which was substantially accelerated with the completion of the State Supplement to the Water Resources Planning Act of 1968, and 5. Quality staff in preparation by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Further encouragement and support to regional planning through the State Mapping Program, "purchase of service" agreements, assistance in the application of the Comprehensive Redevelopment Act of 1968 and the review and comment responsibility being exercised by...
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Irving Hand.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE PLANNING BOARD, PROPOSED WORK PROGRAM, 1968-69

The proposed Work Program for 1968-69 will see continued attention in the second of a proposed three year effort to plan for a Comprehensive State Development Plan. That work is expected to proceed with a minimum of additional authorized assistance, and the employment of consulting services, as necessary, and the continued strengthening of regional planning as part of the work of the Planning Board through the arrangement of "purchases of service" between the State Planning Board and specific planning regions.

During the remainder of this 1967-68 fiscal year and with the resources to be gained by the continuing productivity and effort in working for the best may be gained for the Commonwealth and its people, and in coordinating Federal-State policies and programs as these relate to State Planning and development, recognizing the expected role of regional and State planning as a requirement for Federal assistance.

I. IMPLEMENTATION, with respect to: Executive Action (Governor), Legislative Action (General Assembly), Administrative Coordination (Departments), Interdepartmental Coordination (Regions), Capital Program, Planning Program Coordination and Briefing Room, Office of Administration.


III. Implementation, with respect to: Executive Action (Governor), Legislative Action (General Assembly), Administrative Coordination (Departments), Interdepartmental Coordination (Regions), Capital Program, Planning Program Coordination and Briefing Room, Office of Administration.

The preparation of the State Development Plan has in hand at this time a preliminary review of the Planning Regions as presented by the Commonwealth as gained through studies and analyses by the State Planning Board, the coordinated consideration of the plans, policies, and programs of interested government agencies, and the inputs gained from the examination of each of the State Planning Regions. Development of the draft of the completion of the State Development Plan, will be completed to the extent possible of review of the Planning Regions, generally paralleling in content the State Development Plan, will be evaluated. Emphasis will be placed on the actual application of the State Plan to the Capital Program, requirements of the State Planning Board and the planning, programming and budgeting system under consideration for the State Planning Board.

In addition to the high priority of attention and the allocation of resources to be devoted to the foregoing activities, the Work Program of the State Planning Board will continue to include:


Mapping: Completion of the Regional Base Mapping Program; formulation and implementation of a Camp-Flows State Mapping Program.

Regional Planning: Activities in the State Planning Program: Regional Planning Commission, Northwest Pennsylvania Regional Planning and Development Commission, and Regional Planning in the Tocks Island Area, Commonwealth "701" review requirements of the Local Development Plans and zonings, the State Planning Board in co-ordination with regional and State Planning; County zoning review in co-ordination with local and State Planning.

Participation in "review and comment" requirements of Section 204 of Model Cities Act of 1968.

Soil Conservation Service "small watershed and planning coordination.

Pennsylvania State Planning Board: Budget Request 1968-69

Notes for Budget hearing January 23, 1968, 3:30 p.m.

I. Highlighted comment on State Planning Program:

A. Emphasis on: (1) State Development Plan, (2) Regional Planning, (3) Project and Program Coordination and Priorities, (4) Oversight.

B. Functional overview:


C. Consistent with State Planning Board role as: (1) Staff agency, (2) Advisory, (3) Information center and briefing facility, (4) Planning coordination with respect to planning and development requirements.

II. State Planning Program is proceeding, taking into full account, planning activities in the application to State Government; planning and program parts of State Planning Program most relevant; now preparing three year "701" mapping assistance application to HUD, in estimated amount of $300,000 for 1967-1968, $250,000 for 1968-1969, reflecting funding.

III. Urgent need to enact proposed State and Regional Planning Law; up-to-date legislative changes, currently under consideration by several state legislatures, now require comprehensive planning and more to be added; proposed law will fill the statutory requirement on the basis of which State and regional planning would meet the functional requirements.

IV. Important to proceed with 1968-75 Capital Program, planning activities.

V. Detailed comment with respect to activities concerning State Development Plan.

A. Statewide Outdoor Recreation Plan.

1. Prepared Interim Plan:

(a) Being applied to (1) Project 70-2, (2) Loan for Water Conservation (Federal), (3) Project 500, Pennsylvania Land and Water Conservation and Reclamation Plan.

(b) Eligibility for Federal funds to be expended in Commonwealth approved by Bu-
resu of Outdoor Recreation through July 1968; submittal in May 1968 expected to gain approval through July 1970. I was able to prepare comprehensive, multi-functional outdoor recreation plan under way.

1. Involves staff of State Planning Board and related agencies and consultants.
2. Demand analysis—contract with Hammer, Greene, Siler and Associates ($12,000) for economic analyses with particular application to demands for recreation areas and facilities; included in proposed budget for 1970, 1980, and 2000, by State Planning Region; information will be used by State agencies in recreation planning—Forests and Waters, Fish and Wildlife, Historical and Museum, Community Affairs.
3. Application to Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for $245,000 to assist in preparation of State Plan (total cost of $490,000) as set forth in three year program; assistance to each of State agencies involved.
4. Executive Director, State Planning Board serves as State Liaison Officer for application of Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund to assist in preparatory work, project review, and coordination of each Legislative Committee.

Appalachian Pennsylvania Plan for Development.

(a) Preparation of 1966 Plan.
(b) Economic analyses—contract with Hammer, Greene, Siler and Associates ($12,000) for economic analyses about economic activities and their projection and projection and its projection; fundamental to preparation of 1966 Plan for Development.

Groupings of State Planning Regions and coordinated with State Administrative Regional Planning Committees (SPRPC) and local Development Districts.

Appalachian Pennsylvania Plan for Development.

1. Preparation of base maps being completed.
2. Existing land use information being mapped, tabulated and analyzed.
3. Projected land use; (a) Coordinate with key State agencies, (b) Coordinate with regional agencies.
4. Geo-Coding Project.
5. Acquisition and development of new park lands. was increased to a point where $19 million dollars was authorized for the 1966-67 Bicentennial. The increasing need for the intensive and extensive land acquisition program was recognized, and in 1964, enabling legislation was authorized, which provided $78 million dollars for State and local governments to acquire land for recreation, conservation and historical purposes.

The increasing need for the intensive and extensive land acquisition program was recognized, and in 1964, enabling legislation was authorized, which provided $78 million dollars for State and local governments to acquire land for recreation, conservation and historical purposes. The increasing need for the intensive and extensive land acquisition program was recognized, and in 1964, enabling legislation was authorized, which provided $78 million dollars for State and local governments to acquire land for recreation, conservation and historical purposes. The increasing need for the intensive and extensive land acquisition program was recognized, and in 1964, enabling legislation was authorized, which provided $78 million dollars for State and local governments to acquire land for recreation, conservation and historical purposes.
Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President pro tempore be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT ON FRIDAY UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
April 25, 1968
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE
10627
rivers bill—and I refer to the same staff members—that I am going to try to do everything I can to work out language for this bill that will give us a satisfactory result.
I am going to offer an amendment that would prohibit any exchange power in the Secretary of the Interior, which I would stand for if we could not get modifying language in the bill that will protect us along lines I have been working out.
The language is so broad that it would, in effect, permit a Secretary of the Interior, as I said, to trade off even part of one park in a State to create another. In the case of Oregon, it would permit the exchange of the Oregon and California revested railroad or Coos Bay Wagon Road lands, already dedicated by law to multiple-use forest management to secure that last few years the Oregon Caves, or Fort Clatope inholdings, as well as those in any park or seashore subsequently created.

The language also erodes the protection adopted in the wild rivers bill when it passed the Senate because it sets aside the restrictions written into that bill. Those restrictions were written into the bill because of the objections raised by the senior Senator from Oregon at the time.

The language of the pending bill would have the effect of modifying the arrangements reached with the wild rivers bill that I thought we had satisfactorily worked out last year.
So, as I say, I am unable to understand why the administration continues to proceed, and, the Interior Committee accepts, this exchange language so broad as to permit the vitiation of other authorized programs for parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, and public lands.

Delays by the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management have made good progress in the program of land planning and classification authorized in 1964. Despite the considerable progress made in 1965 that involved a possible exchange of public lands in Curry County to augment Point Reyes Seashore, the overall record has been one of slow progress, that controversy demonstrated that early and complete local discussion of possible land exchanges is most desirable.

That is why I urge procedures for such discussion in my remarks today.

As you know, my preference would be to allocate funds secured from the sale of public lands to the land and water conservation fund. Exchanges should be used only by an amendment to improve its land patterns. An exchange which took public land in eastern Oregon to solidify a park in western Oregon could be fraught with problems.

The language in S. 1401 covers these aspects; and I have to express concern because, as I said earlier this afternoon, do not forget, over 50 percent of the land area of my State is owned by the Federal Government. Therefore, anything the Federal Government does with respect to land in my State owned by the Federal Government is bound to have an immediate economic impact on the State. That is why leaders in my State, county judges, county commissioners, State legislators, the Governor's office, and the congressional officers are always very careful to scrutinize any proposal that in any way involves any change of policy with respect to Federal programs, serial land uses.

The bill sets no legislative policy standard to differentiate between land which might be exchangeable to improve the administering agency's operation and land which is nonexchangeable because it serves no Federal management program.

The language sets no guides for studies and investigation so that facts on exchanges to augment the purposes of authorized programs for parks, monuments, and public lands are highly unlikely in Oregon unless it is done in a way that vitiates these exchange provisions of this bill, I think, are impossible to the extent that virtually every acre of public land is not only being used, but the range and intensity of use is on the increase. Failure to meet these basic public knowledge standards by the language fraught with potential difficulties.

As I have often said, we write legislation not against the standard of who now occupies the office but rather against the standard of providing basic protections in our grants of authority.

My concern, as it relates to Oregon, involves all of the lands there administered by the Secretary of the Interior for which there are specific authorized programs. These include the wildlife refuges, parks and monuments, and public lands, and the vast public domain holdings are locally presented. The language does not provide for public meetings nor does it provide a forum for those who may be using the lands to receive consideration. In my extensive travels in Oregon, I am impressed by the fact that virtually every acre of public land is not only being used, but the range and intensity of use is on the increase. Failure to meet these basic public knowledge standards by the language fraught with potential difficulties.

As I have often said, we write legislation not against the standard of who now occupies the office but rather against the standard of providing basic protections in our grants of authority.

My concern, as it relates to Oregon, involves all of the lands there administered by the Secretary of the Interior for which there are specific authorized programs. These include the wildlife refuges, parks and monuments, and public lands, and the vast public domain holdings are locally presented. The language does not provide for public meetings nor does it provide a forum for those who may be using the lands to receive consideration. In my extensive travels in Oregon, I am impressed by the fact that virtually every acre of public land is not only being used, but the range and intensity of use is on the increase. Failure to meet these basic public knowledge standards by the language fraught with potential difficulties.
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My concern, as it relates to Oregon, involves all of the lands there administered by the Secretary of the Interior for which there are specific authorized programs. These include the wildlife refuges, parks and monuments, and public lands, and the vast public domain holdings are locally presented. The language does not provide for public meetings nor does it provide a forum for those who may be using the lands to receive consideration. In my extensive travels in Oregon, I am impressed by the fact that virtually every acre of public land is not only being used, but the range and intensity of use is on the increase. Failure to meet these basic public knowledge standards by the language fraught with potential difficulties.
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My concern, as it relates to Oregon, involves all of the lands there administered by the Secretary of the Interior for which there are specific authorized programs. These include the wildlife refuges, parks and monuments, and public lands, and the vast public domain holdings are locally presented. The language does not provide for public meetings nor does it provide a forum for those who may be using the lands to receive consideration. In my extensive travels in Oregon, I am impressed by the fact that virtually every acre of public land is not only being used, but the range and intensity of use is on the increase. Failure to meet these basic public knowledge standards by the language fraught with potential difficulties.
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My concern, as it relates to Oregon, involves all of the lands there administered by the Secretary of the Interior for which there are specific authorized programs. These include the wildlife refuges, parks and monuments, and public lands, and the vast public domain holdings are locally presented. The language does not provide for public meetings nor does it provide a forum for those who may be using the lands to receive consideration. In my extensive travels in Oregon, I am impressed by the fact that virtually every acre of public land is not only being used, but the range and intensity of use is on the increase. Failure to meet these basic public knowledge standards by the language fraught with potential difficulties.

As I have often said, we write legislation not against the standard of who now occupies the office but rather against the standard of providing basic protections in our grants of authority.

My concern, as it relates to Oregon, involves all of the lands there administered by the Secretary of the Interior for which there are specific authorized programs. These include the wildlife refuges, parks and monuments, and public lands, and the vast public domain holdings are locally presented. The language does not provide for public meetings nor does it provide a forum for those who may be using the lands to receive consideration. In my extensive travels in Oregon, I am impressed by the fact that virtually every acre of public land is not only being used, but the range and intensity of use is on the increase. Failure to meet these basic public knowledge standards by the language fraught with potential difficulties.

As I have often said, we write legislation not against the standard of who now occupies the office but rather against the standard of providing basic protections in our grants of authority.

My concern, as it relates to Oregon, involves all of the lands there administered by the Secretary of the Interior for which there are specific authorized programs. These include the wildlife refuges, parks and monuments, and public lands, and the vast public domain holdings are locally presented. The language does not provide for public meetings nor does it provide a forum for those who may be using the lands to receive consideration. In my extensive travels in Oregon, I am impressed by the fact that virtually every acre of public land is not only being used, but the range and intensity of use is on the increase. Failure to meet these basic public knowledge standards by the language fraught with potential difficulties.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

JUDICIAL ACTIVISM NEGATES RULE OF LAW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is my firm conviction that many of the troubles which the Nation faces today have arisen because of the judicial activism of the U.S. Supreme Court.

An important article developing this point of view appeared in the Wall Street Journal April 22, entitled "Judicial Jumble: Activism Is Threat to Government of Laws and Not of Men."

It makes a point that all Americans should be made aware of: namely, that court decisions based on the personal predilections and concepts of judges and justices undermine the rule of law upon which our social structure is built.

Judicial activism, as this article defines it, means simply that court decisions turn upon the philosophies and socio-economic values of judges instead of upon firmly established principles of law, upon which all such decisions most assuredly should be based.

"Judicial activism is the handmaiden of self-government on the one hand and tyranny on the other," observes. That, Mr. President, is a devastating indictment of our courts.

It leads to a situation in which the certainty—or what ought to be the certainty—of the law is eroded, a situation in which the lawyer finds it increasingly difficult to say what "law" is; by the time a case reaches court, the interpretation may have changed.

The only conclusion that can be reached is that cases are decided by the personal philosophies of judges, rather than by the law itself.

WILL OF THE LAW

Let us consider what some of the leading legal minds of the past, men whom proponents of activism claim as philosophical antecedents, have thought about the question of whether "judicial power is exercised for the purpose of enforcing the Constitution, declared by a landmark case: "Judicial power is never exercised for the purpose of enforcing the Constitution," said Lord Chief Justice Harlan of the Supreme Court, May, 1920, at its pleasure, keeping changing such a meaning.

The Constitution specifically provides for its own amendment, with procedures that completely exclude the Supreme Court.

Some contemporary pseudo-scholars of the law would have us believe that judicial activism is a proper function of courts, entirely consistent with the historical development of law. This is just not true.

Vague laws, subjectively interpreted and applied, are employed to disguise its effects, careful reflection must lead to only one conclusion: Judicial activism is not merely inconsistent with the rule of law, it is the total negation of the rule of law. If cases are decided on the personal philosophies of judges, then all social laws are meaningless.

PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.
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"Lawyers who are unwilling to study the law as it is may discover, as they think, that study is unnecessary; sentiment or benevolence or some vague notion of social welfare is enough to sustain them in their convictions. If they are hardy need to say that this is not my point of view.

Fred Pollock, probably the chief authority in modern times on Anglo-American jurisprudence, repeatedly cautioned that judges should follow established precedents and legislative intent, not their personal views, in reaching decisions. Two other important jurists, Felix Frankfurter and Learned Hand, both enemies of judicial activism. Mr. Frankfurter, a protege of Holmes, went on the Supreme Court in 1939 as a "lone voice" in 1928—but it was the Court, not Mr. Frankfurter, which had undergone the greater change. Justice Harlan speaks of the idea that all social Ills can be cured by courts as having "subtle capacity for serious mischief."

The criticism is not confined to Olympian levels. The legal profession finds it increasingly difficult to know just what the "law" is. High-ranking attorneys and spirits urge us to break laws we do not like, and eager mobs implement their wills, often accompanied by several different opinions and bitter, sarcastic dissents. This is partly because the status of judges has been considerably redefined.

Some activist judges go to great lengths to make sure that they will not be thought of as having unbiased minds. In speeches, articles and decisions they strive to educate the public about the merits of their cases with the assurance of a court. The Court as a whole is now engaged in the doctrine, which had undergone the greatest change. Justice Harlan speaks of the Court as having "unconstitutional" suddenly "unconstitutional."

No matter what euphemisms are employed to disguise its effects, careful reflection must lead to only one conclusion: Judicial activism is not merely inconsistent with the rule of law, it is the total negation of the rule of law. It is the precarious state of law today. Judicial behavior that a generation ago would have been considered reprehensible.

Out of the vast crucible of human experience and travail we have constructed a splendid system of law and courts that is our duty to sustain and improve. The testing heart of that system is the justice. If this heart is a closed one, which recognizes no authority save his own predilections, then all the great shelves filled with lawbooks—"the law as it is my point of view."

Judge, like other mortals, need a large measure of humility in the conviction that one human mind can embrace but a tiny particle of all wisdom and knowledge. As one of the judges has said of that of the Court, Mr. Medina, has expressed it so well: "I don't think I have any propensity or desire to mold the law to my own views. If I had a question of statutory interpretation and I was convinced the statute meant, and was intended to mean, exactly that, I would decide it meant just the opposite because I thought it was desirable social or economic policy to do so. This twisting and stretching is not for me."
ADJOURNMENT ORDERS MODIFIED—ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BROOKE ON MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for convening Monday at noon be vacated, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate convene at 10 a.m. on Monday; and that the roll call be put off until 10 a.m. on Monday, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke] be recognized for a period not to exceed 2 hours, to be followed by a period for the transaction of routine morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It is my understanding that the previous unanimous-consent request submitted by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] will then take effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's understanding is correct.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 26, 1968, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 25, 1968:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

G. Menne Williams, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Philippines.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Paul Frederick DelliQuadri, of Hawaii, to be Chief of the Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Myron H. Bright, of North Dakota, to be U.S. circuit judge for the Eighth Circuit vice Charles J. Vogel, retired February 20, 1968.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Halbert O. Woodward, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas vice Joe W. Sheehy, retired.

William Wayne Justice, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Texas vice Joe W. Sheehy, deceased.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Elidon B. Mahon, of Texas, to be U.S. Attorney for the northern district of Texas for the term of 4 years vice Harold Barefoot Sanders, Jr., resigned.

Richard B. Hardee, of Texas, to be U.S. Attorney for the eastern district of Texas for the term of 4 years vice William Wayne Justice, retiring.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Orrin G. Judd, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of New York, vice Sidney Fort, resigned.

Anthony J. Travis, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of New York vice Charles W. Bredin, retired.


IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

**

IN THE NAVY

**

B. E. Bevenger, Charles T., III

B. W. Black, Francis M., Jr.

B. W. Black, George D., Jr.

B. W. Blackwell, James M.

B. W. Blackwell, Herbert W.

B. W. Blair, Jack R.

B. W. Blake, David A.

B. W. Blake, Ernest L., Jr.

B. W. Blakely, Donald R.

B. W. Bieye, George A., Jr.

B. W. Baker, Robert W.

B. W. Baker, Stanley C.

B. W. Baker, William H.

B. W. Bakewell, Richard B.

B. W. Barnwell, Eugene J.

B. W. Baldwin, Joseph E.

B. W. Bollinger, Roger W.

B. W. Banks, Harold L.

B. W. Banks, Warren H.

B. W. Bard, Albert E.

B. W. Bard, Nicholas T., Jr.

B. W. Bare, George H.

B. W. Andrews, John F., III

B. W. Baker, Kenneth D.

B. W. Angell, John P.

B. W. Anzini, Bert J.

B. W. Appel, Harry L.

B. W. Apple, Lester A.

B. W. Applegate, Stephen J.

B. W. Archibald, John L.

B. W. Armstrong, William L.

B. W. Armstrong, Eldon L.

B. W. Arnold, Brian A.

B. W. Arrasmith, Charles J.

B. W. Arrasmith, Richard J.

B. W. Arnold, Larry E.

B. W. Arnold, Loren D.

B. W. Arrison, James M., III

B. W. Artus, Robert J.

B. W. Atchison, Thomas L.

B. W. Atkinson, Brian P.

B. W. Atwater, David C.

B. W. Atwell, Felton G.

B. W. Aycock, Robert A.

B. W. Austin, Marshall H., Jr.

B. W. Ayers, James B.

B. W. Beckwith, Bruce B.

B. W. Beckwith, Ted, Jr.

B. W. Beccat, Philip A., III

B. W. Beccat, Robert F.

B. W. Bell, Robert S.

B. W. Bell, Walter A.

B. W. Bell, William F.

B. W. Benford, Malcolm Brown, William J., III

B. W. Benucci, Francis J., Jr.

B. W. Bevilacqua, Gerald W.

B. W. Beyer, Richard H., III

B. W. Bevins, Robert E.

B. W. Bennett, Dyan E.

B. W. Bennett, Robert L.

B. W. Biddle, James D.

B. W. Benigni, Brent M.

B. W. Benson, James N.

B. W. Benson, Lawrence P.

B. W. Benson, William T.

B. W. Bentz, Wilbur L.

B. W. Berdine, Robert A.

B. W. Berke, Peter W.

B. W. Berger, Henry G.

B. W. Bergstrand, Robert E.

B. W. Bernman, Carl R., Jr.

B. W. Bertolotti, Ernest J.

B. W. Beshro, Robert L.

B. W. Biddle, James G.

B. W. Bisnich, Daniel E.

B. W. Sinder, Gregory D.

B. W. Birdsall, James M.

B. W. Birdsall, J. Vogel, retired

B. W. Birdsall, Joseph E., Jr.

B. W. Birdsall, Philip E., Jr.

B. W. Birdsall, Paul S.

B. W. Birdsall, Samuel P.

B. W. Birdsall, Donald J.

B. W. Birdsall, William L.

B. W. Birdsall, Robert W.

B. W. Birdsall, Stanley C.

B. W. Birdsall, Richard S.

B. W. Bevlin, Winston M., Jr.

B. W. Battles, James E., retired

B. W. Battles, John B., Jr.

B. W. Battles, Jerry R.

B. W. Battles, Kenneth E.

B. W. Baniel, Philip E.

B. W. Bain, Paul S.

B. W. Bains, Robert E.

B. W. Bains, W. H.

B. W. Bane, John S.

B. W. Bake, Warren E.

B. W. Baker, Robert W.

B. W. Baker, Stanley C.

B. W. Baker, William H.

B. W. Bakewell, Richard B.

B. W. Bakewell, Eugene J.

B. W. Baldwin, Joseph E.

B. W. Baldwin, Louis S.

B. W. Ball, James H.

B. W. Ball, John H. Jr.

B. W. Ball, Michael H.

B. W. Ball, Robert W.

B. W. Banks, Harold L.

B. W. Banks, Warren H.

B. W. Banks, Rodney A.

B. W. Bard, Albert E.

B. W. Bard, Nicholas T., Jr.

B. W. Bare, George H.

B. W. Andrews, John F., III

B. W. Baker, Kenneth D.

B. W. Angell, John P.

B. W. Anzini, Bert J.

B. W. Appel, Harry L.

B. W. Apple, Lester A.

B. W. Applegate, Stephen J.

B. W. Archibald, John L.

B. W. Armstrong, William L.

B. W. Armstrong, Eldon L.

B. W. Arnold, Brian A.

B. W. Arrasmith, Charles J.

B. W. Arrasmith, Richard J.

B. W. Arnold, Larry E.

B. W. Arnold, Loren D.

B. W. Arrison, James M., III

B. W. Artus, Robert J.

B. W. Atchison, Thomas L.

B. W. Atkinson, Brian P.

B. W. Atwater, David C.

B. W. Atwell, Felton G.

B. W. Aycock, Robert A.

B. W. Austin, Marshall H., Jr.

B. W. Ayers, James B.
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Cameron, William T., Clapper, Richard F.
Campbell, Hugh E., Jr.
Campbell, John A., Jr.
Campbell, James C.
Campbell, Malcolm L.
Caputo, Michael P.
Carr, James M.
Carr, Richard S.
Carr, Gary L.
Carruth, John W.
Carlsen, "W" Eugene
Carlton, James C.
Carlson, James E.
Carlson, Robert W.
Carlyon, Walter E., II
Carola, James C.
Carpen
ter, Alfred T.
Carson, William G.
Carlson, Michael L.
Carroll, Joseph J.
Cecil, John E.
Chadwick, John A.
Chappell, Robert M.
Chase, Robert A.
Chase, Samuel T.
Chenault, John A.
Chotvacs, James F.
Christal, Clark
Christensen, Marion E.
Coffey, Edward D.
Cook, Arthur H.
Collins, Walter S.
Collins, William G., Jr.
Combe, Andrew J.
Combs, Michael C.
Common, John M.
Conlin, Michael
Connell, Daniel E.
Connor, James V.
Content, Dale M.
Cook, Clifford V.
Cook, Douglas W.
Cook, Oren F.
Cooper, John B., Jr.
Cooper, Roger M.
Copeland, Fred R.
Copolla, Ernest J.
Costello, Robert A.
Cortigiani, Leto B., Jr.
Cornell, Clifford L.
Costello, William B.
Coulombe, Michael D.
Coulon, Maurice W.
Coulson, Alan R.
Covas, Albert G.
Coward, Asbury, IV
Cox, John T.
Cox, John V., Jr.
Craig, Norman L.
Craig, Stephen H.
Cranston, Gregory V.
Crawford, Frederick W.
Creekmore, Edwin W.
Crews, Thomas W., III
Croll, William H.
Cross, Robert C., Jr.
Crosson, Bobby D.
Crowley, Lionel L.
Croy, Paul A.
Cubellis, Charles B.
Cullen, Francis S., Jr.
Cumby, James B.
Cumming, Ronald L.
Curley, Richard C.
Curry, David W.
Curtis, Robert E.
Dabney, William E.
Cusano, Jerome H.
Custodi, George A.
Cutcher, Douglas S.
Cutting, William F.
Cutlip, Richard M.
Dalton, David H.
Dalton, John A.
Daly, Daniel A.
Dambach, John A.
Dambrosio, Robert J.
Dameron, Jack E.
Dameron, Michael G.
Daniel, John H.
Dansker, Alfred S.
Dantone, Joseph J.
Davis, John S., Jr.
Dargis, Kenneth R.
Darnell, Carlton H.
Deesler, Frederick W., Jr.
DeHart, John A.
Deford, William F.
Dau, Frederick W.
Davies, Harold L.
Davies, William E.
Dawson, Richard W.
Dawson, Wilbert E., Jr.
Day, Charles J., Jr.
Dean, James A., Jr.
Deenick, Richard B.
Dee, William H.
DeGeer, Donald J.
DelMar, David A.
Dekshenieks, Vidvuds
Dempsey, Philip W.
Dempsey, John E.
Dendy, Robert T.
Denn, William R., Jr.
Dennison, Dean W.
Denmire, Albert G.
Depew, John F.
Deroco, Alan P.
Des Rochers, Thomas C.
Detterman, Bruce M.
Detterman, Donald J.
Dewberry, Joseph E.
Dillon, Brian D.
Dillon, James F.
Dirren, Frank M., Jr.
Disbrow, Richard D.
Disharoon, Donald L.
Dickson, Frank D.
Dobbs, William P.
Dole, Howard W.
Domenicelli, Bernard J.
Donahue, Joseph F., Jr.
Donahue, Stephen C.
Donahue, Robert D.
Donahue, Robert M.
Donnelly, Paul W.
Dorgan, John F., Jr.
Dow, Paul R.
Dowe, James P.
Doyle, Michael W.
Dozier, James L., Jr.
Dozier, Loyale B.
Draper, Dennis G.
Drew, James W.
Dreyer, Arthur F.
Eberle, Lawrence
Edmunds, C. Ill

Fell, William G.
Fetham, Francis M.
Penton, Paul H.
Fitzgerald, James A., III
Fitzgerald, Leander, R., Jr.
Ferrara, Michael A., Jr.
Ferrara, Robert V.
Ferris, Jeffrey E.
Ferris, Donald G.
Fey, William L., III
Fife, Joel R.
Fitzgerald, John W.
Fitzgerald, John R., Jr.
Fitzgerald, W. R.
Flanagan, Donald S.
Fleming, David L.
Fletcher, Paul W.
Flory, Thomas D.
Floy, Rowin K.
Foore, John N.
Foley, Michael J.
Foley, Richard W.
Forbes, King F.
Foulkes, Robert H.
Foster, George S.
Foster, Joseph W.
Foster, Thomas A.
Fox, Arthur D.
Fry, Arthur H.
Fry, Frank C.
Franks, Frank C.
Franks, William J., Jr.
Franz, John H., III
Frank, James E.
Fraser, Ronald R., Jr.
French, Charles A.
French, Gary L.
Frenzel, Joseph W., Jr.
Frey, Raymond
Frick, Dennis D.
Fricke, Paul L.
Friedman, Marcus V.
Friesen, James M.
Fry, John L.
Fugard, William H.
Fuggle, Douglas W.
Fukin, Grant D.
Fuller, James R.
Fuller, Jerry L.
Fulmer, Joseph A.
Fulton, David S.
Fulton, Robert G.
Pulver, John T.
Pulver, James L.
Pulver, William G.
Pulver, Joseph C.
Pulver, Joseph W.
Pulver, William B.
Pulver, William C.
Pulver, William E.
Pulver, William F.
Pulver, William J.
Pulver, William R.
Pulver, William B.
Pulver, William C.
Pulver, William E.
Pulver, William F.
Pulver, William J.
Pulver, William R.
Pulver, William C.
Pulver, William E.
Pulver, William F.
Pulver, William J.
Pulver, William R.
Pulver, William C.
Pulver, William E.
Pulver, William F.
Pulver, William J.
Pulver, William R.
Pulver, William C.
Pulver, William E.
Pulver, William F.
Pulver, William J.
Pulver, William R.
Pulver, William C.
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CIVIL ENGINEERS

Ahl, John S.
Barratt, Mario A.
Barron, Richard M.
Bohning, Lee H.
Brown, Ronald W.
Brewer, John W.
Clarke, Wilmot P.
Clay, Joseph V. F., III
Clayton, James B.
Connel, Thomas P.
Delmanzo, Donald D., Jr.
Dillman, Robert P.
Ebershaker, Jerry C.
Feusten, Stephen C.
Ferrelli, William L.
Free, William E., III
Fuch, Kenneth R.
Gall, Thomas A.
Gallen, Robert M.
Green, Joseph B., Jr.
Greg, Ronald L.
Guglielmino, Richard C.
Gunn, Alexander C.
Haden, Jerry W.
Hai, Mark W.
Hartwell, William R.
Haugen, James A.
Henning, Louis W., III
Herrell, Orval G.
Hibbard, George P.
Jacobs, Paul F.
Jarvis, Jimmy E.
Jennings, Frank J.
Kloch, Warren B.
Kline, Willis W.
Klopp, William H.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Antounopoulos, Adam T.
Ardingale, Gordon L.
Ayres, Samuel H., Jr.
Barr, Kenneth B.
Boyle, Richard L.
Butts, Charles M.
Carter, Franklin W.
Clem, Nicholas J.
Combs, Wesley E.
Conner, Charles A.
Cook, Elvis D., Jr.
Cook, Jimmie C.
Cody, Ronald W.
Cota, Richard J.

Cunningham, William F.
Cunningham, Kenneth Robinson, Richard A.
Dalton, James T.
Dekey, Charles R.
Dolson, Robert M.
Duzey, John W., Jr.
Felt, Walter R.
Fisher, Frank D. R.
Gailes, Richard N.
Gallbreath, Jerry D.
Gregory, George H.

NURSES

Caya, Barbara A.
Langley, April B.
Linehan, Patricia A.

Raymond F. Elworth, United States Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-4 subject to qualification therefor.

James B. Gattiner, United States Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Robert G. Gruse, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Navy Corps in the Navy grade of lieutenant temporary grade of lieutenant commander.

Navv in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and temporary grade of lieutenant:

Larry R. Atkinson
Dennis R. Conley
Sterling E. Nair
Mr. Undesignated
Lloyd A. Dixon

John M. Fleming.

John "J" Windbigler

The following named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Robert C. Claar

John P. Marshall, Jr.

Robert H. Pelder.

The following named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign:

John P. Marshall, Jr.

William H. Spadfora
Raymond L. McCabe
Richard T. Tracy

Steve M. Zientek

William M. Bass, Jr., U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and temporary grade of lieutenant.

Christopher T. A. Krueger, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and temporary grade of lieutenant.

The following named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign:

James O. Jackson

The following-named graduates from the enlisted scientific education program to be permanent ensigns in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Alan H. Armstrong

Denzil M. Attem

Robert D. Axtell

George L. Bass

Norman R. Baker

James J. Battell, Jr.

Robert E. Bixla

Donald C. Beckwith

Fred F., Jr.

Robert L. Elders

William R. Gongaware

Samuel F. Grove

Robert H. Booth

Phillip H. Branam

Stephen J. Brasher

Charles A. Brown

Paul M. Brown

William H. Brown, Jr.

George A. Upham

Johnny W. Burnham, Jr.

William Bushing

Kenneth W. Butcher

Thomas E. Callaham

Fred P. Campbell

Robert C. Cashion

Richard L. Christian

Robert A. Clark

Glenn R. Conrad, Jr.

James H. Conrad

John W. Corsey, Jr.

Norman R. Cotton

Kenneth J. Culveron

Kelly W. Curreton

William H. Curley

Lawrence D. I. Custer, Jr.

James A. Jacques III

John A. Jarrel

Joseph A. Jenners

James D. Jones

George A. Kelley

Terrence C. Keeler

Robert L. Conley

Ralph E. Kenyon

Mr. Marvin W. Kladder

Robert L. Kingsbury

Mr. Jon P. Kielander

Janet A. Koehler

Seelig G. Kopitzka

Wayne J. Leute

Daniel W. Lusack
The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

If ye continue in My word, ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.—John 8: 31, 32.

O God, our Father, and our fathers' God, the land of liberty we sing and pray and live. Make us ever mindful of the cost of freedom to preceding generations and may we be ready to pay the price to keep freedom alive in our own day. Help us to live in its spirit that all men everywhere may see it, and seeing it seek it, and seeking it secure it, for their own good and for the good of all.

Keep Thou the love of liberty glowing in our hearts and the faith in freedom growing in our homes—so shall we continue to be free and so shall the flag of freedom fly forever over the fortress of faith our forefathers founded on these shores.

In the name of Him whose truth keeps men free we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 15944. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 5 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles,

S. 10. An act 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 privilege; and

S. 1069. An act to authorize the use of the vessel Annie B. in the coastwise trade.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested;

S. 1864. An act to define and regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia; and

S. 2017. An act 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 5 years.

HISTORY'S WARNING

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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, the record shows that in all ages where republican forms of government have been lost, it has been through the pretense of a share-the-wealth program, a blind faith in public officials, and apathy on the part of those who could act but did not. To mention only one of many, many examples from past history, may I quote from a statement made by Cicero over 2,000 years ago:

The budget should be balanced, the treasury should be refilled, public debt should be reduced, the arrogance of officialdom should be tempered and controlled, assistance to foreign lands should be curtailed lest Rome become bankrupt, the mobs should be forced to work and not depend on government for subsistence.

History reveals that public officials heed not the warning—therefore, the government collapsed.

SO-CALLED POOR PEOPLE'S MARCH ON WASHINGTON

Mr. HENDERSON. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The previous speaker is recognized.

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