

nese have recognized the potential of the timesaving northern route.

The State Department should grant Japan Air Lines' request and thereby the needs of such service will be partly met.

In turn it is to be hoped that Japan will grant similar American flight privileges so that the recent mistake of our Government will be overcome.

On this subject, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the May 25, 1969, Seattle Times:

SECOND CHANCE ON NORTH PACIFIC

The ever-alert Japanese have recognized what the American government apparently failed to see in its recent, disappointing decision in the transpacific air-route case.

That decision left the Seattle international air gateway with single-carrier service over the short, time-saving North Pacific route between Seattle and Tokyo.

But the Japanese have recognized the impressive traffic potential in such a route if it is provided with adequate backup service to Eastern and Midwestern cities.

A column by Robert L. Twiss elsewhere in the Times today reports on Japanese-government plans to seek two North Pacific air routes in bilateral discussions to be held between the United States and Japan, beginning next month.

One such route would link Tokyo with Chicago and New York by way of Seattle, the closest major United States point to Japan. The other route would connect New York to Tokyo via Anchorage.

Northwest Orient Airlines now is the only passenger carrier on the North Pacific Seattle-Tokyo route. Washington State parties in the transpacific-route case sought without success to convince the administration of the need for competitive service on that route to meet an expected boom in Pacific travel.

The logic of this view can be seen in the opinion of Shizuma Matsuo, president of Japan Air Lines, that air travel between the United States and Japan will double within the next six years.

Japan's interest provides Washington State governmental and trade-promotion groups with an opportunity to renew their bid for competitive service through the Seattle gateway over the North Pacific. It is to be hoped that they will make maximum use of that opportunity.

We urge the State Department to grant Japan Air Lines' request, which, of course, should open the way for additional American flight rights in Japan.

The logic of geography as well as present-day trends in international air transportation support the Japanese position.

PUCINSKI HAS A POINT

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced legislation which will require that all bids for defense contracts would have to list military personnel working for the company submitting such bid.

The Chicago Sun Times has commented on my proposal and I would like today to call the Sun Times editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

I am pleased to have the editorial support of the Chicago Sun Times on this proposal and I believe that the suggestion made by the Sun Times improving the legislation is most valid.

The Chicago Sun Times editorial follows:

PUCINSKI HAS A POINT

Rep. Roman Pucinski (D-Chicago), a former military officer in World War II, has raised an eyebrow at some statistics he uncovered. Pucinski says the nation's 100 largest military contractors employ more than 2,000 retired high-ranking military officers.

Pucinski has introduced a bill to require all defense contractors to list the names of retired military personnel (and their former military assignments) in bids for defense contracts.

There has been much justified criticism of military spending. An enormous amount of waste in dollars and time has been uncovered by the General Accounting Office and others.

Nor is it uncommon for the defense-contracting industry and the military services to band together to conceal the fact that millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money has been wasted.

However, if defense contractors had to list such retired officers in their contract bids, it might be much easier to follow the line of influence when contracts go far beyond the agreed upon amount or violate the time limit for delivery of military hardware.

Pucinski's bill is in the public interest. It should be modified slightly. The bill now requires the listing of all former military men—officer and enlisted—who had served four years to be identified by the defense contractor. The requirement to list the former enlisted men should be dropped. It cre-

ates unnecessary paperwork. Few if any enlisted men ever had any influence in the esoteric circles of defense procurement in the Pentagon.

HON. WILLIAM J. DRIVER

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to join my colleagues in paying tribute to William J. Driver, who is leaving as Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. He does so, I am certain, with pride.

As head of the VA, Bill Driver administered the world's largest medical program involving some 5,000 doctors and 15,000 nurses who care for the wounds and ills of veterans and their families.

He has continuously fought for legislation to improve loan programs enabling veterans and their dependents to own a home, a farm, or a private business.

The VA has the largest program of adult education and vocational rehabilitation and training ever undertaken in this country. The VA has underwritten the GI bill, enabling millions of veterans and certain numbers of their wives and widows to attend schools of higher learning under the direction of Bill Driver.

Few men, Mr. Speaker, have so justly earned the acclaim so justly bestowed on Bill Driver today. I am proud to share in this tribute to my friend and I wish him well.

Mr. Speaker, a few years ago it was my pleasure to have the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), and Bill Driver as guests in my hometown of Muskogee, Okla.

It was a most pleasant experience, and I was highly impressed with the genuine admiration the employees at the Veterans' Administration hospital and the VA regional office in Muskogee showed for Bill Driver.

He earned and received the respect of those he worked for—the veterans—and those who worked for him. This is distinction of the highest order.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 2, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

From the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same the Lord's name is to be praised.—Psalm 113: 3.

Almighty God, our loving Heavenly Father, who art clothing the world with beauty and throwing a mantle of green across the shoulders of the hills, by whose law the planets keep their courses and by whose creative thought life has risen on this planet, make us conscious of Thy presence and help us to be patient and strong in Thee.

May the thoughts of our minds be channels for Thy way. May the dreams

in our hearts fulfill Thy purposes for our Nation and for mankind. May the work of our hands weed out injustice and war and cultivate the seeds that flower into justice for all and peace in our world. By Thy spirit may we have courage enough to be pioneers in brotherhood, sustaining the hands and hearts of all who seek to end strife and to bring peace to the hearts of men.

To this end guide Thou our President, our Speaker, the Members of this body and all who labor with them. Ennobel their lives by the sense of Thy presence that they may be for this generation channels through which Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done on earth.

In the Master's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 28, 1969, 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 a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 412. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as wilderness the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests, in Montana, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Tuesday, May 27, 1969, he did on May 28, 1969, sign the following enrolled bills of the Senate:

S. 278. An act to consent to the New Hampshire-Vermont interstate school compact; and

S. 408. An act to liberalize the eligibility requirements governing the grant of assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain service-connected disabled veterans, to increase the amount of such grant, to raise the limit on the amount of direct housing loans made by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL PROPOSED MOON LANDINGS

(Mr. CONABLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those expressing skepticism about the proposed schedule of 10 additional moon landings after Apollo 11. It is difficult for me to believe that such a repetitive program for exploration of the moon can possibly return scientific knowledge sufficient to justify the expense and the hazard to our fine young men who serve this country as the pioneers of space. A splendid success repeated too often does not remain a success but becomes a waste. NASA tells us that a Saturn V rocket mission to the moon costs \$350 million. Think of the terrestrial benefits \$350 million could bring in the field of, say, pollution control. I do not advocate junking the rockets already built, but I question that we are putting this magnificent hardware to its most scientifically rewarding use in sending men back to the moon time after time.

The success of Apollo is a great tribute to NASA and to the quality control of the American aerospace industry. I have long felt, however, that once we have demonstrated the capabilities involved in landing men on the moon, we should proceed to less dangerous but equally significant scientific projects. If we don't have such projects prepared at this time, because of our concentration on manned space flight, let us save some of these rockets until we can develop a purpose in unmanned space flight worthy of the investment the American taxpayer has already made in the Saturn V.

SUPPORT PRESIDENT NIXON'S ABM REQUEST

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the effect on the President's strength at foreign bargaining tables of denying him his considered request for minimum protection of our missile sites would be well nigh disastrous. Representatives of allies as well as the Soviet Union would immediately conclude that the President could not produce even a minimum of ac-

complishment in the defense of the Nation although he is Commander in Chief. This would be a poor way to send our No. 1 champion to any foreign conference table.

More basically it can be succinctly observed of the modified ABM President Nixon requests that—

It's better to have it and not need it than to need it and not have it.

The President wants the Safeguard system for the national security. After full consultation with legions of defense experts, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, leading scientists, and senior Members of Congress, the Commander in Chief has arrived at his opinion that Safeguard is needed to keep America strong and secure. To fail to support this modified request at this juncture in history is to fail America itself in its hour of need.

The Soviet Union has already deployed an ABM system around Moscow, consisting at present of more than 67 ABM sites. It is steadily expanding its ABM capability.

One of our principal deterrents to aggression upon us is the prospect of certain and devastating retaliation upon any aggressor. The limited ABM system President Nixon asks of this Congress would help assure us a continuing retaliatory capability which is of urgent importance to the National Security and in fact to our survival as a free Nation.

President Nixon's "minimum program essential for our security"—to use his own words—deserves the support of all Members of Congress and the American people in their own self-interest.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

DISCONTINUANCE OF THE ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS AS TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE SETTLEMENT OF PERSONAL PROPERTY CLAIMS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4246) to discontinue the annual report to Congress as to the administrative settlement of personal property claims of military personnel and civilian employees.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING UNITED STATES CODE, TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY CONCERNED TO MAKE PARTIAL PAYMENTS ON CERTAIN CLAIMS WHICH ARE CERTIFIED TO CONGRESS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4247) to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned to make partial payments on certain claims which are certified to Congress.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 336(c) OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3666) to amend section 336(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire as to whether or not there is anything in this Federal legislation that would preclude the various States of the Union from still enacting their own requirements for voting?

Mr. Speaker, in lieu of an answer, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR THE REAPPOINTMENT OF DR. JOHN NICHOLAS BROWN AS CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The Clerk called the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 13), to provide for the reappointment of Dr. John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

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

S. J. RES. 13

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Doctor John Nicholas Brown of Providence, Rhode Island, on April 25, 1969, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of six years.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF THOMAS J. WATSON, JR., AS CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The Clerk called the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 35) to provide for the appointment of Thomas J. Watson, Jr., as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

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

S. J. RES. 35

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian

Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, shall be filled by the appointment of Thomas J. Watson, Junior, a resident of Connecticut, in place of Jerome C. Hunsaker, resigned, for the statutory term of six years.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALABAMA SESQUICENTENNIAL MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10931) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Alabama.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 995, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 995

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the State of Alabama, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Alabama Sesquicentennial Commission five thousand silver and fifty thousand bronze medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by such Commission subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by such Commission, but no medals shall be made after January 1, 1970. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 368).

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for full payment of such costs.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the Alabama Sesquicentennial Commission.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 10931) was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COUNCIL

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I have today

sent to the President a letter commending him for his action last Thursday creating the Environmental Quality Council as a Cabinet-level post to coordinate and direct the protection of our Nation's natural resources. His action marks an encouraging new breakthrough in the efforts at controlling the enormous problems posed by increased industrialization and increased population in urban and suburban areas; and it is an achievement around which all of us who are concerned about the quality of our environment can rally.

For too many people the areas of conservation and preservation of this country's natural resources remain only a latent priority. They fail to acknowledge the real menace perpetuated upon us by a polluted, neglected environment because so often the real menace is impossible to detect without scientific assistance. The President's concern that this trend be reversed is heartening: it prods us to reject a reliance solely on visible evidence in assessing such problems and reminds us that we dare not run the risk of compounded problems caused by our inattentiveness. I submit that this type of Executive foresight has already become a hallmark of the Nixon administration.

Already several of the tasks which the Environmental Quality Council can undertake have become urgent necessities: advancing interjurisdictional coordination of programs, appropriating adequate funds for a broadbased attack on these problems, and arousing greater awareness on the part of the Nation as to the tremendous scope and the nature of the environmental difficulties. I am confident that this Council can provide the necessary guidance and impetus toward the achievement of these ends.

In light of the prospects for progress which the new Environmental Quality Conference projects, I commend the action of the President to the attention of my colleagues.

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY SURVEY ACT

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 763) to provide for a study of the extent and enforcement of State laws and regulations governing the operation of youth camps.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 763

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Youth Camp Safety Survey Act".

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall undertake a study of State and local laws and regulations governing the operation of youth camps to determine—

- (1) the extent of such laws and regulations; and
- (2) the effectiveness of the enforcement of such laws and regulations by State and local authorities.

SEC. 3. As used in this Act, the term "youth camp" means—

- (1) any parcel or parcels of land having the general characteristics and features of a camp as the term is generally understood,

used wholly or in part for recreational or educational purposes and accommodating for profit or under philanthropic or charitable auspices five or more children under eighteen years of age, living apart from their relatives, parents, or legal guardians for a period of, or portions of, five days or more, and includes a site that is operated as a day camp or as a resident camp; and

(2) any travel camp which for profit or under philanthropic or charitable auspices, sponsors or conducts group tours within the United States, or foreign group tours originating or terminating within the United States, for educational or recreational purposes, accommodating within the group five or more children under eighteen years of age living apart from their relatives, parents, or legal guardians for a period of five days or more.

SEC. 4. Within one year from the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the President a comprehensive and detailed report of his findings, including such recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable to insure the safe operation of youth camps.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Advisory Council on Youth Camp Safety to advise and consult with him in the preparation of the report required by section 4 and in the development of the recommendations included therein. The Council shall consist of the Secretary, who shall be Chairman, and eighteen members appointed by him, without regard to the civil service laws, from persons who are specially qualified by experience and competence to render such service. Prior to making such appointments, the Secretary shall consult with appropriate associations representing organized camping.

(b) Members of the Advisory Council, while serving on business of the Advisory Council, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per day, including traveltime; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make a study of the operation of camps and campgrounds conducted by Federal agencies. The Secretary shall include in the report required by section 4 a comprehensive and detailed report of his findings from the investigation carried on under this section, together with such recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable to insure the safe operation of such camps and campgrounds.

SEC. 7. There is authorized to be appropriated \$175,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 71]

Adams	Fish	Moss
Addabbo	Flynt	Murphy, Ill.
Anderson,	Ford,	Murphy, N.Y.
Calif.	William D.	Nelsen
Anderson,	Foreman	Nichols
Tenn.	Frelinghuysen	Nix
Ashbrook	Friedel	Obey
Ashley	Galifianakis	O'Konski
Barrett	Gallagher	Ottinger
Bates	Gilbert	Patman
Berry	Gray	Pettis
Blaggi	Griffin	Philbin
Bingham	Grover	Pike
Blanton	Gubser	Podell
Blatnik	Hagan	Powell
Bolling	Halpern	Preyer, N.C.
Brademas	Hanna	Price, Tex.
Brasco	Hansen, Idaho	Reid, N.Y.
Bray	Hansen, Wash.	Reuss
Brooks	Harvey	Rivers
Brown, Calif.	Hébert	Robison
Brown, Mich.	Heckler, Mass.	Ronan
Burke, Fla.	Helstoski	St. Onge
Burleson,	Henderson	Sandman
Tex.	Hogan	Scherle
Burton, Calif.	Hollifield	Scheuer
Burton, Utah	Jarman	Sebelius
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Calif.
Carey	Jones, N.C.	Smith, N.Y.
Celler	Karth	Staggers
Chappell	Kirwan	Steed
Chisholm	Kuykendall	Steiger, Ariz.
Clark	Landgrebe	Stephens
Collier	Landrum	Stubblefield
Collins	Leggett	Stuckey
Colmer	Lennon	Taylor
Conte	Long, La.	Teague, Calif.
Conyers	Lujan	Thompson, Ga.
Cowger	Lukens	Tiernan
Culver	McClary	Utt
Davis, Ga.	McDade	Waggonner
Dawson	McEwen	Wampler
Delaney	McKneally	Watkins
Denney	Macdonald,	Watson
Dent	Mass.	Weicker
Dickinson	MacGregor	Wiggins
Diggs	Martin	Wilson,
Donohue	Meskill	Charles H.
Dorn	Michel	Winn
Dwyer	Mikva	Wydler
Eckhardt	Miller, Calif.	Zion
Eshleman	Morse	Zwach
Fallon	Morton	
Farbstein	Mosher	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 278 members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOME FINANCING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Home Financing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY SURVEY ACT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, this bill deals in the most precious commodity we have—the lives of our youngsters. I want to commend, therefore, the work

of our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), in bringing this bill to the Committee on Education and Labor and enabling us to bring it to the floor of the House. I invite the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that this bill was approved unanimously by the Select Subcommittee on Labor, of which the gentleman from New Jersey is chairman, and subsequently was ordered reported by the full committee by unanimous voice vote. This is a tribute to the legislative skills of our colleague.

Since 1940 the American Camping Association, a voluntary organization of individuals, agency camps, school camps, church camps, and private camps, has been developing standards for accrediting camps. It is significant that the American Camping Association favors this bill.

Camps are artificially created environments whose administrators must plan carefully to guarantee that all the basic needs of group living are provided in a safe, clean, and healthful manner. Many camp activities have inherent in them a degree of hazard such as swimming, archery, riflery, and horseback riding, which fact makes it imperative that camps live up to their obligations "in loco parentis."

The committee expressed the desire that this study would not only involve the existence or nonexistence of State laws and regulations, but would also concern itself with the important aspects of implementation. State laws and regulations can be magnificent, but if the people who have the responsibility for enforcement are not doing it properly, these laws can prove meaningless.

The committee wishes to emphasize that the power to legislate does not necessarily mean that that power should always be exercised by the Federal Government. In this instance, it is the committee's belief that each State can best implement the findings of the Youth Camp Safety Survey Act through the workings of its own State legislative process.

It is suggested that the findings of this study be widely disseminated and that they be specifically provided to the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. This group is composed of Commissioners from each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. These Commissioners, usually numbering three from each jurisdiction, are under express legislative authority in 33 cases and under general executive authority in other cases. The State legislatures are, of course, free to accept or reject the work of the national conference in whole or in part.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the fact that approximately 7½ million children between the ages of 6 and 18 attend approximately 11,500 youth camps indicates that camping is a big nationwide industry. Today, it is common for a family in one State to send children to a camp in another State. Due to this tremendous migration of children from State to State each summer and a lack of information concerning camp safety standards, it is incumbent upon the Federal Government through its

commerce power to fill this breach by conducting a field study to provide knowledge of camping laws and regulations, and most importantly, information concerning the effectiveness of their enforcement.

This bill directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to undertake a study of State and local laws and regulations governing the operation of youth camps to determine the extent of such laws and regulations and the effectiveness of their enforcement by State and local authorities and report to the President with recommendations. The bill further directs the Secretary to study the operation of camps and camp grounds operated by Federal agencies and to include in the report findings and recommendations. An advisory council on youth camp safety would advise the Secretary in the preparation of the report and in the development of recommendations.

An appropriation of \$175,000 is authorized.

The need for this bill was demonstrated at the hearings by the following statistics: 26 States have only regulated sanitation of youth camps; approximately 15 States have some safety legislation; only three or four States make any reference to camp personnel; 24, or nearly half, the States have relatively little or no regulation in the way of camp legislation.

It is hoped that with the enactment of H.R. 763 many States would be stimulated to follow the example of Michigan and Colorado. These two States have passed the best camp safety laws in the Nation. Before Michigan enacted its camp legislation, the State averaged two to four, and in 1959, six, drowning deaths per summer. From 1963, with the enactment of the State's new program of reporting, inspection and enforcement of State standards, there has been only one drowning fatality.

In 1965, there were five fatalities in Colorado camps. In 1967, with camp standards which included immediate reporting of severe illness or death, licensing and annual inspection, Colorado reported only one severe illness and no fatalities. These two examples graphically indicate that it is possible to significantly reduce and control the hazards in camping for children.

I wish to emphasize that the youth camp safety survey act in no way attempts to standardize camping. It is not the purpose of this study to either encourage or discourage in any way any camping program, specific religion, camp philosophy or camp activity. The purpose of this study is simply to find how best to reduce camp accident and disease statistics.

This bill—which was reported unanimously and with bipartisan approval from both the Select Subcommittee on Labor and the full Committee on Education and Labor—would provide national leadership to germinate the necessary interest and information so that the State legislatures, camping organizations, and parents could all benefit from this comprehensive study of youth camps.

The well-being of our youngsters is our highest priority. I urge all my colleagues to pass H.R. 763.

I might state that the bill merely asks for a very modest authorization for \$175,000. If we save the life of one child, I think it is worth the authorization that we seek by this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), that since the States of Colorado and Michigan have adopted regulations that have practically eliminated fatalities at camps and provided for better sanitary facilities and so on and so forth, it seems to me that is the best argument anyone could make in opposition to this bill, which has all the earmarks of being nothing more than one of these foot-in-the-door propositions of the Federal Government invading the province of the States, which ought to be taking care of the regulations governing the operation of camps within their boundaries.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman if he will tell me why we should embark upon the expenditure of \$175,000 for another advisory council in the Federal Government and for this purpose.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. In answer to the gentleman, I would like to say this. In my remarks I indicated that there are 24 States in this country that have little or no regulations whatsoever so far as camp safety is concerned.

It is not the purpose of this legislation for the Federal Government to establish standards with respect to camps. It is merely the intent of this legislation to prod the States, particularly those States that do not have any legislation, with reference to sanitation and with respect to inspection and health safety to do something worthwhile to protect the life and limbs of our children.

I remember a number of years ago when I sent my two children to a camp in upstate New York and on the day I picked them up in the Catskills my daughter had a rash all over her body. This could have been prevented if we had some kind of adequate State camp legislation.

Mr. GROSS. That could have happened even with passage of this legislation and even by putting a Federal inspector in every camp in the country.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. That is not the purpose of the act.

Mr. GROSS. It could still have happened; could it not?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. It is not the intent of this legislation to put a Federal inspector in every camp. It is the intent of this legislation merely to make a study and report to the President as to what might be done to germinate the States to take some effective action.

Mr. GROSS. At that point, then what happens?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. At the termination of the study we expect the State would do the proper thing.

Mr. GROSS. I would expect the States would do that in the absence of this legislation. Do you mean to tell me that the States of Colorado and Michigan will not pass on to other States the regulations and experience that they have?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Let the record speak for itself. What has happened is that 24 States have done nothing in this field, in spite of the fact that Michigan and Colorado have done something worthwhile. Is that not true?

Mr. GROSS. But there is no compulsion in the bill.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. No.

Mr. GROSS. Is it expected there will be Federal compulsion tomorrow, next year, or some other time?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. There is no intent to compel any State to take affirmative action.

Mr. GROSS. We are looking down the road at a taxpayers' revolt in this country. If we do not start saving \$175,000 here and there and \$175 million here and there, we are going to be bankrupt and the gentleman ought to know it. Why embark on a program of this kind? Other States can write to Colorado and Michigan to find out what they did to correct the situation. You do not provide for any compulsion in this bill, and I am glad that is the case.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. As I said before, and I repeat most emphatically, we do not provide any compulsion. It is merely suggested that the findings of this study be widely disseminated, and that the findings be specifically provided to the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. We do not have to spend \$175 billion. This bill merely asks for a modest appropriation of \$175,000. If we save the life of one child in this country by having the proper safety and sanitation legislation, I think the appropriation of \$175,000 is a very, very small sum to pay, while protecting not only that child's life, but all the other 11½ million children that attend camps in this country.

Mr. GROSS. What are you going to do about protecting them on the way to the camp? What are you going to do about protecting them on the highways?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. That is the responsibility usually of the parents.

Mr. GROSS. What is that?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. When my children went to camp—and that was 20 years ago—it was my responsibility to see that they got there safely.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not the responsibility of the parent to look over the camp before sending his children there, or to inquire as to how it is operated? Is that not

the responsibility of the parent as well? What you are attempting to do here is to spend \$175,000 on some \$100-a-day consultants, apparently.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Surely it is the responsibility of the parents to see that the camp to which they send their child is a worthwhile camp, but often such information is not available. You know, when you send for a brochure, you get back a very glossy, fine, beautiful looking brochure that tells you what a wonderful camp this place is. That camp is miles and miles away from your home—say out in Colorado, New Mexico, or California—and there is no way a parent can go there except at terrific expense.

Mr. GROSS. What is the proposed Federal Advisory Council going to do about that?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. About what?

Mr. GROSS. About wet-nursing the parents of a child that is being sent to a camp. How many additional wet nurses will this require?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. No wet nurses are provided in this bill whatsoever.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. GROSS. Do you have trouble in Wisconsin, too? Are you incapable of communicating with Michigan and Colorado, particularly Michigan, to find out how they do such a good job of taking care of the camps in those States?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I cannot respond as to whether there is communication between Michigan, Colorado, and Wisconsin on this problem. I can suggest to the gentleman that I do support this legislation, and I do so, because I think the hearings clearly indicate that this is one field about which very little is known. It is one of those fields in which there is, in my judgment at least, a legitimate reason to undertake a detailed study of the kinds of rules and regulations, the kind of action that needs to be taken by the various and sundry camps throughout this country in order to do a better job than we are now doing.

I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa—and I share his concern about spending \$175,000 at a time of very tight fiscal situation—there are now hundreds of thousands, literally, of children in the United States, who are attending camps of all types throughout this country, and the number of accidents that are taking place in those camps has increased over a period of time.

Mr. GROSS. You do not think this bill is going to eliminate all accidents and sicknesses, do you?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. No; I do not at all. There is no question about

that. But it will, I hope, at least provide a blueprint with which one can operate at the State level, or any other level that is appropriate, to find out what it is that you must do to make the kinds of alterations in structure and the kinds of changes in rules and regulations in the camps so that the children will be protected.

Mr. GROSS. The State of Michigan and the State of Colorado can tell the gentleman. As the gentleman can note in the report of his own committee, those States have set in motion certain changes that seem to have done the job. Why then do we have to extract \$175,000 from the taxpayers to pay \$100-a-day consultants? The information is available in Michigan, and I am sure they will dispense it if the gentleman writes them and asks for it at the cost of a 6-cent stamp and a little elbow grease to write the letter.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Iowa is well aware of the fact that it often is not done as well as we think it ought to be. I wish that it were possible.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman is bragging about the job they have done in Colorado and Michigan. What more does the gentleman want?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. What I want is, first, a more detailed analysis of both the Michigan and Colorado arrangements, and, second, I want a central point at which we can pull together the kind of information needed.

Mr. GROSS. And how long is it going to be before the gentleman's committee comes in with a bill to put some kind of Federal adviser at \$100 a day in every camp in the country, once this foot-in-the-door Advisory Council is approved?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. That is not my intent, and I do not think it is the intent of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from New Jersey has not said that. The gentleman from Wisconsin has said it, but the gentleman from New Jersey happens to be the chairman of the subcommittee. If we drop \$175,000 into the hands of \$100-a-day consultants, and there are a few conferences in plush surroundings around the country, the \$175,000 will be gone. Does the gentleman intend then to come back and ask for more money for this purpose?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I will say in complete candor, first, I do not intend to come back with a bill to propose Federal standards on all camps throughout this country. I do not think that is appropriate, and I would not support this bill if that were the intent. But, second, based upon the hearings and the testimony before the committee, I believe this is an appropriate thing to do.

If the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, I will ask the gentleman from New Jersey as to whether or not there has been such an opinion expressed on this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare did submit a report, and I will read from a letter from the Secretary:

A study of State and local legislation and regulations with respect to the operation of camps such as that proposed by this bill is a necessary initial step in assuring basic protections, safety and standards, in their operation.

However, they do not specifically endorse this bill, because they say they have authority to conduct the study provided for in the bill and to seek the advice of experts. But the fact remains that HEW has not done anything whatsoever in this particular area. However, they feel that a study of this type is a good idea.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not answered the question as to when the next step will be taken to expand what is being proposed here today. The gentleman has not given assurance to the House that this will be the end of this business when the \$175,000 is expended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of saving the lives of all little children that we can. I would not be in the well of this House as a qualified physician had it not been for extensive experience as a camp director in my youth, and in the summertimes I worked my way through college and medical school in this manner.

At the same time, as far as my qualifications are concerned, I directed the Midwestern American National Red Cross waterfront and camp safety program for many years. I continue to serve on the Health, Camping, and Safety Committee of the National Council, Boy Scouts of America.

I think perhaps this is a "sacred cow" piece of legislation which transgresses federally on the problems of the various States of the Union. It has been aptly described as a foot-in-the-door technique.

I agree with my colleague from Iowa, it does, indeed, cite the successes of some of the States, which problems and findings are available to all others.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, there is a source which has not been mentioned, and is not included in the reports or any of the hearings which are available, and has not been discussed on the floor today. This is the self-policing effort of the various camping and youth agencies.

I am well aware of the activities of the American Camping Association, and I appreciate their recommendations and the need perhaps for collating this information. But I do not believe that we should establish a commission in perpetuity which is unbudgeted, wherein the Department says, "We already have the authority," without going to such organizations as the National Health Camping and Safety Council, the Boy Scouts of America, the Girl Scouts of America, the YMCA, the Camp Fire Girls and others.

Long before camps are established, including all those listed herein in the commission report, those camps are engineered, and the sites are surveyed by the regional officers and camping directors prior to approval of purchase. Long before then, other camps and other organizations are available for cross-reference, capital improvements, financing,

layouts, safety, and so forth. There are loans from one national camping fraternity or organization to another of its engineers, as well as site and camp selection, camp program, waterfront safety program directors, and others.

Last year I journeyed, in the heat of the adjourning 90th Congress, to dedicate a new Girl Scout camp in the district which I am privileged to represent, which had had all of the loans of the various other agencies insofar as the regional and national camping authorities are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the fact that this is a well self-policed area, which needs no additional spending for another commission or another study in perpetuity, there are certain Government agencies which have direct responsibilities, if we would but let them alone, or give the oversight and encouragement that is our responsibility for them to do their jobs.

Insofar as the question of transportation of children across State lines, the question of sanitation, the question of diseases spread during summer camps are concerned, where is the U.S. Public Health Service, the commissioned officers corps and the regional directors and those who have responsibilities for quarantine safety and the prevention of disease, as well as sanitation intrastate, and interstate? I say, if many of those who are "bleeding hearts" and social worker advisers and psychiatric workers, would do less toward destroying a professional uniformed commissioned corps of the Government, the U.S. Public Health Service, and would let them function and provide for them as they conceive their professional missions and objectives, then we would be in better condition to prevent some of the horrendous examples that are given in this report.

Certainly we cannot and will not, after this report is received and studied, ever attempt to put a federally authorized truckdriver in charge of every camp bus, or an adviser in every camp to regulate it nationally, whether it be danger of drowning, snakebite, falls off cliffs, or overexposure from poor layout, planning, execution, or other local responsibilities.

But as to the report, Mr. Speaker, there is a third point I want to make in noting my opposition to this bill. It is that it includes also the survey of religious camps. Now, we are opening up a tremendous "can of worms" when we go into inspecting the short-time summer camps of the various religions which are held for summer Sunday school and instructional purposes and for vacation Bible school and all other religious purposes. I believe that is a matter which will come out in the study commission's report, but the power to legislate must never mean the power to be exercised in control by the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute, and commend him for the statement he has made for he has drawn upon years of experience in connection with youth camps.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the additional time.

Mr. Speaker, history is replete with examples where commissions of this

type have been organized by the Federal Government and where studies and reports have been made, and then the exercise of the control is legislated thereafter. With such well self-policed bodies and such perfectly organized groups such as the Boy Scouts of America—and I stand here probably as proud as anyone wearing the Silver Antelope recognizing the service to youth in general and by all organizations, by the Boy Scouts of America, predicated on experience in camping in the great middle western area—it seems to me absurd that we would at this time take up this sort of a bill, to spend this kind of money, by organizing this type of commission.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that the gentleman is clear that the American Camping Association testified before the committee on this legislation and indicated their support for this bill. In addition to that, they pointed out that only about one-third of the camps in the United States fall within the purview of the rules and regulations of that association.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the purview would be well within the policing of the organizations themselves. This is indeed the very reason why States have not intervened in many instances, that is, in order not to take over the functions of the organizations.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this legislation. I think that we could perhaps assuage the fears of the gentleman from Iowa if we created some legislative intent here. It is the intent of the committee that any rules or regulations promulgated by this study commission will be published in the Federal Register at least 30 days before they become effective so that we have a chance to see them rather than to have this commission, like many others, issue guidelines that no one ever sees until they become effective. It is the intention of this body that any rules and regulations shall be published in the Federal Register for public inspection. I believe we would strengthen this legislation with this understanding.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I will say that I do not think it is the intent of the bill, but the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), the author, is here, and can provide for an interpretation of the regulations. So I would share the gentleman's thought as to the intent.

Mr. PUCINSKI. My friend from Wisconsin has dealt with these agencies long enough to know that somebody has to set up ground rules for the operation of this commission. All I say is that when these ground rules are set up they must be published first in the Federal Register so that we can see what they intend to do. I want it clearly understood this is the intent of the committee and the House.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN).

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, this area of youth camp safety is one that has gained public attention recently. The gentleman from Iowa makes a very persuasive argument which, by the way, was also persuasive to the members of our subcommittee. This is not an area where we should seek or desire Federal regulations or laws to control youth camps, but since this has attracted public attention and there is a lack of State regulation in many States, it is much like a vacuum that is going to be filled in one way or another. I think the members of the subcommittee felt the best way for it to be filled was not by passage of Federal regulations but to encourage States, such as Iowa, that have no State regulations over camping to do the job that they should do. For that reason, as is stated in our report very clearly:

The committee wishes to emphasize that the power to legislate does not necessarily mean that power should always be exercised by the Federal Government. In this instance, it is the committee's belief that each State can best implement the findings of the Youth Camp Safety Survey Act through the workings of its own State legislative process.

So, the very thing about which the gentleman from Iowa worries is something which we worried about in our subcommittee. It was our conclusion that the State legislature is the best place to attack this problem. My suggestion was included in this report to the effect that any of the Commissions' findings should be sent, among other places, specifically to the National Conference on Uniform State Laws and that they turn their attention to recommending a uniform code to their legislative leaders looking toward the enactment of uniform State codes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) asks:

How soon will it be before you will be back here with proposed Federal legislation to put into effect rules and regulations at every camp across this country?

I can answer the gentleman in this manner: The proposals are already being made. The other body has proposals for safety laws providing Federal regulations for every little camp created for summertime enjoyment. The gentleman has asked the question and I answer the question of the gentleman from Iowa, if we do not make this move to encourage the State legislatures to undertake this obligation of policing their own camps, some law such as that which is now pending in the other body will pass and we will have the Federal presence in each one of these camps.

I do not believe we can continue to argue, "Let us not have the Federal Government do it; let the States do it," and then sit by idly watching the States do nothing. I think the only way we can fulfill the kind of desire which the gentleman from Iowa has and which I share with him, is to encourage the States, to take action.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this bill would forestall the imposition of Federal rules and regulations.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would it be too much to expect the House to consider a sense-of-the-House resolution or a concurrent-sense-of-Congress resolution calling attention of the States to the fact that Colorado, Michigan, and other States have done a good job of regulating summer camps instead of always authorizing money for the support of programs such as this that suddenly balloon into costs involving millions of dollars. What this amounts to here today is another "foot in the door" for bigger and better expenditures next year and ad infinitum.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. If a sense-of-Congress resolution would accomplish the job of getting the States to move in this area, I would certainly join with the gentleman in sponsoring it and would be happy to vote for it. I do not think it necessarily will. I feel that the approach of obtaining a compilation of State laws and some recommendations as to what State laws should provide and which seem to be doing the job is a better approach.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that the RECORD is clear on the point which was raised by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI). I think as far as I am concerned and insofar as the minority is concerned, clearly these rules and regulations will be compiled and ought to be a part of the Federal Register.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 763, the Youth Camp Safety Survey Act. This bill is very similar to the original legislation on this subject which I introduced last year.

The problems of youth camp safety are not new, as almost any parent can testify. There are many opportunities, each summer, for children to participate in organized activities to provide them with experiences different from their everyday school experiences. Each year over 6 million children participate in over 12,000 youth camps.

But parents, and children themselves, have never had adequate means to judge the many camps in existence for their suitability, their safety and their operational standards. Instead, they have had a variety of State and local regulations, with varying degrees of enforcement, and the self-imposed standards, some of them laudable, for private camping associations.

In 1967, Senator RIBICOFF and I introduced legislation for a Federal youth camp safety program which provided both standards for all youth camps and assistance to cooperating States to carry out improved youth camp safety programs.

That legislation was the subject of a report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which supported its aims but said that the Department lacked sufficient information on youth camps to judge the need for a comprehensive safety program.

In response to that report, I introduced

the Youth Camp Safety Survey Act of 1968 to provide the information which HEW said was missing. I was, and remain, convinced that such information is already available and that we should proceed now with a program for Federal assistance to the States to improve youth camp safety.

I consider, therefore, H.R. 763 an interim measure which must eventually be perfected by legislation to set Federal standards and assist States in meeting them.

I am pleased to see that the subcommittee chairman, Congressman DANIELS, who has led the fight within this committee for youth camp safety, has proposed in H.R. 763 that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall not only survey youth camp safety standards but also provide Congress with the Department's recommendations to insure the safe operation of such camps.

This bill also provides for the establishment of an Advisory Council on Youth Camp Safety which will advise and consult with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the preparation of the report and the recommendations on youth camp safety.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the prompt approval of this bill by the House will be an important step toward better youth camp safety. Millions of parents must decide each year, on inadequate information, which camps their children should attend and what health and safety provisions will protect them. In many cases these camps are located long distances from the family home, making thorough inspections by parents impractical or impossible. In many cases, also, the camps chosen are located in other States with unfamiliar laws and uncertain enforcement procedures.

Parents, need, and children deserve, better protection than they presently have. With the passage of this bill, the opportunities for better safety for children and better discharge of parental obligations will be greatly enhanced.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 763.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 151, nays 152, not voting 129, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

YEAS—151

Adair	Ayres	Brown, Calif.
Albert	Beall, Md.	Buchanan
Anderson, Ill.	Bell, Calif.	Burke, Mass.
Andrews,	Bennett	Button
N. Dak.	Blester	Byrne, Pa.
Annunzio	Bingham	Clancy
Arends	Boland	Cleveland
Ashley	Broomfield	Cohelan
Aspinall	Brotzman	Collins

Conable	Hays	Patman
Corbett	Hechler, W. Va.	Patten
Corman	Heckler, Mass.	Pepper
Coughlin	Hicks	Perkins
Cunningham	Hogan	Price, Ill.
Daddario	Hollifield	Pucinski
Daniels, N.J.	Horton	Quile
de la Garza	Howard	Rees
Delaney	Jacobs	Reifel
Dellenback	Joelson	Reuss
Dent	Johnson, Calif.	Rodino
Dingell	Johnson, Pa.	Rogers, Colo.
Donohue	Jones, Tenn.	Rooney, Pa.
Dulski	Karth	Rosenthal
Edmondson	Kastenmeyer	Rostenkowski
Edwards, Ala.	Kee	Roybal
Edwards, Calif.	Keith	Ruppe
Eilberg	Kluczyński	Ryan
Erlenborn	Koch	St Germain
Esch	Kyros	Schwengel
Fascell	Leggett	Sisk
Feighan	Long, Md.	Springer
Flood	Lowenstein	Staggers
Ford, Gerald R.	McCarthy	Steiger, Wis.
Fraser	McClary	Stokes
Fulton, Pa.	McCulloch	Stratton
Fulton, Tenn.	McFall	Sullivan
Garmatz	Mathias	Symington
Gaydos	Matsunaga	Taft
Gibbons	Meeds	Teague, Tex.
Gonzalez	Mikva	Thompson, N.J.
Green, Oreg.	Minish	Tunney
Green, Pa.	Mink	Udall
Griffiths	Mollohan	Ullman
Gude	Monagan	Van Deerlin
Hamilton	Moorhead	Vanik
Hanley	Morgan	Whalen
Hansen, Wash.	Nedzi	Wolf
Harsha	O'Hara	Yates
Hastings	Olsen	Yatron
Hathaway	O'Neill, Mass.	Zablocki
Hawkins	Otinger	

NAYS—152

Abbitt	Goldwater
Abernethy	Goodling
Alexander	Griffin
Andrews, Ala.	Gross
Baring	Grover
Belcher	Haley
Betts	Hall
Bevill	Hammer-
Blackburn	schmidt
Boggs	Hosmer
Bow	Hull
Brinkley	Hungate
Brock	Hunt
Brown, Ohio	Hutchinson
Broyhill, N.C.	Ichord
Broyhill, Va.	Jonas
Burlison, Mo.	Kazen
Bush	King
Byrnes, Wis.	Kleppe
Cabell	Kyl
Caffery	Langen
Cahill	Latta
Camp	Lipscomb
Carter	Lloyd
Casey	McCloskey
Cederberg	McClure
Chamberlain	McDonald,
Chappell	Mich.
Clausen,	McEwen
Don H.	McMillan
Clawson, Del	Mahon
Cramer	Mann
Daniel, Va.	Marsh
Davis, Wis.	May
Dennis	Mayne
Derwinski	Miller, Ohio
Devine	Mills
Dowdy	Minshall
Downing	Mize
Duncan	Mizell
Edwards, La.	Montgomery
Evans, Colo.	Myers
Evens, Tenn.	Natcher
Findley	Nelsen
Fisher	O'Neal, Ga.
Flowers	Passman
Foley	Pelly
Fountain	Pickle
Frey	Pike
Fuqua	Pirnie
Gettys	Poage
Gialmo	Poff

NOT VOTING 129

Adams	Bates
Addabbo	Berry
Anderson,	Blaggi
Calif.	Blanton
Anderson,	Blatnik
Tenn.	Bolling
Ashbrook	Brademas
Barrett	Brasco

Celler	Chisholm
Clark	Clay
Collier	Colmer
Conte	Conyers
Cowger	Culver
Davis, Ga.	Dawson
Denney	Dickinson
Diggs	Dorn
Dwyer	Eckhardt
Eshleman	Fallon
Farbstein	Fish
Flynt	Ford,
William D.	Foreman
Frelinghuysen	Friedel
Gallagher	Gallfanakis
Gilbert	Gallagher
Gray	Gubser
Hagan	Halpern
Hanna	Hansen, Idaho

Harvey	Hébert
Helstoski	Henderson
Jarman	Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.	Jones, N.C.
Kirwan	Kuykendall
Landgrebe	Landrum
Lennon	Long, La.
Lujan	Lukens
McDade	McKneally
Macdonald,	MacGregor
Mass.	Madden
Morton	Maillard
Mosher	Martin
Moss	Meskill
Murphy, Ill.	Miller, Calif.
Murphy, N.Y.	Morse
Nichols	Morton
Nix	Mosher
Obey	Moss
O'Konski	Murphy, Ill.
Pettis	Murphy, N.Y.

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gilbert and Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Brasco and Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Kirwan and Mr. Tiernan for, with Mr. Kuykendall against.

Mr. Madden and Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Miller of California and Mr. Biaggi for, with Mr. Burke of Florida against.

Mr. Fallon and Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Ronan and Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Price of Texas against.

Mr. Moss and Mr. Burton of California for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. Reid of New York and Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Lennon against.

Mr. Barrett and Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mr. Brademas and Mr. Adams for, with Mr. Burleson of Texas against.

Mr. William D. Ford and Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Davis of Georgia against.

Mr. Hanna and Mr. Helstoski for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Podell and Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Watkins against.

Mr. Friedel and Mr. Culver for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Carey and Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Nichols against.

Mr. Clay and Mr. Scheuer for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Powell and Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Morton against.

Mr. Anderson of California and Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Gallfanakis against.

Mr. Morse and Mr. Halpern for, with Mr. Scherle against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Hagan with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Foreman.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Landgrebe.

Mr. Obey with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Bates.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Morton.
 Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
 Mr. Young with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Sebelius.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
 Mr. Steed with Mr. Robison.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Wampler.
 Mr. Freyer of North Carolina with Mr. Watson.
 Mr. Blanton with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mr. Burton of Utah with Mr. Pettis.
 Mr. Collier with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. Cowger with Mr. Wydler.
 Mr. Frelinghuysen with Mr. McKneally.
 Mr. Lukens with Mr. McDade.
 Mr. Michel with Mr. Winn.
 Mr. Zion with Mr. Meskill.
 Mr. Harvey with Mr. Denney.
 Mr. Zwach with Mr. Eshleman.
 Mr. Fish with Mr. Stelger of Arizona.
 Mr. Wecker with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Mailliard with Mr. Mosher.

Messrs. DEL CLAWSON, LATTA, and WAGGONER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 763.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REVISING PAY STRUCTURE OF POLICE FORCE OF NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2667) to revise the pay structure of the police force of the National Zoological Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2667

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter VI of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 5365. Police force of National Zoological Park

"(a) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall fix the per annum rates of basic pay of positions on the police force of the National Zoological Park in accordance with the following provisions:

"(1) Private—not more than the rate for GS-7, Step 5;

"(2) Sergeant—not more than the rate for GS-8, Step 5;

"(3) Lieutenant—not more than the rate for GS-9, Step 5;

"(4) Captain—not more than the rate of GS-10, Step 5."

(b) The table of sections of subchapter VI of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding—

"5365. Police force of National Zoological Park."

immediately below—

"5364. Miscellaneous positions in the executive branch."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 5102(c)(5) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding,

immediately after the semicolon at the end thereof, the following: "and members of the police force of the National Zoological Park whose pay is fixed under section 5365 of this title;"

(b) Section 5109(c) of title 5, United States Code, is repealed.

(c) The first section of the Act entitled "An Act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus", approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 634; Public Law 206, Eighty-second Congress; 40 U.S.C. 193n), is amended by striking out "That the Secretary" and inserting in lieu thereof "That, subject to section 5365 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary"

SEC. 3. (a) The foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective at the beginning of the first pay period which commences on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) No rate of basic pay shall be reduced by reason of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is quite simple in that it is bipartisan. There has been no objection to it at any level.

The purpose of the bill, essentially, is to bring into line the salaries of the police of the National Zoological Park with those of the Library of Congress and bring them fairly close to parity with the other police such as the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia and the adjoining areas.

Mr. Speaker, the National Zoological Police are now 21 percent under the Supreme Court Police, 22 percent under the Capitol Police, 42 percent under the U.S. Park Police and 26 percent under the non-Federal sector average.

The result of this has been that there has come about a tremendous turnover of these highly trained men at the National Zoological Park. Oddly enough, they receive less money than manual laborers, but they must satisfy the requirement for employment of having at least 3 years of police experience.

The Director of the Smithsonian would have under this legislation the authority to adjust the wages upward in order to bring them on a parity with the other police forces in the area. But even at the highest level they would still receive no more than the first step of the Metropolitan Police force.

This bill is sponsored by the chairman of the Committee on House Administration (Mr. FRIEDEL), and on the other side it is sponsored by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow), who is a Regent of the Smithsonian.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL).

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2667 is to raise the salaries for the police force at the National Zoological Park to enable the Smithsonian Institution, the parent organization of the zoo, to be able to recruit and retain qualified zoo police personnel.

The salaries currently payable to the

police force at the National Zoological Park are lower than for the other police organizations in the District of Columbia, and we are told there is a pressing need for the salary adjustments that could result from passage of H.R. 2667.

The bill removes the jurisdiction of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, from all positions in the zoo police force, so that they would no longer by law come under the classification standards of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for such positions.

The legislation would however set up a four-level pay schedule for the zoo police generally along the same lines of the pay scale of the Classification Act. In so doing the bill would advance each of the four zoo police ranks two steps from their present levels.

Thus, those with the rank of private who currently are classified in grade GS-5 would receive a salary at the GS-7 level. Sergeants would move from GS-6 to GS-8; lieutenants from GS-7 to GS-9; and the captains from GS-8 to GS-10. In addition, the Secretary of the Smithsonian would receive authority under the bill to place any position on the force in any of the five steps which would comprise each of the four grade levels.

The zoo police would continue to be eligible for benefits such as retirement, life and health insurance.

A bill with identical provisions, H.R. 7195, 90th Congress, was passed by the House last year, on October 7, 1968, but was not passed by the other body prior to adjournment.

Assurances were given that this legislation, which will result in only a modest increase in cost, is very much needed to enable the Smithsonian Institution to maintain an adequate police force at the National Zoological Park and I would urge it be approved by the House.

I include the following statistical information in connection with the bill:

1. Twenty-nine positions are involved.
2. Annual salaries presently for zoo police is approximately \$190,000.
3. Estimated annual increase under the conversion system the Smithsonian intends to use is approximately \$28,500.
4. Comparison of starting salaries among area police systems.

	Metropolitan and Park Police	Capitol (after 2-weeks training)	Zoo	
			Present	Under H.R. 2667
Private.....	8,000	7,562	5,732	6,981
Sergeant.....	10,175	9,950	6,321	7,699
Lieutenant.....	11,710	11,343	6,981	8,462
Captain.....	13,852	13,532	7,699	9,297

5. The National Zoological Park Police force performs various functions which can be compared with other police forces in the city, particularly the Park police. They are there to prevent crime, to prevent disorder from crowds, to direct traffic, to arrest violators, control parking, give first aid, and provide information to visitors.

6. Because of inequities in police salaries, the turnover for zoo police since 1964 has been about 50%.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow).

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a Regent of the Smithsonian I support this legislation and would like to give my reasons for this support.

GROWTH OF ATTENDANCE AND EXHIBITION FACILITIES

The development of many additional exhibition facilities and greater visitor public attendance at the National Zoological Park reflects the increasing need for a police force with special qualifications and associated performance to assure the continued preservation of peace and protection of the public. The growing public interest in the National Zoological Park is evidenced by the fact that during fiscal year 1967, there were approximately 4,937,629 visitors using the park's facilities. In fiscal year 1968, these figures, partly as a result of the disturbances in the city during the spring of 1968, varied only slightly with 4,824,714 visitors recorded. There were 4,055,673 visitors during fiscal year 1959. This represents an average visitor increase of 17.9 percent since the last pay grade raise granted to the policemen of the National Zoological Park.

In 1962, the Congress authorized a major construction and improvement program to renovate the exhibition facilities and to remove heavy arterial traffic from the center of the National Zoological Park. This program has resulted in a material increase in visitor population since that time and we may expect a continued rise in the number of visitors as the exhibitions increase.

This large number of visitors and vehicles in the 176-acre park demands a highly experienced and responsive National Zoological Park Police force. The 3,000 animals and the wild and natural habitat of the area add significantly to the extraordinary police activities. A 24-hour vigil is mandatory, and exposure is heightened because the area is not lighted and approximately 50 percent of the terrain is wooded.

EXPERIENCE REQUIRED

The constant and large assembly of our citizens in a limited area with wildlife requires special zeal and attention unique to the National Zoological Park. Because of the heavy responsibilities for the protection of the public, including a substantial portion of young people, the National Zoological Park Police requires 3 years of police experience which has given the candidate a broad knowledge of police operations, practices, and techniques, prior to employment as a private in the National Zoological Park Police force.

JURISDICTION AND DUTIES

The police force of the National Zoological Park functions as do its counterparts in the city. The force is needed for enforcement of the law, and has the

same responsibility within its jurisdictions as do other enforcement groups within their respective jurisdictions. It is there to prevent crime and crowd disorder, to direct traffic, control parking and to render first aid.

Their most valuable service is the deterrent of potential lawbreakers. The second most valuable service is the observation, reporting, and correction of conditions in the park—concerning the safety of visitors, employees, and animals. Parking and traffic control are a heavy load, as with other police departments. Police patrols protect property, animals from abuse, and the safety of visitors.

The range of services performed by the National Zoological Park policeman is much greater than that commonly found in other law-enforcement jurisdictions. Every policeman on the force is expected to serve as an information source, to enforce park regulations designed to protect the public as well as the animals, to be concerned with public safety against such hazards as overhanging branches, loose rails, icy walks; to respond to snake bites; to provide anti-venom kits upon request to hospitals, to use weapons in an emergency or an animal escape; to check building temperatures and to be alert for animals which appear sick or injured; and to conduct an investigation of all accidents. They serve as the reception point for many official visitors, both foreign and from the States, as well as operating the communications center. These responsibilities

require special training at the National Zoological Park for familiarity with practices, personnel, animals, and buildings.

LOW PAY—HIGH TURNOVER

As a result of the relatively low pay scales authorized for its police force, the National Zoological Park has experienced grave difficulties in recruiting policemen and retaining an adequate force. Since 1964, the turnover rate has been over 50 percent; directly attributed to changes for higher salaries elsewhere. Half of the policemen leaving, secured positions in other than police work, which resulted in a significant loss to the trained police community. We believe the following chart clearly indicates one of the principal reasons for the high turnover rate:

PRESENT POLICE SALARY PERCENTAGE DIFFERENCE (ABOVE NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK POLICE)

National Zoological Park Police	Supreme Court	U.S. Capitol	U.S. Park Police	Non-Federal sector average
Private.....	21	22	42	26
Sergeant.....	34	48	51	42
Lieutenant.....	33	62	46	44
Captain.....	46	76	52	35

That reason is low pay. The National Zoological Park policemen receive 21 percent less pay than the lowest paid recognized police force in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. A further example of the reasons why recruitment and retention is so difficult is shown below:

COMPARISON OF PRESENT POLICE SALARIES AT THE NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK WITH OTHER KINDS OF WORK

Position	Starting salary			Experience required	After 6 months	After 1 year	After 2 years
	Per hour	Per year					
Policeman (private).....	\$2.76	\$5,732.00		3 years of police experience.....	\$5,732.00	\$5,924.00	\$6,115.00
Manual laborer.....	2.73	5,678.40		None.....	5,907.20	5,907.20	6,136.00
Trades helper.....	2.92	6,073.60		Passage of simple written test...	6,323.20	6,323.20	6,572.80

These situations presently exist, and clearly show the financial plight of the National Zoological Park policemen. The policeman must present himself for work in a neat and trim manner befitting a representative of the agency—which requires out-of-the-pocket expenditure for the maintenance of uniforms—only to find that he is—after 6 months—making \$175 less per year than a manual laborer. The manual laborer after 2 years is still earning at least \$21 more per year than the policeman. This has been a continuing cycle, since the manual laborer receives annual cost-of-living increases under the Federal wage board system, which the policeman is not entitled to, since he is a general schedule employee. In the case of the trades helper, he starts out—after passage of a simple written test, with no experience required—earning \$307 more per year than the policeman—who must have 3 years of police experience. After 1 year this trades helper

is making \$399 more per year than the policeman. This same trades helper usually is able to advance to the journeyman level after 4 years and would be making \$7,800 per year. It may be noted that a policeman who spends 18 years in the rank of private can only attain \$7,456 per annum at this time. We believe the above situations clearly demonstrate why the recruitment and retention of policemen at the National Zoological Park is so difficult. An environment of high morale and esprit de corps is extremely difficult to establish and maintain under such circumstances, and it becomes obvious why we have experienced such a large loss—50 percent—of trained officers to the police community.

The following table indicates the present and proposed National Zoological Park Police salary comparisons with counterpart law-enforcement jurisdictions in the Washington metropolitan area:

POLICE SALARY COMPARISONS (SALARY RANGE OF EACH RANK)

Present National Zoological Park Police, rank, grade, and salary range	S. 883 and H.R. 2667 for more comparable salaries for National Zoological Park Police	Supreme Court	Capitol	U.S. Park Police	Non-Federal sector, average of 10 towns
Private, GS-5, \$5,732 to \$7,456.....	\$6,981 to \$7,913.....	\$6,938 to \$8,835.....	\$6,965 to \$9,950.....	\$8,000 to \$10,300.....	\$7,227 to \$10,020.....
Sergeant, GS-6, \$6,321 to \$8,221.....	\$7,699 to \$8,727.....	\$8,448 to \$10,755.....	\$9,353 to \$12,338.....	\$9,570 to \$11,610 (detective).....	\$8,972 to \$12,159.....
Lieutenant, GS-7, \$6,981 to \$9,078.....	\$8,462 to \$9,590.....	\$9,317 to \$11,861.....	\$11,345 to \$14,328.....	\$10,175 to \$12,215 (sergeant).....	\$10,076 to \$13,677.....
Captain, GS-8, \$7,699 to \$10,012.....	\$9,297 to \$10,537.....	\$11,250 to \$14,319.....	\$13,532 to \$16,517.....	\$11,710 to \$13,850 (lieutenant).....	\$10,421 to \$15,493.....

It may be noted that the present starting salary for a private in the U.S. Park Police is \$8,000. By contrast the starting salary for a private of the National Zoological Park Police Force is \$5,732, a difference of \$2,268—in other words, 40 percent less than his counterpart.

We believe the only valid comparison for salary purposes is to compare the work and responsibilities of the National Zoological Park Police privates with the work and responsibilities of the U.S. Park Police private.

On this basis, we have made a point-by-point analysis of the National Zoological Park Police private with the private in the patrol division of the U.S. Park Police. This original study was made in 1964, by the chief of our classification section; and has now been updated as of February 18, 1969. If I may, I would like to submit this in part for the record.

I will point out the conclusions which are readily apparent from this study. First, the study finds that there is no basis for comparing the total National Park Police operations with the National Zoological Park Police. We compare, instead, with the patrol division and we emphasize the comparison of the basic duties of the police privates in both cases. It was concluded that the private on either force may be confronted with serious crime at any time, and that the laws and statutes enforced and the qualifications and training required are comparable in all respects, with the exception of pay. It was noted that the National Zoological Park Police receive less on-the-job training because they must have had 3 years' of police experience prior to joining the force.

The fact that serious crimes, of the same nature generally occur in both jurisdictions is evidence of the comparability of the responsibility of the two police forces. The number of arrests on the part of the National Park Service Police is understandably larger since that police force is about 10 times the size of the National Zoological Park Police. Also, it is to be considered that the zoo is more heavily policed with the consequential greater deterrent effect.

In considering crime statistics it is significant to note that without the patrolling of police and the resulting deterrence to vandalism and crime, there would of course be a far higher incidence of vandalism, abuses of animals, thefts from parked automobiles, and accidents to visitors caused by their own misbehavior.

We have made appropriate adjustments in our comparative study to recognize the difference in size of the National Zoological Park Police and the National Park Service Police. Consequently, the supervisory officer salaries have been adjusted—our sergeant to compare with their detective, our lieutenant with their sergeant, and our captain with their lieutenant.

DIRECT BENEFITS

The pending legislation would remove all positions in the police force of the National Zoological Park from the provisions of law—Classification Act of 1949—which requires the application of Civil Service Commission position classification standards. This action would

avoid conflict with any regulations and standards issued by the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

The pending legislation would confer upon the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution authority to fix the salaries of all positions in the police force of the National Zoological Park, within the limitations of H.R. 2667 and S. 883.

The Smithsonian Institution endorses the principles of this pending bill, recognizing that it does not fully meet the objective of Congress, which is to establish comparable salaries for like work.

Favorable consideration of this bill, however, will be most helpful in attracting and maintaining the quality of police force needed at the National Zoological Park.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 2667.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

SHARING PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9634) to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to improve and make more effective the Veterans' Administration program of sharing specialized medical resources.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 9634

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5053(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting "for the exchange of use" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the mutual use, or exchange of use,".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is a second demanded?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the veterans' bills which will be considered this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to amend the language in section 5053(a)(1) of title 38, to conform to that used in the Public Health Service Act to achieve a more effective and improved administration of the sharing program conceived as a part of Public Law 89-785, which was sponsored by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in an effort to approve education and training within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration. Because it appears that the present law precludes agreements for the mutual use of community resources except in those cases where reciprocal exchanges of a Veterans' Administration resource is a part of the program, this legislation is necessary.

The measure was presented in a formal submission to the Congress.

There would be no additional cost as the result of this act.

The Veterans' Administration has many agreements with medical schools calling for the exchange of the use of specialized equipment, but in order for such agreements to work, the Veterans' Administration is required to have something to give the medical school in return. Under the proposed bill a medical school could have a cobalt unit and if the bill were in effect, the Veterans' Administration could use it, assuming a sharing agreement existed between the two installations. Today, however, the Veterans' Administration would have to have some service or some equipment which the school desired in order for the Veterans' Administration to use the cobalt machine without paying for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may use or require to the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9634. This bill will improve the Veterans' Administration's procedures for sharing special medical resources with community medical resources.

The 89th Congress enacted legislation which permitted the Veterans' Administration to share specialized medical resources with community medical facilities. The legislation was designed to permit the Veterans' Administration to acquire community medical resources for their patients and to improve medical education and training of Veterans' Administration doctors. Because of a literal interpretation of the law, however, the Veterans' Administration can only acquire the use of community medical resources when there is a reciprocal use of VA resources by the community.

The language of H.R. 9634 will permit the Veterans' Administration to acquire the use of community medical resources, regardless of whether the Government is furnishing resources or services in return.

The Veterans' Administration has requested this language and I am advised

that its enactment would result in no additional cost to the Government. I urge that it be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 9634.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR OLDER VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 693) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that veterans who are 70 years of age or older shall be deemed to be unable to defray the expenses of necessary hospital or domiciliary care, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 693

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 622 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before "For", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator may not require any statement under oath from an applicant referred to therein who is seventy-two years of age or older for the purpose of determining inability to defray necessary expenses, and such applicant shall be deemed to be unable to defray the expenses of necessary hospital or domiciliary care."

Sec. 2. Subsection (g) of section 612 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Where any veteran is in receipt of increased pension or additional compensation or allowance based on the need of regular aid and attendance or by reason of being permanently housebound, or who, but for the receipt of retired pay, would be in receipt of such pension, compensation, or allowance, the Administrator may furnish the veteran such medical services as he finds to be reasonably necessary."

Sec. 3. Subsection (h) of section 612 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after the words "by reason of being" the following: "permanently housebound or".

Sec. 4. Subsection (a) of section 610 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (2); (2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(4) any veteran for a non-service-connected disability if such veteran served in the active military or naval service in Mexico, on the borders thereof, or in the waters adjacent thereto during the period beginning on May 9, 1916, and ending on April 6, 1917."

Sec. 5. (a) The provisions of section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 shall not apply with respect to employees of the Veterans' Administration and such employees shall not be taken into account in applying the provisions of such section to the other departments and agencies of the executive branch.

(b) Section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide nursing home care and contract hospitalization for certain veterans living in Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes", approved October 21, 1968 (Public

Law 90-612, 82 Stat. 1202), is hereby repealed.

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

The TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, section 1 would provide that a veteran who is 72 years of age or older no longer be required in order to gain admission to a Veterans' Administration hospital for a non-service-connected disability to sign, under oath, a statement of inability to defray the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care. Inasmuch as present practice relieves all individuals who are on the non-service-connected pension rolls from filing the financial data required of other applicants, regardless of their age, and service-connected veterans are admitted as a matter of right, it would appear that this section is a logical extension of the present practice and one which can be described as providing uniformity and equity for our older veterans.

Section 2 authorizes the Administrator to furnish outpatient care and such other medical services as he finds to be reasonably necessary to any veteran who is in receipt of pension or compensation based on need of regular aid and attendance or who is permanently housebound. Inasmuch as care for service-connected veterans in this category is already administered on the most liberal basis, the only substantial change would occur in the pension field and is restricted to those individuals who are the most severely disabled. The air-and-attendance group is so helpless or blind as to need the regular aid and attendance of another person. The housebound are so disabled as to require them to remain in their homes constantly.

The Veterans' Administration has a well-defined program of prehospital care and posthospital care, developed at the urging of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which is, in effect, outpatient care providing for preparation of the veteran prior to being admitted to the hospital and followup after hospital treatment. Section 2 is a logical, workable, and equitable extension of the existing program for an exceptionally needy group of disabled veterans.

Under present law, drugs, and medicine prescribed by a physician are furnished to veterans for their service-connected disability, they are also furnished to the veteran during periods of hospitalization and during periods of prehospital and post hospital care regardless of whether his disability or disease is service-connected or non-service-connected in character. In addition, under existing law, pensioners who are in need of regular aid and attendance are furnished drugs and medicine prescribed by a physician. Section 3 seeks to extend this provision for

furnishing drugs and medicine at Veterans' Administration expense to those veterans who are receiving additional compensation or pension by reason of being permanently housebound. As in section 2, it seems to the committee that this is a logical extension to a worthy group of disabled veterans.

Section 4 provides non-service-connected medical care for any veteran who served in the active military or naval service on the Mexican border during the period beginning on May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917. The committee believes that this is but a long overdue recognition of the important and valiant service of this deserving group of veterans.

The limitations imposed by Section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditures Control Act of 1968—Public Law 90-364—insofar as they place a ceiling on the number of employees the Veterans' Administration may have, are repealed by section 5 of this act. The original provisions of Public Law 90-364, were modified by section 4 of Public Law 90-612, by providing that the original limitation on employees should not apply to the Veterans' Administration in any month in which the number of such employees does not exceed the number of employees employed by the Veterans' Administration on June 30, 1966. The testimony before the subcommittee on hospitals is replete with references to the fact that the ceiling on employment is a great detriment to the successful operation of the hospital system of the Veterans' Administration.

During the past several years the introduction of certain medical care programs has been planned. These programs were specially designed to meet the requirements of veterans receiving hospital or outpatient care. In many instances they were designed to afford these patients the most up-to-date treatment available.

Included were: Alcohol treatment units, blind clinics, cardiac catheterization, clinical radioisotope, day hospitals, day treatment centers, electron microscopy, epilepsy centers, foster home care, hemodialysis units, intensive/coronary care beds, mental hygiene clinics, organ replacement centers, prosthetic treatment centers, psychiatric medical infirm units, pulmonary emphysema units, pulmonary functions unit, reference labs, speech pathology, stereotactic brain surgery, and supervoltage therapy.

Certain of these, such as hemodialysis units, organ replacement centers, and intensive/coronary care beds have life saving missions. Others, such as day hospitals, day treatment centers, foster home care, and mental hygiene clinics, are designed to further improve programs for the care of the psychiatrically disabled. They are to provide further support to the increasing effort to reduce or prevent hospitalization by providing outpatient care.

Alcohol treatment centers are designed to serve a large and growing problem and supervoltage therapy is planned to offer improved treatment to veteran patients with cancer.

During fiscal year 1969, more than 100 of these programs had been scheduled for activation. To comply with Public

Law 90-364 it was necessary to delay them.

The patient-employee ratio of VA hospitals, 1.5, is approximately one-half of that found in well-run community hospital facilities. It compares with a level of four patient-employee relationship in the best facilities operated in conjunction with medical schools. Regardless of the amount of money available and the shortage of medical and paramedical personnel, it is essential in the judgment of the committee that this personnel ceiling be lifted insofar as the Veterans' Administration is involved if an efficient operation is to be maintained. Unless action of this sort is taken there can only be one certain result and that is a deterioration of medical care provided in the Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The committee has noted with interest the following portion of the text of the Administration's review of the 1970 budget—as inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 16, 1969, by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee:

Consistent with the employment limitation objectives, the President is asking the Congress to repeal section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, which imposes restrictions on hiring in the executive branch. This Administration is in full agreement with the objective of section 201, but experience administering the arbitrary formula it imposes provides ample evidence that it is an inappropriate tool for achieving its objective. The section 201 limitation imposes especially harsh penalties on agencies with high turnover rates. And it takes insufficient account of the urgency or priorities of public service or of the manpower requirements of programs the Congress has approved since 1966.

It is clear from the foregoing that the action of the committee with respect to employees of the Veterans' Administration is completely in line with the plan to repeal the mentioned section 201 limitations with respect to the executive branch as a whole.

Section 1, providing admission of veterans 72 years of age or older to a Veterans' Administration hospital without signing the statement of inability to pay is estimated to cost something less than \$1,825,000 the first year. Section 2, providing outpatient care for aid and attendance pensioners and the housebound group of pensioners would cost approximately \$9,503,000 the first year. Section 3, authorizing the furnishing of drugs and medicine for the housebound pensioners would cost \$3,400,000 the first year. Section 4, authorizing hospital care for the Mexican border veterans is not susceptible to an estimate of cost, the VA advises. Section 5 would not result in any additional benefit costs.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana who sponsored this legislation.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 693, which is under consideration here today. Not only do I strongly advocate and support the purpose of the bill, to allow those veterans aged 72 years and older, to use VA hospitals and domiciliary homes,

without the necessity of proof of financial need, but for another most important reason.

That reason appears on page 3 of the bill in section 4. This section helps a limited number of our American veterans who had service on the Mexican border.

These men have never had the rights and benefits that should have been due them for their vigorous combat service.

At least, this legislation will recognize their service for eligibility to use VA hospitals.

I have long fought for this provision and others for these veterans. On January 3, 1969, I introduced H.R. 583, which would permit these hospital benefits and others not covered by this legislation.

My colleagues, this benefit is long overdue and I heartily recommend your support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill even though I question the wisdom of eliminating the requirement of veterans over 72 years of age filing a financial statement under oath.

There are more good things decidedly in the bill than had so I do support notwithstanding that reservation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 693. This bill in its amended form will liberalize the medical care and treatment program for older veterans and for veterans with more serious disabilities. Additionally, it will exclude the Veterans' Administration from the personnel ceilings imposed by the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968.

Existing law requires that most veterans, irrespective of age, to sign a statement of inability to defray the necessary expense of hospital or domiciliary care, prior to admission to a VA hospital for treatment of a non-service-connected disability. This is the so-called pauper's oath. Excluded from this requirement are veterans with a service-connected disability and those in receipt of pension.

Older persons who are eligible for Medicare may be hospitalized in community facilities irrespective of their personal financial circumstances or their ability to pay for the necessary hospitalization. Section 1 of this bill would merely eliminate the execution of the so-called pauper's oath in the case of a veteran who is 72 years of age or older.

Section 2 of the bill will authorize outpatient treatment for veterans who, because of serious disability, are in receipt of an aid and attendance allowance or a housebound allowance, of compensation or pension. To be eligible for the aid and attendance allowance, a veteran must be so helpless or blind as to require the aid and attendance of another person. The housebound group are so disabled as to require them to remain in their homes almost constantly. This section of the bill not only provides a well-deserved benefit to this seriously disabled group of

veterans, but it enables the Veterans' Administration to provide needed care and treatment on an economical basis than would otherwise be possible in a hospital bed.

Section 3 of the bill will permit the Veterans' Administration to furnish drugs and medicine to the so-called housebound group. This benefit is already available to the aid and attendance group. Its extension to the housebound group is compatible with the concept of providing outpatient care to this group.

Section 4 of the bill will authorize non-service-connected medical care for veterans of Mexican border service between May 9, 1916, and April 6, 1917. Despite the arduous nature of the Mexican border campaign, veterans thereof are not classified as war veterans and are therefore not generally eligible for Veterans' Administration hospitalization. Such recognition, Mr. Speaker, is long overdue.

Section 5 of the bill will exclude the Veterans' Administration from the personnel ceilings imposed by section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. The continued operation of the Veterans' Administration, particularly in its hospital system, under these restrictive personnel ceilings will seriously hamper its ability to render prompt and high quality service and care to the Nation's veterans. Although the administration has requested the repeal of this section for all agencies of Government, the committee believes that the situation requires immediate action in the case of the Veterans' Administration.

This bill is sound legislation and I urge that it be passed.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering, under suspension of the rules, six bills which are of particular interest to the veterans of this great Nation, and especially those veterans who must receive medical care.

These six bills will expand the medical care services which can be rendered to veterans through nursing homes, outpatient facilities, and State veterans homes.

In addition, one bill will improve and make more effective the Veterans' Administration program of sharing specialized medical resources, and another will eliminate the so-called pauper's oath for any veteran who is 72 years of age or older and who seeks to gain admission to a Veterans' Administration hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation and I am hopeful the House will pass favorably on each bill today.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 693. This bill will eliminate the so-called pauper's oath, or statement of inability to pay for hospitalization, in the case of a veteran who has reached the age of 72 and is seeking admission to a Veterans' Administration hospital for treatment of nonservice-connected disabilities. This same veteran, as well as his contemporaries who had no military service, if they are covered by Medicare can be hospitalized in any community hospital irrespective of financial need. It is somewhat ridiculous to require a pauper's oath from a veteran whose sacrifice during time of

war have maintained the security of his Nation.

I urge that this bill be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 693, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 302, nays 3, not voting 127, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—302

Abbutt	Dingell	Kastenmeier
Abernethy	Donohue	Kazen
Adair	Downey	Kee
Albert	Downing	King
Alexander	Duiski	Kleppe
Anderson, Ill.	Duncan	Kluczynski
Andrews, Ala.	Edmondson	Koch
Andrews,	Edwards, Ala.	Kyl
N. Dak.	Edwards, Calif.	Kyros
Annunzio	Edwards, La.	Langen
Arends	Ellberg	Latta
Ashley	Erlenborn	Leggett
Aspinall	Esch	Lipscomb
Ayres	Evens, Tenn.	Lloyd
Baring	Fascell	Long, Md.
Beall, Md.	Feighan	Lowenstein
Belcher	Findley	McCarthy
Bell, Calif.	Fisher	McClory
Bennett	Flood	McCloskey
Betts	Flowers	McClure
Bevill	Foley	McCulloch
Biester	Ford, Gerald R.	McDonald,
Bingham	Fountain	Mich.
Blackburn	Fraser	McEwen
Boggs	Frey	McFall
Boland	Fulton, Pa.	McMillan
Bow	Fulton, Tenn.	Madden
Brinkley	Fuqua	Mahon
Brock	Garmatz	Malliard
Broomfield	Gaydos	Mann
Brotzman	Gettys	Marsh
Brown, Calif.	Glaimo	Mathias
Brown, Ohio	Gibbons	Matsunaga
Broyhill, N.C.	Goldwater	May
Broyhill, Va.	Gonzalez	Mayne
Buchanan	Goodling	Meeds
Burke, Mass.	Green, Oreg.	Mikva
Burlison, Mo.	Green, Pa.	Miller, Ohio
Burton, Utah	Griffin	Mills
Bush	Griffiths	Minish
Button	Gross	Mink
Byrne, Pa.	Grover	Minshall
Byrnes, Wis.	Gude	Mize
Cabell	Hagan	Mizell
Caffery	Haley	Mollohan
Cahill	Hall	Monagan
Camp	Hamilton	Montgomery
Carter	Hammer-	Moorhead
Casey	schmidt	Morgan
Cederberg	Hanley	Myers
Chamberlain	Hansen, Wash.	Natcher
Chappell	Harsha	Nedzi
Clancy	Hastings	Nelsen
Clausen,	Hathaway	O'Hara
Don H.	Hawkins	Olsen
Clawson, Del.	Hays	O'Neal, Ga.
Cleveland	Hechler, W. Va.	O'Neill, Mass.
Cohelan	Heckler, Mass.	Ottinger
Collins	Hicks	Passman
Conable	Hogan	Patman
Corbett	Holifield	Patten
Corman	Horton	Pelly
Coughlin	Hosmer	Pepper
Cramer	Howard	Perkins
Cunningham	Hull	Pickle
Daddario	Hungate	Pike
Daniel, Va.	Hunt	Pirnie
Daniels, N.J.	Hutchinson	Poage
Davis, Wis.	Jacobs	Poff
de la Garza	Joelson	Pollock
Delaney	Johnson, Calif.	Price, Ill.
Dellenback	Johnson, Pa.	Pryor, Ark.
Dent	Jones, N.C.	Pucinski
Derwinski	Jones, Tenn.	Purcell
Devine	Karth	Qule

Quillen	Schadeberg	Tunney
Rallsback	Schneebell	Udall
Randall	Schwengel	Ullman
Rarick	Scott	Van Deerlin
Rees	Shipley	Vander Jagt
Reid, Ill.	Shriver	Vanik
Reifel	Sikes	Vigorito
Reuss	Sisk	Waggonner
Rhodes	Skubitz	Waldie
Riegle	Slack	Watts
Roberts	Smith, Iowa	Whalen
Rodino	Snyder	Whalley
Rogers, Colo.	Springer	White
Rogers, Fla.	Stafford	Whitehurst
Rooney, N.Y.	Staggers	Whitten
Rooney, Pa.	Stanton	Widmall
Rosenthal	Steiger, Wis.	Williams
Rostenkowski	Stokes	Wilson, Bob
Roth	Stratton	Wold
Roudebush	Symington	Wolf
Roybal	Taft	Wright
Ruppe	Talcott	Wyatt
Ruth	Taylor	Wyllie
Ryan	Teague, Calif.	Wyman
St Germain	Teague, Tex.	Yates
Satterfield	Thompson, N.J.	Yatron
Saylor	Thomson, Wis.	Zablocki

NAYS—3

Dennis	Jonas	Keith
NOT VOTING—127		

Adams	Farbstein	Murphy, Ill.
Addabbo	Fish	Murphy, N.Y.
Anderson,	Flynt	Nichols
Calif.	Ford,	Nix
Anderson,	William D.	Obey
Tenn.	Foreman	O'Konski
Ashbrook	Frelinghuysen	Pettis
Barrett	Friedel	Philbin
Bates	Gallifanakis	Podell
Berry	Gallagher	Powell
Biaggi	Gilbert	Preyer, N.C.
Blanton	Gray	Price, Tex.
Blatnik	Gubser	Reid, N.Y.
Bolling	Halpern	Rivers
Brademas	Hanna	Robison
Brasco	Hansen, Idaho	Ronan
Bray	Harvey	St. Onge
Brooks	Hébert	Sandman
Brown, Mich.	Helstoski	Scherle
Burke, Fla.	Henderson	Scheuer
Burleson, Tex.	Ichord	Sebelius
Burton, Calif.	Jarman	Smith, Calif.
Carey	Jones, Ala.	Smith, N.Y.
Celler	Kirwan	Steed
Chisholm	Kuykendall	Steiger, Ariz.
Clark	Landgrebe	Stephens
Clay	Landrum	Stubblefield
Collier	Lennon	Stuckey
Colmer	Long, La.	Sullivan
Conte	Lujan	Thompson, Ga.
Conyers	Lukens	Tiernan
Cowger	McDade	Utt
Culver	McKneally	Wampler
Davis, Ga.	Macdonald,	Watkins
Dawson	Mass.	Watson
Denney	MacGregor	Weicker
Dickinson	Martin	Wiggins
Diggs	Meskill	Wilson,
Dorn	Michel	Charles H
Dwyer	Miller, Calif.	Winn
Eckhardt	Morse	Wydler
Eshleman	Morton	Young
Evans, Colo.	Mosher	Zion
Fallon	Moss	Zwach

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Bray.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Conte.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Mc-Kneally.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Gallifanakis with Mr. Sebelius.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Price of Texas.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Obey with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Preyer of North Carolina with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Zion.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Young with Mr. Helstoski.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Diggs.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The title was amended so as to read: "To amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that veterans who are 72 years of age or older shall be deemed to be unable to defray the expenses of necessary hospital or domiciliary care, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OUTPATIENT CARE FOR CERTAIN SERVICE-CONNECTED VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3130) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may furnish medical services for non-service-connected disability to any war veteran who has total disability from a service-connected disability.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3130

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (f) of section 612 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"(3) where a veteran of any war has a total disability permanent in nature resulting from a service-connected disability."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this measure would make available to any war veteran who has a permanent total disability resulting from a service-connected disability, complete medical services, which in effect means outpatient care for a non-service-connected disability.

While outpatient treatment for veterans is restricted to service-connected disabilities, the prehospital and post-hospital care program now operative in the Veterans' Administration medical system—at the urging of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs—applies in thousands of instances to non-service-connected cases. The "pre" system permits a workup prior to admission to a hospital, "post" authorizes a followup of the care and treatment prescribed in the hospital. The operation of the pre- and post-hospital care program was at one time described as being the equivalent of the construction of three 1,000-bed general hospitals.

Despite the view of the Veterans' Administration substantial evidence exists to believe that the extension of the outpatient service of veterans such as this group would cause a further decline in the inpatient care program of the Veterans' Administration hospital system and would have an overall effect in reducing cost.

The Veterans' Administration estimates, however, that the enactment of this legislation would cost approximately \$8 million the first year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Tennessee, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3130. This bill will authorize outpatient medical care to any totally disabled service connected veteran for the treatment of any non-service-connected disability.

Under existing law, service connected veterans, irrespective of the degree of disability, are entitled to outpatient treatment for their service-connected disabilities only. On the other hand, all war veterans are entitled to outpatient treatment under the so-called prebed care and posthospital care program. The so-called prebed care program in particular has made subsequent hospitalization unnecessary in many cases. It is believed that the extension of outpatient services to the

totally disabled service connected veteran for the treatment of any condition will further relieve the burden upon the Veterans' Administration hospitals. Certainly, the ready availability of outpatient treatment on a timely basis will in many cases make later hospitalization for the same condition unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, this is good legislation and I urge that it be passed.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3130, and would also like to make a few remarks concerning two other veteran bills just considered by the House.

H.R. 3130 would extend to any war veteran who has a permanent, total disability resulting from a service-connected disability, complete medical services including outpatient care for a non-service-connected disability.

I believe this step is an important one, and one wholly in keeping with our commitment to provide a war veteran a complete range of needed medical care. This policy is already being followed for a veteran who has been hospitalized—regardless of whether the cause for the hospitalization is service connected—and it is only logical that it would be provided in this instance.

The two other measures concern the community nursing home program. The two bills extend the periods of time authorized for veterans who need this type of care, both for those suffering from a service-connected disability, and for those otherwise eligible for hospitalization.

Just within the past year, I personally have had the opportunity to see the tremendous success of the community nursing home program, and I am not surprised that the statistics released by the Veterans' Administration reaffirm its value.

The program was established to benefit veteran-patients who have progressed to the point that they no longer need hospitalization, but do still need nursing care. The community nursing home program enables these veterans to be cared for in a private nursing home which is close to their homes and families, and the benefits of the program are many.

First, and most importantly, the patient is generally in an environment more conducive to his recovery. I understand this has been the most successful medical feature of this program, and it is one which is certainly worth promoting.

In addition, the program works to conserve medical energies, and allows VA hospitals to be maintained for those in greatest need. As soon as a patient is able to move to a nursing home, this program encourages just that.

Finally, I would note that this program has, in fact, resulted in a savings to the Government. The general cost for care in a community nursing home, under contract with the VA, is about \$16 per day. This compares with an average hospital cost of over \$50 per day.

It is also important to note that the nursing homes have been most responsive to the program. At one point, there was a serious question as to the applica-

tion of the Service Contract Act to those homes accepting VA patients, but even when that matter was in doubt, most homes proceeded to accept VA patients whenever requested.

Mr. Speaker, the first of these community nursing home bills, H.R. 692, would extend from 6 to 9 months the time a non-service-connected veteran may spend in a private nursing home. This amendment will not affect a large number of veterans, but I believe it is a reasonable increase and one which is supported by some of the experience which has developed under the program.

The other bill, H.R. 2768, would authorize community nursing home indefinitely for a service-connected disability. The VA has indicated strong support for this amendment, and feels it will work a significant relief on the demands for VA hospital facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support these bills. The ideas behind these changes are most worthy and beneficial.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3130. This bill will extend total outpatient services for the treatment of any condition to those veterans who are totally disabled from service-connected causes.

Under existing law, these severely disabled veterans are eligible for treatment on an outpatient basis for their service-connected conditions only. Considerable savings will result in the long run if these veterans can be treated on an outpatient basis early enough to forestall the need for later hospitalization. Certainly, no one can question the merit of extending this added medical benefit to those who became totally disabled as a result of military service during time of war. I strongly support the bill and urge that it be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 3130.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARE IN COMMUNITY NURSING HOMES

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 692) to amend section 620 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the length of time community nursing home care may be provided at the expense of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 692

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 620 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking "six" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "nine".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 88-450 authorizes the Veterans' Administration to operate within its own medical system 4,000 nursing care beds. At the same time it provided in sec-

tion 620 of title 38 authority for the Veterans' Administration to transfer a hospitalized veteran patient who has reached the nursing home care stage to a public or private institution for nursing care at Federal expense for a period generally not to exceed 6 months. Both of these provisions have had the desired effect of removing from active hospital beds operated by the Veterans' Administration those patients who no longer need hos-

pital care but truly need nursing care. It also had an effect on reducing the hospital load throughout the entire Veterans' Administration medical system. The program, both that administered by the Veterans' Administration, as well as that operated in community nursing homes under VA auspices, has worked extremely well. Statistics on the operation of this program between January and June 1968 are shown in the tables which I include as a part of my remarks.

DISPOSITION OF PATIENTS PLACED IN COMMUNITY NURSING HOMES AT VA EXPENSE BETWEEN JANUARY AND JUNE 1968

	Gains, January to June 1968									Losses, January to December 1968						
	Total	Average age	Period of service				Service connection		Total	Deaths	Community nursing home at non-VA expense					
			World War I	World War II	Korean	Post-Korean	Vietnam	Other			SC ¹	NSC	Total	SC	NSC	Other ²
Total.....	4,999	67	2,898	1,763	92	21	28	197	954	4,045	4,974	568	1,470	302	1,168	2,936
Alabama.....	78	69	45	27	2			4	13	65	78	18	19	3	16	41
Arizona.....	161	69	96	47	3			11	30	131	161	30	43	6	37	88
Arkansas.....	107	67	61	39	2			4	28	79	107	12	81	23	58	14
California.....	346	64	140	153	17			2	31	261	346	34	30	8	22	282
Colorado.....	73	69	47	21				2	3	17	73	10	27	8	19	36
Connecticut.....	68	72	41	21	1				5	15	53	15	7	1	6	46
District of Columbia.....	22	61	6	13	1				2	6	20	1	3	1	2	16
Delaware.....	19	69	12	5					1	3	16	1	11	2	9	7
Florida.....	353	69	191	120	5			1	36	66	287	349	48	58	10	48
Georgia.....	82	66	42	34	2				15	67	82	6				243
Idaho.....	21	72	13	7					1	21	21	2	12			76
Illinois.....	404	67	246	146	6			1	54	350	404	8	145	19	126	259
Indiana.....	72	66	46	23	1			1	8	64	72	8	30	4	26	34
Iowa.....	147	73	98	43	2				21	126	146	18	39	5	34	89
Kansas.....	53	67	28	24					11	42	53	3	30	8	22	20
Kentucky.....	143	69	83	49	1			2	8	112	142	26	38	6	32	78
Louisiana.....	83	64	50	30	2				6	77	83	8	22		22	53
Maine.....	29	72	23	5	1				3	26	29	2	9	2	7	18
Maryland.....	36	65	20	15	1				6	30	36	3	10	1	9	23
Massachusetts.....	219	64	159	57	1				55	164	219	16				203
Michigan.....	10	71	7	3					10	10	2	2	6		6	7
Minnesota.....	228	69	160	64	1			1	63	165	228	29	106	31	75	93
Mississippi.....	30	71	23	5					6	24	30	6	8	2	6	16
Missouri.....	63	63	35	27	1				14	49	63	7	19	2	17	37
Montana.....	21	73	17	4					3	18	21		6		6	15
Nebraska.....	52	72	34	15	1				6	46	52	8	12	1	11	32
Nevada.....																
New Hampshire.....	16	69	11	5					8	8	16		5	3	2	11
New Jersey.....	82	70	58	21				3	1	81	70	13	18		18	39
New Mexico.....	36	66	20	1	2			2	6	30	36		5	2	3	31
New York.....	48	71	33	14	1				9	39	48	1	18	4	14	29
North Carolina.....	88	64	37	44	1				19	69	88	14	26	9	17	48
North Dakota.....	21	69	16	4	1				3	18	21	1			20	
Ohio.....	221	66	112	97	5			7	53	168	218	25	69	22	47	124
Oklahoma.....	166	66	74	69	1			11	11	30	166	25	16	5	11	125
Oregon.....	59	68	32	24	1				2	10	49	14	28	4	25	17
Pennsylvania.....	210	68	125	73	3			1	8	153	210	21	91	32	59	98
Puerto Rico.....	33	69	21	9				1	2	5	28	3			30	
Rhode Island.....	44	67	21	21					4	40	44	8	12	2	10	24
South Carolina.....	68	68	47	47	2				6	62	68	8	26	3	23	34
South Dakota.....	15	69	9	6					5	10	15	5	6	1	5	4
Tennessee.....	166	67	89	70				2	1	4	33	133	166	40	27	6
Texas.....	317	68	178	121	7			2	1	8	47	270	317	28	136	24
Utah.....	7	72	6	1					1	6	7	3	3		3	1
Vermont.....																
Virginia.....	148	65	83	54	3			1	7	41	107	148	11	68	21	47
Washington.....	117	65	57	43	9				5	22	95	116	19	29	5	24
West Virginia.....	68	62	49	15	1			1	2	9	59	68	2	44	5	39
Wisconsin.....	147	70	95	47	2				3	19	128	147	14	71	11	60
Wyoming.....	2	72	2						1	1	2		1		1	1

¹ Includes patients with service-connected disabilities hospitalized for non-service-connected disabilities.

² Includes patients whose benefits have expired or who have obtained maximum nursing home care benefits, and who were discharged to a VA hospital, domiciliary, restoration center, or other outplacement other than a nursing home.

VA PATIENTS PLACED IN COMMUNITY NURSING HOMES AT VA EXPENSE, JANUARY TO JUNE 1968, WHOSE CARE WAS EXTENDED BEYOND 6 MONTHS

[By number of months extended]

State	Total	1 month	2 months	3 months	4 months	5 months	6 months
Total.....	28	2	1	3	3	1	18
District of Columbia.....	2				2		
Florida.....	4			2		1	1
Iowa.....	1						1
Kentucky.....	1						
Maryland.....	1	1					
New Jersey.....	12						12
Ohio.....	3						3
Tennessee.....	1						1
Texas.....	1	1					
Washington.....	1			1			
West Virginia.....	1		1				

VA COMMUNITY NURSING HOME PROGRAM

State	Patients placed in community nursing homes, fiscal year 1968					Patients in community nursing homes Oct. 31, 1968, care beyond 6 months					Patients requiring CNH care during 1968 not effected because—					
	VA expense		Expense other than VA			Required					Total	Required level of care unavailable	CNH not available	CNH rejected by patient	Other	
	Number	Per diem cost	Total	Medicare	Medicaid	Other	Total	Not required	Will need	May need						Additional months required
Total.....	8,863		4,712	903	834	2,975	3,167	702	1,927	538	17,628	2,924	810	369	815	930
Alabama.....	123	\$11.68	32	8		24	18	4	12	2	168	83	6	4	28	45
Arizona.....	279	11.78	73	24		49	104	43	48	13	468	24	3	3	13	5
Arkansas.....	263	11.02	249	2		247	95	7	76	12	972	145			36	109
California.....	879	13.18	656	239	227	190	272	48	136	88	1,769	373	245	16	62	50
Colorado.....	131	11.96	82	18	12	52	17	10	7		84	14	1		5	8
Connecticut.....	176	12.00	36	13	3	20	114	54	49	11	566					
Delaware.....	27	11.75	10	4		6	8	6	2		24					
District of Columbia.....	62	11.93	32	7	10	15	29	10	10	3	156	20	20			
Florida.....	513	11.64	72	29		43	206	63	67	76	1,062	21	5	6	7	3
Georgia.....	177	11.38	78	16	40	22	69	7	51	11	192	43	18	4	15	6
Idaho.....	33	11.06	23	4		19	56		56		672	1				
Illinois.....	853	11.78	93	29	15	49	246	55	159	32	1,764	127	17	11	31	68
Indiana.....	68	12.00	72	15	5	52	31	5	13	13	240	10	2	1	2	5
Iowa.....	239	11.79	118	21	9	88	17	7	8	2	682	9	4	1		
Kansas.....	243	9.72	238	22	9	207	43	2	41		492	186	33	8	67	78
Kentucky.....	92	11.35	15	10	1	4	25	16	5	4	90	33	19	5	1	8
Louisiana.....	158	11.68	81	10	29	42	55	3	52		624	65	16	10	20	16
Maine.....	61	11.74	17	2		15	13	4	9		54	19	4	2	8	5
Maryland.....	82	12.33	43	2	10	31	24		23	1	83	85	21	7	1	56
Massachusetts.....	424	11.46	104	27	22	55	147	8	88	51	1,764	55	36	2	3	14
Michigan.....	50	12.36	161	38	68	55	31	29	2		192	31	22		5	4
Minnesota.....	308	11.20	96	13	28	55	233	5	203	25	30	36	16		5	15
Mississippi.....	65	11.90	70	7	13	50	16	6	9	1	36	35		4	22	9
Missouri.....	156	11.81	133	13	29	91	33	6	19	8	78	52	10	2	20	20
Montana.....	22	11.32	30	10	6	14	5	4	1		12	4	2	1	1	
Nebraska.....	111	11.67	118	9		109	25	1	23	1	208	42	28	1	3	10
Nevada.....			13		2	11						4				4
New Hampshire.....	15	12.00	6			6	11				13				2	11
New Jersey.....	71	11.46	26	8	1	18	38	15	16	7	264	98	41		17	4
New Mexico.....	51	11.90	32	2		29	16	3	8	5	32	32	6	6	18	2
New York.....	249	15.49	185	29	72	84	50	10	36	4	164	331	47	141	83	60
North Carolina.....	108	11.99	38	6		32	37	6	29	2	112	79		17	34	28
North Dakota.....	59	11.20	26	7	2	17	8	3	4	1	51	14	6	3	1	4
Ohio.....	376	11.53	133	11		122	143	62	47	34	404	82		1	55	26
Oklahoma.....	248	9.99	81	18	42	21	52	6	46		552					
Oregon.....	79	10.45	160	61	6	93	95	3	87		12	5			5	64
Pennsylvania.....	349	12.67	100	22	28	50	213	74	108	34	920	154	25	20	45	
Puerto Rico.....	62	10.95					13	12			3					
Rhode Island.....	86	11.99	7	4		3	28	4	14	9	276	23	12	3	8	
South Carolina.....	70	12.19	13	2	1	10	16	2	14		90	6		2	1	
South Dakota.....	40	10.82	42			42	5	3	2		24	57	14	1	24	12
Tennessee.....	251	12.27	49	8	8	33	148	28	94	26	1,404	35	1	6	20	8
Texas.....	468	11.46	313	31	23	259	115	10	92	13	434	93	55	3	19	16
Utah.....	11	8.30	291	25	17	249	1		1		12	27	6	10	11	
Vermont.....			13	4		9										
Virginia.....	122	11.31	54	10	2	42	26	13	7	6	174	53	11	8	10	24
Washington.....	220	11.15	208	55	28	125	118	24	76	18	60	90	8	6	21	55
West Virginia.....	116	11.12	70	2		68	28	6	11	11	112	57	9	6	32	10
Wisconsin.....	209	12.00	96	6	65	25	70	2	60	8	36	130	38	41	38	13
Wyoming.....	8	8.50	24		1	23	1	1			24				8	16

Source: "Operations of Veterans' Administration Hospital and Medical Program," House Committee Print No. 1, 91st Cong., 1st sess.

Particular attention should be given to the figures indicating that for a 6-month period only 28 patients had to be extended beyond the basic 6-month period. It thus seems that the purpose of this bill; namely, to extend the period in which a veteran may be treated in a nursing home at Veterans' Administration expense from 6 to 9 months, is a most desirable measure which cost would be minimal in view of the benefit received. The experience and statistics quoted above support this extension of 3 months.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that the cost for the first year would be approximately \$5,954,000.

At this point I include a telegram from the Veterans of World War I:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 29, 1969.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C.:

This is to advise of the strong support of the Veterans of World War I U.S.A. for H.R. 692 and H.R. 693. H.R. 692 badly needed to extend the period of nursing care from 6 to 9 months for those veterans in community nursing homes. H.R. 693 will permit all World War I veterans to enter a VA hospital with-

out signing oath of inability to pay. Our average age is 76 and this provision is badly needed. We support the provision of the bill which provides drugs for housebound veterans and applaud the committee for including veterans with Mexican border service for eligibility for hospital care. The provision to repeal the personnel ceiling on VA has our wholehearted support and is badly needed if the VA medical program is to maintain a proper level of quality care.

VICTOR V. MILLER,
National Commander, Veterans of World War One.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS), a member of the subcommittee who listened to all of the testimony, so that he may give the House an explanation of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy in the role which I played in the Subcommittee on Intermediate Care headed by our late colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Everett, which led to the enactment of Public Law 88-450.

One of the features of that law authorized the Veterans' Administration to place in community nursing homes patients who had been in Veterans' Admin-

istration hospitals, in most instances for a considerable period of time, for 6 months of care in a community nursing home at the expense of the Veterans' Administration. The program has worked extremely well. The nursing homes have been cooperative in meeting the standards and conditions of the Veterans' Administration, and this feature of Public Law 88-450 has relieved the Veterans' Administration of considerable pressure and permitted an increase in the general medical and surgical turnover rate.

Hospital costs in the Veterans' Administration today range as high as \$50 per day and on an average approximate \$40. In contrast, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may only pay a maximum of \$16.50 per day for nursing home care. The savings are obvious.

The bill which I am happy to support today extends the 6-month period to 9 months during which time a patient may be maintained in a community nursing home at the expense of the Veterans' Administration. It seems a logical step forward, and it was supported throughout the hearings which were held over a period of 8 days in the months of April and

May of this year. The measure was conceived by the veterans of World War I, and received the support of all the veterans' organizations.

It was approved unanimously in the subcommittee and unanimously out of the full committee. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will support this measure.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. What standards are applicable to these community nursing homes?

Mr. ROBERTS. The VA has a complete set of standards that provide they must be acceptable to the VA. They are highly acceptable. The nursing homes take care of these eligible veterans in really better shape in many cases than they would be taken care of in a hospital, because they are where their families can come to see them. It is a highly satisfactory arrangement. They do have to meet those criteria. There is no problem with that at all. They have to have registered nurses and doctors available.

Mr. GROSS. In sufficient numbers to provide quality care for our veterans?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is assuring the Members of the House that the community nursing homes are equipped to take care of veterans with the same facilities or with comparable facilities that they have in the Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Mr. ROBERTS. In fact, I think the committee would be almost unanimous in saying that most of the veterans, after they have had their surgery and are in a recovery period, would prefer to be at home or be in a nursing home than be in a medical-surgical hospital.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that, from my experience, the standards are very high.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want the assurance of the committee that they are not being moved out anywhere to substandard conditions for care.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The committee can certainly assure the gentleman that that is a fact.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I commend the gentleman and his committee for bringing this measure up, but there is another bill pending in the gentleman's committee which provides for the voluntary payment over and above the \$16.50 by relatives, friends, organizations, States or municipal governments, or by the veterans themselves, who are willing to make such overpayments. As the gentleman knows, particularly in Hawaii and Alaska, \$16.50 is not sufficient. You just cannot find any day-care center which will take in a veteran for \$16.50 a day. The bill which I introduced would not cost the Federal Government one penny more. It would merely allow a veteran who would otherwise be denied the needed care, to be placed in a nursing

home through the generosity of friends or of the State government or of the municipality. Can the gentleman tell us whether his committee is going to report that bill out?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman I think his bill has merit, but I would like to yield to someone on the subcommittee that has listened to the testimony.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Unfortunately, Alaska and Hawaii being high-cost areas, we simply have not been able to arrange a contract within the rate which has been established for this purpose. I think we are going to have to have some more hearings before we are in a position to recommend to the House an exemption from the existing rates. It is my personal opinion that ultimately we will be able to work out something for the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman. As the gentleman knows, I did appear before the subcommittee of which he is a member and at that time it was indicated that perhaps further hearings were necessary to get the viewpoints of the administration. I would deeply appreciate it if the gentleman, the chairman of the whole committee, will see to it that the subcommittee carries on that hearing, because as it is, the law is no good for Hawaii or Alaska. While it is of benefit to veterans in the other 48 States, veterans in Hawaii and Alaska get no benefit because of the high cost prevailing in those two States. The bill which I introduced would not cost the Federal taxpayer a single penny more. I appreciate the gentleman's efforts in this regard.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman is aware that the committee has had a continuing interest. We did pass a bill at the last session of the Congress, I believe it was the gentleman's bill, which gave Alaska and Hawaii certain exceptions. The chairman of the subcommittee assures me that they are still considering the bill.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, how does the expense per bed operation in the nursing home compare with the per bed operation in the hospital?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is about \$16.40 as against \$40 in a VA general hospital.

Mr. TAYLOR. The result of this legislation would be to provide service needed for veterans and at the same time save the Government some money?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is very true. It has had a tremendous effect on the availability of beds in our hospital system for veterans acutely ill.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, if I may ask the gentleman from Texas, if I understand correctly, this bill provides that a veteran, who has been in the hospital and whose condition is improving, can be put in a nursing home, and he can stay in that nursing home for 9 months instead of 6 months as previously provided?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. What I wish to ask the able gentleman is this. Suppose a veteran becomes old and disabled and is not particularly ill with any emergency illness, but he is nevertheless old and feeble and disabled. He has not been in the hospital and the hospital will not take him because he is a chronic case and not an emergency case. What, if any, provision is there in the law now for taking care of that veteran in either a veterans hospital as long as he lives or in a nursing home as long as he lives and continues to be disabled?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. This is the thing we did in Alaska and Hawaii, and we have not reached the point where we can take care of that situation generally. I would guess further down the road it will probably happen. Right now we cannot handle that kind of load in the system.

Mr. PEPPER. The reason why I ask the question is because I have a feeling—and I am sure it must be shared by many other Members—that one of the problems which will be increasingly facing us today with both veterans and civilians is that type of case: the chronically ill person, usually as the result of old age, who is not eligible for a domiciliary home because he is not ambulatory and who is not eligible for a nursing home because he has not been in a hospital. And we do not have today, other than State and local welfare or charity, any provision to take care of that gentleman.

I understand our distinguished colleague has a bill giving further services to the service-connected disabled, but I want to ask the able gentleman—and I know he has already given consideration to the problem—if he will continue to give consideration to the veteran, and we hope the civilian also, with respect to taking care of the permanently disabled, maybe to provide care in a nursing home through other than charity.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think these hearings comprising over 1,400 pages would prove the committee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY), has had complete hearings.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman. Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Florida, much of which I agree with, I think it is obvious that many of the patients in veterans hospitals can receive ample treatment in nursing homes and at a much lower cost than is now required in the veterans hospital. But the fact is that under the regular VA program, the Veterans' Administration has 4,000 nursing home beds available for use for that very purpose, in addition

to what is provided in the legislation now before the House. Is that not correct, I ask the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, Public Law 88-450 did, as the gentleman has suggested, authorized the Veterans' Administration to operate as many as 4,000 nursing care beds. As of April 30, the average daily census in these beds was 3,769. The same public law authorized the Veterans' Administration to place in community nursing homes veterans who needed nursing care and the average daily census as of April 30, for this type of care was 2,947.

Mr. JONAS. That is true. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas if it is not a fact that the Administrator now has authority, in his discretion, to extend the period of time a veteran can be cared for in a community nursing home beyond 6 months.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is true. But he has used it only in the most severe cases.

There were only 28 such instances in the first 6 months of 1968.

Mr. JONAS. Would this bill make it automatic and a requirement that the period be extended from 6 to 9 months?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. This would give the Administrator authority to determine if the man should be extended. Actually doctors at the VA hospital estimate the length of time a veteran will need nursing care.

Mr. JONAS. He has that authority now.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Well, he wanted an indication, or more liberal authority to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee to comment on that.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas said, the Administrator has the authority now to extend this time, and he seems to be reluctant to use it. He thinks he needs a little broader authority.

I reiterate what the gentleman from Texas said just a moment ago, that he only extended that to 28 veterans, I believe, in the last year. If he needs a little broader authority, I think this will give it to him.

Mr. JONAS. The reason why I raised the question is I did not construe his letter to the chairman of the committee as seeking any broader authority. As a matter of fact, his letter indicates that the Veterans' Administration is opposed to this bill. I was trying to find out why the VA would oppose it. I now find my opinion confirmed that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has the exact authority that is provided for in this bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I doubt there is a Member of the House who is more aware of how this kind of thing operates than the gentleman who has been speaking. The gentleman well knows what happens in the executive branch of the Government. We sent 68 hospital bills down there, and all but two, suggested by the VA, came back negative. It was not the VA that was negative; it was the Bureau of the Budget. Probably the rest of our bills will come back negative. I do not think they will approve a bill that costs a dime.

Mr. JONAS. The letter I read in the report was signed by W. J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Which was cleared by the Bureau of the Budget and which had to so clear. The Administrator is not allowed to send one up that is not cleared. The gentleman is aware of that.

Mr. JONAS. I was trying to find out the basis on which the legislation was needed. The Administrator says he has authority to do exactly what is in the legislation.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If the gentleman will talk with the VA officials privately he will find out they are for this legislation, and they were told by the Bureau of the Budget to be against it.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, who also has worked hard on this legislation.

Mr. DUNCAN. At the present time a veteran cannot get more than 6 months care, unless he wants to go through all of the redtape and all the way to the top of the Veterans' Administration, and then he can get it extended to 9 months. This automatically would give it to him without all of this difficulty of going all the way to the top.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. But he has to be found medically to need it.

Mr. JONAS. Who will pass on it, if he automatically will get the extension?

Mr. DUNCAN. That is a medical determination by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. JONAS. Will he not have to make the same application and go through the same redtape?

Mr. DUNCAN. That will be determined by the VA doctor where he happens to be located, where they put him in the nursing home.

As the chairman has said, it has been true that the Veterans' Administration has declined a lot of worthy cases, that I know of.

Mr. JONAS. I am not arguing against the bill. But I believe the membership of the House ought to know that with respect to this bill, and the one we had a rollcall vote on earlier today, that Mr. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, states that the VA opposes the bills. As to the previous bill, Mr. Driver stated that the VA opposed it because it was discriminatory and not because the Bureau of the Budget opposed it. I think the membership of the House ought to realize that this legislation is opposed by the VA, according to Mr. Driver's letter.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Does the gentleman think our committee should wait and do nothing, just wait for the executive branch to tell us what to do? I believe these 1,400 pages of hearings proves that the subcommittee really worked on this, and knows what it is doing. I have a lot more faith in them than something coming from the Bureau of the Budget. We are not going to sit still and wait for the executive branch to tell us what to do.

Mr. JONAS. I do not advocate that you do that or that you follow every recommendation of the administration or that

you take an adverse position when the administration opposes something; but I was just trying to find out in what respect this particular bill would change existing law when the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has already stated in his letter that he had authority to what the bill authorizes.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBERTS. What would happen at the present time is that they take a fellow at the expiration of the 6-month period back from a community nursing home to a medical and surgical hospital and put him in a Veterans' Administration hospital. They put him back there for a 6-month tour, which is something that they do not have to do. That is what we are trying to avoid by making it a voluntary situation.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 692, and other bills on the House Calendar today, would liberalize hospital services for veterans, especially for veterans of World War I, and I am for just that.

My voting record shows that I believe in economy, but in my opinion, during recent years the Bureau of the Budget has been too strict with veterans hospitals, and those of us in Congress need to let the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget and the President know how we feel in regard to providing hospitalization for needy veterans in veterans hospitals and nursing homes.

In my opinion, it is not only in the interest of veterans, but it is in the national interest and in the interest of the war in Vietnam and in the interest of any future wars in which we may engage that veterans who meet the financial test and who need hospitalization be provided the medical care needed as veterans in a veterans facility with dignity and not be sent to local welfare departments.

Let me remind you that the average veteran is not getting something for nothing. He paid a price for the hospitalization which he may need and may have to seek.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNIS. I got the impression a moment ago that something was said that we are actually saving money in this bill. I want to call your attention to page 7 of the report where, if I understand correctly what the Administrator is saying in his letter that the gentleman from North Carolina referred to, he said there will be an additional cost in the next 5 fiscal years resulting from this legislation that will total about \$37 million. I wonder how that corresponds with the money-saving suggestion which was made here before.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) for an explanation of this.

Mr. ROBERTS. Each person occupying one of these immediate-care beds

would be in a medical-surgical hospital bed, which would cost us \$40 to \$50 a day rather than a maximum of \$16.50 a day. So for every dollar of cost that you are spending in this way you are spending about 20 times as much. Each of those people has to be put in there by the Veterans' Administration. They can put them in a medical-surgical bed for \$40 to \$50 a day or put them in a local nursing home for only \$16.50.

Mr. DENNIS. If the gentleman will yield, this extends the nursing home period, does it not?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes. But that is the period I made just before this. If he is still in after 6 months and he needs the medical care, then they put him back into a medical-surgical bed for 1 day. That is all that is required. That is to keep him in. And then they put him back in for another 6-month period.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 692. This bill will extend the length of time community nursing home care may be generally provided for veterans from its present 6 months to 9 months.

Under existing law, Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration is authorized to transfer a hospitalized veteran-patient who has received maximum hospital care but is still in need of nursing care to a public or private nursing home for a period generally not to exceed 6 months. This community nursing care program, which was enacted in the 88th Congress, has had the desired effect of freeing beds devoted to active hospital care much sooner than would otherwise be possible were it not for the nursing care program.

This has been a good program, Mr. Speaker. It has saved the Government's money and it has served to fill a long-standing void in the program of care and treatment for veterans. Experience has dictated that this program can be more effectively administered if the 6-month time limit is extended to 9 months. Therefore, I support the bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 692. This bill will extend the time limit during which veterans with non-service-connected disabilities can receive community nursing home care at Veterans' Administration expense from its present 6 months to 9 months.

Experience has dictated that the 6-month limitation on community nursing care is inadequate in the case of many veterans. Despite the fact that the Administrator has the authority under existing law to extend this time limit, he has exercised this authority in only 28 cases during the last 6 months. This bill will permit such nursing care for such time as is needed up to a maximum of 9 months, without the necessity of administrative action after 6 months. I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 692.

The question was taken; and (two-

thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NURSING HOME CARE FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2768) to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to eliminate the 6-month limitation on the furnishing of nursing home care in the case of veterans with service-connected disabilities, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2768

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That next to the last sentence of subsection (a) of section 620 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "except where in the judgment of the Administrator a longer period is warranted in the case of any veteran" and inserting in lieu thereof "except (A) in the case of the veteran whose hospitalization was primarily for a service-connected disability, or (B) where in the judgment of the Administrator a longer period is warranted in the case of any other veteran."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, section 620 of title 38, United States Code, authorizes the placement in a community nursing home at the Veterans' Administration's expense—generally for a period of 6 months—hospitalized veterans who are no longer in need of hospital care and whose primary requirements are for nursing care. This bill would authorize such community nursing home care for veterans hospitalized for a service-connected disability without limitation as to the length of time such care may be provided. Service-connected disabled veterans are admitted as a matter of right for their service-connected disabilities to all Veterans' Administration hospitals. Veterans with non-service-connected disability are admitted on a bed available basis.

The committee concludes that in view of the demonstrated reduction in the workload of the Veterans' Administration hospital system, which the basic provisions of section 620, title 38, has accomplished, that the logical step contemplated by this bill would further reduce that workload and also reduce the cost for medical care in a Veterans' Administration hospital. Benefits of this bill now range as high as \$50 a day for hospital care in contrast to approximately \$16.50 a day for community nursing care.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that approval of this legislation would increase the daily nursing care

load in community nursing homes by approximately 350 at \$1,500,000 annually.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY).

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support this bill which I introduced at the request of the Disabled American Veterans.

Service-connected disabled veterans have a right under existing law to a hospital bed when they have a condition which warrants hospitalization. This has been true since the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical system was first created in 1924. Hospital care, including nursing care and doctors' fees costs, is as much as \$50 a day in Veterans' Administration hospitals and on an average is \$40.90 for general hospitals and \$21.63 for psychiatric hospitals. Nursing home care in facilities operated by the Veterans' Administration has an average per diem cost of \$15.60 in contrast to \$13.24 for nursing care provided in a community home at the Veterans' Administration's expense. The Congress has set an overall limit on nursing care costs in community homes of 40 percent of the rate for general care in a Veterans' Administration hospital. This means approximately \$16.50 per day at the present time.

My bill provides that in the case of a service-connected disabled veteran who has been hospitalized in the Veterans' Administration hospital system, that veteran may be transferred to a community nursing home without regard to the present 6-month limitation but may be treated in such community nursing home for his service-connected condition so long as he requires such care. It seems to me that this is a case of setting correct priorities. No Member of the Congress objects, I am sure, to giving service-connected disabled veterans the medical care and treatment which their condition warrants. This bill is an extension of that philosophy and will in my judgment close a gap, and in view of the right which a service-connected disabled veteran has to a hospital bed will very likely lead to savings when this program is fully implemented.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2768. This bill would permit the veteran with service-connected disabilities to receive unlimited nursing care in a community nursing home if the need for such care is clearly demonstrated.

Under existing law, Mr. Speaker, service-connected disabled veterans are subject to the same 6-month limitation on community nursing care as non-service-connected disabled veterans. On the other hand, such service-connected disabled veterans are admitted to VA hospitals as a matter of right for treatment of their service-connected disabilities. Such hospitalization, of course, may continue for as long as treatment is necessary.

As a result, many service-connected disabled veterans are occupying an active hospital bed with its attendant costs, despite the fact that their disabilities have stabilized to the point where they only require nursing care.

The committee believes that the elimination of the 6-month limitation on community nursing care for service-connected disabled veterans will make more hospital beds available for the treatment of acute conditions and at the same time would permit many veterans to receive needed care in facilities closer to their homes. H.R. 2768 will accomplish this purpose. I urge that it be passed.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2768. This bill will benefit the service-connected disabled veteran. It will extend community nursing care to the service-connected disabled veteran without regard to any time limitation.

Under existing law, the service-connected disabled veteran who has received maximum hospital benefits is entitled to up to 6 months of care in a community nursing home in the same manner as is the non-service-connected disabled veteran. This bill would remove that 6 month limitation in the case of the veteran with service-connected disabilities and permit him to receive such nursing care as is necessary.

Aside from the fact that this bill will permit the veteran to receive such care in a nursing home in his local community, it will permit the Veterans' Administration to provide the needed care at a cost of \$16.50 per day instead of the \$40.90 per day for care in a Veterans' Administration general hospital. I urge that the bill be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 2768, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARE OF VETERANS IN STATE HOMES

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9334) to amend title 38, United States Code, to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans homes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 9334

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 641 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The Administrator shall pay each State at the per diem rate of—

- "(1) \$3.50 for domiciliary care,
- "(2) \$5 for nursing home care, and
- "(3) \$7.50 for hospital care,

for each veteran of any war receiving such care in a State home, if, in the case of such

a veteran receiving domiciliary or hospital care, such veteran is eligible for such care in a Veterans' Administration facility, or if, in the case of such a veteran receiving nursing home care, such veteran meets the requirements of paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 610(a) of this title, except that the requirements of clause (B) of such paragraph (1) shall for this purpose refer to the inability to defray the expenses of necessary nursing home care; however, in no case shall the payments made with respect to any veteran under this section exceed one-half of the cost of the veteran's care in such State home."

SEC. 2. (a) Subchapter V of chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 644. Authorization of appropriations —

"(a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and a like sum for each of the nine succeeding fiscal years. Subject to the conditions set forth in subsection (b) of this section, sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making grants to States which have submitted, and have had approved by the Administrator, applications for assistance in remodeling, modification, or alteration of existing hospital or domiciliary facilities in State homes providing care and treatment for veterans.

"(b) The amount which may be granted to a State home for purposes of subsection (a) shall not exceed 50 per centum of the estimated cost of the project, nor may any one State receive in any fiscal year more than 20 per centum of the amount appropriated for that fiscal year.

"(c) Grants under this section shall be made on such terms and conditions prescribed in regulations by the Administrator.

"(d) Sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall remain available until the end of the second fiscal year following the fiscal year for which they are appropriated."

(b) The analysis of chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately below

"643. Applications." the following:

"644. Authorization of appropriations."

SEC. 3. Section 5034(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "one

and one-half" and inserting in lieu thereof "three".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, following the Civil War, a tier of Northern States built and operated State soldiers homes which were for the care and treatment of Federal veterans of the War Between the States. Each home, naturally, set up its own criteria for admission and some homes permitted the veteran to bring his wife with him at the time he was admitted. Originally they were conceived as old soldiers homes and operated as such. Lately they have developed into a more sophisticated type of care providing the full spectrum of care—domiciliary, hospital, and nursing. The program has expanded, in recent years, to cover homes constructed in Georgia, West Virginia, and Oklahoma.

Historically, the Federal Government has made a contribution for the care of each such State home veteran, who is eligible under the provisions of title 38 for care in a Veterans' Administration hospital. That level of payment today stands at \$3.50 per day for medical care and the same amount for hospital care but a \$5 rate is provided for nursing home care, the difference being that hospital care has only recently been added to the State home system.

One of the provisions of Public Law 88-450 was to create this special rate for nursing home care for State homes, and in addition it authorized a \$5 million appropriation to be used on a matching fund basis for the construction of new nursing home facilities.

Basic data on these homes is shown in the material which follows:

BED CAPACITY OF STATE HOMES, MAR. 20, 1969

State and county	Name of home	Total	Domiciliary	Nursing home	Hospital
California: Napa.....	Veterans Home in California.....	2,381	1,507	402	472
Colorado: Rio Grande.....	Colorado State Veterans Center.....	150	130	20	—
Connecticut: Hartford.....	Veterans Home and Hospital.....	1,225	729	—	496
Georgia:					
Baldwin.....	Georgia State War Veterans Home.....	390	390	—	—
Richmond.....	Georgia War Veterans Nursing Home.....	192	—	192	—
Idaho: Ada.....	Idaho Veterans Home.....	126	126	—	—
Illinois: Adams.....	Illinois Soldiers' and Sailors' Home.....	1,032	543	248	241
Indiana: Tippecanoe.....	State Soldiers' Home.....	451	293	158	—
Iowa: Marshall.....	Iowa Soldiers' Home.....	610	345	119	146
Kansas: Ford.....	Kansas Soldiers' Home.....	266	232	34	—
Louisiana: East Feliciana.....	Louisiana War Veterans Home.....	128	128	—	—
Massachusetts:					
Suffolk.....	Soldiers' Home in Massachusetts.....	725	350	75	300
Hampden.....	Soldiers' Home.....	240	78	75	87
Michigan: Kent.....	Michigan Veterans Facility.....	1,083	600	477	6
Minnesota: Hennepin.....	Minnesota State Soldiers' Home.....	389	389	—	—
Missouri: Phelps.....	State Federal Soldiers' Home.....	220	125	95	—
Montana: Flathead.....	Montana Soldiers' Home.....	70	70	—	—
Nebraska: Hall.....	Nebraska Soldiers' and Sailors' Home.....	387	291	96	—
New Hampshire: Belknap.....	New Hampshire Soldiers' Home.....	64	32	32	—
New Jersey:					
Middlesex.....	New Jersey Home for Disabled Soldiers.....	200	112	88	—
Cumberland.....	New Jersey Memorial Home.....	331	164	100	67
New York: Chenango.....	New York Women's Relief Corps Home.....	232	152	80	—
North Dakota: Ransom.....	North Dakota Soldiers' Home.....	134	134	—	—
Ohio: Erie.....	Ohio Soldiers' and Sailors' Home.....	971	721	250	—
Oklahoma:					
Carter.....	Oklahoma State War Veterans Home Facility.....	266	176	90	—
Cleveland.....	do.....	230	230	—	—
Murray.....	do.....	231	87	84	60

BED CAPACITY OF STATE HOMES, MAR. 20, 1969—Continued

State and county	Name of home	Total	Domiciliary	Nursing home	Hospital
Pennsylvania: Erie	Pennsylvania Soldiers' and Sailors' Home	285	221	64	
Rhode Island: Bristol	Rhode Island Soldiers' Home	268	130	138	
South Dakota: Fall River	South Dakota Soldiers' Home	325	255	42	28
Vermont: Bennington	The Soldiers' Home in Vermont	71	49	22	
Washington:					
Pierce	State Soldiers' Home	200	140	50	10
Kitsap	Washington Veterans' Home	510	332	120	58
Wisconsin: Waupaca	Grand Army Home for Veterans	637	138	448	51
Wyoming: Johnson	Wyoming Soldiers' and Sailors' Home	44	44		
Total beds		15,064	9,443	3,599	2,022

3. A project application for Massachusetts is in process:

[Dollar amounts in thousands]			
State	Number of beds	VA participation (estimate)	Total project (estimate)
Massachusetts: Holyoke	157	\$1,200	\$4,220

4. The following 12 States have contacted the VA and expressed an interest in securing financial assistance under 38 U.S.C. 5031-5037:

State	Number of beds	Purpose
California	170	Remodeling.
Colorado	80	Under consideration.
Indiana	168	Planning stage.
Iowa	120	Under consideration (2d project).
Michigan	300	State appropriations.
Nebraska	100	Under consideration (2d project).
New Jersey	100	Under consideration (5th project).
Pennsylvania	175	Under consideration.
South Carolina	150	Planning stage.
South Dakota	100	Do.
Washington: Retsil	80	Under consideration.
Wisconsin: King	200	Under consideration (3d project).
Total	1,743	

MEMORANDUM

MARCH 6, 1969.

To: Chief Medical Director (10).
 From: Director, extended care service (126).
 Subject: Nursing home care facilities, State soldiers' home (supersedes memorandum dated February 6, 1969).

1. Under 38 U.S.C. 641 the following State homes have been approved by VA Office of Jurisdiction to provide nursing home care:

	Number of beds
California: Napa County	428
Colorado: Homelake	20
Illinois: Quincy	357
Indiana: Lafayette	152
Iowa: Marshalltown	93
Kansas: Fort Dodge	22
Massachusetts:	
Chelsea	241
Holyoke	75
Michigan: Grand Rapids	469
Missouri: St. James	93
Nebraska: Grand Island	96
New Hampshire: Tilton	20

	Number of beds
New Jersey:	
Menlo Park	88
Vineland	100
New York: Oxford	7
Oklahoma:	
Ardmore	80
Sulfur	88
Pennsylvania: Erie	64
Rhode Island: Bristol	138
South Dakota: Hot Springs	42
Vermont: Bennington	22
Washington:	
Orting	50
Retsil	80
Wisconsin: King	245
Total	3,070

NOTE.—Cumulative ADNL through January was 2,115.

2. Construction projects approved and completed: Thirteen States have been given tentative approval for 18 construction grants under 38 U.S.C. 5031-5037.

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

State	Number of beds	VA participation (estimate)	Total project (estimate)	State	Number of beds	VA participation (estimate)	Total project (estimate)
Georgia: Augusta	192	\$982	\$2,065	New Jersey—Continued			
Illinois: Quincy	200	1,359	2,717	Vineland (No. 2)	100	\$858	\$2,305
Iowa: Marshalltown	80	532	1,070	Oklahoma: Norman	50	230	460
Kansas: Fort Dodge	88	400	800	Rhode Island: Bristol	30	364	753
Missouri: St. James	60	499	998	Vermont:			
Montana: Columbia Falls	22	158	316	Bennington (No. 1)	22	123	1,252
Nebraska: Grand Island	100	744	2,012	Bennington (No. 2)	40	401	1,124
New Hampshire: Tilton	50	371	743	Wisconsin:			
New Jersey:				King (No. 1)	200	1,181	2,881
Menlo Park (No. 1)	100	1,030	2,073	King (No. 2)	200	1,545	3,344
Menlo Park (No. 2)	100	892	1,783	Total	1,734	12,261	26,993
Vineland (No. 1)	100	592	1,197				

¹ In operation, 614 beds.
² Completed by June 30, 1969, 110 beds.

³ Under contract.
⁴ Completed by June 30, 1970, 300 beds.

PROJECTION

Average VA share per bed of projects approved to date: 7,024.

Potential additional beds: 1,743.

Potential additional VA participation: \$12,243,000.

5. Your attention is invited to increased interest by States in (a) operating nursing care beds, and (b) number of veterans provided nursing care in State homes:

Period	ADNL	Number of approved NHC beds	Percent occupied by veterans
July 1966	939	2,246	42
July 1967	1,426	2,310	62
July 1968	2,028	2,835	72

Only one construction project (22 beds) for nursing care was completed and reflected in above data.

CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION OF VETERANS TO STATE HOMES (FOR NURSING AND MEMBER CARE) AS OF MAR. 21, 1969

Location of State home	How much of the veteran's income does the home collect? Yes or no Criteria	What are the State homes requirements with respect to veteran's assets such as bank account, bonds, and cash?	What are the State homes requirements with respect to veteran's property such as home, automobile, etc.?	Are veterans, when admitted, required to make assignment of life insurance to the State home?	In responding to cols. A, B, C, and D, indicate disposition in event of veteran's death in the State home	What charges other than those covered in cols. A, B, C, and D are made to the veteran or his family or representative by the State home?	Is the State home affiliated with a medical school?	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	
Augusta and Milledgeville, Ga.	No	Not asked this question	None	No	None	Glasses, \$25; dental, charge for material.	No.	
Boise, Idaho	Yes	Above \$65 to maximum of \$40 per month. Income over \$105 per month not disturbed.	Not considered in determining eligibility or monthly rate of charge.	do	No	None	No.	
Chelsea, Mass.	Yes	Aid and attendance pen allowance.	If assets exceed following veteran encouraged to seek other service: Domiciliary, \$2,500; acute hospitalization, \$5,000; chronic hospital care, \$10,000.	If real property exceeds cash values cited in col. B, encouraged to seek other services.	No	As willed by patient.	3d party coverage for care, etc., on assignment by patient.	Negotiating.

CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION OF VETERANS TO STATE HOMES (FOR NURSING AND MEMBER CARE) AS OF MAR. 21, 1969—Continued

Location of State home	How much of the veteran's income does the home collect?		What are the State homes' requirements with respect to veteran's assets such as bank account, bonds, and cash?	What are the State homes' requirements with respect to veteran's property such as home, automobile, etc.?	Are veterans, when admitted, required to make assignment of life insurance to the State home?	In responding to cols. A, B, C, and D, indicate disposition in event of veteran's death in the State home	What charges other than those covered in cols. A, B, C, and D are made to the veteran or his family or representative by the State home?	Is the State home affiliated with a medical school?
	Yes or no	Criteria						
Holyoke, Mass.....	Yes	Aid and attendance per allowance.	None	None	No	As willed by patient	3d party coverage for care on assignment by patient.	No.
Buffalo, Wyo.....	Yes	Not to exceed \$200, but in all cases veteran retains \$50 per month.	Financial statement required of all veterans who are admitted to home.	If no income and has assets, encouraged to convert assets to cash to make monthly payments.	No	According to will or to next of kin under applicable State laws.	None	No.
Quincy, Ill.....	Yes	Graduated scale from \$5 to \$150 per month.	None	None	No	None unless liquid assets exceed \$5,000, then maximum of \$150 per month for period he paid less.	do	Yes.
Sandusky, Ohio.....	No		Eligibility established according to p. 2 of VA form 10-P-10 query. Assets listed and evaluated as to sufficiency for support. Assignment to home made and retained unless claimed by next of kin.	do	No	As willed by patient. Valuables and money by probate court.	do	No.
Grand Rapids, Mich.....	Yes	Over \$60 to maximum of \$126 per month.	Assets listed and evaluated as to sufficiency for support. Assignment to home made and retained unless claimed by next of kin.	Real estate and car listed; however, no assignment of such property required.	No	Assigned at time of admission and retained by house unless claimed by next of kin.	do	No.
Home Lake, Colo.....	Yes	\$36 a month maximum from other income. None from compensation and pension income.	None	None	No	If no heirs to personal property located in 6 months, property sold for benefit of State general fund.	None except for non-veteran.	No.
Marshalltown, Iowa.....	Yes	If personal estate is \$1,500 or more and no dependent, he pays total support. If \$500 or less, charges as follows: 1st \$20, none; \$30, 40 percent; \$70, 75 percent.	do	Home is counted as asset only if it is rented. Car not allowed as an asset.	No	Not required to sign over home. All assets after burial expenses go to next of kin.	Veteran buys his own clothes and personal items.	No.
Menlo Park and Vine-land, N.J.....	No		Veteran must be necessary, insufficient income or assets to maintain himself.	Without dependents is not permitted to have property or car. Married veteran can have home and/or car if used by wife.	No	None	None	No.
Lisbon, N. Dak.....	No		No special provisions. Individual cases reviewed.	No restrictions	No	If no heirs or will, become property of board of trustees.	do	No.
Columbia, Falls, Mont.....	Yes	Approximately 20 percent	None	None	No	If no heirs or will, to State.	do	No.
Lafayette, Ind.....	Yes	\$377 per month. Less if income not adequate. 1st \$30 of compensation and pension exempt; 80 percent of balance collected.	Not admitted if liquid assets \$3,000 or more—this waived if special care required—upon advice of advisory committee.	Permitted to retain property such as home, car, etc.	No	Claim for unpaid maintenance made by State. If dependent parent or minor child, no claim.	do	No.
Grand Island, Nebr.....	Yes	Maximum, \$125 per month. Women must pay \$14 minimum. \$40 allowed for personal needs by State law.	Must be dependent wholly or partially on charity. Income in excess of \$40, reasonable amount charged for maintenance.	See col. B	No	Personal effects and valuables as willed. Property disposed of per State laws.	do	No.
Tilton, N.H.....	Yes	Income from all sources in excess of \$115 per home.	Not admitted if real or personal property exceeds \$1,500, or if receiving unemployment compensation.	\$1,500 limitation covers property, cash, bonds, etc. Cannot own or operate car.	No	As designated on State home application.	Cost of prescriptions	No.
Minneapolis, Minn.....	Yes	1st \$40 exempt; on increments of \$5 income, percent ranges from 10 percent on \$45 to 40 percent on \$100; 90 percent in excess of \$100.	Veteran ineligible if total of all assets and property owned exceeds \$2,000.	See col. B	No	Will is made upon admission. No claim by home.	None	No.
Norman, Okla.....	Yes	If veteran has dependent, no charge regardless of income. If no dependent, no charge if income \$64 or less per month.	None	None	No	Claim against estate for difference between per diem cost and what veteran paid.	do	No.
Ardmore and Sulphur, Okla.....	Yes	In excess of \$64, charge varies from 1.2 percent to maximum of 50 percent, depending on income per month.	do	do	No	May make claim to cover difference between per diem cost and amount paid.	do	No.
Rocky Hill, Conn.....	No		Home acts as custodian for bonds, bankbooks, and cash. No investigation by home of resources.	do	No	Claim against estate billing home cost less Federal aid and medicare received.	do	No.
Erie, Pa.....	No		If total assets exceed \$10,000 veteran not admitted.	See col. B; no dependents and income excess of \$225 per month, not admitted.	No	All assets held 1 yr. if no claim, placed in welfare fund.	do	No.
Bristol, R.I.....	No	Not presently but planning to collect percentage in excess of \$45 monthly.	Remain in veterans name but deposits and expenditures supervised by home.	No restrictions on property; cannot retain car.	No	Advised to make will. Assets become property of State.	do	No.

CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION OF VETERANS TO STATE HOMES (FOR NURSING AND MEMBER CARE) AS OF MAR. 21, 1969—Continued

Location of State home	How much of the veteran's income does the home collect?		What are the State homes' requirements with respect to veteran's assets such as bank account, bonds, and cash?	What are the State homes' requirements with respect to veteran's property such as home, automobile, etc.?	Are veterans, when admitted, required to make assignment of life insurance to the State home?	In responding to cols. A, B, C, and D, indicate disposition in event of veteran's death in the State home	What charges other than those covered in cols. A, B, C, and D are made to the veteran or his family or representative by the State home?	Is the State home affiliated with a medical school?
	Yes or no	Criteria						
Napa County, Calif.	No		Liquid assets should not exceed \$4,000. Needs 9 of dependents are considered.	Real assets not in excess of \$5,000. Needs of dependents considered. Must swear inability to defray cost of care elsewhere.	No	Per will if made 1 yr prior to admission. If intestate, after 5 yrs. assets to post fund unless calimed by kin.	None except for dentures if veteran can afford to pay for them.	No.
Retsil, Wash.	No		\$1,000 limitation of total assets as property, car, cash, bonds, etc.	See col. B.	No	To next of kin. If no heirs after 2 yrs. to State.	Charge of 50 cents a week for personal laundry	No.
Orting, Wash.	No	Not presently but planning to collect percentage in excess of \$45 monthly.	do	do	No	To next of kin. If no heirs after 2 yr., to State.	None	No.
Hot Springs, S. Dak.	Yes	Nothing to \$49; \$5 from \$50 to \$59; \$10 to \$69; \$17.50 to \$79; maximum, \$75 on \$150 or more a month.	Not able to earn living, less than \$1,800 income, unable to support self and dependents.	Property not a factor; may own and use cars.	No	If no will or legal dependents, home is sole heir.	If more than \$3,000 cash accumulated while at home must pay maximum monthly cost until cash assets reduced to \$3,000.	No.
St. James, Mo.	Yes	From \$2 to \$200 graduated scale of 17 to 45.5 percent. Over \$200 per month, 50 percent.	3 percent in excess of \$750 cash added to monthly income.	3 percent of real estate over \$5,000 added to monthly income.	No	As willed or to next of kin.	None	No.
Oxford, N.Y.	Yes	All income in excess of \$30 per month.	Required to place assets in joint ownership with home.	Generally disposed of prior to admission. Retains sufficient funds for tax payments.	Yes	Assets in excess of amounts claimed by home to State.	do	No.
Bennington, Vt.	Yes	All over \$100 if single and no dependents, otherwise none.	Must give evidence of no adequate means of support. All assets, property are considered.	See col. B.	No	To next of kin or heir if will exists, otherwise to State.	do	No.
Fort Dodge, Kans.	Yes	Maximum of \$120 a month. Minimum of \$35 for comfort items. If hospitalized 60 days or more, \$35 reduced to \$15 a month.	Not admitted if cash, bank account, or bonds exceed a figure 6 times current living expenses.	If assessed value of real property exceeds \$2,000, not admitted. No request for surrender of property. Late-model car might be considered.	No	According to State laws.	do	No.
King, Wis.	Yes	1st \$20 exempt; \$30, 40 percent; \$50, 60 percent; \$70, 75 percent; over \$70, 100 percent. If pension payments suspended due to excess assets, per diem cost may be charged to estate.	All assets in excess of \$1,000 must be turned over to home.	See col. B.	No	If no legal dependents, to the State.	do	No.
Jackson, La.	Yes	Not to exceed \$60 per month if single.	None	None	No	None	do	No.

Source: D.M. & S. Circular 10-67-157, dated July 3, 1967, Updated per telephone survey, Mar.21, 1969.

The bill would amend pertinent provisions of title 38 to increase the payment for hospital care in a State home insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, from \$3.50 to \$7.50; authorize a \$5 million appropriation on a matching fund basis for 10 years to assist the States in remodeling and modifying or altering existing hospital and medical facilities at State homes and increase ratio on nursing care beds from the present 1 1/2 per 1,000 war veterans population of the State to three.

It should be borne in mind that domiciliary costs in the Veterans' Administration now average \$6.63 per day in contrast to \$3.50 which the Government pays to a State home for similar care; that for nursing care in a State home at \$5 per day, the Veterans' Administration figure on an average is \$15.60 in its own facilities and for a community nursing home, \$13.24. If the proposed hospital rate of \$7.50 is enacted into law, this will contrast with a VA cost of \$21.63 a day for psychiatric hospitals and \$40.90 for care in a general hospital.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that the first-year cost of the bill would be \$2,803,000. This would be increased by \$2,500,000 in 1971 because of the funds for remodeling and alteration

and another \$2,500,000 in 1972 for the same reason.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY) is an extremely hard-working member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. He chairs the Subcommittee on Hospitals in a most effective way and he and his colleagues have just concluded 8 days of hearings on the bills which the House has considered today. The Subcommittee on Hospitals deals with very complicated questions affecting the largest Government hospital and medical system in the world which provides for the care and treatment of nearly 100,000 veterans each day. Members of the committee know of the intricate problems which are involved in the health field generally and in particular, the Veterans' Administration.

The gentleman from Florida, because of his many years of service on this subcommittee, has an excellent knowledge of the problems of this system. He is devoted to the veterans of this country and has been unsparing of himself in conducting these hearings just concluded and his activity in this instance is typical of what he has done throughout his entire service on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

My thanks to the gentleman from Flor-

ida and all the members of the Subcommittee on Hospitals for a difficult job well done. The other members of the subcommittee are:

MESSRS. WALTER S. BARING, THADDEUS J. DULSKI, RAY ROBERTS, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., W. J. BRYAN DORN, DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III, ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, JOHN J. DUNCAN, WILLIAM H. AYRES, E. ROSS ADAIR, JOHN P. SAYLOR, SEYMOUR HALPERN, JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, MRS. MARGARET M. HECKLER, MESSRS. JOHN M. ZWACH, and ROBERT V. DENNEY.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) for a further explanation of the bill.

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, one of the oldest medical programs is that provided in the State homes located generally across the northern portion of the United States. These homes, which were built following the end of the Civil War, started out as old soldiers' homes. They now provide domiciliary care, nursing care, and hospital care.

From the beginning of this State system, the Federal Government has made a

contribution for the care and treatment of those veterans who are eligible for hospital care in the Veterans' Administration. The present bill increases the hospital rate for State homes from the present \$3.50 Federal contribution to a maximum of \$7.50 per day. In view of the going rate in Veterans' Administration hospitals of \$40, and in some instances \$50 a day, it is readily apparent that the Veterans' Administration is getting a real bargain in an arrangement of this sort.

Another feature of this bill is the authorization of a matching fund program of \$5 million annually for a period of 10 years to assist the States in modernizing their facilities for domiciliary care. This is similar to the provisions enacted as a part of Public Law 88-450 which authorized another matching fund program for nursing care construction.

Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is meritorious and is one which all Members of Congress who are interested in care of our veterans in State homes can cheerfully and logically support.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) has so well pointed out, this bill has my complete support.

I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the ranking member on the subcommittee which considered this bill.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9334. This bill will increase the Federal payments on behalf of veterans who are eligible for Veterans' Administration hospitalization but are receiving hospital care in State veterans facilities. It will also provide an incentive to those States operating domiciliary homes to update their facilities by authorizing a matching fund program for the remodeling or renovation of hospital or domiciliary facilities at State homes. Finally, it will increase the ratio on nursing care beds which the Federal Government will help finance from the present 1½ per 1,000 war veterans population to three nursing care beds per 1,000 war veterans population.

Under existing law, Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration is authorized to pay each State at the per diem rate of \$3.50 for domiciliary or hospital care and \$5 for nursing home care for each war veteran receiving such care in a State home. Section I of H.R. 9334 will increase the rate payable for hospital care to \$7.50 daily. This is proper, Mr. Speaker, since hospital care is far more costly than either domiciliary or nursing home care. Even the \$7.50 daily payment as proposed by this bill is more reasonable than the \$40.90 daily cost for care in a Veterans' Administration general hospital.

Section 2 of the bill will authorize a \$5 million annual appropriation for 10 years to assist States in remodeling and modifying or altering existing hospital and domiciliary facilities at State homes. Funds would be disbursed on a matching basis with States desiring to remodel their existing facilities. Because the State homes are assuming a share

of the Federal burden for the care and treatment of veterans at an extremely reasonable cost, the committee believes it appropriate that the Federal Government share in the cost of modernizing these State facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill and urge that it be passed.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would ask the gentleman what does the Federal Government now do by way of using Federal funds to remodel State-operated veterans' homes, soldiers' homes, as they are sometimes called?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, or perhaps another member of the subcommittee, to answer that question.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, at the moment it is my understanding that the Federal Government participates to a limited extent in the construction of new facilities. This will allow them to modernize buildings and plants that have been in existence for 40 or 50 years. We believe this is a good bill that will permit such a facility to be modernized rather than to build a new facility. We believe we can do that to an advantage.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is saying that Federal support has been given to State-operated veterans' homes over a long period of time; is that correct?

Mr. HALEY. For a long, long time the Federal Government has been in this program; yes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9334. This bill will increase the Federal payment to State homes on behalf of veterans who are hospitalized therein.

The present daily payment per veteran is \$3.50. This bill will increase this payment to \$7.50. The equity in this legislation is readily apparent when one compares the cost of hospitalization, \$40.90 daily, in a Veterans' Administration hospital with the \$7.50 daily proposed by this bill.

Since States are helping the Veterans' Administration assume its burden of providing hospitalization for the Nation's war veterans, it seems logical that the Federal Government should assume at least a reasonable part of this expense. I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of H.R. 9334, a bill which among other things increases the Federal payment for hospital care in a State home for veterans from the present level of \$3.50 per day to \$7.50 per day. This legislation is sorely needed and marks an important step forward in having the Federal Government contribute its fair share to State veterans facilities like those in Connecticut at Rocky Hill.

Connecticut, with a bed capacity of 1,225 in its veterans home and hospital facilities, ranks second in the Nation in bed capacity for such State institutions.

My interest in having the Federal Government provide adequate reimbursement to State institutions is not new. In 1960 I introduced legislation to change the method of payment to a more equitable per diem payment, and set the per diem rate at \$2.50 per day. In 1964 I supported the passage of Public Law 88-450 setting the per diem rate for hospitalization or domiciliary care in a State home at \$2.50 and the per diem rate for nursing home care at \$3.50. In the 90th Congress I introduced H.R. 7236 to raise the per diem rate for domiciliary care to its present rate of \$3.50. While I was encouraged to see the passage of the substance of my bill, I recognized then as I do now that the Federal share must be increased substantially to ensure the continued maintenance of excellent care now provided.

I think the provisions of the bill before us today, in more than doubling present per diem reimbursement rate, authorizing a \$5 million appropriation to assist the States in remodeling or altering existing hospital and domiciliary facilities at State homes and increasing the ratio on nursing care beds goes a long way in bringing the Federal contribution in line with the current costs of operating the State facilities.

The service provided to our most deserving citizens by State institutions is very valuable and I urge the House to unanimously adopt this bill today without prolonged debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 9334.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CADET COL. HECTOR GUTIERREZ JR.

(Mr. KAZEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, in these days of student rebellion and campus turmoil, when our Nation finds many of its colleges and universities wracked with dissent and disorder, violence, and bloodshed, I take great pride in commending one of the outstanding institutions of higher learning in the Nation, Texas A. & M. University, not only for having a distinguished record in its Reserve Officers Training Corps program, but also because of the peace and tranquility that reigns over the Texas Aggie campus, where the majority of the civilian student body has shown a strong support of the ROTC, at a time when the ROTC program has been the target of campus radicals.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to specifically pay tribute to a distinguished student leader, Cadet Col. Hector Gutierrez, Jr., of Laredo, Tex., 1969 commander of the corps at Texas A. & M. University, a university that developed as a land-grant college, steeped in a history of a highly successful mili-

tary program that has provided a record number of officers for our Armed Forces, and has given our country some of our most distinguished military leaders.

A young man whose parents have instilled in him love for his country, Cadet Col. Hector Gutierrez, Jr., has distinguished himself as a responsible student leader seeking to uphold reason, while rejecting force, firm in his resolve to maintain true freedom on the campus, thus assuring that the will of the vast majority of the student body is respected and upheld.

I congratulate his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hector Gutierrez, Sr., his former teachers at Nixon High School, the faculty, and his fellow students at Texas A. & M. University, for their share and role in the molding and development of this outstanding and patriotic young man, whose love for his country and faith in the democratic processes, make of him a most worthy model of American youth, one of whom we can be justly proud.

I am pleased to share with my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD, this most interesting article from the May 1969 edition of the Texas Aggie.

When an NBC news team went to the campus of Texas A&M University last winter to film part of a special report on ROTC, they may well have expected the same sort of anti-ROTC feelings they had encountered at some of the Ivy League schools.

If they did, they were soon disillusioned. The handful of dissenting students who, for the benefit of NBC cameras, painted peace symbols on the statue of a former Texas Governor and A&M President Lawrence Sullivan Ross were all disillusioned.

Non-ROTC students washed away the peace symbols and then guarded the statue throughout the night so that the following day the NBC crew would shoot scenes around an undefiled statue of an A&M hero.

The newsmen also witnessed at work one of the most unique student bodies in the nation—one not split by the dissension that rangles campuses from coast to coast. The key word at A&M is "solidarity."

Symbolizing this solidarity between the civilian student body and the ROTC is the popular 21-year-old cadet colonel, Hector Gutierrez '69, who commands the 2,525-man Corps.

The morning after the statue painting incident David Wilkes, '69, president of the Civilian Student Council, telephoned Gutierrez to offer his support. Wilkes told Gutierrez that the twenty-odd "dissenters" could not speak for the 13,000-member student body.

"We are," Wilkes said, "backing the Corps all the way."

Support for the ROTC Corps by the student majority, just at a time when the usefulness of the ROTC program is being seriously questioned and downgraded in other universities, and, at a time when a minority tried to imply that the majority of the students were anti-ROTC has "utterly confounded the NBC people." Gutierrez maintains, "They just could not understand it."

When viewed in the light of the pacifistic complaisance of the majority of students on such campuses where a militant minority may run amok for weeks at a time, it is not difficult to see why newsmen who had been witnesses to these tragedies would be amazed at a united student body.

Gutierrez' answer to trouble on the A&M campus is "... a proud 'NO!' Our students have managed to put down any attempt at violence."

The kind of student leadership that is

needed to help maintain pride in the ROTC-civilian student tradition at A&M is exemplified in Hector Gutierrez.

Says Army Colonel Jim H. McCoy '40, ROTC commandant and professor of military science at A&M, "Hector has more than proved the validity of our choice. He has patience, assumes responsibility, and acts with vigor."

Gutierrez, the oldest of a family of two sisters and three brothers, was the valedictorian in 1965 at the Loreda Nixon High School. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Hector Gutierrez Sr., commenting on their son's early interest, say, "Hector never seemed to care very much for sports, although he did play tennis. He was very interested in anything the students did, and in the student council."

Besides being first in his graduating class, he was president of the Nixon Student Council and commander of the Nixon ROTC.

"We can't account for his interest in ROTC," says Mr. and Mrs. Gutierrez, "but we do try to teach our children to love our country."

Gutierrez Sr. is a car salesman in Laredo, and Mrs. Gutierrez is a secretary at Laredo Air Force Base.

Gutierrez Jr., who serves in several student functions at A&M, is a senior mathematics major who has not yet decided what his lifetime career will be. Perhaps he will pursue a career in the Air Force, or, after serving his four-year military commitment, attend a "good business school."

Of one thing Gutierrez is certain: When he leaves the university in May, there will be someone capable of filling his shoes as Corps commander.

"Although we are no longer a military school," (A&M is coeducational) Gutierrez explains, "the Corps is through of on the same level of The Citadel and Virginia Military Institute."

A Corps commander is selected after nomination by senior student leaders during his junior year. The selection is then approved by A&M President Earl Rudder '32, Dean of Students James P. Hannigan, McCoy, and Air Force Colonel Vernon L. Head, professor of aerospace studies.

The nominees' military class, scholastic, leadership, and disciplinary records are screened and interviews are conducted by the ROTC faculty to determine aspirations as a student leader, outlook on student life, and on life in general. Final approval of the commander is by the university president who bases his decision on leadership ability, academic standing, character, personality, and campus student activities involvement.

A typical day for the Corps commander begins at 6:15 a.m. After a 7 a.m. breakfast, Gutierrez checks at the Military Science Building, the Trigon, for information about the day's activities which flow through him to the Corps.

Classes consume most of his day, but during the open periods, Gutierrez usually is at the Trigon maintaining Corps-ROTC liaison. He normally meets with McCoy once a week and confers more frequently with his own Corps Staff.

Gutierrez files mail for Corps Staff members, brigade, and wing commanders around 3 p.m., then gets a uniform ready for Ross Volunteer drill at 5 p.m.

After dinner, Gutierrez farms out projects to his 15-member staff and meets with segments of it to iron out details. Some of the problems that may be dealt with include deciding when to have inspections and formations, how to better recognize corpsmen and students who have excelled in their school work and most important, how to improve the Corps.

"In five years," Gutierrez, predicts, "the Corps will have 5,000 members." He says that the cadets of the future will be the same caliber cadets who became generals

and Medal of Honor winners, and presidents of corporations.

Voluntary Corps membership has been in effect since 1965. The Corps member spends about two or three hours a day on ROTC activities. Gutierrez says that although some cadets may leave the Corps to devote more time to their regular studies, "everybody in the Corps can still be an Aggie. It depends on how hard you work at it."

McCoy says that Gutierrez has "instigated changes for the better in the Corps, some of which were deemed impossible."

One change involved the cropping of the freshmen ROTC cadets' hair. Previously, the frosh wore their hair cut short, "convict style," for the first year. Now, freshmen are still given short haircuts, but within the boundaries of good taste.

He has also led efforts to assist freshmen in adjusting to Corps life. "While there has been no lessening in discipline, we have emphasized that freshmen be treated more as individuals," the cadet commander says.

Life on the College Station campus may seem strange to students visiting A&M from another school. Strolling across campus, the visitor may be halted by a student who imparts—without being asked—such information as who he is, what he is majoring in, and what his hometown is, and then expects the visitor to deliver the same information. This is just the A&M students' way of "whipping out," or, greeting each other, and it happens hundreds of times every day on the A&M campus.

Another custom that shows the solidarity better than any other example is the Silver Taps tribute paid by the students to a deceased A&M student. On the night of the funeral, lights on the campus are turned out in a brief memorial ceremony. The entire student body meets in front of the Academic Building at 10:30 p.m. A squad from the Ross Volunteers fires a 21-gun salute, and then, Taps is played three times.

"I also have always taken special pride in Muster Day," Gutierrez says. "There has been a Muster Day since 1903 when the anniversary of the Battle of San Jacinto was observed. There is a memorial service for all the Aggies who have died since the previous Muster Day. Their names are called and someone answers 'Here!' because to us, they will always be part of the university."

Gutierrez spent the summer of 1968 in Poland and Russia by participating in Experiment in International Living, a nonprofit educational exchange organization devoted to fostering mutual understanding and friendship among the peoples of the world.

He studied Polish before going abroad. "I found," he says, "that I could love people who shared a completely different political ideology. I lived with a Polish family, and I had the opportunity to visit a Communist nation not as a tourist."

The 5-foot 7-inch Mexican-American says he weighed 150 pounds when he went to Poland, and gained 20 pounds there. "We had potatoes every day."

He says that in Poland, the trend is for only the older generation to go to Church. Poland has a large Catholic population. "But people of all ages had questions about America."

Gutierrez spent two weeks in Moscow before returning to the United States. Now, he is broadening his experiences there by studying the Russian language.

DON HEATH.

OUR NATION'S RESPONSE TO THE INCREASINGLY URGENT PROBLEM OF POPULATION GROWTH

(Mr. KASTENMEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on May 28, I introduced legislation dealing with our Nation's response to the increasingly urgent problem of population growth.

While major attention has been focused on the rampant population growth in the underdeveloped world, the present rate of increase in our own country cannot be maintained indefinitely without severe social and economic dislocation.

This bill, which has been introduced in the other body by Senator TYNDINGS, is meant to coordinate and improve the current inadequate efforts of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in its implementation of our domestic population program. Establishment of a National Center for Population and Family Planning within HEW, will at long last make possible coordinated, cohesive family planning programs. In addition, this bill will increase the funds available for family planning projects, and stimulate research in methods of contraception. It will also expand and improve the research and service activities of public and private nonprofit agencies. More specifically, the Secretary of HEW will be required to develop a 5-year plan which will provide voluntary family planning services for over 5 million low-income women during their childbearing years. By focusing responsibility in one office whose sole activity is family planning, economies in both funds and efforts will be realized, disciplined planning will be encouraged, and the Congress will be able to better scrutinize and evaluate the administration of our family planning programs.

Mr. Speaker, the rewards from this legislation will be measured in terms of reduced poverty and increased family stability and individual opportunity. The success of our efforts in this field should spur and encourage less-fortunate nations to devote greater effort to their own programs and thereby contribute to the alleviation of the worldwide problem of burgeoning population growth. It is still not too late to avert the disastrous consequences to all mankind of the unchecked population explosion. But if we are to succeed in this enormous task, we must act quickly and decisively. The relatively modest authorizations called for here represent an investment in the future happiness and prosperity of all of us, and of our children. I urge all of my colleagues to give the highest priority to this bill, and by their support express their faith that we can find solutions to the problems we have ourselves created.

FOREIGN COMPETITION FACING U.S. SHOE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

(Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I call the attention of the Members of the House to a petition that is being circulated by Congressman WILLIAM BATES, assisted by Congressman WYMAN, and myself and 22 other Members of Congress, asking for signatures by the Members of Congress to a letter which is being addressed to the White

House bringing to the attention of the White House the acute intensive foreign competition now facing the U.S. shoe manufacturing industry. Since 1960 imports of footwear have increased 600 percent.

Imports equaled almost 28 percent of the total domestic production in 1968. We have every reason to believe that if unchecked, this rate of increase in shoe imports will continue and cause a loss of job opportunities for American shoe workers.

Mr. Speaker, I might point out to the Members of Congress that there are 253 Members of this House who have footwear industries located in their districts. Unless we do something, the footwear industry is going to disappear from the American scene. Thousands of jobs will be lost. Once our defense industry slows down in many of these districts, we will need other industries to act as economic cushions. Many small towns are going to suffer severely.

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Is it the gentleman's opinion that in the practical sense any real relief is expectable from a voluntary approach to import restrictions? Does he really believe our foreign competitors will voluntarily reduce their profitable export of shoes and leather to the United States?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I believe that this approach is the approach that the footwear industry has asked for and that the shoeworkers have asked for in America and we are following their recommendations and hope something will be done. Further, it is our hope that some of these countries will stop accelerating their exports of footwear to this country because if it does not stop it, it means that many of the shoe firms are going to close. This is the approach they have asked us to make and I am going along with their thinking upon it.

The gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN) has been very cooperative in this matter and, actually, he is acting in the place of Congressman BATES right now.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we will be able to obtain the signatures of a majority of the Members of the House on this petition. I will have it available so that other Members of the House may be able to sign and I would be happy to have their signatures.

AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. RIEGLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, it was with the deepest dismay that I read yesterday the remarks of South Korean President Park concerning America's role in the Vietnam war.

Frankly, America neither seeks nor needs President Park's advice with respect to our responsibility in South Vietnam. After 35,000 Americans have died in the swamps and jungles of South

Vietnam, let no outsider presume to lecture the United States or its leaders as to the terms or timing of a Vietnam settlement.

For the record, America's enormous losses in Vietnam were produced not only by our own mistaken policies, but equally by the appalling undercommitment of free Asians to the war they encourage us to continue.

South Korea, to its credit, has 50,000 troops in South Vietnam. But we have over 54,000 U.S. troops stationed in South Korea—and we have been informed that if we withdraw our troops from Korea, they will withdraw their troops from Vietnam. Further, the United States pays every dime of the expense of the Korean troops in Vietnam. This includes wages, food, equipment, transportation, and all the rest. We have also been informed that when we are tired of paying these bills, the Korean troops will leave Vietnam.

I will not lengthen the record with a detailed accounting of the almost seven and three quarters billion dollars in military and economic assistance we have given the Koreans in recent years—amounting to well over \$350 million last year alone—nor recite the figures of the enormous economic windfall the Vietnam war has provided Korea. But, if President Park is to speak to us, let him say that after 17 years of postwar assistance from the United States—with over 54,000 American troops still garrisoned there, and with a native population more than twice as great as North Korea—that the South Koreans are finally able to at least patrol all of the 151-mile-long DMZ separating North and South Korea. Today, America continues to actively patrol 18 miles of that front; which has cost us 37 Americans in the last 5 years. I ask President Park, after 17 years, to tell us how much longer it will be before our men can turn your self-defense back to you and come home to their families?

This is one man in this Congress who is outraged at the way we have squandered American blood and treasure in Asia—and I deeply resent the suggestion from Asian leaders that we should do no less. In fact, they should do more—much more—and quickly.

There is another voice than that of President Park to which we should be listening—the voice of the American people. It is a voice which is loud and clear with a very plain message. I hope to God, that through our new American leadership, we are going to deliver that message to the non-Communist Asians; namely, that the free ride is over—and that we have better things for our young men than to be fed into an endless Asian meatgrinder, fighting wars the Asians will not fight for themselves.

THE CONDUCT OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the American public has been told that senseless military actions in the hills and valleys of Vietnam have delayed successful nego-

tiations at the Paris peace talks. This has a familiar ring. A little more than a year ago we were being told it was the bombing of targets in North Vietnam which was delaying the return of peace. We stopped the bombing. We seem to be no nearer to peace than we were at that time. We have tried time and again to find a basis for meaningful negotiations. In further attempts to bring peace, the United States has accepted Hanoi's choice of a site for negotiations. We then agreed to recognize the National Liberation Front as a party to the negotiations. We have even dropped President Johnson's Manila communique stipulation that no allied troops could be withdrawn from South Vietnam until North Vietnamese troops were removed.

While these concessions were being granted, the Communists have yielded nothing. Instead of showing any indication of a sincere desire for peace, they continue to stall the negotiations at the conference table, and to launch harassing military actions in South Vietnam. Theirs is a waiting game. They know full well they cannot win—except at the conference table. Any limitation on actions of U.S. forces in the field plays into their hands, while demands mount at home for the U.S. Government to end the war and bring its troops back.

Just what is senseless military action? Our efforts for months have been primarily defensive. They have been limited to checking Communist buildups and to point defense of areas under attack by the Communists. The defense of major civilian and military areas in South Vietnam and of our own installations can hardly be called senseless. The inexcusable part is that we have been fighting a war which is largely defensive throughout our involvement in South Vietnam. The Communists have always taken heart from this fact and deduced that they could outlast us.

The Communist strategy in South Vietnam appears to be clear enough. They are seeking the establishment of a coalition government in Saigon. If they can obtain the replacement of hard-line anti-Communist members of the present Government with others who are soft on communism, plus some who are representative of the National Liberation Front, they will have gone a long way toward setting the stage for a takeover in a few years from within.

Who is to judge whether military actions in Vietnam are senseless? There are those who have spent a lifetime in study and in training for war and who are experienced in combat. Is it not better that they judge what is essential for the security of our forces? There are those at high levels who have all the facts at their fingertips which are necessary to decide the implementation of policy for the advancement of the free world cause. Are they not in best position to determine whose judgment to trust on essential military operations?

Or shall we accept the judgment of experts without portfolio whose comments may confuse the American public, and certainly will give heart to the enemy. There is a time for talking and a time for listening. There seems to be

little doubt that some of the "experts" have been talking when they should have been listening.

STUDENT ANTIVIOLENCE ACT

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill aimed at giving law-abiding students legal standing to file a complaint with the Justice Department when they are denied free access to their school's facilities by disruptive students.

The measure also permits the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General to proceed on his own motion without such a complaint whenever he determines that prosecution by the United States is in the public interest and necessary to secure substantial justice.

I believe it helpful to briefly review the body of Federal law in this area in order to demonstrate the difficulties and shortcomings that presently exist should the Justice Department determine that Federal prosecution against one or more individuals is warranted and to show thereby the pressing need for enactment of this new legislation.

CRAMER ANTRIPOT ACT

Section 2101 of title 18 of the United States Code is the Antiriot Act which I had the privilege of authoring. This provision prohibits travel in interstate commerce, or the use of any facility of interstate commerce, by any person with the intent to incite, organize or promote a riot or to commit any act of violence in furtherance of a riot, or to aid or abet any person in furthering a riot. Violators are subject to a maximum fine of \$10,000 and 5 years imprisonment.

The obvious shortcoming of this measure as applied to campus disturbances is that it is only applicable when interstate travel or interstate facilities are used to further the riot. The bill that I have introduced today does not hinge on the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution but achieves its Federal nexus through the expenditure of Federal funds at educational institutions.

FIREARMS

Section 231 of title 18 prohibits the teaching or demonstrating of the use of firearms or explosive or incendiary devices or techniques with the intent that the same will be used in a civil disorder which may obstruct commerce or the conduct of any federally protected function. It prohibits the transportation or manufacture for transportation of any such device with the intent that they be used in furtherance of a civil disorder.

The weakness in this law is that it applies only to "teaching or demonstrating" but does not impose a penalty for their actual use in a disturbance.

Section 924 of title 18 imposes a penalty of not less than 1 year nor more than 10 years for using or carrying unlawfully a firearm to commit or during the commission of any felony which may be prosecuted in a court of the United States. The bill that I have introduced

today carries a like provision as it relates to the use or threatened use of any firearm or destructive device in a campus disturbance. My bill further provides, however, that any term of imprisonment imposed thereunder shall run consecutively with any other penalty imposed as a result of the bill's violation and not concurrently. This is consistent with my bill, H.R. 6197, which amends the entire Firearms Act to accomplish the imposition of consecutive penalties. H.R. 6197 is presently lingering in the House Judiciary Committee with no hearings scheduled.

FEDERALLY PROTECTED ACTIVITIES

Section 245 of title 18 is designed to protect the civil rights of persons participating in or receiving benefits from various federally protected activities. Interference by force or threat of force with these rights carries a range of penalties extending to life imprisonment if death results. The bill that I have introduced today amends this section in two important respects.

First, and foremost, as presently constituted, section 245 requires a showing that a person's rights have been interfered with because he is participating in or enjoying the benefits of any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. The inherent weakness in this language is that the Government must show that a student's rights were interfered with solely because he is attending a school receiving Federal assistance. This is not the reason a student is being denied the right to attend classes and pursue an education by campus revolutionaries. I have amended this section by adding "or while" immediately after "because." In this way, a student acquires a cause of action if his rights are interfered with while he is participating in or enjoying the benefits of any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. And this, I submit, makes a lot more sense and enforcement possible in student disorder cases.

Section 245 also presently makes it a Federal crime to interfere, intimidate or willfully injure by force or threat of force any person "in order to intimidate such person from participating in or enjoying the benefits of any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Here, too, the law misses wide the mark because of the unlikelihood that the campus revolutionary is taking over a building or starting a fire simply to intimidate the law-abiding student from attending classes. The addition of the words "or while" as stated above obviates the need for seeking a prosecution under the extraordinarily complicated and difficult set of facts required by the present language.

My bill also amends section 245 in another important respect. I have added an entirely new subparagraph which clearly makes it a crime to interfere with any person attending a school receiving Federal financial assistance. The law as presently written, read in conjunction with the addition of the words "or while," may be construed to prohibit such interference. Passage of this bill with its precise new language, however, will make it absolutely certain that Congress intended

interference with a student attending a school receiving Federal financial assistance to be a crime.

I have named this bill the Student Antiviolence Act. It is a student-oriented measure which gives conscientious students a legal weapon to combat the radical groups and individuals who are attempting to deny him an education.

Industrious, serious-minded students are presently being denied the right to attend classes and pursue an education in instances where campus revolutionaries are taking over buildings and generally disrupting the institution. College administrators are in many instances reluctant to take stiff disciplinary action against these disruptive students. I believe passage of this measure will bring to the fore the majority of college students who are opposed to this disruptive activity but are presently without adequate means to do something about it.

I wholeheartedly subscribe to the proposition that colleges and universities should have the primary responsibility for dealing with this problem. This bill preserves this responsibility by requiring the Attorney General to make a finding that, before instituting prosecutive proceedings, such action is in the public interest and necessary to secure substantial justice. This finding must be made when a complaint is filed by a student or faculty member as well as when the Attorney General undertakes an action on his own motion.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal interest in this Nation's educational institutions is significant both in terms of money and public policy. Congress, which appropriates millions of dollars annually for America's educational institutions has a concurrent responsibility to insure the taxpayer that this money is not being wasted. Passage of this measure will help protect this interest.

I have a tremendous amount of faith in the integrity and responsibility of America's youth, and I believe they should have the means to rid their campuses of the radicals who are attempting by force and intimidation to deny them an education. This bill provides such a means.

The bill provides a penalty of not more than \$1,000 and imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both consistent with present antiviolence acts in title 18, chapter 245. As I have already mentioned, it provides a separate penalty of not more than \$10,000 and imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both for anyone convicted of using a firearm or any other destructive device in a campus disturbance. This latter provision closes a loophole which presently exists in the Firearms Control Act.

Following is the complete text of the bill:

H.R. 11802

A bill to amend section 245 of title 18, United States Code, to make it a crime to deny any person the benefits of any educational program or activity where such program or activity is receiving Federal financial assistance

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Student Antiviolence Act of 1969".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 245 of title 18 of the

United States Code is amended by adding at the end of subsection (b) (1) the following new subparagraph:

"(F) participating in or enjoying the services, facilities, privileges or advantages of any primary, secondary, or higher educational institution, public or private, or participating in or enjoying the benefits of any educational program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance; or"

(b) That portion of subsection (b) (1) of such section 245 which precedes subparagraph (A) is amended by inserting "or while" immediately after "because".

(c) Such section 245 is further amended by striking "or" at the end of subparagraph (b) (1) (E).

(d) Such subsection (b) of section 245 is further amended by inserting immediately after "or for life." the following: "In addition, any person who violates subsection (b) (1) (F) through the use or threatened use of any firearm or destructive device, as defined in section 921 of title 18 of the United States Code, shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not less than one nor more than ten years, or both. This penalty shall run consecutively with any other penalty imposed as a result of violation of this section."

(e) Such section 245 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Whenever one or more persons are denied rights protected by subparagraph (F) of subsection (b) (1), a complaint asserting the denial of such rights may be filed with the appropriate United States Attorney. The Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General shall prosecute in accordance with subsection (a) (1) of this section. The Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General may proceed on his own motion without such a complaint whenever he determines that prosecution by the United States is in the public interest and necessary to secure substantial justice."

FRAUD IN AMERICA—III

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, when CBS broadcast its shocking and terribly inaccurate, and partially false show "Hunger in America" last year, it failed to acknowledge the fact that persons who appeared on the show had been paid, as is required by law.

The question is whether the FCC will require CBS to acknowledge its violation of law, and to cease and desist from further violations of it.

The FCC ought to take such action because that law has a good reason for existing.

Suppose that the precedent set by CBS is allowed to stand. In such a case a television network could make payments of any amount to persons who appear on news programs, without acknowledging payment. There would be no way to insure that the public knew whether it was seeing spontaneous news, or carefully arranged and well-paid-for acting, or lecturing, or performing, or simply, personal views. In principle, the payments CBS made are the equivalent of bribes. If such payments can be made without challenge, then it is certain that the public will in the future have no way of knowing whether they are seeing news, or manufactured scenarios. There will be no way of knowing whether a scene is faithfully depicted, or whether it is

juiced up to satisfy the visual requirements of the medium, or the artistic desires of the director, or the ratings desires of the sponsors, or the shock values prized by the producers.

I do not have any doubt that CBS produced misinformation and staged scenes in its "Hunger" show because they wanted higher ratings—not because they did not know any better. After all, it is ratings alone that sell shows, and news shows are hard to sell, because they do not normally get good ratings. The news division of a network typically is relatively starved for operating money, because they do not often show a profit. The pressure is on them, just like in every other department of a network, to produce a product that sells. It is understandable why, under such pressure, a producer would resort to staging scenes, writing sensational material, paying persons interviewed, and all other manner of actions in order to hypo interest in his shows. But the crucial difference is that entertainment is one thing and news is another. Catering to ratings is not a public service, but a commercial function, and the networks seem to have lost sight of this crucial difference.

Predictably, when challenged on the accuracy of its show, CBS at first reacted by getting their local station to contact me to request a meeting between myself and the producers. Nothing so direct as a request to me—they wanted to let me feel a little pressure from them, to let me know that I was hurting my neighbor by knocking something he had broadcast—even though he and I both knew that he had no control over the content of the program.

Then CBS decided to answer by citing a few proofs here and there. And when these were refuted, bigger chiefs on the baronial totem wrote longer letters, until finally they just decided that I would not be reasonable. In fact, all I wanted, and all I want now, is some reason to believe that CBS is willing to acknowledge its error, and willing to show some sense of public responsibility and some respect for decent journalistic practice. If that is unreasonable, then I suppose I must plead guilty.

But I cannot afford, nor do I think the people of this country can afford to accede to CBS' conception of reason and responsibility. If they are immune to accountability, and if they can freely manufacture events and then report them, and then get awards for fiction reported as fact, 1984 is closer than anyone imagined. These networks control virtually every bit of information that is reported on television. That monopoly was never envisioned by the writers of the Communications Act of 1934. One can only hope, in the absence of legislation, that the networks will exercise some degree of responsibility. But if CBS is an example, that hope is slender indeed. I believe that Congress must examine its legislation, and determine whether or not we have any assurance that the networks are serving the public interest. I do not believe that we have any such assurance. The monopoly held over the air by the barons of the glass skyscrapers, the arbiters of the public airwaves, ought to be examined carefully and closely by a Congress that has every reason to know the

abuses that have been perpetrated in the name of news, and for the sake of marketing.

CAN RESUMPTION OF BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM BREAK THE PEACE STALEMATE IN PARIS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the bombing pause began on April 1, 1968, the United States has suffered a total of 14,639 American soldiers killed in action on the battlefields of South Vietnam.

This is almost one-half of the total number of losses that this country has suffered since the war began, or at least since our involvement in this war began on January 1, 1961.

In other words, in 14 months—from April 1, 1968, to May 24, 1969, which is only last week—the United States lost 14,639 soldiers, while our total losses for 8 years—from January 1, 1961, to May 24, 1969—were 35,530 U.S. soldiers killed.

Since January 1, 1961, through May 24, 1969, the number of allied dead in Vietnam totaled 118,029, of which 35,530 were U.S. soldiers, 3,056 were free world forces and 79,554, were soldiers of the Republic of South Vietnam.

Most Americans are not aware of the fact that during this bombing pause the United States has suffered almost one-half of its total losses. Now are they aware that since the peace talks in Paris got started on May 9, 1968—5 weeks after the bombing pause went into effect—we lost 12,579 American soldiers killed in combat in South Vietnam, or almost one-third of our total losses of 35,530 since January 1, 1961.

President Nixon, on May 14, made a very generous offer to North Vietnam when he spelled out his eight-point program for peace in Vietnam.

There is no question in my mind that every single American and, yes, I would dare say that every free man in this world wants to see the conflict in Vietnam come to an end just as quickly as possible. Mr. Nixon quite properly reflected his own desire to end the conflict as well as the desire of his fellow Americans.

I think only when we see these tragic losses of 14,639 American soldiers killed during the bombing pause and fruitless peace talks can we realize the futility of trying to deal with the Communists.

Since President Nixon made his very generous and honest offer for peace on May 14, there has been no significant affirmative response from North Vietnam and I believe that even the most altruistic and optimistic observer will have to agree that we are now in a hopeless and helpless stalemate in Paris.

There is not one iota of forward movement toward peace in Paris. The casualty rates continue to climb and every week more and more of our boys are dying in the jungles of South Vietnam.

Mr. Nixon quite properly stated in his speech on May 14 that if this needless suffering continues, this country will have to reappraise its position.

Mr. Nixon made his offer 3 weeks ago and there is no evidence whatsoever that the enemy is in any way ready to talk meaningful and significant peace.

So perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we ought to follow the President's admonition and reexamine our position.

What is that position?

Today, North Vietnam is a sanctuary for the Communists—free of any losses from our bombers, free from bombing—free from any damage, and free from the ravages of aggression they are waging in South Vietnam.

I despair at the naivete of those who would have you believe that somehow or other when we stopped bombing North Vietnam we created a morale problem in North Vietnam.

I saw last week in one of our national magazines a statement that Ho Chi Minh is having trouble keeping up the morale of his people in their support of his war since the bombing stopped. I submit that this kind of warped reasoning is nothing more than an alibi for those who a year ago preached the doctrine of stopping the bombing and promised the American people that if we would just stop the bombing, peace would be restored to Vietnam immediately.

We remember well the speeches made by some of the most outspoken leaders in the other body—and there were some in this body—who said more than a year ago: "If you just stop the bombing, we will bring the war to an end. That is all we need. Just show some good faith to the Communists and they will sit down at the peace table and we can have peace, that glorious peace that we all seek."

Well, they were wrong; dead wrong. And the 14,639 American soldiers who have given their lives since the bombing pause began are a tragic monument to how wrong they were.

Mr. Nixon would be well advised to take a hard look at the situation today when he meets with President Thieu in Midway next week. I pray he does not follow the advice of these false prophets in Congress who never were able to understand the real menace of world communism.

Everybody in this country wants to find some way to get out of the war in Vietnam, and I join with them. But I submit perhaps the time has come when we ought to make it crystal clear to the North Vietnamese that our patience is not inexhaustible, that we are not going to let this slaughter continue, and that if there is not any forward movement and meaningful movement for peace in Paris, this country may very well have to exercise its option of resuming the bombing of the North.

There are those in the Pentagon, I am told, who believe the United States could withdraw from combat duty in the swamps of Vietnam almost immediately 100,000 of our soldiers, and eventually we could withdraw all of our troops from combat duty in South Vietnam if we did resume the bombing of the North.

And why do they feel that way? Because when we stopped bombing North Vietnam on April 1, 1968, we automati-

cally released for combat duty 400,000 North Vietnamese troops that had been pinned down in North Vietnam on anti-aircraft duty and supervising civilian repair crews working on the damage that we inflicted—400,000 troops that were tied down in North Vietnam.

It is rather significant that while we were bombing North Vietnam, the enemy casualties that we recovered in South Vietnam were for the most part Vietcong, young peasants who joined the Communist cause. I think it is of the greatest significance that today, the casualties that we recover in South Vietnam are North Vietnamese soldiers in North Vietnamese uniforms, carrying North Vietnam credentials and, in many instances, maps and charts.

There can be no doubt that since the bombing pause started, the North Vietnamese have plunged at least 100,000 of the 400,000 North Vietnamese soldiers that were relieved from home duty in North Vietnam into South Vietnam to wage aggression against our soldiers.

These fresh and well-trained North Vietnamese Communist troops, relieved from duty on the homefront since this bombing pause started, are now in Vietnam killing our soldiers.

That is why in the short span of only 14 months, we have seen American casualties mount to the extent that now we have almost half of our total casualties in Vietnam inflicted during the bombing pause alone.

The past 14 months during this bombing halt are a tragic litany of truce violations by the Communists.

Not only have they moved more than 100,000 North Vietnamese troops into South Vietnam to kill our soldiers, but we have ample evidence that there are large concentrations of North Vietnamese troops in the demilitarized zone itself, restoring Communist arms into what was supposed to have been a neutral buffer zone. The Defense Department reports more than 5,000 sightings of enemy activity in the DMZ, even though one of the conditions of the bombing halt was that there would be no armed activity in the DMZ.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have a right to ask what should be our policy toward restoring peace in Vietnam?

The withdrawal of American troops at the same time that we resume bombing of the north would have a twofold effect: First of all, it would placate American discontent with the war and deny Ho Chi Minh his greatest weapon—his belief that American discontent will force us to falter in Southeast Asia—and second, resumption of bombing would let the Communists know they are in for a long siege of attacks upon their cities. Only then, I believe, can we impress upon the Communists the need for some meaningful progress toward peace in Paris.

There is ample evidence that by forcing the Communist to return north to defend their land against renewed bombing, South Vietnam's army of more than 1 million soldiers could carry on its struggle without American ground troops if we leave them American air cover. President Thieu stated publicly he be-

lieves his armies can defend South Vietnam without American ground troops if we leave him our air cover.

In the absence of any pressure on North Vietnam, one has a right to ask himself today why should Hanoi agree to any kind of terms other than their own terms in Paris?

Their cities are not being burned. There is no damage being done to North Vietnam. Families of North Vietnamese soldiers killed in action are not told about casualties. When a North Vietnamese soldier is killed in South Vietnam, there is no publication or notification. The people of North Vietnam are oblivious to any losses that North Vietnam is suffering in South Vietnam. There is no public criticism of the war and Ho's tightly controlled Communist press has the North Vietnamese believing they are winning the war. Most important, there is no pressure on Ho Chi Minh himself to bring the conflict to an end as there is on our own President.

The damage is being done in South Vietnam. It is the poor people of South Vietnam who are suffering the full ravages of Communist terror and subversion. It is South Vietnam that is being methodically destroyed by the Communists.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, our own home situation is rapidly deteriorating. I agree with the commission that concluded yesterday that Vietnam is one of the main causes of discontent and the unrest on our American university campuses.

There is no question in my mind that this long, hard, costly war has created serious domestic problems.

There is no question in my mind that most Americans would rather see the monstrous cost of this war diverted to our domestic needs.

We have great needs when we see people suffering hunger in this country, and schools in need of aid, and housing and hospitals and all the other things that we need.

This war, if we include the 1970 budget, will cost the American people \$108 billion. It is the second costliest war in the history of the United States.

So there is rapid deterioration on our own home front, and there is suffering on the home front in South Vietnam, while Mr. Ho Chi Minh sits back comfortably in Hanoi waiting until the whole structure collapses.

Ho Chi Minh won the struggle against the French in Paris—not on the battlefield of Vietnam. The Communists were able to get so much turmoil stirred up in France against the French involvement in Vietnam that the French Government was faced with collapse, and so the French pulled out of there helter-skelter and left a vacuum for the Communists to fill.

Ho Chi Minh is counting on history to repeat itself and on the American will at home to collapse and on our commitment to help South Vietnam also to collapse. He believes once this happens his victory will be complete.

It is the tragedy of our time that learned men in this country, responsible Members of the Congress, cannot understand that once South Vietnam falls to

the Communists, the whole of Southeast Asia follows. Even at this late date there are those who question the domino theory, completely unmindful and oblivious to the fact that what the Soviet Union wants to do in Asia is to create a cordon sanitaire of Communist captive nations, very much like they have in Europe today. And when they are through with Southeast Asia, the Soviet Union then intends to set up a cordon sanitaire of captive nations in the Middle East.

This is why the Soviet Union has rearmed all the Arab States. Every single Arab army today has been thoroughly rearmed by the Soviet Union, and Soviet military leaders are today in command of these Arab armies.

And that is why 80 percent of all arms being used by North Vietnam against our troops are supplied by the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union's timetable is to destroy the will to resist in Southeast Asia. When they have completed that test, then they will move into the Middle East and destroy Israel, because only Israel stands in the way of Soviet expansion in the Middle East. And then the Soviet Union will have its cordon sanitaire of European captive nations, a cordon sanitaire of Middle East captive nations, a cordon sanitaire of Southeast Asia captive nations; and her goal of world domination will be complete.

There are those who today admonish and urge peace at any price, unmindful that nothing has changed in the Soviet Union.

For the past 20 years, the Soviet Union has kept this world in turmoil.

The United States has been compelled to spend one trillion four hundred billion dollars in the last two decades on defense and armaments to protect itself against Soviet conspiracy and Soviet infamy. And the Soviet Union plays its options at will. They create turmoil wherever they want to, whenever they want to, and the United States for 20 years has been reacting, never quite able to pull this country together to understand the great threat and the great menace of Soviet colonialism.

Even today, in this bitter debate on Vietnam, there are those who say, "President Thieu has to accept the fact that he will have to learn to live with a coalition government or go it alone." I think it is to his everlasting credit that he is strong enough and bold enough to renounce the imposition of a Communist coalition government unless such a government is elected by the free will of the people of South Vietnam.

Why, the whole tragic story of Soviet colonialism has been written in coalition governments forced upon the smaller nations of Europe. I wish that those who urge upon South Vietnam a Communist coalition government would look at the tragic history of Europe. How do they think 180 million people were plunged into Communist captivity, except through Communist coalition governments?

The Soviet Union today has complete control of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, of Estonia, of Latvia, of Lithuania, of Hun-

gary, of Rumania and of Bulgaria. All of these started out as coalition governments.

What some of these naive Americans cannot understand is that the Communists have indestructible patience. They want only a foothold in a coalition government, and then they create their turmoil, and they have nothing but time, and they take that time to break down the will of the righteous elements of a coalition government until they create such total panic and chaos the government finally falls and the Communists take over.

One need only look at the coalition government of Poland. Why are 38 million Poles today in Communist bondage? You show me one single nation of Europe today whose people willingly voted for a Communist government. These captive nations are today victims of Communist oppression against their will because there were voices in America after World War II, as there are voices today, who said, "Let us put Communists in a coalition government in Poland to work out the postwar problems."

Premier Mikolajczyk went to Poland in good faith after World War II. He went there thinking that somehow or another perhaps he could help work out a program for postwar Poland in a coalition government. Well, the rest is history. Halena Wasilewska headed a group of Communists who were brought in from Moscow, trained in the art of disorder and subversion, and they very quickly tied Mikolajczyk into all kinds of knots and tied that coalition government into such hopeless turmoil that he fled in disgust. Poland became a captive slave of Russia. The same can be said of every one of the captive nations of Europe.

Today there are voices in this Congress and in this country who say, "Well, let us try some of the same in Vietnam."

President Thieu was correct when he said that China stands as an excellent example of what happens when we surrender to Communist expediency.

Mr. Speaker, those who today urge acceptance of a Communist coalition government in South Vietnam are, perhaps unwittingly, following the footsteps of those who preached this same doctrine after World War II and saw half of Europe plunged into the Soviet orbit, then saw China plunged into the Communist orbit, and then saw Cuba plunged into the Communist orbit.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that through all of these years they have not learned a thing. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is difficult today for those who see the clear danger of the Soviet Union's grand design for ultimate conquest in this world, to get any exposure for their views when it is popular to talk only about peace at any price. Too often the voices of those who see the clear and apparent danger of Communist subversion are ridiculed or totally ignored.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the American people need to know the facts.

President Nixon was correct when he said that if this needless slaughter continues, we will have to reappraise our situation.

If, indeed, there is any merit to those who say that by resuming the bombing of North Vietnam we will force them to divert most of their troops back to the north, making it possible for the South Vietnamese to take over the bulk of the fighting and if there is any merit to the suggestion that we can withdraw large numbers of our combat troops from South Vietnam once the bombing has been resumed, then we ought to study it.

President Thieu has said that with his army of one million soldiers and 600,000 home guards the South Vietnamese are more than able to defend themselves, if we leave them American air cover. My judgment is that the American people would agree it would be better to leave the South Vietnamese air cover if we can withdraw our ground troops because our greatest losses have been on the ground, our greatest losses have been in the search and destroy missions.

I think, Mr. Speaker, one of the great distortions of our time and one of the great tragedies of our time is the statement that the South Vietnamese soldier is not a good fighter. The South Vietnamese soldier is more than able to carry his share.

I was in Vietnam. I saw the South Vietnamese troops. Even the New York Times, which is now carrying a series about the South Vietnamese soldiers, says, if you read the articles carefully, that the bulk of South Vietnamese troops are well trained and highly motivated even though the Times tries to suggest they could not defend their country alone. If we need any further proof of the gallantry of the South Vietnamese soldier, let us look at the casualty lists. The South Vietnamese have lost twice as many soldiers on the field of battle as all of us combined. South Vietnam has lost 79,443 soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we ought to let North Vietnam know that our patience is not inexhaustible. We want to be out of Vietnam as quickly as possible. We want a lasting peace as quickly as possible. We want to contribute to that peace as much as possible. However, I cannot think of anything more tragic than for us to walk away from Vietnam today and let the Communists take that country over.

In my judgment, we ought to take a hard look at this proposal and seriously let North Vietnam know that if there is no meaningful progress made toward peace in Vietnam, this slaughter of our American troops will not be permitted to continue unilaterally. If necessary, we will reluctantly have to resume the bombing.

There are those who call that escalation.

On the contrary, if we can in fact pull our combat troops out of South Vietnam and replace them with resumption of bombing of the north, my judgment is that most Americans would agree to such a quid pro quo.

It is my hope that as the President prepares to leave for Midway to meet with President Thieu, he will reaffirm his statement that if the needless suffering continues, we will have to reappraise our situation. I hope that the President will make it clear to North Vietnam that we

have a right to expect from them some meaningful contribution toward peace and, if that is not forthcoming, then perhaps, if suffering exists in South Vietnam, there ought to be some suffering in North Vietnam.

I have every reason to believe that the South Vietnamese are well-trained soldiers. We have made a huge contribution to their training. They do have enough soldiers now for a 15-to-1 ratio against the Vietcong. Our generals tell us in this kind of guerrilla warfare, you need a 15-to-1 ratio in order to offset effectively the activities of a Vietcong subversive. That ratio has now been reached. So it is entirely possible that we might indeed see the day come when American combat troops can pull out of Vietnam if bombing of the North is renewed. Hanoi must understand it will not break our will or break the will of the South Vietnamese. They then have but one alternative, and that is to sit down and make some meaningful contribution to working out a peace solution in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I have every reason to believe that the Government of South Vietnam wants peace. I know our Government wants peace. I believe that the whole world wants peace. What we have to do now is impress on Hanoi the fact that it is not going to continue indefinitely waging aggression against our people without suffering the consequences itself, I believe this is the only road to lasting peace. The stalemate in Paris cannot and must not continue.

RETIREMENT OF HON. WILLIAM J. DRIVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere regret that I have learned of the resignation of William J. Driver. As the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Bill Driver has been one of the most efficient and capable men ever to head the Veterans' Administration. His 4 years as head of this vast agency has seen many advances in the field of veterans affairs. His able administration of the third largest agency of our Federal Government has been a credit to all agencies and departments.

Bill Driver has been the kind of man that epitomizes what the Federal worker should be. He has been loyal and devoted to those he served—the 26 million veterans of this Nation. He has shown great compassion in his understanding of the needs of our veterans, and has made outstanding proposals to bring about needed changes as well as new ideas and programs.

His administration has been marked with a better understanding of the desires of the people of this country in providing benefits which are more meaningful to those who have given so much in defense of our country. We had new concepts of what service could mean with such programs as sending representatives right to the battlefields of Vietnam, even before our servicemen had completed their tours of duty, in order

that they could take advantage of the many benefits which had been provided for them by Congress.

I express my appreciation to Bill Driver for a job well done—for a job in which he gave much more than was demanded because he was concerned and involved with the problems of our veterans.

I have enjoyed my close relationship with Bill Driver during his time in office. We shall miss him, and we sincerely hope that his successor will follow in his steps by providing the leadership demanded of this exacting post.

I extend my thanks and wish Bill Driver continued success in his future undertakings.

TREATYMAKING POWER: CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FOR THE INCLUSION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SEQUEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in June 1967 the Presidents of the United States and Panama announced the completion of negotiations for the proposed new Panama Canal treaties, which agreements would cede U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama, make that small and unstable country a partner in the management, and defense of the canal, and eventually give to Panama not only the existing canal but also any new canal constructed in Panama at the cost of our taxpayers to replace the existing canal.

The total expenditures of our country on the Panama Canal enterprise, including defense, from 1904 through June 30, 1968, were \$6,368,009,000 and the total recoveries during the same period \$1,359,931,421.66, leaving a net investment of more than \$5,000,000,000.

As this projected treaty giveaway of U.S. territory and property was undertaken without constitutional authority, the reactions in Congress were dynamic, with some 150 Members of the House introducing or cosponsoring resolutions opposing such surrender and Members of the Senate also strongly opposing the monstrous proposal. The result was that the treaties were never signed. As they have never been repudiated they may be reactivated at any time.

The giveaway proposal did, however, focus wide attention on the composition of the treaty power of the United States and the importance of the House of Representatives being made a part of that power.

One of the major reasons why the House should have equal power with the Senate in the making of treaties is the provision in article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution which provides as follows:

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

The wisdom embodied in this clause of the Constitution is that our Federal do-

mains and property cannot be given away or impaired by the President and the Senate alone through the treaty process. Except for this provision, treaties could be made ceding to other countries major sections of the United States like Texas, California, and other parts of the vast Southwest as well as Alaska and Hawaii. In the grave responsibility now vested alone in the President and the Senate there certainly should be constitutional provisions to include the House of Representatives in the making of treaties.

On February 5, 1969, I introduced House Joint Resolution 394, 91st Congress, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties. This was followed on February 19 with a statement by me to the House on the treaty power emphasizing the fact that the historic reasons for noninclusion of the House of Representatives in the treaty making power no longer apply and why it should be included. I followed this on March 6 with a letter to Members of the House of Representatives requesting my colleagues to introduce or cosponsor like resolutions. Many have done so indicating wide support.

In looking up the role of parliaments in foreign affairs in other countries, I find that though the practice of treaty ratifications varies, the trend seems to be toward requiring parliamentary approval, even in some countries behind the Iron Curtain. Incidentally, I note that, under article 49 of the Constitution of the Soviet Union, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet ratifies and denounces international treaties of the U.S.S.R.

In order that Congress and the Nation may have the information developed since my February 19, 1969, statement, I quote my March 6 letter and part IV of a summary of the powers of parliaments concerning the conclusion of treaties contained in the January 1969 issue of the Interparliamentary Union Quarterly.

The indicated documents follow as part of my remarks:

MARCH 6, 1969.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The closure of the Suez Canal during the June 5-11, 1967, Arab-Israeli War diverting traffic around Southern Africa, was followed by the announcement on June 26 by the Presidents of the United States and Panama of the completion of negotiations for three proposed treaties ceding sovereignty over the U.S.-owned Panama Canal Zone to Panama, thus serving to focus wide attention on the make-up of the treaty power of our government, with some 150 Members of the Congress introducing resolutions opposing the adoption of such proposed treaties.

The indicated agreements, negotiated without the authorization of the Congress, violated Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, of the U.S. Constitution, which provisions vests the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States in the Congress and not in the President and the Senate alone.

In studying the history of the treaty-making power, I find that the original reasons for excluding the House of Representatives from this function of government no longer apply and that the time has come when the House should be made a part of this power. A summary of the history of the non-inclu-

sion of the House of Representatives will be found in the June 12, 1967, pamphlet by the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service on the "Treaty-Making Power in the Constitution", quoted by me in a statement to the House in the Record of February 19, 1969, pp. 4006-4010.

To meet the situation, I have introduced H.J. Res. 394, copy attached, and would urge all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to introduce or to co-sponsor like resolutions.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

H.J. RES. 394

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"No treaty with respect to which the advice and consent of the Senate is required by section 2 of article II of this Constitution may be made without the advice and consent of the House of Representatives, two-thirds of the Representatives present concurring."

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION CONSTITUTIONAL AND PARLIAMENTARY INFORMATION: THE ROLE OF PARLIAMENT IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS PART IV. PARLIAMENTARY POWERS CONCERNING THE CONCLUSION OF TREATIES

Foreign policy becomes specially manifest in the conclusion of treaties, in war and peace. This is doubtless why the role played by Parliament in the conclusion of treaties is, after decisions on war and peace, most frequently provided for in Constitutions of countries replying to the questionnaire.

Chapter I. Parliamentary influence on treaty negotiations

In general it is not possible for Parliament, neither legally nor practically, to take part in the negotiations leading up to the conclusion of treaties, because everywhere the negotiation of treaties is a matter exclusively in the competence of the Government. This holds true even though, as has been described above (Part I, chapter 5d), (p. 13), Members of Parliament have in several cases acted as members of governmental delegations, or even as agents of the Government, to prepare or conduct negotiations.

Moreover, there seems to be no instance of a Parliament which can legally bind the Government to enter into treaties.

Quite generally parliamentary influence may be brought to bear through the ordinary processes of debate and question.

Furthermore, through the right to pass resolutions Parliament is in a position to exert political influence on treaty negotiations (cf. Part II). By such resolutions or recommendations Parliament may even suggest to the Executive that it should negotiate and conclude certain treaties on certain subjects; in Belgium and the Netherlands the suggestion may even extend to the scope within which the treaty must be concluded. Although these suggestions are not legally binding upon the Government, the latter would, more often than not, take them into consideration, especially if later on parlia-

mentary approval of the treaty has to be obtained.

Finally in the United States, as probably in other Parliaments, prior cooperation on the part of individual Members of Congress has been found to be helpful in obtaining ultimate Senate ratification of treaties.

Chapter II. Approval requirements

In many countries negotiated treaties are subject to the approval or consent of Parliament before ratification. (There seems to be no case where the consent of Parliament must be obtained before the text of a treaty has been finally negotiated. In Japan, Art. 73 of the Constitution provides that the Cabinet has power to conclude treaties, provided, however, that it is required to obtain prior or, depending on the circumstances, ex post facto approval of the Diet. It is to be assumed that "prior approval" in this context relates to ratification as the final act of the conclusion of treaties.)

The Japanese provision thus appears not to deviate from the general pattern that parliamentary approval is required only after a treaty has been negotiated.

Such approval of Parliament is required in 20 of the 25 countries from which answers were received: Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Ireland (in exceptional cases), Italy, Japan, Jordan, Libya, Netherlands, Norway, Senegal, Somalia, Switzerland, United States and Yugoslavia.

In Ireland approval of the Dail is required only where an agreement (not being one of a technical or administrative charter) involves a charge on public funds.

In the other countries the situation is different: there is no participation of Parliament at all in the conclusion of treaties in Pakistan.

In Poland treaties are ratified by the Council of State, a body elected by the Diet from amongst its Members and acting as the "collective head of State."

In Great Britain it is the usual practice of the Government (known as the "Ponsonby Rule") not to proceed with ratification until a period of 21 days has elapsed from the date on which the text of the treaty is laid before Parliament. (This rule applies only to treaties requiring ratification). Thus, Parliament is given a chance to debate a treaty, if the opposition or a large majority so request. Such debates, however, seldom end in a vote.

In India treaties are not subject to the approval of Parliament, except where the treaty itself provides for its ratification by Parliament. When necessary; Government may bring forward legislation (in the form of a bill) for implementing a treaty or a motion for its ratification.

In Israel where treaties are not subject to the approval or consent of Parliament, the only reference to the submission of a treaty for parliamentary approval occurs in the Fundamental Law where it is provided that the President of the State shall sign all international agreements which have been approved by the Knesset. However, no provision in law has been made which requires such approval so that a request for approval is within the discretion of the Government. This was done only once in the case of the Genocide Convention. Since international agreements are not binding on the Israel courts, internal laws must often be enacted to give effect to treaty provisions.

When submitting such Bills, the Government usually accompanies the Bill with an explanation to the effect that the adoption of the law will enable the ratification of the treaty.

Unlike all other countries where parliamentary approval of treaties is required by the Constitution, in Canada there is neither a constitutional provision nor any strict conventions about the participation of Parliament in the ratification or acceptance of

international agreements. In 1926, however, the House of Commons adopted a resolution the final paragraph of which reads that the House considers that:

"Before His Majesty's Canadian ministers advise ratification of a treaty or convention affecting Canada, or signify acceptance of any treaty, convention or agreement involving military or economic sanctions, the approval of the parliament of Canada should be secured."

The Rt. Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King who moved this resolution said in a speech in 1928 in the House of Commons:

"I submit that the day has passed when any government or executive should feel that they should take it upon themselves without the approval of parliament, to commit a country to obligations involving any considerable financial outlays or active undertakings."

And in an important statement made in 1941 he summarized the Canadian practice as follows:

"The present practice is that, except in the case of very unimportant agreements or in the case of great urgency, the Senate and House of Commons are asked to approve formal treaties, conventions and agreements, before they are ratified by or in respect of Canada."

Thus, in Canada all treaties and agreements require parliamentary approval, except (i) in the case of very unimportant agreements, (ii) in the case of great urgency, and in addition (iii) agreements which are in the form of an exchange of notes.

Agreements are made in this form either because they are too unimportant for a formal agreement, or because they are intended to be of a temporary character.

As the Canadian example shows not all kinds of international agreements are likely to be subject to parliamentary approval. Even in countries where all treaties require approval by Parliament as in Canada (see above), Japan, Libya, the Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, and the United States, some exceptions are usual.

In Japan and Switzerland agreements or conventions of merely technical or administrative character are exempt from this requirement.

In the Netherlands the approval of the States-General is not required for (i) a convention for which a law has provided for no approbation being necessary, (ii) a convention solely concerning the execution of a convention already approved, (iii) a convention which does not contain important financial obligations, if the duration of the convention does not exceed a period of one year, or (iv) in case of time pressure. In the latter case, the convention is subsequently to be submitted for approval.

In Norway treaties of any importance are subject to the approval of Parliament or, as it is stated in the answer, the King has no right to sign a treaty without the consent of the Storting. Explicitly, however, the consent of Parliament is required for treaties (i) of "special importance," (ii) which necessitate new legislation, (iii) which necessitate a decision of the Storting, i.e. appropriation of money.

In the United States at last, the constitutional provision refers solely to "treaties," but there is another form of international agreement, called simply an executive agreement, that is resorted to frequently for diverse purposes and does not require the concurrence of the Senate. It is also generally conceded that the President has that authority in his capacity as the sole organ of foreign relations, or as commander-in-chief of the armed forces, but the large majority of executive agreements are made pursuant to prior statutory authorization.

Executive agreements are binding upon the national government and have been so recognized by the Supreme Court. They do not have the same force in domestic law as

treaties. They are not resorted to as a device to circumvent the Senate's treaty-making role, and are not often challenged by the Senate, or by the Congress as a body, because the exigencies of modern international relations require expeditious actions and agreements which would not be feasible under treaty procedures.

Chapter III. Categories of treaties subject to approval

There is, probably, not much difference between these seven countries where all treaties are subject to approval, and some of those countries where parliamentary approval is required only for certain categories of treaties as enumerated in the Constitution.

According to Art. 50 of the Austrian Constitution political treaties and other ones as far as their text is amending or supplementing laws can only be concluded by authority of the National Council. When approving such a political treaty or one amending or supplementing laws the National Council may decide that this treaty shall be executed by the adoption of laws.

Under Art. 68 of the Belgian Constitution, treaties of commerce or treaties which could burden the State or be binding on Belgians individually are to become effective only after having received the assent of the Chambers, and no territorial change may take place except in pursuance of a law.

In Cameroon, according to Art. 12 of the Constitution, treaties on matters of federal law shall before ratification be submitted to the Federal Assembly in the form of a bill.

Art. 33 of the Finnish Constitution Act provides that treaties must be approved by Parliament insofar as they contain stipulations falling within the domain of legislation or otherwise requiring, according to the Constitution, the consent of Parliament. The latter alternative includes for instance territorial changes and appropriations.

In France and Senegal the Constitution¹ requires approval, by way of legislation, for peace treaties, treaties of commerce, treaties relating to international organization, involving a charge on public funds, modifying provisions of a legislative nature, relating to the status of persons, or involving territorial changes.

Art. 59 of the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany provides that treaties which regulate the political relations of the Federation or relate to matters of federal legislation require the consent of Parliament.

In Greece, according to Art. 32 of the Constitution, treaties are concluded by the King and communicated to Parliament together with the necessary explanations. However, treaties of commerce and all treaties involving concessions which, pursuant to other provisions of the Constitution, may be enacted only by legislation, require the consent of Parliament.

In Ireland distinctions are made in Art. 29 of the Constitution between different categories of treaties. In general, every international agreement to which the State becomes a party shall merely be laid before Dail Eireann. However, any agreement involving a charge upon public funds requires approval by Dail Eireann. Neither provision applies to agreements of a technical and administrative character. Beyond that, no international agreement shall be part of the domestic law of the State save as may be determined by the Oireachtas (President of Ireland and both Houses of Parliament).

According to Art. 80 of the Italian Constitution, the ratification of treaties being of a political nature, or providing for arbitration, or involving territorial changes, charges on public funds or modifications of legislation, has to be authorized by a law.

Art. 33 of the Constitution of Jordan provides that treaties of peace, alliance, trade,

¹ Art. 53 of the French Constitution and Art. 77 of the Senegal Constitution.

navigation, and treaties involving territorial changes or adversely affecting sovereignty, or incurring financial commitments, or affecting the general or private rights of Jordanians shall not be brought into force unless approved by the National Assembly.

In Somalia Art. 67 of the Constitution provides that the Assembly shall authorize by law the ratification of political, military and commercial treaties or of treaties which involve a modification of the law or financial commitments not included in the budget.

In Yugoslavia, according to the Constitution, the Federal Assembly ratifies international treaties on political and military cooperation and international treaties which require the enactment of new, or amendment of the existing, laws. Other international agreements are ratified by the Federal Executive Council (the Government).

The following table is intended to facilitate comparison. It should however be pointed out that: the controlling power of a Parliament depends on the information available and on its watchfulness rather than on the categories of treaties that have to be expressly approved by it; the categories overlap largely. Thus, for instance, the term "political treaties" covers much of what is enumerated in other lists, and the same is true with formulations like, "relating to federal legislation", "shall be part of the domestic law", or "involving a charge upon public funds".

The table lists the categories of treaties and the countries where treaties falling under those categories (are laid on the table or) require the approval of Parliament or of one of its Chambers.

1. (a) All treaties with certain minor exceptions (approval): Canada, Japan, Libya, the Netherlands (as to procedure, see below), Norway, Switzerland, United States.

(b) All treaties ratified by a special parliamentary body: Poland (Council of State).

(c) All treaties requiring ratification laid on the Table: Great Britain, Ireland (Dail Eireann).

(d) Treaties providing for their ratification by Parliament: India, Yugoslavia.

2. (a) Political treaties, treaties regulating the political relations: Austria, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Somalia.

(b) Treaties on political and military cooperation, military treaties: Somalia, Yugoslavia.

(c) Alliances: Belgium (only notice given), Jordan, Switzerland.

(d) Treaties relating to international organization: France, Senegal.

(e) Treaties adversely affecting sovereignty: Jordan.

3. (a) Treaties relating to matters of (federal) legislation or to be part of domestic law: Cameroon, Finland, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Ireland.

(b) Treaties modifying existing law or necessitating new legislation: Austria, France, Great Britain, Italy, Senegal, Somalia, Yugoslavia.

4. (a) Treaties affecting rights or status of persons: Belgium, France, Greece, Jordan, Senegal, Yugoslavia.

(b) Treaties providing for arbitration or judicial regulations: Italy.

5. Treaties involving a charge upon public funds: Belgium, Finland, France, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Senegal, Somalia, Yugoslavia.

6. Treaties of commerce: Belgium, France, Greece, Jordan, Senegal, Somalia.

7. Treaties involving territorial changes: Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Greece, Italy, Jordan, Senegal, Yugoslavia.

Chapter IV. Procedure for approval

As has been seen already in the preceding chapters, not only the types of treaties requiring approval vary considerably, but also the ways in which treaties are submitted to the Parliament for approval. Apart from Great Britain and Ireland (to the extent that no approval is required) where treaties are

merely laid before Parliament (in Great Britain as a Paper laid by command of Her Majesty—Command Paper), the following solutions can be distinguished:

"(i) In Belgium, Cameroon, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, Jordan, Libya, Senegal, Somalia and Yugoslavia a treaty is submitted to Parliament in the form of a bill, that is, as an annex to a bill pronouncing approval of the treaty or authorizing its ratification; in Yugoslavia the text of the treaty is an integral part of the law by which the Federal Assembly directly expresses ratification. The bill is referred to committee and dealt with under the usual legislative procedure."

In France as well as in Cameroon and Senegal the bill authorizes either ratification of the treaty or, if the agreement does not require ratification, approval. In Greece it can be a bill authorizing the Government to negotiate and conclude a certain treaty under certain conditions or bill approving a treaty already concluded.

In Canada approval is sometimes contained in a statute, particularly if enabling legislation is required; more usually, it is in the form of a joint resolution adopted by both Houses.

"(ii) In the Netherlands the approval of the States-General may be either explicit or tacit. Under the explicit procedure a bill to approve a treaty is introduced, debated and passed in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure. Under the tacit procedure the Government lays the text of the treaty before both Houses together with a letter asking for their agreement. Approval is assumed to have been given if within a period of thirty days no request has been made for approval to be given explicitly in the form of a bill. Such a request must be sponsored by one of the Chambers or at least one fifth of the members of both Chambers.

"(iii) In Austria, and in Canada usually (see above), as well as in Norway, Switzerland and the United States, a treaty is approved in the form of a resolution adopted by Parliament."

In Ireland (in case of an agreement involving a charge on public funds) the approval of Dail Eireann is signified by the adoption of a resolution.

In Norway, the Government presents the negotiated treaty to the Storting together with explanations. The matter is referred to a committee which reports to Parliament, with a recommendation.

In Switzerland a treaty is submitted to Parliament in the form of a simple federal decree (*arrêté fédéral simple*) or, if the treaty is concluded for an unlimited duration or for a period exceeding fifteen years, in the form of a federal decree of general application (*arrêté fédéral de portée générale*).

In the United States a certified copy of the signed treaty is submitted to the Senate accompanied by an "executive communication" from the President requesting ratification by the Senate. The decisions made by the Senate after its deliberations in committee and in the Chamber, as provided for in detail by Rule XXXVII of the Senate, the concurrence of two-thirds of the present Senators being required, are reduced to the form of a resolution of ratification, with or without amendments or reservations, as the case may be.

"(iv) In Finland and Japan, a treaty is submitted to Parliament with the request (or motion) for approval and that approval is given by a vote, without adopting a resolution. In Finland, a treaty involving territorial changes requires approval by at least two-thirds of the votes cast. Furthermore, in Finland at least, matters relating to treaties must first be considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee."

In many countries treaties modifying existing legislation or necessitating new legislation or where the subject matter of a treaty is to become domestic law—have to be approved through enacting legislation.

Thus, in Finland, the Government submits to the approval of Parliament one or more bills purporting to bring the existing legislation in accordance with the provisions of the treaty. In Great Britain, when a treaty has been ratified, it may be necessary to introduce consequential legislation. In Ireland, when a treaty is to become part of the domestic law of the State, this has to be determined by both Houses of Parliament by enacting legislation. In India, when necessary, the Government may bring forward legislation for implementing the treaty or a motion for its ratification. In Israel, where international agreements are not binding on the Israeli courts, internal laws must often be enacted to give effect to treaty provisions. When submitting such bills, the Government usually accompanies the bill with an explanation to the effect that the adoption of a bill will enable the ratification of the treaty.

In some countries the Constitution provides for special procedure where a treaty is not reconcilable with the Constitution. In Austria, in such a case, the National Council in the resolution approving the treaty must expressly state that the treaty amends the Constitution, the resolution requiring a two-thirds majority. In the Netherlands, the law approving such a treaty must likewise be adopted by a two-thirds majority. In France and Senegal, if the Constitutional Council (in France) or the Supreme Court (in Senegal) declares a provision of an international agreement to be contrary to the Constitution, ratification may be authorized only after the Constitution has been amended.

There is no instance of a Parliament in which treaties have to be considered in secret sittings. However, in all Parliaments except that of India the House may so decide in accordance with the general rules. According to the answers received, this has never happened or is very exceptional. Probably, in committee it happens more often that treaties are considered in confidential or secret meetings (cf. above, Part III).

It may be mentioned here that there are only two Parliaments which, directly or through a special body, ratify treaties, namely the Parliaments of Poland and Yugoslavia.

In Poland, as has been mentioned above, international agreements are ratified by the Council of State acting as the collective Head of State on a motion presented by Government. This body is elected by the Diet form amongst its Members and in all its activities is subordinate to the Diet. The resolution on the ratification as adopted by the Council of State is published in the Journal of Laws as a document of ratification. In actual practice there was one instance of the Diet ratifying a treaty of special importance, the Warsaw Pact, on May 19, 1955. In this case, the motion for ratification was presented to the Diet by the Council of State. The matter was referred to the Committee for Foreign Affairs which, after preliminary examination, reported on it to the Diet. The Diet, at its plenary meeting of May 19, 1955, adopted the resolution as to the ratification of the Warsaw Pact. On the basis of this resolution, the document of ratification was drawn up by the Council of State and published, in regular form, in the Journal of Laws.

In Yugoslavia, as has been mentioned before, the Federal Assembly ratifies, according to the Constitution, international treaties on political and military cooperation, and international treaties which require the enactment of new legislation or amendment of existing legislation. Other international agreements are ratified by the Federal Executive Council (the Government). This is expressly provided for in Art. 164 (9) of the Constitution, although the instruments of ratification of international agreements, according to Art. 217 (3) of the Constitution, shall be issued by the President of the Republic.

Chapter V. Extent of powers of parliament when approving treaties

(a) *Power to Amend Treaties:* In general, Parliament has only the power to approve or reject a treaty, since the treaty submitted to Parliament has been finally negotiated. No amendment to the bill approving a treaty may affect the contents of the treaty. However, if a treaty should ever be rejected, Parliament could indicate its objections.

In Finland Parliament may, if it is still possible, request the Government to take measures to modify the provisions of the treaty in accordance with the decisions of Parliament, and if the treaty allows for reservations, Parliament may request the Government to act according to the decision of Parliament.

In the United States, as the only exception, the Senate is not limited to either approving or rejecting a treaty. When the Senate intends that its ratification be limited, it normally adds reservations, or proposes amendments to the treaty, in the resolution of ratification. If amendments are proposed by the Senate, the treaty must be renegotiated by the President and, when agreed to by the parties, resubmitted to the Senate for ratification, unless the only changes are the incorporation of the amendments proposed by the Senate—in which case the previous resolution of ratification (in which the amendments were proposed) usually is sufficient.

(b) *Significance of Preambles:* The preamble to a treaty may be helpful for its interpretation, in particular if it has to be construed by the courts. It is however generally held in the answers received that parliamentary approval necessarily extends to the preamble and that such extension has no special significance.

With regard to the preamble to the bill or resolution approving a treaty, it is generally held that such a preamble does not have any significance or the interpretation of the treaty in as much as it cannot bind the other parties to the treaty.

According to the Finnish Constitution, it is doubtful whether treaties can be interpreted through legislative measures.

In India and Ireland, preambles to Acts of Parliament are not common. In Ireland, preambles may be used by the Courts as an aid to interpretation if the meaning of the text of the Act is not clear and unambiguous. The Indian answer holds that it can affect interpretation of the provisions of the bill to the extent they are not clear or are ambiguous.

A preamble to the bill authorizing ratification is not possible in France, Italy, Senegal and Yugoslavia. In Italy, however, Parliament when passing a law may come to a resolution inviting the Government to act in a certain sense, though the resolution would not have binding force.

In Switzerland, it is held that the text of the law (including a preamble) approving, or authorizing ratification of, the treaty may affect the interpretation of the treaty.

The German Bundestag when adding a preamble to the bill approving the German-French treaty did not intend to influence interpretation of the treaty but only wished to clarify its approval as far as other treaties and external relations were concerned. Thus, it was meant to interpret the bill of approval, not the contents of the treaty.

Similarly, in the United States preambles to resolutions generally are useful for purpose of construing the resolutions, as indicating the intent of the legislative body in taking the action. If the Senate intends that its ratification be limited, it normally adds reservations or proposes amendments to the treaty in the resolution of ratification. In the case of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, however, the Senate inserted a preamble to its resolution of ratification designed to require that subsequent amendments to the treaty be submitted to the Senate for ratification.

Chapter VI.—Referendum on treaties

In respect of referendum, reference is made to chapter 10 of Part I (p. 27-28).

Special mention has to be made here only of Norway where Parliament may decide that a consultative referendum should be held before a treaty of great importance is ratified. When an intense public debate arose out of Norway's request for membership in the European Economic Community, Parliament decided that a consultative referendum should be held before a final decision would be taken.

ITALIAN NATIONAL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, June 2, 1946, is a significant date in the varied and tumultuous history of the Italian people. On that day, at the polls, the Italians put their trust in a republican form of government to lead them on the road to peace and prosperity. By providing a democratic framework in which the Italians could freely exercise their individual talents and put their creative energies to work, the Republic proved to be best suited to the Italian character and temperament. Indeed, in less than a generation, not only have the Italian people rebuilt a war-torn economy, but they have accomplished an economic miracle often compared with that of Germany. Handicapped by a lack of natural resources, they have managed to transform the north into one of the most vital industrial centers of Europe. And thanks to ingenious agricultural and industrial programs, the gap between the north and the south is being rapidly filled. Italian products flood world markets at highly competitive prices. Today, Italy's currency reserves, set at \$5.4 billion, are the world's highest after the United States and West Germany.

Postwar Italy has also become one of the staunchest allies of the United States in Western Europe. Under the able leadership of men of vision such as Alcide de Gasperi, Italy has endeavored to secure a lasting peace in Europe by promoting the cause of an economically and politically integrated Europe, including Great Britain, in close alliance with the United States. It was at Messina that the plans for a common market were elaborated, and at Rome that the treaty establishing the European Economic Community was signed in 1957. Italy has also linked her security with that of the United States and has welcomed NATO on her shores. The skill and tact of NATO's present Secretary General Manlio Brosio, have been instrumental in enabling the organization to surmount crises and successfully adapt to changing conditions. Italy has promptly adhered to the nonproliferation treaty, and her active participation in world organizations and conferences reflects her concern for world peace.

Therefore it is with pride and admiration that I wish to pay tribute to the Italian people on the 23d anniversary of the founding of the Republic, and also to Italy's exceptionally capable and charming ambassador to the United States, Egidio Ortona. The sentimental, histori-

cal, and cultural ties which have bound the United States and Italy in the past have been reinforced and revitalized by the realization on both sides of the Atlantic that not only do we share a common heritage, but that we also share a common future.

ANDRETTI WINS BIG IN THE "INDY 500"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to lay claim to a distinctive honor which none of my colleagues can claim in this first session of the 91st Congress. That is, Mr. Speaker, that a member of my constituency in the 15th Congressional District of Pennsylvania piloted the winning car at the Indianapolis Speedway in the 53d annual running of the Indianapolis "500" on Memorial Day 1969.

I say "piloted the winning car" because that is what Mario Andretti, the fearless racing driver from Nazareth, Pa., did. Mario virtually flew around the 2½-mile speedway track, recording the fastest average time in the history of the Memorial Day classic—156.867 miles per hour. His average speed was nearly 4 miles per hour faster than the previous record of 152.882 miles per hour set just a year ago by Bobby Unser.

Mario Andretti took the checkered flag at Indianapolis last Friday afternoon after successfully completing the 200-lap race in his back-up car. Nine days earlier, his No. 1 car crashed on the speedway. Mario escaped from that crash with his life, having suffered only facial burns. Undaunted, he demonstrated the racing form of a real champion in Friday's race.

The victory was tremendous in many respects. Andretti received record prize money for the feat—\$205,727.06—as he became the first Indy 500 driver ever to top \$200,000 in winnings in a single race. Andretti also succeeded where others had failed—he provided car-owner Andy Granatelli with his first "500" victory after 23 years of trying as driver, mechanic and more recently as owner of racing cars.

The community of Nazareth in the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania, Mario's adopted home, is proud of its champion. I am honored to have this opportunity to recognize his spectacular feat in this Chamber and to renew the sincere congratulations I wired Mario and his family Friday afternoon.

KING'S OFFICIAL RECORD MUST BE MADE PUBLIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues is disgruntled because on May 26 I pointed out to the House the incredible dedication of a law school at the University of California in honor of Martin Luther King, Jr. I referred to King as an

errand boy of international communism. I was not on the floor when this vituperative personal attack was leveled against me, and any objective discussion is precluded inasmuch as the complaining Member failed to address himself to any facts on King but rather confined his remarks to emotional oratory.

Having read documentation on King and having examined the RECORD available to this House, I reiterate my remarks of May 26 and suggest the following action.

I call on King's apologists to join me in demanding that the present administration authorize J. Edgar Hoover and the Justice Department to make public their files on the activities, the confidants and the financial sources of Martin Luther King, Jr. Certainly there is nothing to hide and our people are entitled to a full disclosure of the entire record to either substantiate or disprove previously published information which I insert following my remarks to be placed here in the RECORD:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 16, 1967]

DISCARD RIOTS

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many excuses and explanations are being fed to the American people as to why the riots, looting, and bloodshed have occurred in our cities.

Seldom is it even suggested that so-called civil rights legislation and promoted race mixing—not poverty—is the cause.

Unless our people through their elected leaders stop this forced amalgamation the result can but be either a society of semi-slavery under so-called social laws, or a race war—in either event, neither can benefit America.

I trust our colleagues will read a letter recently received from Bishop C. Fain Kyle of Box 1366, Richmond, Calif., who as a Negro presents his views on the created race problem.

I also include a news release from the August 15 Washington, D.C., Evening Star:

"DISCARD,

"Richmond, Calif., August 11, 1967.

"Hon. JOHN R. RARICK,

"Member of Congress,

"Washington, D.C.

"MY DEAR SIR: Where there is no vision, the people perish! Your Negro writer was one of those able to foresee from the very beginning that these civil-rights agitators posing as crusaders would eventually and inevitably provoke a general frightening race war in this country through their hatred, bigotry and defiance manifested through these nonsensical demonstrations.

"Said foresight resulted in the establishing of the above-named anti-demonstration organization which was chartered by the State of California on November 19, 1963.

"In our first press release, we issued the following statement: 'There is no doubt but what there are in existence certain evils and inequities that need to be dealt with, but open rebellion on the part of any people is certainly not the answer and should not be tolerated in America, where we have constitutional government, and where it is every citizen's constitutional right to seek redress in the courts of the land if he has been dealt with unfairly, or exposed to lawless violence.'

"Perhaps you can help to arrange for your humble servant to be invited to appear and testify before one of the congressional committees so that the American people can be thoroughly informed by hearing from an American-born Negro who is a very definite part of that 97 percent of the Negro popula-

tion in this country which now and always have been opposed to demonstrations, riots, insurrection and anarchy.

"For the consideration which shall be given to this letter, please accept my sincere thanks in advance.

"Respectfully,

"BISHOP C. FAIN KYLE.

"RICHMOND, CALIF.—Bishop C. Fain Kyle is Executive Director, Dedicated Independent Society Committee Against Racial Demonstrations, Inc., Presiding Bishop; Conservative Christian Churches of America, Inc., National Chairman, Christian Conservative Party, Inc., President, Conservative Broadcasting Corporation, Inc., and State Chairman, California Recall Committee, Inc.

"Each one of the above named Nonprofit Corporations recently went on record charging Dr. Martin Luther King as being directly or indirectly responsible for the chaos, anarchy, insurrection and rebellion brought about through agitation, demonstrations and rioting throughout the United States in recent years, months, weeks and days.

"This includes the Selma and Montgomery mess, shame and murders in Alabama, the Americus, Georgia, debacle and murder, riots, injuries, arson and murders in the State of Mississippi, lawlessness in Chicago, Springfield, Massachusetts, and the fair city of Los Angeles, where the nation witnessed the greatest catastrophe of its kind in history took place in Watts.

"King was severely criticized, condemned and censured by all of these organizations for being the inspiration or instigator directly or indirectly of all these sordid affairs. King was further condemned for his hypocrisy in posing as a non-violent leader and Christian Minister, when in reality just about every move King has inevitably resulted in both violence, bloodshed and murder.

"The organizations further censured and condemned King for his noticeable failure or refusal to go or even send word to Los Angeles ordering the rioters in Watts to cease and desist from all violence and lawlessness which King knew to be wrong, both morally and legally.

"Furthermore, these organizations took note of the fact that instead of King trying to do something, anything to bring a halt to the recent Los Angeles war in Watts which has brought shame upon our nation, that King left the country for a sort of vacation speaking engagement in Jamaica, West Indies, during the time the lawlessness in Watts was at its peak.

"According to the five organizations which authorized Bishop Kyle to issue this news release, the whole world should now be aware that King is a false, hypocritical wolf in sheeps clothing, who, knowingly or unknowingly, is being used by the Communists to provoke a general frightening "race war" in this country that could very well result in the destruction of America.

"During the past several years, Bishop C. Fain Kyle has repeatedly warned and sought to alert the American people (both Negro and White) that King is the most dangerous man in the world today, that such disasters as the one that recently struck Los Angeles are inevitable under his kind of leadership, and that in due time the entire nation will become locked in a hopeless, devastating "race war" unless King, who has openly defied Municipal, County, State and Federal Court edicts and injunctions, and gotten away with it—is shorn of his power and imprisoned for his criminal acts and deeds for defying the courts of the land."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 4, 1967]

REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING: MAN OF PEACE OR APOSTLE OF VIOLENCE?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most incredible cases of American naivety can be

found in the strange story of Rev. Martin Luther King. While alert Americans generally seem intent on discovering the facts, discussing the issues, and developing a dialog in scores of social, economic, political, and religious areas and debating the pros and cons of the Bishop Pikes, the Rap Browns, and the George Lincoln Rockwells, there is a strange silence and lack of debate when it comes to Martin Luther King.

It is almost as if he is being consciously protected by the press which normally accepts accolades for presenting both sides of a story and piercing with rays of informative reportorial light all proper facets of national life. King is a national figure, this cannot be denied. He is one of the only men who can go from jail cell to a conference with the President of the United States. His name is known; his cause is said to be civil rights. For one reason or another, however, very little is known about the real Martin Luther King. I believe that if his true character were known, he would not be able to command a corporal's guard to follow him.

While preaching nonviolence, I believe the record clearly shows him to be an apostle of violence. While gaining major support from clergymen, I believe he has preached an expedient, totally materialistic line which is the antithesis of religious teachings. He has openly associated with the most radical elements in our society. I believe he has done more for the Communist Party than any other person of this decade.

These may sound like strong words, Mr. Speaker, but the facts are even harsher. I have heard Reverend King speak. On one occasion he may have a soulful melancholy that is, without doubt, most impressive. On another, he can rant with the best of the demagogues, and while more sophisticated than Stokely Carmichael or Rap Brown, he says, in effect, the same thing. He makes no pretense at keeping his skirts clean or his house in order. He does not have to because the past 10 years have demonstrated that the liberal community and the news media of our country will either not note or meekly forgive his indiscretions.

Take the year 1967 alone. At a time when Detroit and Newark had just witnessed a virtual guerrilla war and a chaotic lawlessness without equal in modern times, King was urging a massive dislocation of northern cities. Instead of intervening as a moderating influence he took up the cause of the rabble-rousers and threatened these dislocations which, he averred, would force the Congress to provide financial assistance for slum Negroes. Yes, he would force us. Force us in this free society. Force is a word he understands well. He added:

"This is something like a last plea to the nation to respond to nonviolence. There is a great deal of bitterness (in the slums). If there is not provided a channel of constructive action, this bitterness will lead to desperation riots and social disruption."

At a time when the incendiary statements of Brown and Carmichael were sparking the riot-prone tensions, did King emerge as a national leader seeking to soothe these passions? No, he attended as keynote speaker the most radical assemblage of anti-Americans ever put together, and as the Communist Daily Worker approvingly and glowingly reported:

"He described vividly the racism that can praise in its history books a white Patrick Henry who sounded the call against the British redcoats while it condemns H. Rap Brown who insists that black victims of oppression in America should fight for their freedom."

Imagine that—comparing the rabble-rousers, the looters, the social misfits in America to patriots like Patrick Henry. He was further quoted as saying "Maybe the bluecoats in the ghetto are our redcoats."

The convention, the National Conference for New Politics—NCPN—heard chantings of "Kill Whitey, Kill Whitey" and the most rev-

olutionary anti-American doctrine that could be imagined and yet the August 29-September 4, 1967, confab had the supposed "man of peace" Mr. King as their keynote. It represented a major breakthrough for the Communist Party and King helped. For years, the Communists have chafed at the doctrine of separation which tended to keep them out of respectable liberal gatherings. In the 1930's, the liberals worked hand in hand with the Reds but the growth of anti-communism in the Nation has brought about a change in the 1950's and 1960's. Except for the more radical groups, liberals in general have tried to keep Communists from participating in their causes and at their conventions. King has consistently worked with Communists and has helped give them a respectability they do not deserve. The NCPN in Chicago represented such a breakthrough in the Red goal of "nonexclusion" that they editorialized gleefully in their organ, the Daily Worker, on August 22, 1967.

Reverend King is the hero of many militant Negro leaders although denounced by others in the black power structure. He has allied with Cassius Clay. When you study his speeches closely you are struck by the obvious fact that while ostensibly condemning racism, he himself preaches a black racism. One of the leading black racists in the country is Rev. Albert C. Cleage, Jr., who just after the terrible riot told his Central United Church of Christ in Detroit:

"There is no escape for you and when white people try to tell that good niggers can get through this golden door of integration, don't believe it. We don't even want that door because that's destroying us."

Cleage went on to say:

"We are dealing with an enemy who is not going to accept us into American life."

In extolling King, he noted:

"Dr. King led black people to understand that integration could never come to pass. He helped black men understand that 'the man' is an enemy."

In his flagrant disregard for law and order, Reverend King has given credibility to one of the most dangerous dogmas than can be promoted in an orderly society. He simply arrogates to his own inspiration the whim to disobey any law which he loosely terms unjust. Court orders, State, and Federal laws, municipal ordinances—they must all fall in front of his supposition that he has a divine right to break the law. His conduct is clearly criminal in this regard and certainly has helped develop the idea among rioters and looters that they can obey their own concepts of good and bad laws and act accordingly.

Like most power-hungry tyrants, he has gone one step too far. In disobeying a court order, he was sentenced to jail. On appeal to the Supreme Court, he was surprised to find that a usually supine and hopelessly liberal Court rose up in indignation and slapped his wrists in a strong indictment of his illegal activity. Said the Court in affirming his jail sentence on June 12, 1967:

"This Court cannot hold that the petitioners were constitutionally free to ignore all the procedures of the law and carry their battle to the streets. One may sympathize with the petitioners' impatient commitment to their cause. But respect for judicial process is a small price to pay for the civilizing hand of law, which alone can give abiding meaning to constitutional freedom."

Mr. Speaker, this succinct statement should be burned into the consciousness of all of those who have at one time or another fallen for the pious pronouncements of Martin Luther King. Carrying the battles to the streets, as the court phrases it, is not a constitutional right. It is, in reality, criminal conduct and should not be condoned by any thinking American. I repeat again the Court's most emphatic statement:

"But respect for judicial process is a small price to pay for the civilizing hand of law,

which alone can give abiding meaning to constitutional freedom."

At the height of the rioting fury which was sweeping the country, King joined three other civil rights leaders in issuing a cautious call for an end to violence because, among other things, it is self-destructive to the Negroes' interest. This was on July 26, 1967. Two days later King was visiting Cleveland, Ohio, on an inspection tour. He tersely expanded on his theme of violence being self-destructive when he said:

"I can't recommend burning down Cleveland. We end up getting killed more than anyone else and our businesses get burned."

No statement, Mr. Speaker, could more clearly expose the irresponsible, cynical nature of the subject of these remarks. This is typical of the manner in which he advocates "nonviolence." Burning, looting, and killing are not immoral or wrong, it would seem. Merely destructive to the self-interest of this particular minority group.

Reverend King expresses indignation over Vietnam. In this he is joined by many millions of Americans. Few of us are pleased at what is happening there but we are not disloyal to our Nation. Reverend King showed his true colors in April of this year in a major speech he delivered on Vietnam. I believe that any thinking American who will study his words must conclude as I have that he is disloyal to the United States. He maligned his country with lies and accusations that come straight from the Communist Party line. A strong statement you say. Listen to what he said. He praised Ho Chi Minh as the only true leader of the Vietnamese people. He condemned the United States as the "greatest purveyor of violence in the world today," and likened our Nation to Hitler's Germany. He condemned the late President Diem as "one of the most vicious modern dictators" and threw out wild charges like the United States may have killed 1 million children in Vietnam. He conjured up an American napalm war in Peru so he could denounce it. He said we have no honorable intentions in Vietnam and our minimal expectation is to occupy it as an American colony. These are but a few of the wild accusations of the Nobel Prize winner many people have been led to believe is a man of peace.

Even the ultraliberal Washington Post could not stomach King's blatant lies and propaganda. In an editorial entitled "A Tragedy," they roundly condemned King by saying:

"A TRAGEDY"

"Dr. Martin Luther King's Vietnam speech was not a sober and responsible comment on the war but a reflection of his disappointment at the slow progress of civil rights and the war on poverty.

"It was filled with bitter and damaging allegations and inferences that he did not and could not document. He flatly charged the Government with sending Negroes to fight and die in extraordinarily high proportions relative to the rest of the population. But Negro troops constitute 11 per cent of the enlisted personnel in Vietnam (10.5 per cent of the population was Negro in 1960). Negro casualties are higher than this (22.5 per cent of killed in action) because of higher Negro enlistment for elite corps and higher rate of Negro re-enlistment. No doubt these figures reflect in part the fact that civilian employment opportunities are not as great for the Negro. But they also reflect, in part, the zeal and courage of Negro soldiers. And they reflect the fact that in this war the Negro in uniform is not limited to work battalions.

"Dr. King says the United States may have caused a million civilian casualties in Vietnam—mostly children—but he did not give any supporting authority for this statement.

"He stated flatly that 'our officials know' that less than 25 per cent of the members of the National Liberation Front are Commu-

nist—but he neglected to say what officials or where they said it.

"He contends that Ho Chi Minh knows that the bombing and shelling we are doing is 'part of traditional preinvasion strategy,' but gives no credence to our express declaration that no invasion is intended.

"He has no doubts that we have no honorable intentions in Vietnam and thinks it will become clear that our 'minimal expectation is to occupy it as an American colony.' He feels that men will 'not refrain from thinking' that our 'maximum hope is to goad China into a war so that we may bomb her nuclear installations.' It is one thing to reproach a government for what it has done and said; it is quite another to attribute to it policies it has never avowed and purposes it has never entertained and then to rebuke it for these sheer inventions of unsupported fantasy.

"He has even conjured up an American napalm war in Peru so that he could denounce it.

"Dr. King is right to reproach America for not ending discrimination and poverty. But these are failures for which every Administration in the history of the United States deserves more reproach than this one. It is strange irony indeed that the Government which has labored the hardest to right these ancient wrongs is the object of the most savage denunciation, the most unreserved criticism and the most unfair blame.

"Dr. King has done a grave injury to those who are his natural allies in a great struggle to remove ancient abuses from our public life; and he has done an even graver injury to himself. Many who have listened to him with respect will never again accord him the same confidence. He has diminished his usefulness to his cause, to his country and to his people. And that is a great tragedy."

To those liberals and bleeding hearts who have not intelligently discerned what King has been saying and doing, during his decade of prominence, this may have come as a tragedy. To those of us who have followed him closely and have been aware by both public and confidential documentation, of his questionable activity, it comes as no surprise at all. In 1967 the real King surfaced and yet where is the criticism he should be getting?

These are but a few highlights, Mr. Speaker, in the disappointing story of Martin Luther King. I say disappointing because he has had a rare opportunity to align himself with an important cause and work for solutions to social ills through our democratic process. This he has not done. He has had the opportunity to work with men of good will but all too often he has allied himself with the most radical and un-American elements in our country. I now present in detail some of the background of Martin Luther King.

THE VIOLENT NONVIOLENCE OF DR. KING

"I have a deep commitment to non-violence"—Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

On May 4, 1963, police dogs and firehoses were used to quell a demonstration by lawbreakers in Birmingham, Ala. There had been violence plain and simple. Martin Luther King and his righthand man, Rev. Fred L. Shuttlesworth, threatened that these demonstrations would continue until there were not only promises of an end to segregation but "action." There was, they said, "no intention of relaxing pressure without such action. We negotiate from strength" and "will consider" calling off the demonstrations after the action. This was the mood of the well-known nonviolence of Dr. King.

The day following action by police dogs and firehoses, the New York Times reported that residents of Birmingham heard from the lips of King, the man who preached peace in the streets but led the lawless bands:

"Today was D-Day. Tomorrow will be double D-Day."

One seldom hears Martin Luther King's name without the "nonviolent" slogans coming in successive breaths. But quite often the nonviolence of King leads to violence of riot proportions. The big lie technique is clearly used. Repeat "nonviolence" over and over so the public will believe it and then practice violence or the encouraging of violence.

Violence accompanied King during his early days in Birmingham. It was present during the death of a fellow pastor at, of all places, a Baptist convention. It was with him in Albany, Ga. It returned with him to Birmingham and Albany. It followed him to St. Augustine, and they were together in Chicago. It is not an exaggeration to say he leaves a trail of violence in his wake.

In addition to the physical presence of Martin Luther King in flammable cities, there is the presence of King's words and ideas in every tension area across the United States. The power of Dr. King to promote violence was recognized early. Arrested for loitering in 1958, King was charged with irresponsibility by a judge who said:

"It is regrettable that this case arose . . . there was serious danger of an incident."

On many occasions, like Chicago in 1966, he goes to the scene of violence and instead of trying to settle troubled waters, he adds to the riot-producing tension.

Early statements of King reveal continued use of the phrase "direct action programs." His philosophy and purpose as outlined in his book, "Why We Can't Wait," amount to this. Note his forked tongue semantics. He admits that there is an effort to create a "crisis packed situation" but he concludes he is not a "creator of tension." He stated: "The purpose of our direct-action program is to create a situation so crisis-packed that it will inevitably open the door to negotiation. . . . Actually, we who engage in non-violent direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open, where it can be seen and dealt with."

In August of this year, at a time of serious racial tension, he said virtually the same thing—again with a certain amount of double talk. King said:

"Negroes will be mentally healthier if they do not suppress rage but vent it constructively and its energy peacefully but forcefully to cripple the operations of an oppressive society."

Read that one over several times and try to tie together the words "rage" which somehow is to be "vented" to "cripple" an "oppressive society."

Louis Waldman, a leading Negro labor lawyer in Chicago, answered King's statement this way:

"The philosophy and purposes of Dr. King's program . . . is to produce 'crisis-packed' situations and 'tension.' Such a purpose is the very opposite of nonviolence, for the atmosphere-of-crisis policy leads to violence by provoking violence. And the provocation of violence is violence. To describe such provocation as 'nonviolent' is to trifle with the plain meaning of words.

"The perpetual crisis technique has been used by the Communist movement government out the world, both Communist governments and parties follow it. . . . It was used by Hitler in Germany, both on his road to power and after power came to him. . . . It is disruptive of democratic society and institutions.

"Whether Dr. King knows it or not, or wills it or not, the policy of perpetual crisis, of provoking 'tensions' as he calls it, and of civil disobedience, are disastrous to the Negro people themselves, to civil liberties and to constitutional government. Such a policy flies in the teeth of the very purpose of our Constitution, which is clearly stated

in the Preamble to be, among other things, 'to insure domestic tranquillity.'

This is a damning indictment from a man who praises nonviolent approaches to problems of civil rights, and it comes not from a racist, but from a Negro who has been a champion of civil rights for decades.

Most Americans call the bloodshed, looting, fire bombing, and vandalism by its true name, violence, and to argue that these results of the King-led, -organized, and -backed marches, demonstrations, sit-ins, lie-ins, and the like are the fault of those who react against them is to argue not only against logic but also the law. The Supreme Court, in *Hague* against CIO, 1939, said:

"The privilege of a citizen to use the streets and parks for the communication of views on national questions must be regulated in the interests of all . . . and must be exercised in subordination to the general comfort and convenience, and in consonance with peace and good order."

This opinion of the Court was reaffirmed as late as 1966. Former Supreme Court Justice Charles E. Whittaker makes the point that it is an "ancient and honored legal maxim that all men are presumed to intend the natural consequences of their acts." From this maxim comes severe condemnation of Dr. King for the broad areas of unrest and lawlessness which he promotes under the title of civil rights. Largely through the connivance of the liberal community, King has generally escaped the responsibility he deserves for the logical consequences of his civil disobedience pronouncements.

THE UNJUST LAWS

King explained his ideas on civil disobedience in terms of just and unjust laws, and how they are to be broken, during an interview on the March 28, 1965, "Meet the Press":

"I do feel that there are two types of laws. One is a just law and one is an unjust law. I think we all have moral obligations to disobey unjust laws.

"I think that the distinction here is that when one breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, he must do it openly, he must do it cheerfully, he must do it lovingly, he must do it civilly, not uncivilly, and he must do it with a willingness to accept the penalty."

To King the only guide whether or not to violate the law is his own particular whim or caprice. He and he alone will decide. Note that there is no mention of the fact that following one's conscience may violate the conscientious obedience to the law by many other citizens. To King it makes no difference, if one accepts the penalty.

In the recent Birmingham decision, already cited, which upheld fines and jail terms for King and others who defied a court injunction against a civil rights march, the majority of the Supreme Court agreed that:

"Civil liberties, as guaranteed by the Constitution, imply the existence of an organized society maintaining public order without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of unrestrained abuses . . . Respect for the judicial process is a small price to pay for the civilizing hand of law, which alone can give meaning to constitutional freedom. (Emphasis added.)"

As usual, Reverend King tried to equate his own illegal contempt of court to Negro injustice. Appearing on the nationwide June 18, 1967, ABC program "Issues and Answers" he found the prospect of his 5-day jail sentence and the U.S. Supreme Court decision which ordered it upsetting to all Negroes. He warned the decision would "encourage riots and violence in the sense that it all but said that Negroes cannot redress their grievances through peaceful means without facing the kind of decision that we face."

This is directly false. In addition to his usual "invitation" to riots and violence, he tries to evade the real issue. He was not engaging in "peaceful means." He was engaging

in illegal means, flouting the judicial process. The court decision was not saying anything to Negroes, it was a statement of the law of the land which was clearly applicable to every American. The true King can be seen in this twisting of the facts, his effort at personal martyrdom and the veiled threat of riots and violence which he uses in virtually every situation.

The value of committing acts of civil disobedience "openly," "lovingly," as it were, is commented on by Attorney Waldman, previously cited:

"Apparently, Dr. King thinks that in violating laws 'openly' he and his followers are more virtuous than those who violate laws secretly. As a matter of fact, the reverse is true. The open violation of law is an open invitation to others to join in such violation. Disobedience to law is bad enough when done secretly, but it is far worse when done openly, especially when accompanied by clothing such acts in the mantle of virtue and organizing well advertised and financed plans to carry out such violations. The secret violator of law recognizes his act for what it is: an antisocial act; he may even be ashamed of what he is doing and seek to avoid disapprobation of his neighbors. But the open violator, the agitating violator, acts shamelessly, in defiance of his neighbor's judgment and his fellow man's disapproval."

Dr. King defines unjust laws as "those in which people are required to obey a code that they had no part in making because they were denied the right to vote."

When pinned down about communities where Negroes have the right to vote, and asked whether there was still the "right" to disobey, King expanded his code for lawlessness even more:

"There may be a community where Negroes have the right to vote, but there are still unjust laws in that community. There may be unjust laws in a community where people in large numbers are voting, and I think wherever unjust laws exist people have a right to disobey these laws."

Here King jumped from Negroes to all people and from people without voting privileges to even those who do have the constitutional methods of change open to them. To him, the majority might always be wrong, the minority always right. Acceptance and promotion of this philosophy can only lead to the disintegration of American society. From it follows the chaotic situation where any one who believes, or even feels, that a law is unjust merely disobeys. The denial of freedom to the majority of Americans who obey the law is proportional to the number of persons who set themselves up as final judge and then disobey. While professing Christianity and humility, King strikes a harder blow at fundamental concepts of justice than any would-be dictator or other demagog in contemporary American history.

On the same "Meet the Press" program referred to earlier, Tom Wicker of the New York Times asked:

"How are we to enforce law when a doctrine is preached that one man's conscience may tell him that the law is unjust, when other men's consciences don't tell him that?"

King responded:

"I think you enforce it, and I think you deal with it by not allowing anarchy to develop. I think the chief norm for guiding the situation is the willingness to accept the penalty, and I don't think any society can call an individual irresponsible who breaks a law and willingly accepts the penalty."

This is more King jibberish and feigned piety. To commit murder, for example, and then willingly go to prison to pay the penalty cannot change the nature of the transgression—it is still wrong.

Willingly or not, the question is still, in Judge Whittaker's words:

"Can anyone reasonably believe that a disorderly society can survive? In all recorded

history none ever has. . . . History also shows that, in each instance, the first evidence of the society's decay appeared in its toleration of disrespect for, and violation of, its law. There is no good reason to believe that similar toleration will serve us differently."

WHEN CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE BECOMES NECESSARY

Inflammatory statements, threats and actual instances of civil disobedience are evident throughout the career of Martin Luther King. In December 1959, King called on southern Negroes to practice civil disobedience, if necessary, and to break, openly, any State or local law "not in harmony with Federal law. This," he continued, "is the creative moment for a full scale assault on the system of segregation. We must practice open, civil disobedience."

In the fall of 1961 King spoke on the role of the Negro student, stated his hollow call for nonviolence and in the next breath called for "disobeying the unjust laws."

Two years later in Birmingham, King warned that city of more massive demonstrations:

"I hope civil disobedience will not be necessary but, if something is not done quickly, if Congress filibusters the civil rights bill and does not pass the public accommodation section, Negroes will have to engage in massive civil disobedience."

Ten days later he said he feared violence and warned agains that if the civil rights bill did not pass it "may lead to a night of darkness and violence."

I personally heard his threats at Howard University in 1964 during the time when Congress was debating the civil rights program, and I can assure you that he spoke not as a man of peace but as a man of violence.

In February of 1966, King and his men decided to assume "trusteeships" of a six-flat tenement in Chicago as part of a campaign to improve living conditions for the residents. King had no authority; his power was only that which is derived from police-state tactics. He simply took over. His reasoning: "morality" is more important than the law and property rights, the action was "supralegal," above the law.

In early April 1966, a circuit court judge enjoined King and his associates from entering the building, interfering, or collecting rent from the tenants, all of which they had done. There can be no denial of King's influence and the results of his "nonviolent" demonstrations and "direct action" programs.

The New York Times of July 16, 1962, stated that Reverend King "threatened a new drive for Negro rights" in Albany, Ga. Ten days later, leader King, according to the Times, set a day of penance following a night of rioting during which Negroes were arrested as they marched on city hall, hooting, laughing, and throwing bottles, bricks, and rocks at law officials. August 11, the police chief of Albany testified that the situation had been under control until King returned to the city to be tried for an illegal demonstration.

Another example of the "nonviolent direct-action" programs of Dr. King was exposed in July 1966 in the syndicated column by respected columnists, Robert Allen and Paul Scott. Their exposé reported that King and company were contacting, and enlisting, Chicago street gangs and "bringing them into the civil rights movement to fight 'the power structure.'"

From a report said to be circulating through the U.S. Department of Justice, the columnists quoted these statements: King's lieutenants telling gang leaders that "the real foes are Mayor Daley, policemen, slumlords, bankers, businessmen, and school administrators"; or haranguing that this is an "unjust society"; and that "the gang members are being incited to violence instead of being taught nonviolence"; that "gang lead-

ers have little or no understanding of civil rights, but do know how to use force." King, they said, had personally met several times with gang leaders who have a combined following of 1,000.

During the same month that King was reported to be enlisting the gangs, Chicago police battled some 300 Negroes for 2 straight hours of rioting.

Some time later, August 9, the Chicago Tribune reported that:

"The Chicago Lawn area was the scene Friday night of civil rights disorder as the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., led Chicago marchers into the community to promote open housing for Negroes."

The Chicago riots of July 1966 deserve elaboration. Here is a selected sequence of events: The July 12 riot broke out just 2 days after King's mass civil rights rally.

The Baltimore Sun, July 10, 1966, reported: "In an interview . . . Dr. King acknowledged that his 'end slums campaign in Chicago is an implementation program for the concept of 'black power';' but under a more palatable name.

"Dr. King acknowledged that his presence in Chicago, the street rallies, sit-ins, marches, and door-to-door campaign to sign up members of protesting [units] have more far-reaching aims than the immediate dramatization of problems of impoverished Negroes."

The next day King and Mayor Daley held a "showdown" meeting in the mayor's office. On July 14 the New York Times reported that the near West Side was tense after a police car was stoned by more than 100 Negro youths. Martin Luther King attributed the disturbance to the Mayor's refusal to make concessions to his civil rights program. This is his typical style. Rarely has Reverend King chastized looters, arsonists, and conspirators for violence. He always justifies their actions and, directly or indirectly, encourages them.

The report continued:

"Dr. King . . . spoke at the headquarters of the West Side Organization, where a sign on the wall said: 'Burn, baby, burn, boycott, baby, boycott.' Roving bands of youths and some adults . . . broke windows, looted stores, and stoned police cars and small police vans."

During the weekend of the 16th, 17th, and 18th, Governor Kerner called out the National Guard when police could not control rioting that in 3 nights included burning, looting, two deaths, 100 injuries, 300 arrests, and extensive property damage.

A few days before the riot, King stated that disrupting the flow of Chicago's traffic—a tactic of Dr. King's—would be "rough" on city officials "when they have to get 200 people off the Dan Ryan (expressway) but the only thing I can tell them is: Which do you prefer, this or a riot?" Another "non-violent" pilot project was thus in action.

It is doubtful that the city officials made the final choice.

Chicago's Mayor Daley, as reported in the New York Times, "asserted angrily that the strife was 'planned!' Dr. King's aides were in here for no other reason than to bring disorder to the streets of Chicago," he concluded.

Following contact with the gangs mentioned earlier, it is disturbing to note that press accounts of the riots stated that Negro street gangs fanned the flames in the riot and were given credit for spreading violence to greater limits.

The Chicago Tribune reported that prior to the riots, King had shown films detailing the violence of Watts. Asked by the Tribune about this, King replied:

"The films showing the Watts riots were to demonstrate the negative effect of riots."

The films add another dimension to the activities of King that are well known by law enforcement officials. Their general re-

action to King is summed up by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in this statement:

"Unfortunately, some civil rights leaders in the past have condoned what they describe as civil disobedience in civil rights demonstrations.

"Martin Luther King, Jr., for example, after arriving in Chicago, Ill., early in 1966 in connection with the civil rights drive there, commented about the use of so-called civil disobedience in civil rights demonstrations and said:

"It may be necessary to engage in such acts. . . . Often an individual has to break a particular law in order to obey a higher law."

"Such a course of action is fraught with danger for if everyone took it upon himself to break any law that he believed was morally unjust, it is readily apparent there would soon be complete chaos in this country."

When the riots broke out on July 12, did Martin Luther King enter the scene as a moderating influence? Absolutely not. On the second day of the riot, July 13, a rally was held at a local church and King appeared with one Chester Robinson, executive director of the West Side Organization, who made highly inflammatory accusations about the Chicago police. King's respectability added to the occasion. Robinson, incidentally, is an ex-convict with an extensive arrest record dating back to 1949. Such are the men King finds himself with time and time again.

The first amendment guarantees the right to assemble peaceably and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances, but it does not allow any latitude for disobedience. It is absurd to even imagine a situation where a law protects the right to disobey a law. To say this is to say that law is not law.

Throughout, the actions of Dr. King have been termed "civil" disobediences, but Justice Whittaker makes this point: "What we are confronted by, and must deal with, are active, overt, willful mass violations of our criminal laws. That conduct is not 'civil disobedience' in any dictionary or acceptable sense of those words. The understandable desire to avoid openly admitting advocacy and commission of crime cannot excuse us from calling that conduct what it is. Active and overt acts willfully committed in violation of our criminal laws are criminal violations and not 'civil disobedience.'"

The final result of disobedience is not only gross violations of law during riots and marches, but in this opinion of Justice Whittaker, encompasses a general furthering of lawlessness throughout the country. "Toleration and appeasements" of the "many misguided preachers and activities of Dr. King are heavily contributing causes of the general disrespect for law and hence of the crime that is now rampant throughout our Nation."

I believe it is fair to conclude that Martin Luther King has been an apostle of violence and lawlessness, not peace and non-violence. His method has been criminal conduct and conspiracy, not civil disobedience. To call it anything else would be the same perversion of the truth that King has engaged in for years.

A MINISTER BUT OF WHAT?

Although Dr. King asks the world to believe that he is a man of God and appeals to "higher laws" in justifying his acts of law breaking, it is incredible that he should expect the people of the United States to be so gullible as to accept the Biblical and historical precedents he conjures up as valid. They are not.

To use Biblical passages as a pretext for his call to lawlessness, King must first deny the context in which the Apostles lived and preached. They had no system of appeals.

There was no guarantee of freedom. There was no free speech. The parallel is invalid.

In the opinion of the dean of Talbot Theological Seminary, Rev. Dr. Charles L. Feinberg:

"Those who point to Biblical examples of resistance to authority forget the spiritual principles involved there, and are unmindful that they in that day had no such legal provisions for redress for their grievances such as we have today."

That Dr. King should disregard the total context of the New Testament, and the Book of Acts in particular, can hardly be believed.

It is also incredible that King would attempt to compare the civil disobedience of today with the Boston Tea Party. To make this comparison is, again, to forget that there were no channels of appeal or meaningful democratic remedy available to those American patriots. It is interesting to note that the Boston Tea Party and other acts against authority by the colonists were the beginnings of the overthrowing of a foreign government. We must assume that Dr. King knows this basic historic fact. His views and tactics on this point are hardly American.

Dr. King uses these methods to push into areas and communities where the residents, from mayor to fellow clergyman, say he is not wanted or needed. Some of the greatest condemnation of Martin Luther King has come from men of the church.

In 1964, delegates to the American Council of Christian Churches passed a resolution, "noting with regret that the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., civil rights leader and Nobel Peace Prize winner, had been represented before the world as a peace-loving Christian minister crusading in the interest of Negro life."

In 1966, Dr. J. H. Jackson, Negro leader of the National Baptist Convention, said that civil disobedience and nonviolence would not carry the civil rights movement any higher and might even lead to disrespect for law and order and to possible violence.

In 1965, a Negro alderman in Chicago, Ralph H. Metcalf, criticized King and his group, said King had "ulterior motives" in moving into Chicago with his programs and leveled the blast at King that:

"This is no hick town. The leaders can handle the situation. We have adequate leadership here."

Metcalf said that King would not be "objective."

The Chicago Tribune of June 30, 1967 reported:

"The Chicago chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, long critical of the civil rights tactics of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., has formally split with Dr. King's group. . . ."

The article added that King's group and the NAACP have been at odds over King's tactics last year in the open housing march.

Episcopal minister, Dr. Robert B. Watts, of La Jolla, Calif., is another clergyman who has scored King's disobedience stand and his apparent belief that the end justifies the means. Dr. Watts declared that no one, "however exalted he may be or regard himself, has the right to say that what was wrong before becomes morally right if the acting party is willing to be punished if caught." The doctrine of morally justified civil disobedience should be rejected, he added.

Perhaps one of the strongest statements from a fellow clergyman came in April of this year. The blunt, descriptive attack on King came from the Rev. Henry Mitchell, leader of a group of West Side Chicago ministers. Here is the account as reported by the Chicago Tribune:

"The leader of a group of west side Negro ministers declared yesterday that Dr. Martin Luther King should 'get the hell out of here' because his civil rights marching in Chicago last summer (1966) 'created hate.'

"If he wants to march on the west side, let him march with rakes, brooms, and grass seed," said Rev. Henry Mitchell . . .

"He said the ministers represented the sentiments of 50,000 Chicago Negroes who want 'peace, love, and harmony,' don't approve of civil rights marches, and 'just want to live in their communities and upgrade them.'"

Justin E. Walsh wrote in the monthly magazine, Rally, about those who use the pulpit for their strange social and political pronouncements. It seems to fit Martin Luther King, Walsh said:

"Thus the pulpit becomes a political rostrum from whence God Himself directs the defeat of Barry Goldwater, the march on Selma, or a teach-in protesting American involvement in Viet Nam. The sacred and profane become confused, religion is reduced to an adjunct of political agitation, and church attendance falls because Americans do not endorse such schemes, will not listen to preachers who do.

Possibly the answer can be found in I Corinthians 1:27. It quite prophetically says:

"But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty."

In his constant preaching that the ends justify the means, King is not speaking in the Judeo-Christian heritage belief. This is crass materialism and Marxism. It is expediency not principle. It is frightening to contemplate the many leading clergymen that consciously join his cause or acquiesce by their silence. Even worse, he is being currently depicted as a modern Christian hero by a Catholic catechism series. The total picture of Martin Luther King brings one fundamental question to mind: He says he is a minister. A minister of what?

SOME OF KING'S ADVISERS AND ASSOCIATES

When one considers the backgrounds of some of Martin Luther King's advisers and associates, it is hardly surprising that some of King's activities work to the detriment of true civil rights progress and that he ends up mouthing the Communist line.

A UPI release of October 10, 1965, reported a meeting which King had with U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg concerning the war in Vietnam. The release stated that "King was accompanied to the meeting by Bayard Rustin, his special consultant," and others.

On February 10, 1966, Director Hoover of the FBI had this to say about Rustin:

"At the University of Maryland last year, at a law enforcement institute held for police officers of Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, D.C., the university invited Bayard Rustin to be one of the speakers. Bayard Rustin was convicted for sodomy, a violation of the Selective Service Act and was an admitted member of the Young Communist League."

Unfortunately, this is not the only case where the backgrounds and/or activities of some of those close to King certainly harm the civil rights movement in the eyes of the public.

Rev. James L. Bevel, one of King's assistants in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, is another of King's cohorts whose activities certainly do not reflect the sentiments of sincere civil rights exponents. Bevel was a sponsor of Vietnam Week, mentioned above, and was given leave by King to serve as national director of the Spring Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, one of two committees which planned and organized Vietnam Week. The House Committee on Un-American Activities stated that "Communists are playing dominant roles" in the Spring Mobilization Committee.

Bevel was the signer of a public appeal for funds to furnish the DuBois Clubs "Freedom Center" clubhouse in Chicago and has joined as coplaintiff with the DuBois Clubs in their suit to restrain the Subversive Ac-

tivities Control Board from holding hearings on the DCA as petitioned by the Attorney General. FBI Director Hoover has publicly stated that the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs were started by the Communist Party U.S.A. as a youth front.

In addition, Bevel was a sponsor of the Chicago conference on December 28 to 30, 1966, to discuss the idea of a nationwide student strike and other forms of demonstrations protesting the U.S. effort to resist Communist aggression in South Vietnam. According to the HCUA report, "Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week":

"Organizers of the conference have openly admitted that representatives of the following Communist organizations took part in the conference: Communist Party U.S.A.; W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America; Progressive Labor Party (the Peking-oriented faction of the U.S. Communist movement); Socialist Workers Party (the Trotskyist Communists); Young Socialist Alliance (youth branch of the Socialist Workers Party); Youth Against War and Fascism (youth arm of the Workers World Party, a Trotskyist splinter group); National Guardian (published by Weekly Guardian Associates)."

Rev. Fred L. Shuttlesworth, according to the Cincinnati Enquirer of June 9, 1963, was elected to the presidency of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., and when contacted by the Enquirer in Birmingham, Ala., concerning the nature of the SCEF, stated:

"I have the highest regard for this organization (SCEF) for the work it has done since I have been a member of the board, and I have seen nothing on the part of any persons, with whom I have been associated, to give any substantiation to these charges."

Shuttlesworth has been a close associate of Martin Luther King and the New York Times of January 11, 1966, lists him as secretary of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Like King, he has been associated with a number of cited Communist fronts. He was a speaker at the 25th annual convention of the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America which, as indicated before, was expelled from the CIO by the 1949 convention on grounds of Communist domination.

When unable to attend, he sent a statement to be read at the rally held by the New York Council To Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities, a cited Communist front.

He was one of 200 guests at the National Guardian's 15th anniversary dinner on November 26, 1964. The Guardian is a cited Communist publication.

According to the Mine-Mill Union of July 1965, the official publication of the International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, Shuttlesworth was scheduled to speak at the 59th Mine-Mill International Convention, August 16, 1965, in Denver, Colo. This union was expelled by the CIO in 1950 on grounds of Communist domination.

Reverend Wyatt T. Walker, another of Martin Luther King's associates, also has several Communist fronts listed in his name. In 1962 he was cochairman in charge of conference facilities for a lawyers' conference on civil rights held in Atlanta, under the sponsorship of the National Lawyers Guild's Committee To Assist Southern Lawyers, and the National Bar Association's Civil Rights Committee in cooperation with King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The National Lawyers' Guild, as previously stated, has been cited as a Communist front.

Walker was a sponsor of the Yasul Welcoming Committee which in turn was sponsored by the National Guardian, a Communist front.

As in the case of Shuttlesworth, Walker was a sponsor of the National Committee to Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee, a Communist front.

Of all those associated with Martin Luther King and the SCLC, perhaps none have had such a close relationship with the Communist Party as Hunter Pitts O'Dell. A UPI release which appeared in the New York Times of July 27, 1963, reported that King stated that O'Dell had worked twice for the SCLC. King acknowledged that O'Dell "may have had some connections in the past" with communism but King added that:

"We were convinced that he had renounced them and had become committed to the Christian philosophy of nonviolence in dealing with America's social injustices."

King said O'Dell left the movement on June 26 by "mutual agreement" because of concern that his affiliation with the integration movement would be used by "segregationists and race-baiters."

The surest indication of O'Dell's break with the Communist Party would be, of course, his willingness to appear before a congressional committee and give the U.S. Government the benefit of his party experience. Indications are that O'Dell could be of immense help in disclosing the identities of 20th-century Benedict Arnolds biding their time for the downfall of the United States.

In 1956 O'Dell testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. He invoked the fifth amendment and refused to say if he was a southern district organizer for the Communist Party. Robert Morris, counsel for the subcommittee, said information had been received that O'Dell was, in fact, a district organizer for the Communist Party in New Orleans, and that O'Dell gave "directives to the professional group" in that city and that he operated under three different names—the other two being John Vesey and Ben Jones.

RIGHT DOWN THE COMMIE LINE

April 4, 1967, Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., rose to the speaker's platform in New York City's Riverside Church and delivered what must surely be the greatest condemnation of American policy and involvement in Vietnam ever to come from a well-known citizen. His attack was ruthless, packed with misleading innuendoes and distortions. A Presidential aid was later quoted: "a speech on Vietnam that goes right down the Commie line."

More and more, King has been branching out from civil rights into the field of foreign affairs. More and more he parrots the far left, pro-Communist line.

If there were any doubt, the April 4 speech washed it away. In this speech, King lashed out at the United States, called our Nation "the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today," charged the Nation with "cruel manipulation of the poor" and, as if written by the Daily Worker, said that U.S. troops "may have killed a million South Vietnamese civilians—mostly children." Keep in mind that these are only selections from the speech.

This speech and his involvement with the Vietnam Week protests brought down on King's head an abundance of denunciations, from civil rights leaders, legislators, military men, journalists and many Negroes who believe King has gone way, way too far.

King's Riverside speech is a hideous perversion of fact, a perversion nearly without limits. He said that Americans "poison the water" of the South Vietnamese. He stated that "we kill a million acres of their crops" and that American bulldozers "destroy their precious trees" and that "they wander into the hospitals with at least 20 casualties from American firepower for each Vietcong-inflicted injury." These are King's words. To this array of absurdities he added:

"We test out our latest weapons on them, just as the Germans tested out new medicine and new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe."

These are a few of the Communist-line invectives which King delivered on April 4. Since they were spoken, various "transcripts"

of the speech have appeared, "cleansed" versions brought forward in an apparent attempt to soothe the irate response of the great majority of Americans.

For all his vocal attempts to keep his anti-Vietnam stand and civil rights separate, and on a "personal" basis, these attempts have not worked. There is a joining of the two and King has helped direct it.

At the 1966 annual meeting of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the group condemned the war, called it mass murder and authorized King to "throw the resources" of the organization behind efforts to end the war. It was at this time that King said he would write to the leaders of the governments involved. Doubtless, he dropped the idea when someone told him that the Logan Act, which he would have violated, forbids an individual from dealing in this way with a foreign government.

King maintains that he has never advocated a "mechanical merger" of the civil rights and peace organizations—which at other times he says are inextricably bound together—but, mechanical or not, he did release the Reverend James Bevel from the SCLC to head the Spring Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam. Incidentally, Bevel's wife, Diane, not long ago got back from a Hanoi pilgrimage, so that helps understand the Bevels.

CONCLUSIONS

In November 1964, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover called Reverend King "the most notorious liar in the country." Mr. Hoover spoke with no small amount of authority or knowledge. King has avoided a direct encounter with the famed public servant because the record is clearly unfavorable to the civil rights leader. Mr. Hoover is privy to many confidential reports on Mr. King's activities just as I am, and while their nature cannot be disclosed, I can say without equivocation that Martin Luther King does not want nor can he stand a public airing of his record. I can rest my case against King with the public utterances and actions of this man and any revelation of confidential matters is entirely unnecessary.

Why has he been immune for so many years and, in the parlance of the day, "allowed to get by with murder?" There is a peculiar double standard which the liberal community consistently applies. If any prominent person, particularly a conservative, were to identify with or share a speakers' platform with a member of the John Birch Society or some group the liberals might currently be attacking, he would be maligned forever. Let Martin Luther King openly identify with Communists and radicals, have a Communist as an adviser, engage in criminal activity, appear at the most way-out meetings in the Nation and advocate racism, revolution or civil disobedience and these same people look the other way.

In the long run, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we don't have to worry that much about the Martin Luther Kings. Our society is open enough, free enough, and resilient enough that it can withstand demagoguery. What is frightening, however, is to see the usual guardians of the public interest, ranging from the press to the Justice Department, look the other way and virtually assure such people a green light in their operations.

The press has repeatedly referred to Reverend King as a moderate. He is not. While he is not telling Negroes to arm themselves with guns or to "burn, baby, burn" like the Rap Browns and Stokely Carmichaels, he is, in a sophisticated way, agitating for the same thing. He is going to have a massive dislocation of northern cities but no violence. He says that upsetting a city without destroying it can be more effective than a riot, whatever that means. This is the enigma of Martin Luther King. He preaches non-violence but somehow this can end up in illegal or violent actions. Then he says he is

not responsible, although he himself has often participated in illegal acts.

He has thrust himself into community after community where even the Negro leaders have asked him to stay away. Only this year, King again foisted himself into the Chicago turmoil and announced his own brand of solutions to their ills. Rev. Henry Mitchell, a leader in the area King chose as a "target" asked him to leave and charged that King "created hate." King has thrust himself onto the Cleveland, Ohio, scene and promoted a boycott of a local dairy. In that particular case, he cited as some demands on that firm actions which could be a violation of the civil rights law. He also said the firm must advertise in Negro newspapers and put money in Negro savings and loan associations to avoid a Negro boycott. All in all, this is the blackmail tactic of a would-be dictator and power-hungry demagog, not a responsible leader.

By word and deed, he has been a potent force for lawlessness in our country. He has been a scoundrel. He has arrogated to himself the right to pick and choose the laws he will obey. He has set a poor example for others to emulate. He has countenanced draft evasion. He has been disloyal to his own country.

In an age when our country needs statesmen and builders, he has been a demagog and wrecker. Many of his ideas are alien to our way of life. In America, he can constitutionally say virtually anything he wants and command any following that he can muster for legitimate pursuits. It is important, however, that he be understood in his true perspective so honest and well-meaning Americans will not be duped because they did not fully understand the man, his mission, and his tactics.

(NOTE.—This contains about one-half of the original speech which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 21, pp. 27814-27827.)

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 16, 1968]

THE UNTOLD STORY OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John S. Perilloux, of Ewa Beach, Hawaii, offers a documented story of Martin Luther King, Jr., with which he feels the American people should reacquaint themselves before the past is forgotten—and history written from half-truths.

I include Mr. Perilloux' "Untold Story" in the RECORD:

"THE UNTOLD STORY OF MARTIN LUTHER KING (By John S. Perilloux)

"Few men have had so many words spoken and written about them as has had the late Martin Luther King, Jr. The Reverend King was the center of a storm of controversy and violence from the time he achieved prominence in 1955, when he led a successful boycott against the bus system of Montgomery, Alabama, until the day of his death in Memphis, Tennessee, on April 4, 1968. Indeed, the controversy continues even after his death.

"Because of his success in the bus boycott King gained the respect and admiration of many Americans. Overlooked by some, and unknown to most, were the character and backgrounds of the men and women chosen by King to assist him in his assault upon such formidable obstacles as segregation and racial prejudice. Had he enlisted the support of worthier people as his immediate aides, King could have been a potent force in strengthening America and uplifting his people. However, such was not the case, and from the pinnacle of success in 1955 he descended to an all-time low in April of 1967 when he called the United States 'the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today'.

"Who was this man who has been commended as a man of peace and damned as an apostle of violence? To those liberal and

bleeding hearts who have not intelligently discerned what King had been saying and doing during his twelve years of prominence this may come as a shock and a tragedy. To those of us who have followed his activities closely and have been aware of his questionable activity it comes as no surprise at all. In 1967 the real Martin Luther King stood up, and yet, where is the criticism he deserved and should have gotten?

"On January 15, 1929, Michael Luther King, Jr., was born in a 13-room house in Atlanta, Georgia. When he was six his father changed both their names to Martin. He entered Morehouse College in Atlanta at the age of 15 and from Morehouse went to Crozer Theological Seminary in Chester, Pennsylvania.

"In 1955 King became pastor of the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Alabama. On December 1st of that year a Montgomery bus driver ordered Negroes to stand so Whites could sit. One woman, Mrs. Rosa Parks, refused and was arrested. Within hours Negroes began a boycott against the bus system which was to last for more than a year. King's gift of articulateness, his willingness to defy city officials, and his apparent lack of personal motives made him the natural leader of the boycott. When the boycott ended Martin Luther King had become world-famous.

"The January 1963 issue of Fellowship reveals Rustin to be a 'friend' of Kwame Nkrumah, former Communist dictator of Ghana. The same issue of Fellowship credits Rustin with having worked to establish a 'center for nonviolence' at Dar es Salaam, Tanganyika, which has proven to be a training center for communist guerrillas. Terrorists, trained at this center, have conducted raids on Rhodesia and South West Africa.

"In September 1963, at Richmond, Virginia, Rustin said that 'more bloody Negro suffering should be encouraged so that squeamish Northern Negroes would be horrified into line'. (12) It is possible that some would be horrified. However, it is certain that this is part of the strategy of the communists for propagating racial warfare in the United States.

"On August 28, 1963, Rustin led a 'march on Washington'.

"On August 29, 1963, he urged that the only hope for Negroes was to 'go left'. (13)

"On February 3, 1964, Rustin was a leader of the New York City school boycott.

"On February 4 he was photographed leaving a cocktail party at the Soviet mission to the United Nations. (14)

"This, then, was the leadership of the Montgomery Improvement Association; Martin Luther King and two ex-convicts who were also communist-fronters.

"And what of Mrs. Rosa Parks, the woman who precipitated the bus boycott?

"Shortly before the incident on the bus, Mrs. Parks had attended the Highlander Folk School in Monteagle, Tennessee. (15) To fully understand the nature and purpose of this school we must go back to the early 1930's, a time when the Communist Party had great dreams and expectations for using the Negro in the Party's plans for overthrowing the government of the United States.

"It was in the 1930's that the party organized the People's Institute of Allied Religion. As part of its program this organization set up the Commonwealth College at Mena, Arkansas. It was organized around 1932 by identified communist James A. Dombrowski and fellow-traveler Myles Horton. It was cited by the U.S. Attorney General as a communist front (16) and fined \$2500 for violating the seditious statute of the state of Arkansas. (17) The faculty then moved to Monteagle, Tennessee, and organized the Highlander Folk School. In addition to Dombrowski and Horton those assisting in the school's operation included Don West, district director of the Communist Party in

North Carolina (18), and identified communist Aubrey Williams. (19)

"In 1945 the U.S. Senate rejected the appointment of Aubrey Williams as administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration because of his communist affiliations. (20).

"Aubrey Williams was President of the Southern Conference Education Fund until 1963, at which time he became national chairman of the Committee to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. (21) This organization has been cited as a communist front.

"Can there be any doubt as to what was taught at the Commonwealth College where the hammar and sickle were prominently displayed? Or at the Highlander Folk School where Rosa Parks was trained

"But who had assisted King in toppling segregation on Montgomery buses? Surely, no one man, no matter how articulate or how brave, could succeed in such an undertaking alone. And who is Mrs. Rosa Parks?

"Dr. King led the boycott as the head of the Montgomery Improvement Association which had been formed by the Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth, former convict who has also been President of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc. (1) The SCEF had been formed from the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. Identified communist James A. Dombrowski was administrator of the SCHW, Paul Crouch, one of its founders, and an admitted communist from 1925 to 1942, testified that the SCHW 'was intended to lead to class hatred and race hatred, dividing class against class and race against race'. (2) The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee exposed the SCHW, stating that it was 'conceived, financed, and set up by the Communist Party in 1938 to promote communism in the Southern states'. After the SCHW was exposed the Party replaced this organization with the Southern Conference Education Fund. (3)

"This new communist front continued to use the same address as the SCHW, the same publication, the same telephone number, and almost identical officers. Dombrowski continued to serve as administrator, identified communist Aubrey Williams remained on the board, and identified communists Carl and Anne Braden were made field secretaries. After conducting an investigation the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee described the SCEF as a communist transmission belt for the South. (4)

"It is extremely interesting that the President of the SCEF was at one time the Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth, founder of the Montgomery Improvement Association and Vice President of Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

"Also in the Montgomery Improvement Association with King and Shuttlesworth was Bayard Rustin. FBI reports state that Rustin joined the Young Communist League in 1936 while at the College of the City of New York and was active in this organization on the campus and elsewhere. During World War Two he was arrested several times for advocating resistance to the war and served 26 months in Federal prisons for draft dodging. (6)

"Rustin has worked closely with the War Resisters League, the World Peace Brigade, Liberation, the Medical Aid to Cuba Committee, the Committee for Non-Violent Action, the Greenwich Village Peace Center, and similar organizations, often as an officeholder. (7) He has also been active in the American Forum for Socialist Education, a communist-dominated organization. (8)

"In 1953, in Pasadena, California, Rustin was arrested on a charge of sex perversion and went to jail after pleading guilty. (9)

"There are those who might argue that Rustin had mended his ways by 1955 when Martin Luther King hired him as his secretary and adviser. Let's follow Rustin's activities since 1955.

"In 1957 the Communist Party invited him to its 16th national convention as an 'observer'. (10) He has been socially entertained at the Soviet embassy and in 1958 went to Russia under the sponsorship of the Nonviolent Action Committee Against Nuclear Weapons. (11)

"In March 1967 the Southern Christian Leadership Conference was organized in Atlanta. Martin Luther King was installed as President, Fred Shuttlesworth as Vice President, and the Reverend Andrew Young as program director.

"The Atlanta Constitution of July 24, 1963, had this to say about Andrew Young:

"The Reverend Young has been headquartered rent-free in Savannah in the offices of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. The Subversive Activities Control Board, an agency of the Federal government, has found the union to be communist infiltrated. Another coincidence.

"In 1957 King was photographed at the Highlander Folk School during the Labor Day weekend. Also in attendance and photographed were Rosa Parks, Aubrey Williams, Myles Horton, and Abner W. Berry of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. (22)

"Now it would seem that the Reverend King would have gotten some inkling of the backgrounds of his associates at this school and the nature and purpose of the school itself. Nevertheless, on a form letter from school director Horton, dated May 15, 1963, the Reverend Dr. King is listed as a sponsor of Highlander. (21)

"In December 1959 King called upon Southern Negroes to practice 'civil disobedience' and to break openly any state or local law 'not in harmony with Federal law'. (32)

"In 1960 Hunter Pitts O'Dell replaced Bayard Rustin as secretary and adviser to King. Let's delve a little into O'Dell's background.

"In 1956 he refused to testify before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, taking the 5th amendment when questioned about his communist activities. He repeated this performance in 1958. (23) In 1962 the House Committee on Un-American Activities published a report entitled 'Structure and Organization of the Communist Party in the United States'. On page 576 there is a list of those elected to the National Committee of the Communist Party, USA, as known to the House Committee in November of 1961. Among the names is that of Hunter Pitts O'Dell.

"The facts are that O'Dell was district organizer for the Communist Party in New Orleans, Louisiana, in 1956 (23), was a member of the Communist Party when Martin Luther King hired him, and was elected to the National Committee of the Communist Party while on King's payroll.

"On October 26, 1962, the St. Louis Globe Democrat printed an article stating that King had a communist on his payroll, so King claims to have fired O'Dell at this time. However, O'Dell then went to work as administrator in the New York office of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The SCLC, you will recall, is an organization of which Martin Luther King was President. Pressure from the press again caused King to 'fire' O'Dell, this time on June 26, 1963. In July 1963 a reporter for United Press International phoned the New York office of the SCLC and was told that O'Dell was still administrator of that office. (24)

"In 1960 there was the restaurant 'sit in' in Atlanta, led by King. (25)

"In 1961 demonstrations in Albany, Georgia, led to his arrest. He declared dramatically when arrested that he would remain in jail until the city desegregated public facilities. Two days later he was out on bail. (25)

"In St. Augustine, Florida, after getting Negroes fired up for demonstrations King went to jail amid great fanfare. But two

days later he was bailed out again so he could receive an honorary law degree at Yale University. (25) In the meantime, the aged mother of Massachusetts' Governor Peabody remained in the St. Augustine jail after having been arrested in the demonstrations. White segregationists 'Hoss' Menucl and Connie Lynch were in St. Augustine whipping up mobs into a murderous fury. King was safely at Yale.

"King's American Committee for Africa sponsored and financed the American tour of communist terrorist Holden Roberto, leader of the 'war of national liberation' which began in Angola on the morning of March 15, 1961. A thousand whites were murdered and dismembered and also about 8,000 Africans. (34)

"In October 1962 King met with communist Ahmed Ben Bella of Algeria in a hotel in Harlem. (26) From the United States Ben Bella traveled to Cuba for conferences with Fidel Castro.

"In 1963 there were the demonstrations in Birmingham, Alabama. A bomb in a church, which resulted in the deaths of four Negro girls, was described as the work of white segregationists and the Ku Klux Klan. Possible. Equally possible is that it could have been the handiwork of agents provocateurs. Remember Carl Braden? He was indicted, tried, and convicted of conspiring with Negroes to bomb the house of a Negro and then place the blame on white segregationists. (40)

"On October 5, 1963, state and local police raided the office of the Southern Conference Educational Fund at 822 Perdido Street in New Orleans. Quantities of communist literature were seized. Also seized were a check from James A. Dombrowski made out to and endorsed by Martin Luther King. There were letters from King to Dombrowski and the Bradens and a photograph of King, Dombrowski, and the Bradens. The photograph had been taken at the 5th annual meeting of King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference. (27)

"King was directly responsible for a Supreme Court ruling in 1964 in the case of 'New York Times vs. Sullivan.' The case dealt with a full-page ad placed in the Times by King and other civil rights leaders. Many statements in the ad, charging that Negroes in Montgomery were being abused, were proven false. Sullivan, a Montgomery city official was subsequently awarded a \$500,000 libel judgment. The Supreme Court reversed the judgment, ruling that criticism of official conduct cannot be termed libelous without showing actual malice, which is knowledge that the statement was false or reckless disregard for whether or not it was false. (28)

"In 1964 there was the march from Selma to Montgomery. Who were the participants? An entry by U.S. Representative William L. Dickinson in the Congressional Record for March 30, 1965, will help to enlighten us.

"Mister Dickinson says there were four distinct groups participating in the march. 'One group was the Alabama Negro who participated to secure rights and privileges which he felt had been withdrawn from him illegally.' A second group were the do-gooders from out-of-state motivated by compassion for their fellow human beings. He describes the third group as 'human fliotsam: adventurers, beatniks, prostitutes, and similar rabble.'

"And what of the fourth group, the ones who welded the others together and gave them cohesiveness? Who were they? In the words of Congressman Dickinson, 'the Communist Party.'

"Look at the speakers on the platform in front of the State Capitol in Montgomery or participating prominently in the march or demonstrations:

"Carl Braden, a well-known communist who was convicted of conspiring to bomb a Negro's house.

"Abner Berry, one of the directors of the Communist Party. He was in and out of the Selma-Montgomery area.

"James Peck, who has a federal criminal record and who once tried to prevent the launching of our first nuclear submarine.

"Bayard Rustin, who by his own admission in the Saturday Evening Post was a communist party organizer for 12 years.

"Martin Luther King, who has amassed the staggering total of over 60 communist front affiliations since 1955 (41).

"On page 6114 of the Congressional Record for March 30, 1965, there is an affidavit, sworn to under oath, by Karl Prussion, a former counterspy for the FBI. Part of the wording of that affidavit is as follows:

"I hereby also state that Martin Luther King has either been a member of, or wittingly has accepted support from, over 60 communists fronts, individuals, and/or organizations which give aid to or espouse communist causes."

"In the New York World-Telegram for July 23, 1964, there is an article on page 2 in which King says he is sick and tired of people saying the civil rights movement has been infiltrated by communists and communist sympathizers. He said there were as many communists in the movement as there are Eskimos in Florida.

"In November 1964 J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, said King was the most notorious liar in the United States. (29)

"In 1965 King began to make critical speeches about U.S. foreign policy. The communist press gave extensive coverage to his speeches, often featuring them on the Communist Party's official newspaper, the Worker. In September of 1965 he called upon Arthur Goldberg at the United Nations and urged the United States to press for a UN seat for Communist China. He also asked for a halt in U.S. air strikes against North Vietnam and recommended negotiations with the Vietcong. (25) Has anyone ever heard of the Reverend King calling on North Vietnam to halt its subversion, murder, and terrorism in the South?

"In 1965 an organization known as the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty was founded. Respected author and writer George Schuyler had this to say about that organization:

"Its officers include the Soviet-trained Reuther, Martin Luther King, black power promoter James Farmer, radical socialist Michael Harrington, ADL sneak Dore Scharf, the Vietnik Doctor Benjamin Spock, and a team of other such revolutionaries crimson enough to dye the Pacific Ocean a brilliant red. (30)

"Gus Hall, General Secretary of the Communist Party, USA, commented, "We are at a new stage in the struggle, because this is the crossroads where the civil rights struggle meets the class struggle". (31)

"In an interview on "Meet the Press" on March 28, 1965, King said, "I do think that there are two types of laws. One is a just law, and one is an unjust law. I think we all have moral obligations to disobey unjust laws". (32) And who is to decide which laws are just and which are unjust? King was advocating chaos and anarchy.

"The connections between the civil rights movement and the Communist Party became stronger in April of 1966 when all three South-wide civil rights organizations lined up in opposition to U.S. policy in Vietnam. These organizations were the Southern Conference Educational Fund, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference. They termed their merger a 'meshing of the civil rights and peace struggles.' (43)

"The riots which began in Chicago on July 12, 1966, broke out just two days after King held a mass civil rights rally in Soldiers Field. The Chicago Tribune reported that prior to the riots King had shown films de-

tailing the violence of Watts. Asked by the Tribune about this King replied that the films showing the Watts riots were to demonstrate the negative effect of riots. (Negative effects such as rioters carrying off color TV sets?) During the Chicago rioting King reportedly sped from one trouble spot to another, but reporters noted that he seldom got out of his car. (32)

"The Allen-Scott Report of July 1966 states that King and company were contacting and enlisting Chicago street gangs and 'bringing them into the civil rights movement to fight the "power structure" '.

"In a speech in Los Angeles on February 25, 1967, King called for a 'merger' of the peace and civil rights movements. He called the Vietnam war the result of 'paranoid anti-communism.' (44)

"In a speech at the Coliseum in Chicago King again called for the merging of the peace and civil rights movements, saying, 'We must combine the fervor of the civil rights movement with the peace movement. We must demonstrate, teach and preach, and organize until the very foundations of our nation are shaken.' (45)

"In a statement delivered April 4, 1967, King called upon Negroes and Whites to register their opposition to the Vietnam war by becoming conscientious objectors to military service. (28)

"On April 4, 1967, the Reverend Martin Luther King rose to the speaker's platform in New York City's Riverside Church and delivered what was later described by the Presidential aide as 'a speech on Vietnam that goes right down the commie line'. In his speech King called the United States 'the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today'. He charged the nation with 'cruel manipulation of the poor' and said that U.S. troops 'may have killed a million South Vietnamese civilians—mostly children'. He added 'We test our latest weapons on them. Just as the Germans tested out new medicines and new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe. (32)

"On April 13, 1967 Michael Laski, Chairman of the Communist Party, USA, (Marxist-Leninist), told a press conference in New York: King knows what's going on. He is allowing himself to be utilized by the Communist Party. . . . King willingly enters into an alliance with the Communist Party. . . . Mr. King receives financial support from organizations and individuals that are tied to the Communist Party. He knows what is happening, and so does James Bevel. (33)

"James Bevel just happens to be one of the top men in King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Bevel helped to organize the Spring Mobilization Committee and in July 1967 met with North Vietnamese and Vietcong officials in Stockholm, Sweden. Bevel's wife, Diane, visited Hanoi in December 1966 and conferred with women in Ho Chi Minh's government. (35)

"One of the strongest statements from a fellow-clergyman came in April 1967 from the Reverend Henry Mitchell. As reported by the Chicago Tribune: The leader of a group of West Side Negro ministers declared yesterday that the Reverend Martin Luther King should "get the hell out of here". His civil rights marching last summer "brought hate".

"The Chicago chapter of the NAACP, long critical of the civil rights tactics of King formally split with King's group. (46)

"From August 29, 1967 to September 4, the National Conference for New Politics held its convention in Chicago. Every subversive organization in the United States was represented. A par-list of organizations which participated include:

"Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam.

"Draft Resistance Union.
Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

"Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

"W.E.B. DuBois Clubs.

"Revolutionary Action Movement.

"Socialist Workers Party.

"Progressive Labor Party.

"Communist Party, USA.

"The keynote speaker for the convention was Martin Luther King. Part of his speech follows:

"These are revolutionary times. All over the globe men are revolting against old systems of exploitation and oppression. Out of the wombs of a frail world new systems of justice and equality are being born. We in the West must support these revolutions. . . . A morbid fear of communism has made Americans the arch anti-revolutionaries. This has driven many to feel that only Marxism has the revolutionary spirit. Communism is a judgment of our failure.

"We have deluded ourselves into believing the myth that capitalism grew and prospered out of the Protestant ethic of hard work and sacrifices. The fact is that capitalism was built on the exploitation of black slaves and continues to thrive on the exploitation of the poor—both black and white.

"The way to end poverty is to end the exploitation of the poor and ensure them a fair share of the government's services and the nation's natural resources. We must recognize that the problems of neither racial nor economic injustice can be solved without a radical redistribution of political and economic power. (36)

"Lenin couldn't improve on that speech.

"On September 21, 1967, King was made an honorary lifetime member of ILWU local 10 in San Francisco. (37) The ILWU, you will remember, is the labor union which was expelled from the CIO when it was found that the ILWU was communist-dominated. The leader of the ILWU, Harry Bridges, is a communist and was ordered deported from the United States. The deportation order was overruled by Roosevelt's Supreme Court at the urging of Eleanor Roosevelt. (38)

"In November 1967 King was guest speaker at the National Labor Leadership Assembly for Peace in Chicago. In his speech King denounced the Johnson administration. (39) If communist press reports were accurate the 'left wing' of labor dominated the convention. The Worker of November 19, 1967, says, "This was the most significant anti-war gathering of labor leaders ever held in this country. The conference radiated awareness that here was the force capable of mobilizing the decisive factor of the people, the working class, against the Vietnam war." Communist Harry Bridges got a standing ovation when he addressed the closing session.

"On March 5, 1968, the Honolulu Star Bulletin carried an article in which King stated that flame throwers in Vietnam are fanning the flames in the cities of the United States.

"In 1967 King began planning for massive demonstrations in Washington, D.C. The demonstrations were scheduled to take place beginning on April 22, 1968. In addition to recruiting thousands of the poor, he planned to organize and train black militants involved in last summer's riots for major roles in his campaign of massive civil disobedience.

"King revealed this in private conferences with Stokely Carmichael, the pro/Vietcong, pro/Castro revolutionary, and other black militants.

"At one point in their meeting Carmichael said that the time had come to begin disrupting American cities 'to help our Vietcong comrades-in-arms'. King, while stressing that he was vigorously opposed to the Vietnam war, argued that if such an objective were announced for his campaign it would backfire. King's plans included:

"(a) Selection of five cities in which to train 100 neighborhood leaders. The suggested cities were Chicago, Cleveland, St. Louis, Houston, and Atlanta.

"(b) Contacts would be made with the residents of the poor community. Young men who were actively involved in last summer's riots were to be sought out and trained as leaders.

"King also told Carmichael, 'To dislocate the functioning of a city without destroying it can be longer lasting, more costly to the society. It is more difficult for the government to quell it by force. The disruption of the cities you want will come much easier'.

"King also reported that ousted Congressman Adam Clayton Powell would play a major role in the Washington demonstrations. Powell himself has said, 'My return to Washington in April will help rock the entire country'. (42)

"Take a close look at this again, ladies and gentlemen. Stokely Carmichael recently returned to the United States after conferring with Fidel Castro, North Vietnamese officials, and communist revolutionaries in many countries in Africa, Asia, and Europe.

"James Bevel, who is on the staff of the SCLC which is drawing up the battle plans for the disruptions, conferred with North Vietnamese and Vietcong officials in Stockholm last July.

"Adam Clayton Powell was in California recently where he attempted to organize students, white as well as black.

"This is the groundwork for a revolution, and the only people who can possibly benefit from such a coalition are the enemies of the United States.

"In late March of 1968 King's attention was drawn to Memphis, Tennessee, where a garbage collectors strike was in progress. He went to Memphis and organized a demonstration which culminated in a riot. During the burning and looting which followed, a 16-year-old was killed. A judge issued an injunction prohibiting any more demonstrations because of the explosiveness of the situation in Memphis, but King promptly announced he had no intention of obeying. He had again decided to disobey an 'unjust law.'

"On April 4, 1968, Martin Luther King was killed by a sniper's bullet fired by someone who has not as yet been apprehended, despite a massive investigation instigated by Ramsey Clark. The odd circumstances surrounding the murder are again suggestive of an agent provocateur.

"On April 11, 1968, U.S. Representative John R. Rarick of Louisiana inserted in the Congressional Record a news item concerning King. In volume 114, part 8, page 9816, there is the following:

"[From the Yakima (Wash.) Eagle, Nov. 30, 1967]

"The first disclosure that an FBI report existed which tied Martin Luther King to communism was published in Washington Observer Newsletter No. 13 in the February 15, 1966 issue.

"At that time Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach refused to turn over this file to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In fact Katzenbach, in the presence of Lyndon Johnson, lied and denied to Congressman John Bell Williams that the file even existed.

"WO is now happy to report that the FBI report is not only in the hands of HCUA, but copies are also in the hands of Congressman John J. Rooney of New York.

"The lawmakers were so shocked at what they read in the FBI report that they plan to summon King before their committees and delve deeply into his involvement with communist conspirators. When the FBI agents had King under surveillance they observed him meet a well-identified Soviet espionage agent at Kennedy Airport in New York. They also secured evidence that King was receiving large sums of money from a well-known American communist agent who gives King instructions which he implicitly obeys. The Federal agents also adduced evidence of his unsavory personal conduct in

Washington hotels and elsewhere and the fact that he had violated the Mann Act (white slavery). This is a violation of the U.S. criminal code, but neither Attorney General Katzenbach nor his successor, Ramsey Clark, would allow the FBI to present the evidence to a Federal grand jury.

"The record of Martin Luther King strongly indicates he had been grossly irresponsible in learning the backgrounds of his associates and associations or that he chose to use them for his own ends. The only other conclusion that a reasonable person can come to is that Martin Luther King covertly and consciously attempted to promote the cause of the Communist Party.

"DOCUMENTATION

"(1) Louisiana Legislative Report on the Southern Conference Educational Fund, part 1, pp 13-14.

"(2) Communism and Race in America, p. 36.

"(3) Senate Internal Security Subcommittee Report, Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., p. 1.

"(4) The Communist Attack on U.S. Police, p. 26.

"(5) Louisiana Legislative Report on the Southern Conference Educational Fund, part 1, p. 13.

"(6) Allen-Scott Report, August 16, 1963.

"(7) National Review, August 20, 1963.

"(8) Annual Report—1957, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, pp 36-40.

"(9) This information is recorded in the files of the Pasadena Police Department under Rustin's official arrest number 33194.

"(10) Daily Worker, February 25, 1957, p. 1.

"(11) Boston Globe, February 5, 1964.

"(12) Ibid.

"(13) Richmond News-Leader, September 27, 1963, editorial.

"(14) Boston Globe, February 5, 1964.

"(15) Testimony of J. B. Matthews given before the Florida Legislation Committee, volume 1, p. 24.

"(16) New York Times, April 28, 1949, p. 6.

"(17) Report of the Louisiana Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities, entitled "Activities of the Southern Conference Educational Fund", part 1, p. 25.

"(18) Testimony of Paul Crouch, leading Communist Party official in the South at the time. See House Committee on Un-American Activities, May 16, 1949, pp. 191-193.

"(19) 'Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc.' Report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, p. 45.

"(20) J. B. Matthews, testimony before the Florida Legislation Investigation Committee, volume 1, p. 21.

"(21) It's Very Simple, by Alan Stang.

"(22) Photographs may be obtained from The Councilor, 1827 Texas Avenue, Shreveport, Louisiana, price \$1.

"(23) St. Louis Globe-Democrat, October 26, 1962.

"(24) UPI story in the Jackson, Mississippi, Clarion-Ledger, July 26, 1963.

"(25) Reader's Digest, September 1967.

"(26) New York Times, October 14, 1962.

"(27) Activities of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., in Louisiana, part 2, p. 81.

"(28) Reader's Digest Almanac, 1968.

"(29) North American Newspaper Alliance, November 19, 1964.

"(30) George S. Schuyler in American Opinion, January 1968.

"(31) The Worker, February 13, 1966.

"(32) U.S. Representative John Ashbrook in Congressional Record.

"(33) Gary Allen in American Opinion, July-August 1967.

"(34) New York Times, March 20, 1961, p. 3.

"(35) Esquire, November 1967.

"(36) Gary Allen in American Opinion, November 1967.

"(37) Imua Fact Finder, 568 Alexander Young Bldg., Honolulu, Hawaii.

"(38) Gary Allen in American Opinion, March 1967.

"(39) Imua Fact Finder #3, December 1967.

"(40) New York Times, December 14, 1954, p. 26, and October 2, 1964, p. 6.

"(41) CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 5, page 6333.

"(42) Human Events, March 2, 1968.

"(43) The Worker, April 26, 1966.

"(44) The Worker, March 12, 1967.

"(45) The Worker, April 2, 1967."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 26, 1969]

CALIFORNIANS HONOR COMMUNIST ERRAND BOY

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the California taxpayers are now forced to perpetuate the memory of an international communism errand boy.

Their new University of California law building was dedicated as the M. L. King, Jr., Law Building, appropriately by outgoing Chief Justice Earl Warren.

Perhaps it is a fitting tribute to a man whose only claim to fame was disobedience of the law—save those which served his own ends and conveniences. Or was this action by the regents felt necessary to prevent the building from being burned? Makes about as much sense as UNESCO's eulogizing the bloody dictator, Lenin, as a humanist.

Perhaps this is the beginning of a trend in the naming of law schools and buildings after other famous in connection with the law—such as the James brothers, John Dillinger, or Bonnie and Clyde.

Many wonder why the present administration does not authorize the Department of Justice to tell the American people the truth about King and his lifetime of subversion and immorality and exploitation.

Or does it, too, fear it has more to gain by suppression of the truth than by telling the American people the facts.

A clipping from Parade for May 25 follows:

"Q. I understand that California's Governor Ronald Reagan would not permit a new law building at a University of California campus to be named in honor of the late Martin Luther King, Jr. Is this so?—Henry Ackerman, Berkeley, Calif.

"A. The governor voted against naming the building after King. The reason, he explained, was because King has not been a lawyer. The majority of the regents, however, outvoted the governor, and the new law building at the Davis Campus of the University of California is now known as the Martin Luther King Jr. Law Building. The building was dedicated by U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 28, 1968]

THE KING AND HIS COMMUNISTS

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, more and more documentation on the Southern Christian Leadership Conference—SCLC—continues to be brought to light.

The leaders of this mockery of names and titles must be exposed for what they are so that our people knowingly will never be duped into emotional submission.

This must be one of our foremost duties to our constituents—to get them the facts so they can decide for themselves the truth and knowing they will remain free.

Under unanimous consent I submit a report from the American Opinion magazine in 1965 titled, "The King and His Communists" by Alan Stang, and an article from Time for May 1968 for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

"THE KING AND HIS COMMUNISTS

"(By Alan Stang, a former business editor for Prentice-Hall, Inc., and a television writer,

producer, and consultant (Mike Wallace Interviews and Biography)

(NOTE.—Mr. Stang is a frequent contributor to American Opinion and is author of the Western Islands bestseller, *It's Very Simple: The True Story of Civil Rights*, a book which we heartily recommend to our readers.)

"It was Sunday morning in Alabama. It was clear. It was cool. It would be a perfect day. And the most wonderful thing about it was that a foreboding, pervasive sense of non-violence hung heavy in the air—a premonition of nonviolence in the afternoon.

"Selma was so full of nonviolence it was fit to bust.

"At one end of the bridge were the troopers, mounted and afoot, billies in hand. Nothing much needs to be said about them. Everybody knows, don't they, that all white Alabamians, especially the police, are filled with hatred and police brutality.

"At the other end of the bridge were the others, meek, innocent, pure, abused: the 'Civil Rights' fighters. Nothing much needs to be said about them. Everybody knows that they were stuffed with love. They were full of it, crammed with it, there was no way at all you could jam in any more of it.

"The troopers tensed. The marchers marched.

"Was this going to be it at last? Were we finally going to get some nonviolence going—most people were basically so peaceful—you had to spend such a long time lying before you got any of it at all, and then what you got might not even be decent.

"For weeks," *Newsweek* of March 22, 1965, explains, "Martin Luther King had been escalating his Selma voter-registration campaign toward the state he calls 'creative tension'—the setting for a paroxysm of segregationist violence that can shock the nation to action. . . ."

"The Negroes' rationale in holding night marches," explains the *New York Times* of February 24, 1964, "is to provoke the racist element in white communities to show its worst."

"Believe me, you don't know what work is until you've tried to provoke some non-violence.

"And then at last, O Happy Days, the troopers were charging across the bridge, kicking and clubbing and tear gassing—gosh, it was wonderful. It was great. Man you talk about nonviolence! *Newsweek* of March 22, 1965, tells it this way: ". . . At a half-walk, half-run, troopers shoved and clubbed the marchers into retreat. Behind them, the sheriff's cavalry mounted a Cossack charge into the scattering column. . . ."

"Cossacks! You get it? You remember the Cossacks. They were the crowd who used to ride down the luckless, Russian workers on orders of the Tsar. Later on, the 'workers' made a 'revolution.' You may have heard about it.

"But Alabama Cossacks didn't do it on orders of the Tsar. The only reason they were there at all it seems, was that the March had been forbidden, because of this very premonition of nonviolence, by an order from George Wallace, the Ivan the Terrible of American society, otherwise known as the Governor of the once sovereign state of Alabama—if you will pardon the expression.

"Now, what's the point to all this nonviolence? We know it's about 'Civil Rights,' of course; but why must the nonviolence get so bloody? What's the theory behind it? Well, the man behind it is of course the 'Reverend' Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and he tells us about it all in *Saturday Review* for April 3, 1965:

"1. Nonviolent demonstrators go into the streets to exercise their constitutional rights.

"2. Racists resist by unleashing violence against them.

"3. Americans of conscience in the name of decency demand federal intervention and legislation.

"4. The Administration, under mass pressure, initiates measures of immediate intervention and remedial legislation.

"Ladies and gentlemen, here it is from the man himself. Let's spell it out—in English: "1. 'Nonviolent demonstrators'—that's anyone who, say, has a pair of sandals and needs a bath—go into the streets to provoke the Hicks.

"2. 'Racists'—that's anyone, say, who doesn't have a pair of sandals and doesn't need a bath—finally lose their heads, or are simply forced to use violence—as in Selma.

"3. 'Americans of conscience'—that's a reader of the *New York Times*, a professor at Yale, or anybody calling himself a clergyman—put on the pressure for more federal intervention to promote collectivism that leads to Communism.

"4. The Administration—I don't know who that is—under mass pressure (you know what this is), sends in more troops and passes more laws.

"In short—and remember that this is from the massive brain of the man himself—the violence that usually occurs in a King Production isn't unexpected, isn't to be avoided, isn't something to be sorry about. It is exactly what he wanted. It is the point to the whole Production.

"It is in fact, says Dr. King, the only reason for a 'nonviolent' demonstration: To generate pressure on the Congress to install more collectivism.

"As we have seen, the Selma March, for instance, caused the lightning passage of the 'Voting Rights' Bill, under which the federal government, rather than the states, now conducts voting registration—the point being, of course, that in any dictatorship, whether Communist or Nazi, all the power must be centralized.

"So when Dr. King sees the troopers, he isn't sorry. Land O'Goshen, no! He's glad; the 'paroxysm' is on its way! He loves to see his own supporters get their skulls cracked.

"You see, when the nonviolence broke out in Selma, for instance, the skull of King—as chance would have it—was safe in Atlanta.

"What does it all mean? What's behind it? What manner of man is Martin Luther King?

"Well, there are all sorts of opinions. The 'Reverend' Ralph Abernathy, for instance, explained on the Selma March, according to the *New Yorker* of April 10, 1965, that King was 'conceived by God.' Legend has it, we read in *Newsweek* of April 2, 1965, that after his conviction for leading the Montgomery Bus Boycott, Negroes gathered outside shouting: 'Behold the king! Long live the king!'

"Talk about cult of personality!

"Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to make a lot of wild charges; I'm really going to throw them around. But you never know. There may be a 'Liberal' among us. Maybe even somebody from the Anti-Defamation League. So let's avoid speculation, opinion, and evaluation for the moment, and begin with a simple narration of the known facts.

"Before 1955, nothing much happened to this King of Kings. *Time* of January 3, 1964, tells us that he did try to commit suicide twice. But, then, life is lonely for prophets and such an act may not always denote emotional instability. Lots of people try to kill themselves just to get some attention.

"But then, on December 1, 1955, a non-violent lady named Mrs. Rosa Parks, who is a Negro, refused to move to the back of the bus in Montgomery, Alabama. 'I don't really know why I wouldn't move,' says Mrs. Parks, according to *Time* of February 18, 1957. "There was no plot or plan at all. I was just tired from shopping. My feet hurt."

"Is it possible? Yes, it is 'possible.' But what is definite is that Mrs. Parks had no doubt been prepared for the adventure by a recent educational experience that included a course at an institution by the name of the Highlander Folk School, then located in the town of Monteagle, in the State of Tennessee. The Highlander Folk School was or-

ganized with the assistance of a gentleman by the name of Don West. Don West, of course, was at the time District Director of the Communist Party of North Carolina. The Highlander Folk School was of course a Communist Training School, teaching the overthrow of the U.S. Government—and authoritatively cited as such by several agencies of your government.

"It was of course the Montgomery Bus Boycott, launched by Mrs. Parks of the Communist Highlander Folk School, that put Dr. King on the long road to nobelification. He would not again attempt suicide; he had all the attention he needed. You may recall that Dr. King did his work at the head of an organization by the name of the Montgomery Improvement Association (M.I.A.). The Montgomery Improvement Association had been formed by the 'Reverend' Fred Shuttlesworth. Now, the 'Reverend' Fred Shuttlesworth is probably a very wonderful gentleman I am sure, but he is also a former convict, says the Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities of the State of Louisiana, and 'has been affiliated with several communist-front organizations.'

"The *New York Times* of August 22, 1965, tells us that his Cincinnati congregation—composed of Negroes—may soon ask the 'Reverend' Shuttlesworth to resign. A suit has been filed, which charges 'that Mr. Shuttlesworth had usurped the power of the church trustees and officers and assumed absolute authority over the church's property. It also alleged that he had deposited funds of the church in institutions without authorization of the trustees and that he had denied members the right to call a meeting of the congregation.' And Judge Frank M. Gusweiler of Common Pleas Court has issued an injunction, forbidding Mr. Shuttlesworth from spending any church funds.

"What they basically want the 'Reverend' Shuttlesworth to do, says a committee—a 'freedom' committee (that's right)—of the worshippers, is 'to treat the officers and members of the church as intelligent human beings and not as illiterate slaves as he does now.'

"According to a spokesman for the 'Reverend' Shuttlesworth—and you will remember that all of this is from the pages of the *New York Times*—the trouble is caused by jealousy of the 'Reverend' Shuttlesworth's 'Civil Rights' activities—jealously 'inspired by white persons.'

"One of these activities, we read in the *New Yorker* of April 10, 1965, was the Selma March—conducted, as chance would have it, By Dr. Martin Luther King.

"Another former convict is a gentleman by the name of Bayard Rustin. Dr. King thinks very highly of Mr. Rustin. He describes him, according to the *Washington Post* on August 11, 1963, as 'a brilliant, efficient and dedicated organizer and one of the best and most persuasive interpreters of nonviolence.'

"In 1953, the Pasadena Police Department described him differently. Arrest record No. 33914 includes Mr. Rustin's qualifications as a sexual pervert.

"The *Allen-Scott Report* for August 16, 1963, says of the qualified Mr. Rustin:

"As a student at the College of the City of New York in 1936, Rustin joined the Young Communist League and was active in its operations on the campus and elsewhere.

"In World War II, he was arrested several times for making speeches advocating resistance to the conflict against Hitler and Mussolini. As a professed conscientious objector, he served 26 months in the federal prison at Ashland, Ky., and Lewisburg, Pa. [Emphasis mine.]

"He says he resigned from the Young Communist League in 1941. What probably happened was that he was graduated.

"*National Review* of August 20, 1963, says 'Rustin worked closely, often as an office holder, with: the War Resisters League, the

World Peace Brigade, *Liberation* magazine, the Medical Aid to Cuba Committee, the second General Strike for Peace, the Monroe (N.C.) Defense Committee, the Committee for Non-Violence Action . . . the Greenwich Village Peace Center, and any number of other groups, ad hoc committees, petitions, etc., few of which are arrestingly wholesome. . . .

"Mr. Rustin has also been active in a group called the American Forum for Socialist Education, which is Communist dominated, says the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

"In 1958, Mr. Rustin got involved in a trip to Russia sponsored by a group known as the Nonviolent Action Committee Against Nuclear Weapons.

"The January, 1963, issue of *Fellowship* reveals Mr. Rustin to be a 'friend' of Kwame Nkrumah, the Communist dictator of Ghana.

"In September of the year, he was in Richmond, Virginia, where he suggested, says the *Richmond News Leader* of September 27, 1963, 'that more bloody Negro suffering should be encouraged so that squeamish Northern Negroes would be horrified into line. . . .'

"He was fresh from the March on Washington, which he conducted on August twenty-eighth to help pass the 'Civil Rights' bill, the day after which he urged that the only hope for Negroes was to 'go left.'

"On February 3, 1964, Mr. Rustin successfully conducted the New York City school boycott. On the next day, photographers recorded his departure from a cocktail party at the Russian mission to the United Nations. He has a real feel for comedy, Bayard does. He says he was there to discuss 'artistic freedom' in Russia.

"And finally, as chance would have it, Mr. Rustin somehow managed to find employment, in the year of 1955, as 'secretary' and 'adviser,' to a Very Important Person.

"The person's name was Martin Luther King—as chance would have it.

"So the three of them—ex-con and Communist-Fronter Fred Shuttlesworth, ex-con and Communist-Fronter Bayard Rustin, and the 'Reverend' Dr. King—went ahead and improved Montgomery.

"After they had improved Montgomery for more than a year, they held a meeting in Atlanta, in March of 1957, at which they formed the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (S.C.L.C.).

"The meeting probably couldn't have been called in February because Mr. Rustin, Dr. King's 'secretary' was then attending the sixteenth national convention of the Communist Party. He had been officially invited, as an official 'non-Communist' observer, you see. The observers observed in a signed statement that:

" . . . The sessions of the convention were democratically conducted with vigorous discussion of all matters brought to the floor. There were many indications that no individual or group was in a position to control the convention.

"You will recall that at the time, the Animals were trying to shed the image they deserved for crushing the Hungarian Revolution. But that didn't bother Bayard Rustin and the other observers, who also said:

"Finally, we wish to protest vigorously against the continuance by Senator Eastland's Senate Internal Security subcommittee of the un-American practice of governmental inquisition into political opinions and activities. . . ."

"My goodness, these 'non-Communist' observers come in handy, don't they?

"The President of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference is the 'Reverend' Dr. King.

"The Vice-President of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference is the 'Reverend' Fred Shuttlesworth. And the 'Reverend' Fred Shuttlesworth is the new President of the Southern Conference Educational Fund.

"The Southern Conference Educational Fund, ladies and gentlemen, has been described by three agencies of your government—the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and the Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities of the State of Louisiana—as a department of the Communist Conspiracy. It was organized by Communists. It is run by Communists. It is the most important Communist organization in the South.

"Mr. Carl Braden of Louisville, Kentucky, who serves as field director of S.C.E.F., has been named under oath as a member of the Communist Party. Mrs. Anne Braden, also of Louisville, Kentucky, and editor of the *Southern Patriot*, which is published by S.C.E.F., has also been named under oath as a member of the Communist Party.

"Mr. Braden is a former convict, of course. While in Louisville, he was convicted of a felony—a little matter involving some dynamite. And Mrs. Braden was indicted for sedition. It seems she doesn't care for our form of government.

"Carl Braden is also listed on its letterhead as one of the 'national sponsors' of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee which sponsored member emeritus Lee Harvey Oswald, the 'lone fanatic'—which is a Communistic Front. Braden was one of the main speakers at the F.P.C.C. dinner in New York on April 28, 1961.

"Benjamin E. Smith and his law partner, Bruce Waltzer, take part in the general management of S.C.E.F. Both are under indictment for multiple violations of the Louisiana Subversive Activities and Communist Control Act. At a closed meeting of the S.C.E.F. on February 3, 1964, at the Roosevelt Hotel in New York, Benjamin E. Smith, explained as follows: 'Come June, armies will take the field.' These armies are coming to strike. The Southern Conference Educational Fund is one of those armies.' 'The Southern Conference Educational Fund occupies a unique place in the South, it furnishes a staff organization supervising others.' 'There will be strikes, sitdowns, movements, we must play our part.' 'Revolution is on its way.'

"Mr. Aubrey Williams was President of S.C.E.F. until 1963, when he got so busy as Chairman of the National Committee to Abolish HUAC—which is a Communist Front—that he decided to make himself President Emeritus. As Director of the National Youth Administration under President Roosevelt, Mr. Williams was Lyndon Johnson's boss. He also held other important jobs in the New Deal. In 1945, however, the U.S. Senate rejected his appointment as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, after his affiliations with the Communist apparatus had been placed in the record.

"On March 19, 1954, Mr. Williams testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that he had made the following statement in a speech in New York on September 11, 1947:

"It is my belief that it is precisely at this point that we take our stand and defend the right of any Communist to maintain his position as an employee of the Government of the United States . . . [Emphasis mine.]"

"In April of 1954, at Hearings held in New Orleans by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Mr. Williams was identified as a Communist Party member by one witness who had been in the Party, and was identified by another witness as one who had accepted Communist Party discipline.

"It was Mr. Williams, a Communist, whom the 'Reverend' Shuttlesworth—friend and colleague of the 'Reverend' Dr. Martin Luther King—recently replaced as President of S.C.E.F., a Communist organization.

"Mr. Williams died recently. There is always something sad about the death of a man even a professional criminal and Communist like Aubrey Williams.

"The Executive Director of S.C.E.F. is Dr. James A. Drombrowski. At the S.I.S.S. Hearings in March of 1954, John Butler, former Alabama Communist Party official, testified that on July 8, 1942 he attended a meeting of Communist Party leaders in the Thomas Jefferson Hotel, in Birmingham, Alabama, at which Alton Lawrence introduced James A. Drombrowski as a member of the Communist Party. Butler said this meeting of Communist Party leaders was held in Drombrowski's own hotel room.

"The Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities of the State of Louisiana has preserved a letter dated September 21, 1960, from Carl Braden to James A. Drombrowski, which shows that the 'Reverend' Fred Shuttlesworth—friend and colleague of Dr. Martin Luther King—was using the Bradens to write his news releases.

"In fact, ladies and gentlemen, on October 7, 1958, the 'Reverend' Dr. King himself wrote a letter to Anne Braden, who as you will recall is a Communist and had been indicted for sedition by the American State of Kentucky, Louisiana Committee Counsel Jack Rogers explains at a hearing that 'in this [letter] King urges Anne Braden and her husband, Carl, both Communist party members to become permanently associated with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. . . . Of course, the Bradens were well identified publicly as Communists long before the date of this letter.' We offer the letter.

"The next document is a letter from Martin Luther King to James A. Drombrowski, dated August 16, 1960. It shows the friendly personal relationship that had developed between these two men by that time. It is very brief, I will read it to the Committee. It says: 'Dear Jim: This is just a note to acknowledge receipt of your letters of recent date. We, too, were more than happy to have you in our home, the fellowship was very rewarding. I will expect to hear from you when Bishop Love returns to the country. At that time we can set the date for an Atlanta meeting. Very sincerely yours, Martin.' [Emphasis mine.]

"Committee Counsel Rogers testifies furthermore that Dr. King actually filed a lengthy affidavit in the Federal Court in New Orleans strongly supporting James A. Drombrowski and the Southern Conference Educational Fund as 'integrationists' of good character, and that Dr. King refused to repudiate the affidavit even after Mr. Rogers showed him absolute proof that they were all actually Communists.

"Indeed, a photograph exists which shows the 'Reverend' Dr. King along with Anne Braden, Carl Braden, and James Drombrowski (the last three all identified Reds), the back of which reads as follows in Drombrowski's handwriting: 'The 6th Annual Conference of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, September 25 to 28, 1962.'

"And there is a check, issued by the Southern Conference Educational Fund, signed by Benjamin E. Smith and James A. Drombrowski, and dated March 7, 1963, to the order of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., in the amount of \$167.74, with a notation on it: 'New York expenses'—and the endorsement, on the back of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

"The Committee concludes that the Southern Christian Leadership Conference—headed by Dr. King—is 'substantially under the control of the Communist Party through the influence of the Southern Conference Educational Fund and the Communists who manage it.'

"It is important to repeat that nothing of what we have said so far is speculation, rumor, hearsay, or opinion. All it is a simple narration of the known facts—some of them—to be found, among many other places, in a report entitled *Activities of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc. in Louisiana*, issued by the Joint Legislative

Committee on Un-American Activities of that State and available now from American Opinion.

"Also of interest is the career of the 'Reverend' Andrew Young. The 'Reverend' Andrew Young was trained at the Highlander Folk School, which as we have seen is a Communist Training School.

"Before its charter at Monteagle was revoked, the *Atlanta Constitution* of July 24, 1963, tells us, 'the Highlander School received support from the International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers.

"An officer of the union, now under indictment on a charge of filing a false non-Communist affidavit, was one of the directors of the Highlander School.

"The Reverend Young has been headquartered rent-free in Savannah in the offices of the International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers. The Subversive Activities Control Board, an agency of the Federal Government, has found the union to be Communist infiltrated. The Mine-Mill Union has appealed the finding to a Federal court of appeals."

"The 'Reverend' Andrew Young, we read in the *New Yorker* of April 10, 1965, was one of the directors of the Selma March, which was headed, of course—as chance would have it—by Dr. Martin Luther King. In fact, the 'Reverend' Andrew Young is Program Director for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference—which is headed, of course, by Dr. Martin Luther King. As chance would have it.

"On the Labor Day weekend of the year 1957, at this same Highlander Folk School—a Communist Training School—many humanitarians gathered to discuss 'civil rights.' A photograph of the events records the presence of Mrs. Rosa Parks. That's the Mrs. Rosa Parks. The 'Reverend' Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was there, of course, with his close friend and associate, the 'Reverend' Ralph Abernathy. A photograph records the Abernathy presence. Another photograph shows the 'Reverend' Dr. King addressing the assemblage—perhaps at the very moment when he piled praise on School Director Myles Horton, whose 'noble purpose and creative work' he says he has long admired, possibly because it has included some cash to Dr. King.

"Mr. Horton's creative work consists of having run, with Communist James Drombrowski, an outfit called Commonwealth College, which was convicted under the laws of the American State of Arkansas of displaying the hammer and sickle and openly teaching Communism—and which on April 27, 1949, was cited by the U.S. Attorney General as a Communist Front; and of operating the Highlander Folk School, a Communist Training School. His 'noble purpose' is apparently to Communize the South.

"Dr. King also mentioned Aubrey Williams—a Communist—whom he called "one of the noble personalities of our times."

"Still another photograph—the best—shows the following comrades enjoying a lecture: the 'Reverend' Dr. King; Aubrey Williams, a Communist, and then President of S.C.E.F., a department of the Communist Conspiracy; Myles Horton, friend and teacher of Communists, and director of this Communist school; and Abner W. Berry, of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

"Comrade Berry looks bored, but the others seem to be enjoying the lecture very much. In fact, on a form letter from Director Horton, dated May 15, 1963, the 'Reverend' Dr. King is listed as a Highlander sponsor.

"As chance would have it.

"Then there is the interesting case of a gentleman who is sometimes known as Mr. Hunter Pitts O'Dell. 'The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee declared today,' we read in the *New York Times* of September 16, 1956, "that a 'smoothly coordinated' Communist underground was operating in New Orleans as late as last spring. The panel

made public in support of its finding the transcripts of hearings held in that city in April."

"The subcommittee said that American Communists "sought to infiltrate labor unions, churches, farmer organizations, parent-teacher organizations, channels of public opinion and other streams of influence in our society . . .

"Much of the Senate panel's case was built up at New Orleans from material found by New Orleans policemen in the abandoned apartment of one Hunter Pitts O'Dell. Mr. O'Dell had been identified in previous testimony as being the district organizer of the Communist party in New Orleans."

"On April 12, 1956, identifying himself as Hunter Pitts O'Dell, a New Orleans waiter, we read in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* of October 26, 1962, 'he testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. He invoked the Fifth Amendment and refused to say whether he was a southern district organizer for the Communist Party.

"Robert Morris, counsel for the subcommittee, said information had been received that O'Dell was, in fact, a district organizer for the Communist Party in New Orleans; that O'Dell gave 'directives to the professional group' in that city, and that he operated under three different names—the two other names being John Vesey and Ben Jones."

"In 1958, when O'Dell was living in Montgomery, he again declined to answer on grounds, *et cetera*.

"In 1962, the House Committee on Un-American Activities published a two-volume study entitled *Structure and Organization of the Communist Party of the United States*.

"On Page 576, there is a list of those elected to the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., as known to the House Committee in November of 1961.

"Among the names was that of Hunter Pitts O'Dell.

"With this as a reference, Mr. O'Dell went looking for a job. And in 1960 he landed one. It was quite a job.

"As chance would have it, he went to work for an outfit called the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, headed by a gentleman by the name of Dr. Martin Luther King.

"Who says an intelligent, young Negro in America can't make good?"

"But 'racists' and 'imperialists' naturally began to complain: 'A Communist has infiltrated to the top administrative post in the Rev. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference,' we read in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* for October 26, 1962.

"He is Jack H. O'Dell [another alias], acting executive director of conference activities in southeastern states, including Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana."

"So Dr. King developed an interesting strategy.

"You may have heard of it.

"We call it lying.

"Like Bayard Rustin, Dr. King has a real feel for comedy. He developed the strategy of firing O'Dell.

"After he got fired, Mr. O'Dell was probably pretty broken up. But in America you can't keep a good man down. He landed another job, this one with the 'Reverend' Andrew Young, who as you will recall was trained at the Communist Highlander Folk School by Communists, and is program director for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, which is headed, as chance would have it, by Dr. Martin Luther King.

"After that, O'Dell got still another job—as Administrator of the New York office of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, which is headed, as chance would have it, by Dr. Martin Luther King.

"Legend has it that they got on great, until the odor got to be too much even for the American Press.

"Dr. King acted, swiftly, decisively.

"He fired O'Dell.

"King said the Negro, Jack H. O'Dell of New York, left the S.C.L.C. the second time June 26 by mutual agreement,' we read in a U.P.I. story inserted in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* for July 31, 1963, 'because of concern that his affiliation with the integration movement would be used against it by 'segregationists and race baiters.'

"That ended it.

"Some time later, in the summer of 1963, U.P.I. had an interesting story inserted in the *Congressional Record* for July 31, 1963. It seems that the *Atlanta Constitution* had published a report that O'Dell was still working for S.C.L.C. as Director of the New York office. So U.P.I. called the office.

"... A Staff employee who answered the telephone Thursday morning told United Press International O'Dell was still with the office as administrator of the New York operation. Later in the day the same office said he was not connected with the agency and had no knowledge of his whereabouts.

"King told reporters he could not understand why anyone in his office would say O'Dell worked there when he doesn't . . . [Emphasis mine.]

"It's quite a strategy.

"So it's very reasonable to assume, wouldn't you agree, that Hunter Pitts O'Dell, of the National Committee of the Communist Party, may very well be working with Martin Luther King right now.

"In fact, we read in the *Boston Globe* of April 15, 1964:

"Official warnings have again been given to King about another, even more important associate who is known to be a key figure in the covert apparatus of the Communist Party. After the warnings, King broke off his open connection with this man, but a second-hand connection none the less continues . . . [Emphasis mine].

"Ladies and gentlemen, there's no need to go on. I am sure you will agree. In fact, we can't go on—you see, they only allow us ninety-six pages per issue of the magazine. So let's leave it at that, and remind ourselves again that all we have recorded here is a simple narration of the known facts—some of the known facts. There are others—many others—as I say. So there's no need to mention, for instance, that the American Committee for Africa, which Dr. King allows to use his name, sponsored and financed the American tour of Communist terrorist Holden Roberto, the Butcher of Angola; or that in October, 1962, King turned up in a Harlem hotel with Communist Ahmed Ben Bella, of Communist Algeria, who joined him in a statement that the two injustices of colonialism and American segregation are 'linked.'

"What do you make of it?"

"As you know, it is my usual practice to garnish even the most minor assertion with a wagon load of evidence. But I now take the position—after Los Angeles—that to add to the obvious facts that the 'Civil Rights movement' was not only planned by the Communists, but was begun, is staffed, and is conducted by the Communists—and has only one real purpose: the destruction and Communization of America—would be an unforgivable redundancy.

"Readers of my book—or of *Two Revolutions at Once*, by Robert Welch—will know that the Communist 'revolution' now going on in this country, under the cloak of 'Civil Rights,' consists of two parts. The first is the drive for a Soviet Negro Republic, an independent 'nation,' consisting of several Southern states—and is of course conducted by the 'Reverend' Dr. King. It is the Soviet Negro Republic that the current 'voter registration campaign' is all about—a campaign which includes the amazing spectacle of the Attorney General of the United States boasting publicly that he is forcing the sovereign states to register total illiterates.

"The second part of the Communist scheme also bears a faint resemblance to the activi-

ties of the 'Reverend' Dr. King—as chance would have it. It consists of course of forcing more and more legislation through the Congress under the cloak of 'Civil Rights,' all of it designed only to destroy the states and concentrate the power.

"Recent developments leave little doubt about the 'Reverend' Dr. King. As we have seen, he has begun a new series of the usual violent and money-making visits—but for the first time including cities of the North—complete with the usual hints of guerrilla warfare if Americans do not immediately come to heel. He has recently decided to conduct American foreign policy himself, by negotiating our defeat directly with North Vietnam, apparently having lost patience with Dean Rusk—and who can blame him? And at this writing he has just landed in Los Angeles to establish what he calls a 'community of love,' but in actuality of course simply to return to the scene of the crime. The man behind Dr. King on the television screen when he was interviewed on arrival in Los Angeles looked very much like Bayard Rustin, who of course is an authority on establishing 'communities of love.' Mr. Rustin was also allowed to accompany Dr. King to Oslo for the Prize; they go everywhere together.

"Angelinos of all colors should keep their backs to the wall, until the verified departure of the King and the Thing.

"It is unfortunately true that some American Negroes have suffered from injustice, and obviously true that the few remnants of this injustice must be erased.

"But ladies and gentlemen, it is equally and much more dangerously true that the 'Civil Rights movement' which is supposedly designed to erase them is what we have said it is, *only* what we have said it is, and *nothing else but* what we have said it is.

The interesting question remains of why Dr. King does it.

"It is remotely possible that Dr. King was not already a practicing Communist when he was selected to conduct the Montgomery Bus Boycott. That is possible.

"If this was the case, there can be no doubt that he was broken in slowly, in the usual way, step by planned step, until the ultimate revelation, when it was fully explained to him what he had become.

"Dr. King says he did it because he wanted to create a 'community of love,' whatever that is. He says he felt a moral obligation; that it was his duty. And most important, he says he wants nothing for himself. He couldn't care less about material things, you see. He's above all that. In fact, we learn from Mrs. King, in *Redbook* for September, 1961:

"There was a time when he was quite concerned about his personal appearance. Today I have to remind him that he needs a new suit. Our trip to India in 1959 to study Gandhi's independence movement made a deep impression on him. He became even more committed to non-violence and much less interested in material things. At times he has even talked seriously about whether or not he should own anything that's not absolutely necessary for the rest of the family.

"My goodness, he's quite a little gentleman.

"In fact, we read in *Newsweek* for December 21, 1964:

"To share his moment of triumph, Dr. King had brought with him the largest entourage in Nobel Prize history—some 26 relatives, friends, and aides. 'We are all of us very poor people,' said one, explaining that they had scraped together the money for the trip from savings accounts, pension funds, and 'travel now, pay later' arrangements.

"Gosh! Ain't it terrible? The poor Negroes down in the South!

"As it happens, ladies and gentlemen, the senior 'Reverend' King, a Southern Negro, had earned the money down in the South to pay for his son's college education. Mrs. Martin Luther King Jr. is a graduate of Antioch—that's right. *Commonweal* of June 10, 1960, tells us that the father of the "Reverend" Abernathy—King's colleague and cell mate—had his own *five hundred acre* plantation—in Alabama!

"You know—this makes me mad! My father did not have the money to send me to college and to graduate school. But I went. I invoked an unusual procedure—I worked. I drove a taxicab. My father also does not own a five hundred acre plantation. I bawled him out about it as soon as I got the news about the "Reverend" Abernathy. You see, I got all kinds of funny feelings in the "racial integrity." Maybe I'll go out and organize a spontaneous riot.

"It's enough to make you wish you were a Negro down in the South.

"Once again the fact is dramatically and irrevocably proved that Communism is not caused by "poverty," or by "hunger," or by "sickness," at all. The cause of Communism is so simple that many honest men have missed it, and many dishonest men have hidden it.

"Communism is caused by criminals. "There is no other cause of Communism.

"You see—as Dr. King is well aware—there are essentially two types of degenerate thug; the big timer, and the small timer. The small timer is represented by a specimen such as John Dillinger. Sure, John liked robbing and killing and beating people up—bad mannered stuff like that—but you must admit that at the mention of his name you can't help but feel a touching nostalgia. There was a refreshing sincerity about the man; he told you straight out what he wanted. He didn't claim that he was robbing you and beating you up for your good; he was perfectly pleased to admit that he was doing it for his own good.

"That was his mistake.

"A big timer would have known that the first thing to say was that he was doing it for you. They want nothing for themselves, this type. Everything they do is for your own good. Classic specimens of this variety are called Socialists, of course, and they include for instance, the things known as Stalin and Hitler.

"Whatever the type, they believe, because of their own insignificance, that it is impossible for men to deal fairly with each other, and that a man has only two real choices; whether to be master, or whether to be slave. Like all sure losers, they blame the system for their own insignificance. They talk only of power, and deal only in force.

"All of which makes it now seem reasonable to theorize that as a smart, young man on the make, Dr. King quickly found out how the wind was blowing.

"Ladies and gentlemen, the time has come. J. Edgar Hoover is wrong. Martin Luther King *isn't* the 'most notorious liar in the country.' He's the *biggest*. He isn't notorious enough. That this man cannot be only tolerated, but honored and admired, quoted and consulted—by the President of the United States—is a travesty compared with which that nemesis of the innocent known as Earl Warren can seriously be called a judge.

"King has no real interest in the real welfare of black—or white—Americans.

"He is only interested in tricking them both into civil war—and in lifting their money.

"He doesn't mind that it is exactly because of his own activities that Negroes aren't making the progress he complains they aren't.

"He doesn't really mind that many Negroes are illiterate—as long as they register and vote for him.

"What he really wants is to be a black plantation boss giving orders to 'his people.'

"In a rational society, he would be a carny barker or a snake oil salesman in a crooked side show.

"So let's do it. Let's do it now.

"As you know, the origin of the exact science of ducknology is irrevocably lost in the mists of antiquity, although it is undoubtedly based on the master principles discovered by Aristotle—the first great extremist.

"Let's apply them.

"The Thing walks like a duck.

"It smells like a duck.

"It looks like a duck.

"It quacks like a duck.

"Ladies and gentlemen, there can be only one explanation. I can not even imagine any other explanation.

"It's a duck."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 29, 1968]

MARTIN LUTHER KING—A STUDY

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Church League of America, 422 North Prospect Street, Wheaton, Ill., on its News and Views Report for May 1968, has issued a 55-page comprehensive documentary on M. L. King, Jr., entitled "His Three-Pronged Attack On: 1. Christ and the Bible, 2. The United States of America, 3. Law and Order."

Any of our colleagues desiring comprehensive documentation will want this Church League report.

I am asking that a few portions of the report follow my remarks in the RECORD. Deleted from reproduction in the RECORD are news clippings and speeches such as Congressman ASHBROOK's from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 4, 1967, Congressman DERWINSKI's of January 22, 1968, Congressman RARICK's for March 25, 1968, and the House Appropriations Report on "Law and Order" for 1967:

"MARTIN KING'S THREE-PRONGED ATTACK

"In recent days the United States was treated to one of the biggest doses of mass hysteria and idolatry through the media of public communications in the history of any nation of the civilized world. The occasion was the demise of a Negro man by the name of Michael King, born with this simple name as recorded on his birth certificate, with the name changed to 'Martin Luther' by his father to imply an affinity for religious causes after the fashion of the famous leader of the Protestant Reformation in Germany, Dr. Martin Luther.

"Few of the masses of United States citizens had available for their study the undisputed and documented facts concerning the late Mr. King's life which would stand up under oath in any court of law or before any United States Congressional Investigative Committee—facts which, for some unknown reason, the public was denied by the same supposedly responsible mass media of communication.

"Mr. King was hailed over the ether waves, through the printed page, on the theatre screens, and in orations from the pulpit, classroom and government chambers as everything from a modern Messiah to one of the greatest leaders of all of history. Such words as 'crucifixion' and 'resurrection' were used in reference to Mr. King.

"Politicians who formerly scorned him over television and from the public platform assumed a countenance of mourning and mortification. Some public leaders who had denounced him as a rabble-rouser and an instigator of violence and revolution, suddenly eulogized him as a great apostle of peace and love.

"What is the truth concerning Martin Luther King's views on theology, his country and law and order? While being called a 'Christian' was he in reality a Christian believer as defined by Holy Scripture? While stating that he was for bringing about social

justice within the United States of America, was he actually loyal or disloyal to the United States of America? While declaring that he came into cities as an apostle of non-violence (the type which Mahatma Gandhi advocated—satyagraha), did he actually contribute to the breakdown of law and order and the rise of anarchy throughout the United States?

"The Church League of America can only come to the conclusion after looking at the record, as made by Mr. King himself, that many people who were swayed by the hysteria following Mr. King's regrettable departure from this world have a lot of catching up to do on their home-work. It is time for people to deal in facts and not in emotion. The orderly conduct of a civilized society is at stake and with it the lives and property of millions of people!

"*Martin Luther King, Jr.*

"Activities in his religious life

"Martin Luther King was born in Atlanta, Georgia, on January 15, 1929, into a devoutly religious home. At the age of 29 he became the minister of Dexter Avenue Baptist Church after turning down several other offers.¹ He began to work with Atlanta's Intercollegiate Christian Council. King's training had consisted of finishing his high school education at age 15, going to Morehouse College in Atlanta, and attending Crozier Seminary in Chester, Pennsylvania, where he received a B.D. degree in Divinity in 1951 and the Pearl Plafkner Award for scholarship. While at Crozier, Mr. King became president of the student body and was graduated at the head of his classes. It was here that he was influenced by Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president of Harvard, a strong believer in Gandhi, Hindu non-violent resistance leader. Finally, King obtained his Ph.D. degree from Boston University in 1955 where he was a Louis Crozier Fellow.¹

"Was co-chairman of the Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom.²

"Editor-at-large of the *Christian Century*.³

"Attended the National Council of Churches' General Assembly in 1960. Was a speaker at the 18th Ecumenical Student Conference on the Christian World Mission, 1960.

"President of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.⁴

"Assistant pastor at Ebenezer Baptist Church.⁵

"Sponsor of a statement calling for peaceful resistance to Communism and for unilateral disarmament—pamphlet called 'A Christian Approach to Nuclear War' put out by the Church Peace Mission.⁶

"Was unable to attend the Baptist World Alliance youth conference in Beirut, Lebanon, July, 1963.⁷

"Was speaker at the Second Methodist Conference on Human Relations, August 26-30, 1963.⁸

"Contributor to *Motive* magazine—a Methodist youth publication.⁹

"Keynote speaker at the Union of American Hebrew Congregations convening in the Hilton Hotel in Chicago.¹⁰

"Honorary chairman of the Baptist Action for Racial Brotherhood Committee of the American Baptist Convention.¹¹

"Listed as a speaker at 'Freedom Now' meeting sponsored by the Milwaukee civic and religious community held in Milwaukee City Auditorium, 1/27/64.¹²

"Addressed the 1964 American Baptist Convention where he received the first annual Edwin T. Dahlberg Peace Award.¹³

"Is one of the leaders of the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights.¹⁴

"Spoke at a meeting of the Central Conference of American Rabbis; asked them to join with him 'in a creative witness to our joint convictions of equality and racial jus-

tice.' Consequently, 16 rabbis and one Jewish layman participated in a civil rights demonstration in St. Augustine, Florida. The 17 were arrested on June 18, 1964.¹⁵

"Spoke in two Protestant churches in Communist East Berlin.¹⁶

"Had a 25-minute session with Pope Paul VI.¹⁷

"Spoke at the 61st general convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Rt. Rev. Arthur Lichtenberger praised him as 'one of the great men of our times.'¹⁸

"Because of his increasingly heavy schedule, King could not accept an editor-at-large assignment for the *Christian Century*.¹⁹

"Dr. Martin Luther King was to be among the speakers for the Montreat, North Carolina, Christian Action Conference, August 19-22, 1965. He was to be a keynote speaker at the meeting.²⁰

"Activities in his secular life

"Became president of the Montgomery Improvement Association after graduation from college.²¹

"Married Coretta Scott, a singer, and now has four children.¹

"Speaker at the 25th anniversary celebration of Highlander Folk School, once declared a Communist training school.²²

"Was on the National Advisory Committee of the Congress of Racial Equality.²³ Of C.O.R.E., Senator Eastland stated in the *Congressional Record*, vol. 107, pt. 7, pp. 8956-8957, 'This organization is the war department of those who sell hate, collect donations, and sow the seeds of discord in this country. Since its inception, its creed has been lawlessness, and its tactics have followed the pattern set by communist agitators the world over.'

"Editorial contributor or member of the Fellowship of Reconciliation,²⁴ radical pacifist organization which opposes military defense.

"Head of the Congress of Racial Equality.²⁵

"Made a speech at the War Resisters dinner honoring A. J. Muste.²⁶

"Ad Hoc Committee on the Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks to Explore the Requirements of Peace—member.²⁷

"Sponsor of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.²⁸

"Led a successful boycott to integrate Montgomery's city buses.²⁹

"Honorary co-chairman of the Africa Freedom Day to benefit the African Defense and Aid Fund sponsored by the American Committee on Africa.³⁰

"Member of the National Committee of the American Committee on Africa.³¹

"Sponsor of an appeal for Morton Sobell, convicted atom spy, in article, '1,200 clerics urge Ike free Sobell.'³²

"Writer for *Liberation*, a leftist, pacifist magazine.³³

"Fellowship of Reconciliation—member of advisory council.³⁴

"Editorial contributor, *Fellowship*, a pacifist magazine of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.³⁵

"Listed as a supporter of Sobell's release from prison sponsored by the National Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell.³⁶

"Contributor to radical *Liberation*.³⁷

"On the advisory committee of Congress of Racial Equality.³⁸

"On the national committee of sponsors of the American Freedom of Residence Fund.³⁹

"Launched a drive to double the voting strength of Negroes in the South before the 1964 Presidential election.⁴⁰

Participant in the conference sponsored by the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and Southern Conference Educational Fund. The conference was on 'The Deep South: Ways and Means to Integration' in Birmingham on April 13-14, 1962.⁴¹

"Slated to be principal speaker at the annual reception of the New York Friends of

the Southern Conference Educational Fund to be held in the Biltmore Hotel in New York City, 2/8/63.⁴²

"Member of the Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell according to a leaflet of February, 1963.

"Spoke for the New York Friends of the Southern Conference Educational Fund. Guests were invited to make reservations through William Howard Melish, identified by Louis Budenz as a Communist.⁴³

"Sponsor of Highlander Center, 1625 Riverside, Knoxville, Tennessee, the newly formed group out of Highlander Folk School.⁴⁴

"Photograph of King allegedly attending the Highlander Folk School is printed in the *Augusta Courier*, 7/8/63. In answer to a question from Lawrence Spivak on 'Meet the Press,' King said he was 'there' (Highlander Folk School) 'only an hour' and that he 'made a 45 minute speech.' The program appeared on T.V. on March 28, 1965.

"Spoke at Cobo Hall along with Detroit Mayor Cavanagh and Walter Reuther. It was the end of the 'Walk to Freedom' program, June 23, sponsored by the Detroit Council of Human Relations.⁴⁵

"Endorsed a Cobo Hall meeting in Detroit on November 8-10, 1963, headed by Rev. C. L. Franklin who led the Detroit June 23 Freedom Walk. At this meeting Negro leaders from 15 Northern cities planned to establish a Northern Negro Leadership Conference.⁴⁶

"The Justice Department furnished a rented car to transport King in Alabama.⁴⁷

"Contributing author to *Renewal* magazine published by exploratory program in journalism of the Chicago City Missionary Society.⁴⁸

"Contributor for *Liberation*.⁴⁹

"Conducts workshops in nonviolent demonstrations. Said the workshops had two goals: instruction in methods of nonviolent action and speedup in voter registration.⁵⁰

"In Oakland, California, a mass rally addressed by Martin Luther King, Jr., drew 17,000 participants.⁵¹

"Endorsed Lyndon B. Johnson and said Goldwaterism must be defeated.⁵²

"Was a special student at the University of Pennsylvania and Harvard.⁵³

"Participated in Selma March.⁵⁴

"*Aid Received from Religious Sources*

"The Synod of the Reformed Church of America sent a gift of money and commendation to the Southern Leadership Conference headed by Martin Luther King.⁵⁵

"*Aid Received from Secular Sources*

"Speakers at rallies in support of King and his activities were Dr. Herbert Aptheker (member of the National Committee of the Communist Party in the U.S.A.), Mrs. Alva Buxenbaum (National Chairman of the Progressive Youth Organization), and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn (late secretary of the Communist party).⁵⁶

"Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and Benjamin Davis, Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., protested the arrest of King in wires to President Eisenhower.⁵⁷

"King's attorneys charged in the Georgia state court of appeals that King's constitutional rights were violated when he was sentenced to a four-month prison term for violating probation in a traffic case.⁵⁸

"A rally was held under the auspices of the Emergency Committee to Support Birmingham' to back King and his efforts in Birmingham. The principal speaker was Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth. Other speakers were James Farmer and the late Malcolm X.⁵⁹

"Sammy Davis, Jr., gave \$20,000 to King.⁶⁰

"Was backed by a \$50 contribution from the Wisconsin Democrats for 'human rights campaign.'⁶¹

"A photograph shows King and three officers of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, all 3 identified Communists, together. A check was made payable to King

personally and deposited by him in his Southern Conference Educational Fund.⁶²

"King received \$50,000 in cash and pledges for use in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference by the New York Central Labor Council.⁶³

"Union Boss Hoffa presented King with a \$25,000 check and said that the donation 'was authorized by the international executive board and we have no intention of changing our position.'⁶⁴

"Announcements made by King

"Asked President Eisenhower to end what King called 'a reign of terror in Montgomery, Alabama.' His charges were dismissed by the city's police commissioner as 'the rantings of a rabble-rousing agitator.'⁶⁵

"I was immediately influenced by the social gospel . . . Christ furnished the spirit and motivation while Gandhi furnished the method . . . The choice today is no longer between violence and nonviolence. It is either nonviolence or nonexistence . . . I have tried to embrace a realistic pacifism.' He pays glowing tribute to Walter Rauschenbusch and Gandhi as influencing him the most.⁶⁶

"Announced at a news conference in New York City 6/10/60 that he and Asa Philip Randolph planned to use at least 6,000 pickets at both Democratic and GOP national conventions as a protest against segregation.⁶⁷

"Addressing Freedom Forum in Schenectady, New York, last week, said he favors admission of Peoples China to the United Nations.'⁶⁸

"Spoke in Los Angeles to 'spur voter registration.'⁶⁹

"Was critical of the F.B.I., especially in Albany, Georgia.⁷⁰

"In a sermon delivered November 15, in New York City King is quoted as saying that reports of alleged Southern outrages against Negroes filed with the F.B.I. 'produced no action.'⁷¹

"Called on President Kennedy to sign an executive order to outlaw segregation.⁷²

"Made a statement 'we are through with gradualism . . . we want our freedom now.'⁷³

"J. Edgar Hoover told a House Appropriations Committee that communists are infiltrating the Civil Rights movement. King said that that statement was a smear and that Hoover 'has allowed himself to aid and abet the fallacious claim of Southern racists and extreme right wing elements.'⁷⁴

"After receiving the American Baptist Convention's first annual Edwin T. Dahlberg Peace award, King, a member of the American Baptist Convention said, 'Nothing could be more tragic, than for the civil rights movement to become "all Negro".'⁷⁵

"Spoke at a civil rights rally in Chicago on June 21, 1964. Urged continuance of demonstration, boycotts, rent strikes, and other means of protest.⁷⁶

"Was among those who issued a statement urging Negroes and their friends to impose a moratorium on marches, mass picketing, and other mass demonstrations, until after the presidential election. The statement urged friends of civil rights to concentrate on voter registration, enforcement of the civil rights laws, and other appropriate forms of political activity. The statement declared that 'racism' had been injected into the campaign by the Goldwater forces.⁷⁷

"Wanted the Democrats to endorse a 10-year \$50 billion 'bill of rights' program to aid the 9,000,000 poverty-stricken American families.⁷⁸

"In his July-August Newsletter, King implied that anti-Semitism may have been a factor in racial outbursts in New York City and Rochester.⁷⁹

"Declared Barry Goldwater was a man indifferent to civil rights, peace and poverty.⁸⁰

"Supports C.O.F.O. and said that it was

'one of the most creative instruments in the civil rights movement.'⁸¹

"Called for a grand alliance of American intellectuals, liberals, labor union and religious leaders to fight the battles in the civil rights struggle. Said the next final step in the fight for civil rights would be for the movement 'to work in the field of political action and reform.'⁸²

"Advocated Communist China's membership in the United Nations. Said it would help toward disarmament efforts.⁸³

"Called for a withdrawal of all troops and mercenaries from the Congo.⁸⁴

"Complained to President Johnson that many federal judges 'abuse and misuse' their power. He told Johnson that it was important that large numbers of Negroes be assigned top jobs in local levels of the President's anti-poverty program. He and his staff arrived in Washington in the private airplane of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller.⁸⁵

"Johnson, Humphrey, Katzenbach and King conferred on voter registration. He asked the justice department to seek an injunction against the prosecution of more than 3,000 Negroes arrested in Selma.⁸⁶

"Said, 'I would strengthen a channel that is already in existence, the United Nations . . . I would work to bring about universal disarmament and set up a world police force through the United Nations . . . I would also consider some form of world government. As we grow and come to see the oneness of mankind and the geographical oneness of the world, made possible by man's scientific and technological ingenuity, more and more we are going to have to try to see our oneness in terms of brotherhood. This does not mean that everyone has to agree at every point. There can be a world government where diversity exists, and this would lessen many tensions that we face today; and it would also enable everybody to understand that we are clothed in a single garment of destiny, and whatever affects one nation directly in the world, indirectly affects all.'⁸⁷

"Autographs King has made

"Signer of statement calling for suspension of nuclear-weapons tests sponsored by the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.⁸⁸

"Signer of Church Peace Mission statement calling for cancellation of nuclear-weapons tests.⁸⁹

"Signer of open letter to the House of Representatives opposing the Committee on Un-American Activities sponsored by the Southern Conference Educational Fund.⁹⁰

"Signer of Manifesto of Southern Negro Leaders against Passage of New Sedition Laws by the States.⁹¹

"Signer of a full page advertisement supporting President Eisenhower's Invitation to Khrushchev and Appeasement Line with Respect to the U.S.S.R.⁹²

"Signer of statement of Negro Leaders against proposed new sedition laws sponsored by the Southern Conference Educational Fund.⁹³

"Signer of paid full page advertisement in the New York Times, 2/8/60, sponsored by the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy favoring ban on further U.S. atomic testing.

"Signer of advertisement sponsored by the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy—'Agenda for Geneva' end all nuclear Tests—Total Disarmament.⁹⁴

"Signer of telegram to President Eisenhower sponsored by the Southern Conference Educational Fund.⁹⁵ Advertisement was titled 'Must Southern Negroes Turn to the U.N.?'

"His name appeared on a leaflet advertising a mass meeting in Washington, D.C. on November 19-21, 1960 for the National Appeal for Freedom for Morton Sobell.

"Signed paid advertisement in the Washington Post, 7/31/58, demanding that the

House Committee on Un-American Activities, 'stay out of the South.'⁹⁶

"Signer of petition to the 87th Congress to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities.⁹⁷

"Signer of clemency petition sponsored by the Southern Conference Educational Fund to President Kennedy on behalf of Carl Braden.⁹⁸

"Signer of petition for clemency for Carl Braden—also denounced the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.⁹⁹

"Signer of letter to President Kennedy sponsored by the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy to ask that the United States remain steadfast in its determination to succeed in test ban negotiations.¹⁰⁰

"Initiator of petition to President Kennedy asking clemency for Carl Braden, convicted field secretary of the Southern Conference Educational Fund.¹⁰¹

"Signer of a statement sponsored by the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy to guide the United States in conference negotiations with the Soviet Union on the future of Germany and West Berlin.¹⁰²

"Initiating signer of petition sponsored by the Southern Conference Educational Fund to the President for Clemency for Carl Braden.¹⁰³

"His name appeared on a press release of November 1961 of the National Clemency Appeal on behalf of Frank Wilkinson and Carl Braden.

"Signer of charge that 'HUAC (sic) threatens national security'—the appeal was addressed to the House of Representatives from an Ad Hoc Committee.¹⁰⁴

"One of 550 prominent Americans who signed a petition to President Kennedy to pardon Junius Scales.¹⁰⁵

"Signer of plea on behalf of the Communist Party leader of North Carolina convicted under the 'membership clause' of the Smith Act, Junius Scales, to pardon him.¹⁰⁶

"Signer of statement opposing resumption of nuclear tests sponsored by the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.¹⁰⁷

"Signer of an appeal to desist from testing while negotiating with the Soviet Union for disarmament agreements—Clergymen's Message to the President Opposing Resumption of Atmospheric Nuclear Tests.¹⁰⁸

"Signed a letter asking clerics to deliver sermons and lectures on the first Sunday in January denouncing both the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.¹⁰⁹

"King sent a telegram to Jesse Gray, identified as an organizer of the C.P. of Harlem which said: 'You have my absolute support, in your righteous and courageous effort to expose the outrageous condition that Negroes confront as a result of substandard housing conditions.'

"Associates of Dr. King

"At Morehouse College in Atlanta King came under the influence of the President of the College, Benjamin E. Mays, who has an extensive record of support of communist fronts and causes.¹¹⁰

"In the Youth March for integrated schools of Washington, D.C., in 1958 Martin Luther King was co-chairman of the group along with a veteran supporter of Communist fronts, A. Philip Randolph. Again, Rev. King made the pages of the Communist Worker which reported: 'Rev. King said: The Oppressed Always Marched for Freedom.' On May 17, 1959, the Worker devoted the entire front page and fourteen columns of print to the March. That King's Washington March was aided and engineered by the Communists is attested to by the Worker. On page 15 they said: 'Large number of the Left (Communist) forces actively aided in mobilizing support for the Youth March and were in vast audience.'

"Challenge, official publication of the Young People's Socialist League (11/1/58) headlined the story and pointed out that the Marchers' White House Student delegation leader and 14 of the main youth organizers were members of the Young People's Socialist League.

"Bayard Rustin (a joiner of Communist fronts) was secretary to King from 1955 to 1960 and helped to organize the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.¹²¹

"At the sixth annual conference of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in Birmingham, September 25-28, 1962, Anne Braden, Carl Braden and James A. Dombrowski (identified as Communists) spoke.¹²²

"King met with Ben Bela of Algeria in New York.¹²³

"Allegation is made that the American Committee on Africa (of which King is a member of the National Committee) sponsored a tour of the United States by Holden Roberto, an African terrorist of the Angola-Congo region.¹²⁴

"Rev. John B. Thompson, a veteran supporter of communist fronts, introduced Myles Horton, director of Highlander Research and Education Center, as the "grandfather" of Martin Luther King explaining that King has stated he owed his entering the civil rights movement to Rosa Parks, a Highlander alumna.¹²⁵

"Has accepted and is almost certainly still accepting communist collaboration and even communist advice.¹²⁶

"Urged the Bradens to become permanently associated with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference according to a letter dated October 7, 1959, to Anne Braden in which King also thanks Carl Braden for his participation in a meeting.¹²⁷

"King was advised to have Hunter Pitts O'Dell dismissed from his organization because he was an identified communist. Either he failed to do so or later rehired him because just over a year ago O'Dell was again on King's payroll as director of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference office in New York City.¹²⁸

"Bayard Rustin introduced Martin Luther King to Kwame Nkrumah, communist dictator of Ghana.¹²⁹

"Arrests of Dr. King

"Sentenced to four months imprisonment for parole violations—Atlanta, Georgia, picture and story.¹³⁰

"Vowed to be arrested for committing an act of civil disobedience to dramatize the integration campaign. That was his 14th arrest. He was charged with trespassing, intent to breach the peace and conspiracy.¹³¹

"Arrested for not having a permit to parade in Selma, Alabama. This one was his first since he won the Nobel peace prize in November and apparently was part of a plan prepared . . . by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.¹³²

"Awards for Dr. King

"In *Times* magazine in 1956 he was selected as one of the "outstanding personalities of 1956."

"Received the Spingarn Medal at the NAACP Convention in Detroit in June, 1957.

"Received the 1957 Social Justice Award given by the Religion and Labor Foundation.¹³³

"Received an award from Local 6 of the Hotel and Restaurant Union after membership poll 'overwhelmingly' voted him the American who made the greatest contribution in the past year to the improvement of race relations.¹³⁴

"Recipient of the St. Francis Peace Medal, the first Catholic reward he received.¹³⁵

"Was given the North American Voice of Fatima award, also the Third order of St. Francis.¹³⁶

"Named Man of the Year by *Time* magazine.¹³⁷

"Received an honorary doctor's degree from Yale University.¹³⁸

"Two papers, published in Oslo, one of them a church paper, urged that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., be awarded the 1964 Nobel peace prize. Earlier, in February 1964 eight members of the Swedish parliament nominated Dr. King as candidate to receive this award. *The Christian Century* endorsed Dr. King for this award.¹³⁹

"Was awarded the Nobel peace prize. He 'has consistently asserted the principle of nonviolence' the Oslo Nobel Institute said in its statement announcing the award.¹⁴⁰

"Awarded the John F. Kennedy Prize by the Catholic Interracial Council in Chicago.¹⁴¹

"To be honored at a dinner sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews.¹⁴²

"Accounts Dr. King has made of the civil rights movement

"Article, 'The Negro Revolution in 1964' published in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference *Newsletter*, January 1964, page 7.

"Wrote 'Why We Can't Wait' reviewed in the *Chicago Tribune*, 6/28/64.

"Author of 'Strength to Love' published by Harper and Row.¹⁴³

"Author of 'Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story' published by Harper and Row.¹⁴⁴

"Author of 'Why We Can't Wait' published by Harper and Row and reviewed in the *Christian Century*, 8/19/64, page 1045.

"Appraisals of Dr. King

"The subject of real headshaking is the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. His influence is very great. Yet he has accepted and is almost certainly still accepting communist collaboration and even communist advice.¹⁴⁵

"He is nothing but a dastardly misleader, and is leading the Negroes in the South down the road to bloodshed and violence.¹⁴⁶

"To rally the masses against imperialism we need also slogans that correctly express the nature of today's struggle for Negro rights . . . The right of Negroes to be the administrator of Civil Rights laws, interpreters of their provisions and enforcers and judges of violations, must be recognized. One of the movements that developed and shook the world in the field of Negro liberation . . . is the Martin Luther King Improvement Association. This movement inspired Negroes of other cities to conduct similar struggles. So powerful was this movement, that the young Martin Luther King emerged five years ago from an obscure clergyman to prominence as an international figure. King, Abernathy, Shuttlesworth and other prominent ministers in the South are the most authorized spokesmen for this movement.¹⁴⁷

"King was accused by President J. H. Jackson of the National Baptist Convention at Kansas City, Missouri, of 'designing the tactics that led to a fatal riot' and the death of the Rev. A. O. Wright of Detroit.¹⁴⁸

"An editorial in the *Oakland Tribune* of 10/14/61 entitled, 'A Foolish Statement' indicated that King called for recognition of Red China by the United States.

"Editorial in the *Christian Century*, 'Last Chance for White Alabama?' Supports King's defiance of local court orders to cease demonstrations.¹⁴⁹

"Advised by Billy Graham to 'put the brakes on a little bit' in Birmingham demonstrations. Graham was criticized for his advice by the Fellowship of Reconciliation.¹⁵⁰

"Commended by the American Baptist Assembly.¹⁵¹

"Of King the late Manning Johnson, former negro communist, and later a U.S. Government witness, said:

"Rev. King is doing the negroes considerable harm. Rev. King has none of the qualifications, nor the wisdom to give leadership to the negroes of the South in this period. He has at the present time organized masses of negroes, and he has got them worked up to

a frenzy to the extent that they are willing to follow him although he is misleading them.¹⁵²

"Two very favorable letters suggest that Martin Luther King's 'letter from a Birmingham Jail' should be placed on the same level as Holy Scripture.¹⁵³

"Strom Thurmond read into the *Congressional Record* a statement giving much data on King on August 13, 1963.

"Two American Negro agitators were recently arrested in Birmingham, Alabama. Their names are Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Rev. Ralph D. Abernathy. These two men are expert professional riot-makers. They have been in contact with advisers in direct links with the Soviet Secret Service and extremist African groups operating from Europe.¹⁵⁴

"Was denied the right to speak at the University of Maryland in 1962.¹⁵⁵

"At the 176th General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., spring of 1964, the Presbytery of West Tennessee made an overture to the effect that the church 'refrain from inviting Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., and any and all others who share his persuasion to disregard and violate constitutional laws, to speak at its sessions.' No action was taken on the overture.¹⁵⁶

"Gus Hall stated that the Communist Party leaders in the United States 'consult with and advise top Negro leaders in their Civil Rights campaigns . . . Members of the Communist Party are very active in all the Negro organizations engaged in the Civil Rights struggle.'¹⁵⁷

"In a survey which was conducted by the *New York Times*, and in which 190 New York Negroes were interviewed, three out of four said that, of all their leaders King was doing the most for Negroes. Results of the survey were released on July 27, 1964.¹⁵⁸

"J. Edgar Hoover called King 'the most notorious liar in the Country' and never retracted that statement.¹⁵⁹

"After King spoke at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in May, 1961, three churches in Alabama voted to withhold funds from the seminary.¹⁶⁰

"Former president Harry Truman called Dr. King 'a troublemaker.'¹⁶¹

"Thomas J. Dodd, (D. Conn.) a strong supporter of King's civil rights activity in the past, spoke against him.

"Negro Bishop C. Fain Kyle issued a news release in which he charged King as 'directly or indirectly responsible for the chaos, anarchy, insurrection and rebellion brought about through demonstrations and rioting throughout the United States in recent years, months and weeks and days.' He suggested that King be 'shorn of his power and imprisoned for his criminal acts and deeds for defying the courts of the land.'¹⁶²

"ITEMS FROM VARIOUS NEWSPAPERS ON MARTIN LUTHER KING

"1. Called for Federal laws to ban discriminatory hiring practices by state and local courts and law-enforcement agencies, to establish uniform jury-selection procedures, and to make it a Federal crime to kill a civil rights worker.

"Also said that he would continue to speak out 'as an individual and as a minister' against the war in Vietnam. (*New York Times*, November 11, 1965.)

"2. Called the Vietnam war 'bad for our nation and the world,' and suggested that those opposed to it be permitted to substitute civil rights activity for military service. (*Chicago Tribune*, January 13, 1966.)

"3. Conferred with Archbishop John P. Cody, head of the Catholic Roman Catholic Archdiocese on racial problems in Chicago. (*Chicago Tribune*, February 4, 1966.)

"4. Police boosted their protection of King after a telephoned death threat, which came shortly before King spoke in a church and at-

tacked the Chicago Board of Education for its decision to build a new high school in the Kenwood district. (Chicago Daily News, February 4, 1966.)

"5. Urged residents of the East Garfield Park district of Chicago to be 'dissatisfied' until improvements are made in housing, employment, and educational facilities. (Chicago Tribune, February 6, 1966.)

"6. Was scheduled to speak at the Illinois Wesleyan campus at Bloomington, Illinois. (Chicago Daily News, February 9, 1966.)

"7. Threatened to lead economic boycotts against local industries which refuse to hire negroes for 'bigger and better jobs.' (Chicago Tribune, February 12, 1966.)

"8. Editorial noted that King is shifting part of his emphasis from slums to job discrimination. Editorial also demonstrates that negroes are better off economically than King would have us believe. (Chicago Tribune, February 15, 1966.)

"9. Told labor leaders that his civil rights movement in Chicago will emulate labor's techniques and seek its financial support. (Chicago Tribune, February 17, 1966.)

"10. Received pledges of \$20,000 to \$25,000 as a starter after he asked labor unions for financial support. (New York Times, February 17, 1966.)

"11. Urged people to join his proposed 'union against slums.' (Chicago Tribune, February 18, 1966.)

"12. Said that he will meet Muslim leader Elijah Muhammad in Chicago. (Chicago Daily News, February 18, 1966.)

"13. Said that his campaign to get 'bigger and better' jobs for negroes would begin with bread, milk, soup, and soft drink companies. (Chicago Tribune, February 19, 1966.)

"14. Said that he backs dissident teachers and parents who seek the ouster of the principal of Jenner Elementary School in Chicago. (Chicago Tribune, February 22, 1966.)

"15. Met for the first time with Elijah Muhammad, leader of the Black Muslims. (Chicago Daily News, February 24, 1966.)

"16. Three civil rights organizations led by King 'assumed trusteeship,' without court authority, of a building in a slum on Chicago's west side. (Chicago Tribune, February 24, 1966.)

"17. Editorial criticized King and three civil rights organizations with which he is associated for 'assuming trusteeship' over a building. (Chicago Tribune, February 25, 1966.)

"18. The action of King and the West Side Federation in assuming what they called 'trusteeship' of an apartment building was blasted as illegal by judges, lawyers, and real estate officials. (Chicago Tribune, February 25, 1966; New York Times, February 26, 1966.)

"19. Erwin A. Salk, a Chicago mortgage banker, alleged that King's takeover of a building may be justified. (Chicago Daily News, February 26, 1966.)

"20. King was sued in Circuit Court by the owner of a building which was taken over by him and three organizations of King's followers in a self-proclaimed 'trusteeship.' (New York Times, March 5, 1966.)

"21. A top aide of King said he 'welcomed' a Circuit Court suit challenging King's takeover of an apartment. The aide said that the civil rights groups which took over the building 'welcomed' the suit, because it would enable the court to speak of the right of citizens and tenants to take emergency action such as we took.' (Chicago Daily News, March 5, 1966.)

"22. Sided with the Rev. William H. DuBay in urging priests to organize into a union 'in order to protect their human rights.' Rev. DuBay has been suspended by James Francis Cardinal McIntyre of Los Angeles for 'irreverence and disobedience.' (Chicago Tribune, March 6, 1966.)

"23. The Chicago Committee of One Hundred condemned King's method of assuming

'trusteeship' of a building. (Chicago Tribune, March 8, 1966.)

"24. A newspaper item indicated that tickets for King's 'Freedom Festival' are almost sold out. (Chicago Daily News, March 8, 1966.)

"25. An editorial criticized King's illegal procedures. (Chicago Tribune, March 8, 1966.)

"26. Will speak to Southern Methodist University students and faculty. He will also speak at the International Convention of Christian Churches, where he will participate in a three-man panel which will discuss the role of the church in relation to civil rights. (Dallas Morning News, March 13, 1966.)

"27. Made the following statement: 'When it is appropriate, we will encourage sit-ins, stand-ins, rent strikes, boycotts, picket lines, marches, civil disobedience and any form of protest and demonstrations that are nonviolently conceived and executed.' (Chicago Sun-Times, March 13, 1966.)

"28. Urged negroes to 'come forth out of your slum shock.' He described 'slum shock' as the condition of persons who do little or nothing to end slum conditions. (Chicago Tribune, March 13, 1966.)

"29. Chicago Alderman Charles Chew Jr. urged King not to attend a special conference of local religious leaders called by Mayor Richard J. Daley. (Chicago Daily News, March 16, 1966.)

"30. Turned down an invitation to meet Mayor Richard J. Daley on the ground that previous commitments would prevent him from attending the meeting. (Chicago Tribune, March 17, 1966.)

"31. Article states that relations between King and Mayor Daley are officially cordial, but that a state of undeclared war exists between many of their key supporters. (New York Times, March 24, 1966.)

"32. The East Garfield Park Community Organization, a key organization in King's anti-slum campaign, subjected two West Side landlords to a three-hour grilling and gave them 10 days to produce building permits for repair of ten of their buildings. (Chicago Daily News, March 24, 1966.)

"33. Stated that he was not leading any campaign against Mayor Daley of Chicago. (Chicago Tribune, March 26, 1966.)

"34. Told an audience in Paris, France that in Chicago 41% of the housing for Negroes is considered substandard. (Chicago Tribune, March 29, 1966.)

"35. King and singer Harry Belafonte were honored as heroes in Sweden. (Chicago Tribune, April 2, 1966; also article, Miami, Florida newspaper, undated.)

"36. Has been given a public service award by the Sidney Hillman Foundation of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, (AFL-CIO). (Chicago Tribune, April 6, 1966.)

"37. King and his agents were enjoined from entering or collecting rents from a building which he had previously taken over in what he called a 'supralegal' move. They were also ordered to submit an accounting in 20 days of any rents collected. (New York Times, April 6, 1966; Chicago Tribune, April 6, 1966.)

"38. King stated that he would fight a court order ending his 'trusteeship' of a building in Chicago. (Chicago Daily News, April 6, 1966; Chicago Tribune, April 7, 1966.)

"39. Editorial praised the decision of a Circuit Court judge who enjoined King from confiscating a building on Chicago's west side. (Chicago Tribune, April 7, 1966.)

"40. On arriving in Miami, Florida, King stated that his staff researchers had found 'hostility and alienation' and that 'these could manifest themselves here as they have in all other urban ghettos through misguided violence and rioting.' (New York Times, April 12, 1966.)

"41. The court-appointed receiver for a building previously seized by King stated

that King should educate tenants in cleanliness rather than seize slum buildings. The receiver reversed his previous decision to ask for demolition of the building after he found it in better condition than he expected. (Chicago Tribune, April 12, 1966.)

"42. Article By Arthur Krock blames 'the preaching of Dr. Martin Luther King that individuals have a right to select the laws they will obey on their judgment of which is or is not just and discriminatory' as one of several causes for a riot of negro juveniles which began at a Maryland amusement park and erupted onto the streets of Washington, D.C. (New York Times, April 14, 1966.)

"43. Ernest R. Rather, president of the Chicago Committee of One Hundred, charged that King is hurting negro property owners by distorting census figures of negroes living in substandard housing. Mr. Rather charged that King's figure of 41 to 46% is false, and that census statistics, as interpreted by department of urban renewal officials, show that less than 20% of non-whites now live in substandard housing in Chicago. (Chicago Tribune, April 18, 1966.)

"44. Was scheduled to address a pep rally in support of a boycott of Jenner Elementary School in Chicago. (Chicago Daily News, April 20, 1966.)

"45. Chauncey Eskridge is an attorney who is representing King in an appeal of a court order barring King from interfering in the operations of a building in Chicago which he (King) took over two months previously. Eskridge is himself owner of a building and he was one of the landlords subpoenaed by the Illinois Commission on Low Income Housing. He claims that the violations in the building he owns were subsequently corrected. (Chicago Tribune, April 24, 1966.)

"46. Urged negroes to vote as a bloc in the Democratic primary in Alabama. (New York Times, April 30, 1966.)

"47. Disassociated himself from a 'Black Nationalist' stand taken by the new chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. (New York Times, May 28, 1966.)

"48. King stated that he sees a 'long, hot summer of sustained, nonviolent action programs' for Chicago. Stated that there will be marches, sit-ins, and even tent-ins in the suburbs and at real estate firms to protest housing segregation. (Chicago Daily News, May 28, 1966.)

"49. Called for the Federal Government to spend \$100,000,000,000 in the next 10 years to obtain equal rights for negroes. Also called for a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam and said that we should make clear a willingness to negotiate with the Vietcong on ending the war. Also called for the admission of Red China to the U.N. and diplomatic recognition of that country by the U.S. (Chicago Tribune, May 30, 1966.)

"50. Likened the civil rights movement in the United States to the recent uprising by Buddhist monks in Vietnam. (Chicago Tribune, June 1, 1966.)

"51. Made a list of 50 demands on the city of Chicago, including fair employment practices, a guaranteed annual income for everyone, the scattering of negroes throughout the city, the setting up of 10 new towns, each with 30% negro population, and the increase of welfare payments by 10%. (Chicago Daily News, June 11, 1966.)

"52. To receive a \$100,000 check for his Southern Christian Leadership Conference from the Martin Luther King fund in Sweden. (Chicago Tribune, July 2, 1966.)

"(All items in this report are stated as they appeared in the newspaper sources as given.)"

FOOTNOTES

¹Fellowship of Reconciliation booklet; Martin Luther King and the Montgomery story (no date).

²Worker, 4/21/57, page 2 Daily Worker, 6/7/57, page 3.

³News and Views, 3/59, page 1.

- "¹⁴⁴ *Atlanta Journal*, 3/10/60.
 "¹⁴⁵ *Idem*.
 "¹⁴⁶ Pamphlet and list of sponsors, dated 4/6/62.
 "¹⁴⁷ *Christian Century*, 9/14/63, page 1086.
 "¹⁴⁸ *Christian Century*, 9/18/63, page 1139.
 "¹⁴⁹ *Motive*, 10/63, page 56.
 "¹⁵⁰ *Chicago Tribune*, 11/15/63.
 "¹⁵¹ *Baptist Bible Tribune*, 1/10/64, page 7.
 "¹⁵² Program leaflet.
 "¹⁵³ *Christianity Today*, 6/5/64, page 39.
 "¹⁵⁴ *Christian Century*, 8/12/64, page 1012.
 "¹⁵⁵ *Christian Century*, 8/28/64, pages 1061-2.
 "¹⁵⁶ *Los Angeles Times*, 9/14/64.
 "¹⁵⁷ *Chicago Tribune*, 9/19/64.
 "¹⁵⁸ UP release, 10/15/64.
 "¹⁵⁹ *Christian Century*, 11/18/64, page 1422.
 "¹⁶⁰ *Presbyterian Journal*, 4/28/65.
 "¹⁶¹ Fellowship of Reconciliation booklet: Martin Luther King and the Montgomery Story (no date).
 "¹⁶² Official program, 8/20 to 9/2/57.
 "¹⁶³ Letterhead, 1958.
 "¹⁶⁴ *News and Views*, 8/58, page 2.
 "¹⁶⁵ *National Republic*, 11/58, back cover.
 "¹⁶⁶ War Resisters League *News for March-April 1959*.
 "¹⁶⁷ Announcement of meeting, 9/20/59.
 "¹⁶⁸ Leaflet dated 2/60 and 4/61.
 "¹⁶⁹ *Atlanta Journal*, 3/10/60.
 "¹⁷⁰ *New York Times*, 4/4/60.
 "¹⁷¹ Letterheads dated 9/24/58 and 5/17/60.
 "¹⁷² *Worker* 11/27/60, page 2, also, *National Guardian*, 11/28/60.
 "¹⁷³ Leaflet, 3/28/61.
 "¹⁷⁴ *Fellowship*, 11/1/61.
 "¹⁷⁵ *Idem*.
 "¹⁷⁶ Sobell Committee newspaper, 11/61, page 4.
 "¹⁷⁷ Letterhead, 1961.
 "¹⁷⁸ Letterhead, 1961.
 "¹⁷⁹ *Progressive*, 1/62, advertisement.
 "¹⁸⁰ *Charlotte Observer*, 4/6/62.
 "¹⁸¹ *National Guardian*, 4/30/62, page 6.
 "¹⁸² Letter mailed on 1/8/63 by the Southern Conference Educational Fund.
 "¹⁸³ *Tocsin*, 2/13/63, page 2.
 "¹⁸⁴ Letterhead, 5/15/63.
 "¹⁸⁵ *Christian Century*, 9/11/63, page 1112.
 "¹⁸⁶ *Worker*, 11/10/63.
 "¹⁸⁷ *Chicago Tribune*, 11/16/63 and *Chicago Daily News*, 11/9/63.
 "¹⁸⁸ *Christian Century*, 11/27/63, page 1482.
 "¹⁸⁹ *Liberation* masthead, 1/64.
 "¹⁹⁰ *St. Petersburg Times*, 4/20/64.
 "¹⁹¹ *Christian Century*, 8/12/64, page 1021.
 "¹⁹² *Chicago Tribune*, 10/12/64.
 "¹⁹³ *Who's Who in America*, Vol. 31, 1960-61, page 1590.
 "¹⁹⁴ *Chicago Tribune*, 3/31/65.
 "¹⁹⁵ *Christianity Today*, 7/5/63, page 33.
 "¹⁹⁶ *Worker*, 5/14/63.
 "¹⁹⁷ *Worker*, 10/30/60.
 "¹⁹⁸ *Chicago Tribune*, 2/9/61.
 "¹⁹⁹ *Worker*, 5/14/63.
 "²⁰⁰ Committee on Christian Laymen, *Progress Report*, 6/63.
 "²⁰¹ *Chicago Tribune*, 6/5/63.
 "²⁰² Louisiana Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities 11/19/63, Report #4, pp. 100-101.
 "²⁰³ *Chicago Tribune*, 3/31/65.
 "²⁰⁴ *Atlanta Times*, 4/1/65.
 "²⁰⁵ *Atlanta Journal*, 3/10/60.
 "²⁰⁶ *Christian Century*, 4/16/30.
 "²⁰⁷ *New York Times*, 6/10/60.
 "²⁰⁸ *Worker*, 10/22/61, page 8.
 "²⁰⁹ *Los Angeles Times*, 6/16/62.
 "²¹⁰ *New York Times*, 11/19/62.
 "²¹¹ *People's World*, 11/24/62, front page.
 "²¹² *Chicago Tribune*, 5/28/63.
 "²¹³ *Christianity Today*, 8/2/63, page 47.
 "²¹⁴ *Daily Worker*, 5/5/64.
 "²¹⁵ *Christian Century*, 6/3/63, pages 724-5.
 "²¹⁶ *Christian Century*, 7/8/64, page 894.
 "²¹⁷ *Christian Century*, 8/12/64, page 1005.
 "²¹⁸ *Chicago Daily News*, 8/20/64.
 "²¹⁹ *Christian Century*, 9/30/64, page 1196.
 "²²⁰ *Chicago Tribune*, 10/30/64.
 "²²¹ *Stamford, Conn. Advocate*, 12/1/64.
 "²²² *Chicago Tribune*, 12/10/64.
 "²²³ *Chicago Tribune*, 12/7/64.
 "²²⁴ *Chicago Tribune*, 12/4/64.
 "²²⁵ *Chicago Tribune*, 12/19/64.
 "²²⁶ *Chicago Tribune*, 2/10/65.
 "²²⁷ *Redbook*, magazine, 1/65.
 "²²⁸ *Nation*, 2/22/58, pages 162-163; *New York Times*, 8/13/59, page 17.
 "²²⁹ Press release, 12/2/57; and press release, 4/21/58.
 "²³⁰ *Washington Post and Times Herald*, 7/31/58, page B8.
 "²³¹ Press release, 6/12/59.
 "²³² *New York Times*, 9/17/59.
 "²³³ *Southern Patriot*, 9/59, page 4.
 "²³⁴ *Washington, D.C. Post*, 3/13/60.
 "²³⁵ *New York Times*, 3/30/60.
 "²³⁶ National Committee To Abolish the HOVA booklet, 1960.
 "²³⁷ *Washington, D.C., Post*, 1/2/61, two page advertisement.
 "²³⁸ *New York Post*, 5/2/61, page 1.
 "²³⁹ *Worker*, 5/14/61, page 12; *National Guardian*, 5/15/61, page 3.
 "²⁴⁰ *New York Times*, 5/26/61.
 "²⁴¹ *Southern Patriot*, 6/61, page 4; and letter soliciting signer of petition, 6/61.
 "²⁴² *New York Times*, 7/20/61, page 13; and *New York Herald Tribune*, 7/20/61, page 13, (full page advertisement).
 "²⁴³ Petition, 9/19/61.
 "²⁴⁴ *New York Times*, 2/22/62, page 17 (advertisement).
 "²⁴⁵ Petition, 4/3/62.
 "²⁴⁶ Press release, 4/5/62.
 "²⁴⁷ *New York Times*, 4/10/62; page 31; and *New York Times*, 4/16/62, page 30 (advertisement).
 "²⁴⁸ *New York Times*, 4/19/62, page 25 (advertisement).
 "²⁴⁹ *Tocsin*, 1/14/62, page 1.
 "²⁵⁰ "Thirteen for Christ" by John Howard Griffin, pp. 33-34.
 "²⁵¹ *Congressional Record*, vol. 110, pt. 8, p. 10186.
 "²⁵² Louisiana Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities, 11/19/63, Report #4, pp. 100-101.
 "²⁵³ *The Register*, 10/21/62.
 "²⁵⁴ American Committee on Africa (leaflet; Tenth Annual Report)
 "²⁵⁵ *Tocsin*, 1/22/64, page 3.
 "²⁵⁶ *Congressional Record*, vol. 110, pt. 8, p. 10186.
 "²⁵⁷ *Tocsin*, 5/25/64, page 4.
 "²⁵⁸ *Atlanta Times*, 11/26/64.
 "²⁵⁹ (American Friends Service Committee—flyer-undated)
 "²⁶⁰ *New York Times*, 10/26/60.
 "²⁶¹ *Chicago Tribune*, 6/12/64.
 "²⁶² *Chicago Tribune*, 2/2/65.
 "²⁶³ Program of luncheon, April 24, 1957.
 "²⁶⁴ *Daily Worker*, 5/28/57, page 3.
 "²⁶⁵ *Stamford Advocate*, 11/63.
 "²⁶⁶ *Times-Picayune*, 11/10/63.
 "²⁶⁷ Associated Press release (no date.)
 "²⁶⁸ *New York Times*, 6/16/64.
 "²⁶⁹ *Christian Century*, 8/12/64, page 1006.
 "²⁷⁰ *Chicago Daily News*, 10/14/64.
 "²⁷¹ *Chicago Daily News*, 10/26/64.
 "²⁷² *Atlanta Times*, 1/21/65.
 "²⁷³ *Christian Century*, 8/19/64, page 1045.
 "²⁷⁴ *Idem*.
 "²⁷⁵ *New York Herald Tribune*, Joseph Alsop column (no date.)
 "²⁷⁶ Louisiana Legislative Committee hearings, Part II, March 6-9, 1957, pages 203-208.
 "²⁷⁷ From the Communist Party document, 'Draft Resolution,' 10/25/59, by Pettis Perry—House Committee on Un-American Activities, Appendix to Hearings dated 6/10/60, Part 4, pages 2338-2349.
 "²⁷⁸ News Interview in Kansas City, Missouri, 9/9/61, reported in the *New York Times*, 9/11/61.
 "²⁷⁹ *Christian Century*, 5/1/63, page 574.
 "²⁸⁰ *Ecumenical Press Service*, 5/10/63, page 1.
 "²⁸¹ *Ecumenical Press Service*, 5/31/63, page 2.

- "²⁸² Louisiana Joint Legislative Report on Un-American Activities, Subversion in Racial Unrest, Part II, page 203.
 "²⁸³ *Christian Century*, 8/7/63, page 986.
 "²⁸⁴ *Intelligence Digest and Weekly Review of England*, 5/63.
 "²⁸⁵ *Christian Century*, Jan.-June, 1964, page 501.
 "²⁸⁶ *Christianity Today*, 6/19/64, page 30.
 "²⁸⁷ *St. Louis Globe Democrat*, 1/12/64.
 "²⁸⁸ *Christian Century*, 8/12/64, page 1005.
 "²⁸⁹ *Chicago Tribune*, 11/19/64.
 "²⁹⁰ *Christian Century*, 11/20/64, page 1431.
 "²⁹¹ *San Francisco Chronicle*, 4/13/65.
 "²⁹² Bishop Kyle's news release (undated)."

VIOLENCE COMMISSION SHOULD STUDY EVENTS IN BERKELEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, events in Berkeley, Calif., over the past 2 weeks have sickened the entire country.

There has been needless violence and over-reaction on all sides. There have been exaggerated and inflammatory statements. And there have been nearly 2 full weeks of confrontation and tension on the campus and streets of Berkeley.

At this moment it is not so important to fix the blame for the events which have transpired as it is to find a solution which will provide for the return of an environment suitable to rational dialogue and inquiry.

But in the longer run, public confidence can be maintained only if a full and impartial investigation and report of the events can be produced. Then it will be possible to learn from past mistakes how to avoid similar or even more violent occurrences in the future.

Last week I wrote to Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Chairman of the National Commission on Causes and Prevention of Violence, again asking that his respected Commission review the events of these last 2 weeks in Berkeley. I have in my letter attempted to inform Dr. Eisenhower of the incidents reported since I had first asked him for an investigation.

I believe this letter may be of interest to the readers of the RECORD, and I ask that it be included at the conclusion of my remarks.

The events in Berkeley can serve to teach us all a lesson if only we will inquire. I most urgently request the help of the Violence Commission in making the facts available.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, D.C., May 28, 1969.

DR. MILTON EISENHOWER,
 Chairman, National Commission on Causes and Prevention of Violence, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. EISENHOWER: I would like to take this opportunity to expand on my telegram of May 21 requesting your distinguished commission to initiate an investigation into the Berkeley disorders of this month.

My great concern after carefully reviewing the events of the past 13 days is that we are witnessing in our community a marked escalation of violence in student-police confrontations which may well establish an alarming precedent for future disorders both here and elsewhere around the country.

We in the Bay Area have long witnessed the growing animosity and hostility, leading in recent times to open violent confrontations.

In the last several years, we have seen the Bay Area become a crucible for student and demonstrator tactics and police response. The mood and the tactics of both sides in confrontations around the country frequently have their roots in earlier incidents here.

The level of violence in these confrontations continues to rise steadily and we were all appalled at the heights to which it rose in the Chicago convention disorders which your organization so carefully and objectively examined with significant impact on both sides.

Student disorders began with sit-ins, then gave way to the physical occupation of University buildings and finally to street clashes. Police response has ranged upward from the simple patrol of rallies to club-swinging mass arrests and now to the use of firearms as a means of crowd dispersal.

In my judgment, and now in the judgment of many of my fellow citizens, a most serious new level of violence has been reached with the present disorders in Berkeley.

If I may, I would like to outline some of the more significant incidents of the past 2 weeks. None of these has yet been subject to the scrutiny of a formal investigation so that we have a clear understanding of the facts. The news media reports, however, are generally in agreement over what has transpired in our community.

On May 15, apparently in response to a flurry of rock throwing and other incidents, law enforcement officers opened fire on a main boulevard in Berkeley with shotguns.

One young man, James Rector, positioned on the roof top of a theatre overlooking the street scene was fatally wounded by a shotgun blast. The County Pathologist, Dr. Alan McNie, attributed Rector's death after a post mortem examination "to shock and hemorrhage due to multiple gunshot wounds. . . ."

Three pellets were removed from his body and are being examined by ballistics experts for an accurate determination of their type. Preliminary and reliable reports from law enforcement and medical officers, however indicate the pellets were approximately 1/4" in diameter, about .30 calibre size, and "consistent with double aught buckshot."

Physicians at Herrick Memorial Hospital who treated several dozen wounded, including two newspaper reporters, have reported in the news media that at least four other persons were hit with pellets of the same general description.

Alameda County Sheriff Frank Madigan whose officers were armed with shotguns and are generally believed responsible for the shooting, said the men were issued only "birdshot," the size of BB's. He noted, however, that double aught buckshot shells are part of the ammunition normally carried by the officers.

Two photographs so far printed in local newspapers depict at least two of the shooting incidents.

One photograph shows an officer sighting along his shotgun barrel at the back of a man fleeing down a street nearly 2 car lengths away. The photographer, Emmitt Wallace, 26, a student, told the San Francisco Chronicle that he snapped the photograph a split second before the officer fired and hit the man.

The Daily Californian, student newspaper on the Berkeley campus, has printed a photograph which reportedly shows an officer on Telegraph Avenue firing up onto the rooftop, hitting James Rector.

There has been widespread and repeated use of teargas and "pepper fog," frequently under questionable circumstances. There have been several reports from teachers at McKinley and Whittier Elementary Schools that teargas was used near their schools without apparent regard for the effect on young students in class at the time. On May 16 after the

arrival of over 2,000 National Guardsmen in the area someone in a commanding position authorized a National Guard helicopter to make a gas-spraying run across the University's Sproul Plaza.

Authorities reported that the decision to use the helicopter was made under the clear and present threat of a large, menacing crowd which has been warned a few minutes earlier that gas would be dropped if it did not disperse.

A number of news media representatives on the scene, however, questioned strongly that there was any threat of any significance and also reported that the people in the area where completely ringed by National Guard troops and were unable to escape. Additionally, some even questioned that such an order to disperse was issued or at least that if so it was unable to be heard in many areas of the Plaza. The gas from the helicopter attacks spread widely over the area including private residences, local business, and even Cowell Memorial Hospital.

On May 22 nearly 500 persons were arrested during a demonstration and transported by bus to the Alameda County Rehabilitation Center at Santa Rita for detention. Among the group was Mr. Tim Finley, a reporter for the San Francisco Chronicle, who wrote a lengthy account of the treatment of the prisoners by jail deputies.

Mr. Finley's report, supported by statements from many individuals also arrested, indicated that prisoners were verbally and physically harassed by deputies, forced to lie down on an asphalt lot for several hours and only allowed to turn their heads once every half hour, and were in custody for nearly 14 hours without food.

Additionally, many persons reportedly were refused access to toilet facilities for several hours, and were needlessly and repeatedly awakened throughout the night by guards whose apparent intent was harassment for its own sake.

These are a few of the more vivid incidents which have taken place in Berkeley in the last 2 weeks. I am sure that a thorough investigation would probably uncover many more.

As this letter is being written, Berkeley is facing the distinct possibility of another mass confrontation on Memorial Day, not less than 48 hours away.

There has been a statewide call by leaders of the "People's Park" movement for young people to come to Berkeley and join in a mass rally and march, possibly culminating in the physical removal of the park fence, which has become a symbol of the conflict. At the same time state officials are saying that they have the fullest intentions of meeting any threat to the community with whatever force they deem necessary.

I have the deepest concern for the violence potential in this confrontation and respectfully submit and strongly believe that an announcement of the Commission's intention to investigate the entire Berkeley disorders could be of significant assistance in cooling passions and preventing new violence.

At the same time, the terrible significance of what has transpired in Berkeley demands the closest scrutiny by a neutral organization with the eminence and acceptance with which I feel the Commission is held.

I would appreciate your earliest possible response to this request.

Sincerely yours,

JEFFERY COHELAN,
Member of Congress.

UNDER SECRETARY WALKER SAYS ADMINISTRATION PLANS TO DO NOTHING ABOUT HIGH INTEREST RATES

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration has decided to take a "do-nothing" attitude about holding down interest rates.

This morning's Wall Street Journal quotes Dr. Charls Walker, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, as saying "the Treasury will not take a stand one way or the other on the matter" of high interest rates.

With the country faced with the high interest rates in more than a hundred years, this is a shameful statement for a high Government official to utter.

Dr. Walker's attitude should dispel any doubt about who is running the Treasury Department. It is obviously the bankers—the big bankers.

Dr. Walker is quoted as saying:

We believe in a market approach. The market makes better decisions than a bureaucracy makes.

In other words, Dr. Walker is saying this administration is not going to do a thing that the banks do not want done. They will not even use the powerful force of moral suasion to hold down interest rates and protect the public.

It is the responsibility of high public officials—such as the Secretary of the Treasury and the Under Secretary—to do everything possible to hold down interest rates and to urge the banking community to stop gouging the public. But this administration now says it will not do that. It will not do its duty—its sworn duty—to protect the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, when these interest rates climb once again, this administration, the Secretary of the Treasury and his underlings, will share the blame right along with the big banks. They have agreed to lie down and play dead and let the banks do as they please about high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Walker's statement of surrender to the big banks was made in New York late last week after I had sent the Secretary of the Treasury a telegram asking that he issue a public statement demanding that the banks not raise the prime interest rate. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of this telegram.

MAY 29, 1969.

DAVID M. KENNEDY,
Secretary of the Treasury, U.S. Treasury
Department, Washington, D.C.

Reports persist that the large commercial banks are planning still another assault on the American people through an increase in the prime lending rate. As you know, an increase in the already usurious 7½ per cent prime rate will send a shockwave through the entire economy, raising interest rates on every item.

As Secretary of the Treasury you have the power to stop this latest effort to increase interest rates. I urge you to announce today that you and the Nixon administration are flatly opposed to any increase in the prime rate.

I urge that you demand that the commercial banks refrain from any conspiracy to jack up the rate. Such a statement, coming from the Secretary of the Treasury, would stop the increase.

Another increase in the prime rate will all but halt an already badly depressed housing market and will raise the price of goods to millions of American families. Another increase is totally unnecessary and it is noth-

ing more than an attempt by the banks to gouge the American public during a critical economic period.

The big commercial banks believe that this administration is more concerned about their welfare than the welfare of the American people. They are convinced that they can raise the prime rate without criticism from you or the administration. You now have the power to prove them wrong in this instance by coming down hard in a public statement opposed to a higher prime rate.

Mr. Secretary, I hope you will use the great powers of your high office to protect the American people. I hope sincerely that you will choose the public interest over the bank interest.

WRIGHT PATMAN,

Member of Congress, First District of Texas.

HIGH INTEREST RATES INCREASE THE COST OF LIVING

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Leon Keyserling, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, has been a consistent battler against high interest rates.

Through the years, Mr. Keyserling, one of the Nation's most respected economists, has done much to clear away the fog surrounding monetary policy and to set the record straight about the effects of high interest rates on the economy.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Mr. Keyserling addressed the Consumer Assembly of Greater New York, and his speech is one of the best analyses of the effect of high interest rates on inflation that has ever been produced. Mr. Keyserling plainly states that high interest rates are one of the main factors in causing inflation.

Mr. Keyserling says:

The rising interest rates, because people have to borrow, are just as much an element in the cost of living as the rising price of meat, or the rising price of bread, or the rising price of medical care, or the rising price of housing, of which the interest rate is a part.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD the text of Mr. Keyserling's address as it was published in the Co-Op Contact, a publication of the United Housing Foundation.

PRICES—INTEREST—TAXES—AND THE CONSUMER

(By Leon H. Keyserling)

My friends, I have heard the very excellent remarks of your public servant and my friend, the Attorney General. Speaking within the scope of his range of public service, he has talked about ways of protecting the consumer against the private crimes of infamous people. I'm going to talk today about the public crimes of famous people; about the public as distinguished from the private crimes in the so-called war against inflation. For although no one is more desirous than I of stopping what the consumer thinks inflation does to him, I have been trying and would like to continue to try, with your help and understanding, to stop what is done to the consumer in the name of fighting inflation.

Broadly speaking, while I appreciate the immense importance of controlling the private crimes of the infamous, I think that the

public crimes of the famous, insofar as they bear upon prices and income distribution, affect the consumer as much, and maybe even more, than the private aspects of the matter.

First of all, let's try to get a few matters straight. I object not in the slightest to concentration upon the problem of inflation, which I will define very simply as rising prices, and specifically a rising cost of living. I object not at all to maximum concentration upon that problem, so long as it is not transmuted into a frenzy and a scare, under the smokescreen of which the consumer is plundered in the name of fighting inflation.

Therefore, and for this reason only, even at some risk of being misunderstood, I would like to bring a few simple matters to your attention.

First, George Washington could throw a dollar across the Potomac because a dollar could go further in those days—and ever since the price level, with some periodic interruptions, has been rising in the United States. The price level rose more during the fifty years before 1919, than during the fifty years since. And, during each ten-year period within the last fifty years, the average annual increase in prices has tended to be about the same, except during the years of the Great Depression, the deflation thereafter and the aftermath of World War II. So we are not now living in a "new age" of inflation.

Second, during the past thirty years, despite rising prices, the American people have enjoyed higher standards of living, made more rapid increases in social progress, and (with all their faults which I am ready to concede) achieved perhaps more improvements, not only in the distribution of income, but also in other social gains and civil rights, than any other people in human history at any time. It therefore does not make sense to say that a rising price level is our only problem; that we should become so concentrated upon dealing with that one problem that we forget about everything else; and that we should leave in the hands of those in public positions who are dealing with that one problem the control of the destiny of everything else that happens to us, while our attention is distracted by their crocodile tears about what inflation does to the average person.

To get down to brass tacks, the real concern of the consumer is not what price he pays, but what his income can buy. To take a simple illustration: When I was a youngster in South Carolina, a well-paid cook got six dollars a month. Now, that's not a slip of the tongue, not six dollars a week, six dollars a month. Today the same job pays about a hundred dollars a month, which is not munificent, but it's more than sixteen times as much.

Meanwhile, prices have come somewhere between doubling and tripling. So the cook can buy from about five to six times as much; sleep in a house instead of a hut; eat a varied diet rather than rice with a little cow peas over it; ride on a paved road instead of a rutted sand road; possibly even have a car; have some years of schooling though not enough, while in that time she had none; have medical care, when at that time there was none within reach, not even a practical nurse; and perhaps may be concerned with the problem of integration and the quality of the school, when at that time, in that place, there were no schools within reach of blacks or whites or anybody else.

This is merely an illustration of the fact that what raises the standard of living of particular people is the increase in the per capita output of the country, and how it is distributed among the people. If that increase were at a maximum rate, and if the distribution were proper, it would not matter what the price level were.

So why does it matter what the price level is, and why does it matter so much what

the perpetrators of the public crimes do about inflation? The reason is this, and I can use as an analogy a game of bridge, or pinochle or poker. I can't play poker, because I can never learn to remember the relative values of the different combinations—it's too hard for me.

Therefore, let's get back to bridge, but it's all the same. Let's deal a hand of cards to four people, and they have certain combinations of cards, and each of those cards has a certain purchasing power in taking tricks. The Queen has a higher purchasing power than the Jack. Then, the tournament referee comes along and says, "I'm going to change the value of the cards. I'm going to reduce the purchasing power of each card. All the Aces will be worth Kings, all the Queens will be worth Jacks, all the Tens will be worth Nines, and so forth, and the Twos will be worth Ones, and this will apply to each of the four hands. In that event, there's no change in the game, and all four players are right where they were. None of the players is any better off, and none of the players is any worse off. If you changed it the other way, and raised all the Queens to Kings and all the Aces to Double Aces, and the Twos to Threes and so forth, nobody would be any better off or any worse off."

But suppose that, in the alternative, the referee said, "I'm going to change the Queens to Kings in some hands, and in other hands I'm going to change the Queens to Tens." That would redistribute the purchasing power, and that would make a difference.

This is the real problem in connection with prices. Either under falling prices, stable prices, or rising prices, there may result a better or worse distribution of purchasing power or income, and I don't need to tell this group what a better distribution is. We still have a very unsatisfactory income distribution in the United States. Too much is going to too few, and not enough to too many, in terms of the buying power of their incomes.

The next important thing to bear in mind is that rising prices, or inflation, do not automatically worsen income distribution. I can give you an example of when falling prices distributed the income worse. The best example would be the Great Depression. Prices fell tremendously, but who was worst hurt? The people who could least protect themselves, the people who got unemployed and had no income, the people who had no savings, the people who had no resources. Many of the people at the top were hurt considerably, and they were scared, but if they were well enough protected, they rode it out relatively well.

So this was an example of falling prices being damaging, not because the change in the price in itself means anything, but because the falling prices in that instance redistributed income badly.

In contrast, from 1939, which was the end of the Great Depression to, let us say 1953, partly during World War II, and partly after World War II, prices, in the main, rose. They rose very substantially, but we had one of the most profound redistributions of incomes in a favorable direction than we've ever had in the United States.

Negroes had opportunity for industrial employment which they had never had before. Women were able to work who had never been able to work before. Collective bargaining brought a better distribution of national income, and so did farm price supports, despite all the incentives leveled against them, and so did social security, and so did many other things. In this instance, a rising price level was combined with an equitable distributive program, which we called equity of sacrifice during the war, and didn't have any particular name for after the war. The rising prices were accompanied by a great improvement in the incomes, both absolute and relative, of those

lower down, and a relatively much more rapid increase in their living standards than in the living standards of those higher up.

Let us now ask: What's the trouble with the current war against inflation? The trouble with the current war against inflation is that, in the name of fighting inflation, and while shedding crocodile tears about inflation and how inflation inflicts its cruelest curse upon those who are unable to protect themselves, while uttering all these shibboleths and all these tear-jerkers, the programs which are adopted to fight inflation are inflating the fat, starving the lean, repealing many of the social gains and social thinking that we earlier achieved, and distributing income in the wrong direction on a larger scale than was ever done before by our national public policies.

Lest I seem politically ungenerous, let me hasten to add that I was talking about the Eisenhower Administration, the Kennedy Administration, the Johnson Administration, and perhaps the Nixon Administration. The great money manager in the United States (and I'm going to talk about money policy as prime examples); the great architect of income redistribution in the wrong direction, and I've said this many times, is Mr. William McChesney Martin who served as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board under Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, and who foreseeably will serve under Nixon. I am not one of those who believe that it is always to the great credit of a man that he can serve all masters equally well. Sometimes it is not.

There is not much basic difference in the fundamental economic and social thinking of the recent Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Henry Fowler, and the prospective Secretary, Mr. David Kennedy, or between the new Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Mr. Paul McCracken, and the recent Chairmen—Walter Heller being the best known. I'm not saying this to pillory individuals. I'm saying this, and it's an optimistic note in one sense, that we have as good a chance to change some of these policies under the new Administration as under the old, and that what happens will depend upon the people, upon their understanding of the issues, and upon how vocal they are.

We organize people into groups such as this and others, in order that they may know what it's all about, but unfortunately they have been so brainwashed that they do not yet know.

Now, let's get down to the specific policies. I refer to the money policy. Since 1952, we have, with very slight interruptions, experienced a staggering increase in interest rates—tight money and rising interest rates. All of us have been told, and most of us believe, that this is the prime weapon in the war against inflation.

How can this be so? Inflation is a rise in the cost of living, in what you pay for what you get. More than half the people in the United States spend more money per year than they earn after taxes. In other words, they are net borrowers, and they borrow very heavily, relative to their incomes. They borrow to rent or to own a home, because even rent payments cover capital costs. They borrow to buy a car to go to work. They borrow to send the wife to the hospital when there's a long illness. They borrow to send a child to college. They borrow for the refrigerator or the television set. They're borrowing all of the time.

Furthermore, they're borrowing because they have to borrow, and that shows the difference between the private crimes and the public crimes. It is all very well, and I favored the bill, to reveal to consumers what interest they're paying, and also to reveal to them, as friend Colston Warne is helping so much to do, the relative values of the goods they buy. But in the final analysis, how far does it go to reveal how much the loan is

costing them, if they have to pay the high interest anyway because they haven't got the money and because that's what the rate is? It helps with some, but it's not the main problem.

The rising interest rates, because people have to borrow, are just as much an element in the cost of living as the rising price of meat, or the rising price of bread, or the rising price of medical care, or the rising price of housing, of which the interest rate is a part. Yet, we are told that these rising interest rates help to fight inflation.

During the past seventeen years or so, because excessive interest costs have been increasing year by year, 150 billion dollars has been transferred out of the pockets of those who borrow money, and into the pockets of those who lend the American people back their own savings. About 9 billion a year has been transferred out of the pockets of the young couples getting married and renting houses. In this year alone, 17 to 25 billion dollars will be transferred out of the pockets of these young people and into the pockets of those who do not need income supplementation in the form of the higher and higher interest rates they receive.

This is being done to consumers through national public policies. I haven't got time to prove it here today, but this is being done by the Federal Reserve System and its local affiliates, in one way or another. It is being done by a national system, created by law, membership appointed by the President, living under theoretical Congressional supervision. In addition, there are specific interest rates, such as the interest rate on housing, and the interest rate on small business loans, and the interest rate on farm loans, and the interest rate on college loans, which are set directly by the Congress.

So we now have in operation a set of national policies—I call them national crimes—to feed the fat and starve the lean by this interest rate monstrosity.

To give you one more example of the significance of 17 to 25 billion dollars a year: If that amount of money, under different policies were used in other ways, what could it do? We're talking about welfare payments, guaranteed incomes, a minimum-income floor for people, and I'm for these measures. I won't go into the details, except to say that it is not only my estimate, but also the estimate of most economists who have looked into the subject, that 11 to 13 billion dollars a year would be enough to bring all of the 30 million people in the United States who are below the poverty-income ceiling as it is rather stingily defined, up above the ceiling. In other words, about half of the money that is being transferred by rising interest rates alone to the wrong people, if transferred to the right people, would be the quickest and shortest and most direct way of getting rid of the problem of poverty, and I think that has something to do with the problems of consumers.

Why are we told that this interest rate crime is desirable? The argument runs this way. By lifting the interest rate, people borrow less. Some people can't borrow, and if they can't borrow there's less economic activity. If there's less economic activity, there'll be less pressure on the economy, and if there's less pressure on the economy there won't be as much inflation. Therefore, while this remedy seems to be painful, it's really helpful. Thus runs the prevalent fairy tale. But let's get at the truth of the matter.

Suppose that, during World War II, you didn't have enough meat to go around. Some people were saying that there was a very simple remedy for that. Let's just let the price go up, and let the price ration the meat. The affluent people will be able to continue to buy it, and the poorer people with the large families won't buy it, and they'll go back to eating rice and beans, and then the demand for meat will be less and

the price will go down. What would our response be to that kind of argument?

Yet, this is just what the perpetrators of the rising interest rates are saying. We will raise the price of money, and we will try to reduce the pressures on the economy by sharing out the people who are most vulnerable, people about whom we are shedding the crocodile tears won't get in at all. Now the proof that this is what they are saying is to be found in their current argument that national policies should deliberately promote some more unemployment "to stop inflation." Not too much more unemployment, they say, just enough of it.

Well, I haven't got time here to go into all of the reasons why this whole argument is entirely erroneous. There is, in the main, no positive connection between the amount of unemployment and the amount of price stability. I can prove that there frequently is more inflation when there's more unemployment, and so forth, but let's put this aside. Let's suppose there were something to their argument. Even then, they would be saying to the man who has a job at \$4,000 a year, "you become unemployed, and you take \$1,500 a year on relief or on unemployment insurance, or \$2,000 a year to make it simple. You take a 50% reduction in income, and then the inflation won't be quite so hard on the people who have nice jobs and good pay, and Leon Keyserling won't have to pay 1% more on the next Cadillac car that he buys, or on the next fur coat that he buys for his wife, because very recently she hadn't been working to support him."

Now what kind of a people are we, when we take the word of those who say to those suffering from unemployment, which even today is terribly high among some vulnerable groups as we all know; who say to the other people whom they want to make unemployed; who say to the old people for whom they don't want to spend more money for pensions or Social Security benefits, although three-quarters of them are poor; who say to the people in the slums that they don't want to provide universal, prepaid medical care, although 40% of all consumers as we know can't afford it at costs within their means—what kind of people are we, when we listen to those who say that it would be inflationary to use enough of our vast national income to meet these pressing needs, but who at the same time insist that we should use 17 to 25 billion dollars a year of our national income to pay higher and higher interest tribute to the affluent and rich?

Some of our other natural economic policies, in recent years, have moved in the same direction of feeding the fat and starving the lean. In 1964, we undertook very massive tax reductions, and a family with an income of \$300,000 a year got a 35% increase in disposable income, and a family with an income of \$3,000 a year got a 2% increase. When I talked to the New Frontiers among us, they said,—"well, you have to do that. These families at the lower level pay so little taxes that when you reduce taxes of course you can't reduce theirs as much." I said, "Well, you don't start with the idea that the object is to reduce taxes. You start with the idea of whom you want to help, and if you can't help people by reducing taxes, then let's go some way that does help them, the right people. And, furthermore, you're not right anyway, because, instead of these tax reductions beginning at the top, if you had increased the exemptions from \$600 to \$1,800, which you should have done, this would have helped the middle income families and the lower middle income families and even the poor families, and we would have been inflating the lean instead of inflating the fat, and this would have been a good kind of inflation."

Also, when they decided upon those tax reductions for the wrong people, they starved the capacity of the government to spend

money for essential public purposes, which the consumer needs most of all. Aid to education, aid to public schools, aid to teachers, aid to the municipalities which are in trouble, aid to take the poison out of the airs and waters, aid to health services, and so forth and so on. So, they deliberately decided to stimulate the economy by handing the money out to the people who were stimulated already, and depriving themselves enduringly for at least ten years ahead, and we're seeing the results now, of the tax revenues needed to do the things the consumer needs. In short, they have squandered the money, both in the tax reductions and in the interest payments for the people who didn't need it.

This doesn't even make the economy perform better, it makes the economy perform worse, and it'll become still more unstable because of this maldistribution of income, but I haven't got time to go into that.

Now finally, they imposed a tax surcharge of 10%. You would have thought, that since the tax reductions fed the fat and starved the lean, that when they started turning the other way, they'd start to remedy some of it. But they slapped on a 10% surcharge. Everybody knows that a 10% tax increase applied "equally" to families at all levels violates the whole American principle of taxation according to ability to pay, and hurts those most who need help most.

We have consumers coming to meetings, and I hope you won't take this critically, talking about all of the little minutiae of this and that and the other things, and talking about a hundred different programs to help the consumer, and hardly bothering to really concern themselves very deeply with these two tremendous things. If you take the tax policy and the money policy together, they are distributing today easily 20 to 25 billion dollars a year, away from the kinds of consumers we're interested in, and toward the kind of people who don't need it and aren't entitled to it and shouldn't get it.

Consumers include everybody: consumers are citizens, consumers belong to all kinds of organizations, consumers are employed people, and unemployed people, and people who need health care, and people who need everything. I think the large consumer movements have got to interest themselves more in these large questions.

The war against poverty has been thus far a disappointment, in many respects, because of this open-minded desire to cover the waterfront, has led to a thousand different kinds of poverty programs, spawned by all the sociologists, the do-gooders, and street corner philosophers, done at the local level all over the country. This represents failure to distinguish between genuine democratic participation and pseudo-participation in lieu of basic public responsibility. And what's happening to the schools in the City of New York is another example. I want to see our public schools come up to uniform high standards for the training of Americans. I don't want to see the schools of Mississippi and in Brownsville and in Yorkville and in Westchester County becoming more and more dissimilar, because the parents—and the children already in those schools happen to be so different. Should we compound this, and make them more and more different in the name of a spurious participation?

In the war against poverty, we should concentrate on a few big things, jobs, income guarantees, Social Security improvements, health and welfare, and housing, to develop strategic attack pointed at the real basic elements in the problem.

Why didn't we? Because so many are interested in a dilettante approach. I merely use this as an example of the fact that I think the consumer, who is everybody, has got to get back to the basic things that I have been talking about, and I'm not enamored of them because I'm an economist or a specialist. These are the big things. These are the things that mean a thousand dollars

to the consumer for every hundred dollars or fifty dollars that is met by these other subsidiary aspects of protecting the consumer which I'm for also.

And, on taxes, when we look at all taxes, the sales taxes, the property taxes, the local taxes, the state taxes, instead of just the Federal income tax, the \$3,000 a year family pays a larger portion of its income in taxes than the five, and the five larger than the ten, and the ten larger than the twenty, etc., even not counting the evasions. We put through a big Federal program of revising taxes, without even talking about that.

Now I suggest that we start focusing upon the two tremendous instruments of national policy affecting the consumer—the tax policy and the money policy, and we can add other things also. If we get those straightened out, or even begin to get them straightened out, or dissipate some of the clouds, or call attention to some of the public crimes, we will be making an immense contribution to the well-being of the consumer and to the well-being of the whole economy, and to the return of those progressive policies of taxation and money policy which we did follow for many years, but have certainly abandoned with magnanimous equanimity, more recently, whether we have had Republican or Democratic Administrations.

A STUDENT LOOKS AT BERKELEY

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the other day the mother of a student at the University of California in Berkeley showed me a letter which her daughter had just written to her. This student is a junior and, her mother tells me, has not been politically involved. She wrote in part:

I take it you aren't hearing much about the state of affairs at Berkeley. Without going into the whole thing—the place is as if occupied by a foreign army. Two thousand national guardsmen are camping in the People's Park. Thirty-eight people were shot. One died—a spectator—a freshman. The owner of a movie theatre was blinded. A classics graduate student was shot in the face coming out of the library. Those are all I know about but some other people are in pretty bad shape. There is a 10 o'clock curfew. Helicopters circle overhead and drop tear gas—huge amounts quite indiscriminately. Public gatherings are illegal. —'s professor was called to see why twenty members of —'s poetry class were meeting at her house off campus. —'s professor was arrested for vagrancy one night while driving back from a movie.

Five hundred people were arrested yesterday. Some were just eating lunch in a nearby restaurant. The ball is \$750-\$1,000. Guys are getting beaten in jail. A friend of —'s was walking down Shattuck two hours after a demonstration. Police grabbed him, twisted his arm, and broke it. Yesterday two guys were beaten up in front of our house. Twenty medics were arrested. A friend of a friend who runs a nursery school said parents are calling up asking what to do because their kids wake up screaming at night. — was there when the cops gassed the junior high school kids as they came out of school. The local news radio station was ordered off the streets. —, one of the good regents, said that when parents will allow things like this to happen to their own children there is a fascist state.

Local merchants, citizens, and professors are trying to do something but all they get are answers from Reagan like:

"The confrontation was a deliberate provocation by a well-organized group who

had stockpiled (bricks) ammunition to use against the police."

Those aren't the exact words but you can see the attitude. This seems to be just one step farther than Chicago. It is amazing how many things can be put in jail for—taking pictures, provoking a riot (that can cover anything), insulting a police officer, being in the wrong place at the wrong time, being a medic. Once arrested no one ever heard of the writ of habeas corpus. It's sort of funny how people get punished before the trial (beaten or shot).

Mr. Speaker, the letter speaks for itself. The situation recounted in this letter is a national tragedy.

FOOD VERSUS BOMBERS

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, two articles on the front page of the May 31 Washington Post help dramatize the dilemma facing our Nation.

One article spoke of the cost of "closing the hunger gap" at a cost of \$2.93 billion. This conclusion was reached in an unpublished Budget Bureau study. The study, according to the Post, concludes:

Every dollar spent on feeding the hungry poor, particularly small children, is returned many-fold in enhanced learning and earning capacity and productivity later in life, and in avoidance of the social and medical costs of brain damage, blindness and other handicaps that can result from malnutrition.

The other article discussed the AMSA, an Air Force proposal for a new advanced manned supersonic aircraft. Its total cost is estimated at \$8 to \$12 billion. The article went on to say:

While Air Force leaders have publicly said a new bomber is "urgent" other Pentagon strategists see AMSA's main value as a way to force Russia to spend billions on air defense.

This type of economic warfare, though little discussed, is very real as the United States and Russia try to keep each other off balance.

Mr. Speaker, the Nixon budget does not contain sufficient funds to close the hunger gap. The budget does have room, however, for \$100 million, added to \$35 million in carryover funds, to shorten the design phase and start full-scale engineering development of AMSA. Previous allocations have averaged about \$20 million yearly.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether or not the Soviet Union has malnourished children as we do in the United States. I do know that it is madness to build a new strategic bomber fleet to force new spending on the Soviet Union for air defenses while we continue to let hunger go unchecked at home.

MILITARY GRANT AID PROGRAM

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Friday I was quoted in the Washington Post as favoring "killing" the military grant aid program. Although I am deeply critical

of this program, I have not yet reached the point of wanting to end it altogether. Because the reporter with whom I spoke is very competent, the erroneous impression probably originated with me.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to point out why I have been deeply concerned with the military grant aid program. Perhaps its most distressing aspect is the indiscriminate manner in which the aid is handed out. In administering this program we give it to authoritarian rulers of all kinds—in the name of freedom. A senior editor of *Look* magazine concluded recently after a trip to Greece that "we are spending around \$40 million a year of American taxpayer's money for aid to a government that rules by torture."

Greece is the most current example of the amoral character of the military grant aid program. If one looks at all the countries of Western Europe today, it is striking that our grant aid goes to nations ruled by dictators. They include Spain, Portugal, and Greece.

In Latin America we continue to give aid for many years to Argentina. We cited Peru as a prime example of how our military aid would successfully alter the attitude of the Peruvian military toward democratic institutions; look at the result. Brazil, under virtual dictatorship, has received this aid for many years.

For some Americans it is enough, of course, that these governments are anti-Communist. I hope that someday we will have learned our lesson. Rulers who care little about democracy will quickly make their deals with the Soviet Union when it suits their ends. What is more, totalitarian regimes rarely encourage the political, social, and economic progress which most nations badly need.

I do not believe that the granting or withholding of military aid alone will have any great impact on events in these countries. I do believe that the United States should disengage itself from the relationship created by giving military aid to dictators who hold democratic values in contempt, imprison their opposition, censor their newspapers, and engage in various kinds of other suppression, including torture. Perhaps if our vital security interests are involved we can justify such a course, but that is seldom the case.

The United States must be true to its own sense of decency and morality. U.S. influence in the past has been augmented by demonstrating such decency and morality in the conduct of our affairs. We need to return to that standard.

Military grant aid has never been carefully scrutinized by the Congress. Many problems have beset that program: excessive staffing, personnel who embraced the views of the oligarchy in the country in which they serve, and high-level personnel who see in the military aid program a means of achieving "stability" without reference to the wishes of the people themselves.

Perhaps if military aid programs are not reformed and limited to nations whose governments respect the rights of their people, the entire military aid program should be killed. I would prefer to see reforms and policy changes, because

such a reformed program of military aid would best serve the interests of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, to illustrate some of the examples I mentioned earlier of the bankruptcy of our military aid policy, I ask that the following three newspaper articles be reprinted in the *RECORD*. The one on Argentina appeared in today's *Washington Post*. The other two, on Greece and Brazil, were printed in the *New York Times* of Sunday, June 1.

VIOLENCE SHATTERS ILLUSION OF STABILITY IN ARGENTINA

(By John M. Goshko)

BUENOS AIRES, June 1.—As Argentina counts the casualties from last week's outburst of violence and civil strife, it is becoming clear that one of the chief victims is the image of President Juan Carlos Onganía and his government.

Propelled into the presidency by a 1966 military coup, Onganía has been touted by his admirers as precisely the sort of stern, paternalistic leader needed to bring order and stability to this country of 23 million people.

His aim, he announced on taking power was nothing less than a "revolution" that would completely remake the bases of Argentine social, political and economic life. The job, he hinted, might take 10 years or more, and in the interim the military-backed regime would decide what was good for Argentina.

Now, the image of Onganía as the man who restored order and set his countrymen back on the road to hard work and morality has been badly tarnished by a spontaneous explosion of resentment that touched almost every corner of Argentina.

Its culmination came last week in the industrial city of Córdoba, where for three days students and workers fought the army in an orgy of violence that left at least 11 people dead and more than 30 injured.

[In Córdoba today, two labor leaders charged with "public incitement to rebellion" were sentenced by a military court to seven and eight years in prison, the Associated Press reported. Light sniper fire broke out last night and continued early today in Córdoba, where troops still control the streets.]

Although order is being restored in Córdoba and elsewhere, it is clear that the forces that Onganía has so decisively dominated since 1966 are again in foment. What the interaction of these forces and the military strongman will be is, at this point, less clear.

Underlying this struggle is Argentina's continued agony in attempting to extricate itself from the shambles left by the demagogic dictatorship of Juan Domingo Peron during the 1940s and '50s.

When Peron finally was overthrown in 1955, he left behind an economy in ruins, a runaway rate of inflation and his power base, a labor movement that had been rewarded with special political and economic privileges.

UNIONS BLOCKED MOVES

During the ensuing years, this virtual veto exercised by the unions over Argentine life frustrated the efforts of successive civilian governments to restore stability. Finally, on June 28, 1966, the armed forces deposed elected President Arturo Illia and replaced him with Onganía, former commander in chief of the army.

Under the dour and conservative Onganía, Argentina has suffered from a case of political schizophrenia. His government, although clearly to the right of center, has from the outset been composed of two contesting factions.

One, the so-called liberal group, has tended

to emphasize economic matters, seeking an eventual return to democracy—but only after the economy has been rebuilt along private enterprise, big-business-oriented lines. Its chief spokesman within the regime is the economy minister, Adelbart Krieger Vaasena, and it is the faction that has given the regime its chief economic direction until now.

The other faction, usually referred to as the nationalists or the corporativists, has vague ideas about turning Argentina into a highly centralized, statist-oriented country rather than falling back on the traditional model of democracy. Its focus is chiefly political, and its principal representative within the Cabinet is considered to be Guillermo Antonio Borda, the Interior Minister and Onganía's principal political adviser.

DELAYS CHOICE

Until now, the two groups have coexisted uneasily within the government, waiting for Onganía to make a choice between them.

The President, however, has steadfastly deferred any decisions about future political directions concentrating instead on economic matters and on more immediate problems of neutralizing potential political rivals.

Outwardly, the system seemed to be working. In the political sphere, the government successfully managed to break the backs of such one-time power sources as the traditional political parties and the labor movement, most of whose leaders were forced into an openly collaborationist stance.

On the economic side, Krieger's policies also seemed to be achieving dramatic results in reducing inflation, attracting new investment and generally getting the economy revved up again. This was done, however, by resorting to wage freezes and other measures that put the brunt of austerity on the working classes.

As a result, the Onganía government entered 1969 with a reputation for being among the most stable in Latin America. The majority of Argentines were described as being "relieved" at no longer having to worry about the uncertainties of politics. Abroad, the regime's economic policies were being held up by Washington and such institutions as the International Monetary Fund as a model for the rest of the hemisphere to follow.

But there were deep pockets of discontent, and eventually they came together to create an explosion much like the one that hit the de Gaulle government in France a year ago.

DISSIDENTS UNITE

As in the French situation, the two forces that merged to bring rioting and bloodshed to Argentina were the university students and the workers.

The students seemed to have become fed up with the government's attempts to assert strict control over the national university system, with the low-budget priority it assigned educational matters and with its attempts to impose a stifling Jansenist Catholic morality on Argentine intellectual and artistic life.

The workers, in contrast to most of their titular leaders, were never convinced of the need to give up their long-held privileges or to carry the major brunt of austerity. And, as their resentment deepened, they began unobtrusively but increasingly to listen not to the collaborationist leadership of the General Labor Confederation but to a break-away rebel faction headed by Raimundo Ongaro, who preached defiance.

There were other factors as well. One was the increasing role of Catholic priests in encouraging workers to protest and attacking the social injustices of the regime. Another was the restiveness created by an abortive terrorist campaign by extreme leftist Peronists earlier this year.

The igniting spark came on May 15 when students at the University in Corrientes staged a demonstration to protest a rise in cafeteria prices. In scuffling with the police,

a student was shot to death, and the result was a wave of nationwide campus protests.

SOLIDARITY SOUGHT

The students touched a sensitive nerve in the Argentine populace. Workers and even middle-class shopkeepers began joining the student demonstrations in a gesture of solidarity.

As the incidents mounted and the regime replied with force and intransigence, Ongaro was able to lay the groundwork for a highly successful 24-hour general strike. In contrast to past strike efforts that the government had suppressed, worker sentiment this time was so aroused that even the rival collaborationist labor faction was forced to join the strike plan.

It was Thursday night—the eve of the strike—that the explosion came in Cordoba, a city that is both the site of an important university and the center of the Argentine automobile manufacturing industry. Police opened fire on a column of workers marching toward the center of town from the Ika-Renault auto factory, and within hours the city was in a virtual state of civil war.

THE LESSON?

Now the question puzzling observers here is what lesson—if any—has been learned from the bloodbath. Some think the regime has been shaken and will move toward a more conciliatory stance—one that might take some of the burden of austerity off the working classes and dispel past vagueness about the political future.

Others, however, think the regime will consider any effort at conciliation as an admission of weakness and a possible threat to its announced economic goals. Accordingly, they look for an even greater tightening of the dictatorship.

Many point to the example of Brazil, where similar signs of public restiveness toward a military-backed strongman regime resulted last December in a campaign of repression.

In Brazil, the effect of the clampdown was to take real power away from the President, Arthur da Costa e Silva, and place it squarely in the hands of the armed forces officer corps. Today, one can hear many predictions in Buenos Aires that much the same thing will happen here.

[From the New York Times, June 1, 1969]
GREEK MILITARY COURT CONVICTS 37 MORE OF ANTIREGIME ACTIVITY

ATHENS, May 31.—Thirty-seven Greeks were convicted today of having plotted against the nation's army-backed regime. At the same time, security forces continued a wave of arrests of suspects including a former defense chief, Vice Admiral Spyridon Avgeris.

The number of Greeks convicted of sedition by military tribunals in the last three weeks rose today to 125 when the Salonika court-martial condemned 37 out of 39 persons charged as members of the leftist anti-regime organization known as Patriotic Front.

Four men were given life terms, five got between 15 and 25 years in jail, 14 from six to 13 years, nine from 13 months to 5 years, five had suspended sentences and two were acquitted.

The five-officer court in the northern Greek city returned the verdicts after an all-night sitting at the close of the 16-day trial. Total sentences passed by military courts since May 12 for political offenses added up to 802 years, plus 10 life terms.

FORMER OFFICERS ARRESTED

As the wave of mass trials apparently drew to an end—none were slated for the coming week—security forces put under arrest a number of retired officers and civilians.

An official statement said the retired officers had been arrested because they were

engaged in activities "directed against public order, security and tranquillity."

Admiral Avgeris, who was ousted and retired after King Constantine's abortive attempt to unseat the military rulers on Dec. 13, 1967, was arrested in his Athens home.

Another officer given a dishonorable discharge for backing the King's bid, Col. Nikolaos Zervoyiannis, was also arrested, bringing the total number of retired officers rounded up this week and scheduled for deportation from Athens to at least 12.

Qualified sources said it was unlikely that all the arrested officers were together in a subversive plot. Their seizure and banishment to remote Greek islands was seen both as a punitive and a deterrent action.

In the last two years, some 2,000 officers were ousted from the forces as a precautionary move by the regime.

The action against the former officers was followed by large-scale arrests of civilians in Athens in the last four days. Reliable reports said about 50 persons were rounded up each night and taken to security police headquarters.

Most of them are being released after several hours of questioning, but a large number are still held at the headquarters building.

This action followed the stepping up of antiregime activity, including several explosions of home-made bombs in downtown Athens and Salonika in the last two weeks.

EX-U.S. AIDE JOINS PROTEST TO BRAZIL—GORDON AND OTHER EXPERTS ASSAIL FACULTY PURGES

WASHINGTON, May 31.—A former high State Department official once closely identified with United States support for the military-dominated Government in Brazil has joined American professors in a written protest against recent faculty purges in Brazilian universities. The document was cabled to Arthur da Costa e Silva, President of Brazil today.

The former United States official is Lincoln Gordon, now president of Johns Hopkins University, who served from 1961 to 1966 as Ambassador to Brazil and until early 1967 as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. He is one of 10 American specialists in the field of Latin-American studies who signed the cablegram. It was one of two such protests circulated at more than 20 colleges and universities in the United States and sent to Brazil this weekend with a total of more than 300 signatures.

"My objection to the removal of the professors is part of my general feeling of grave concern over the arbitrary use of power in Brazil since December," Dr. Gordon said in a telephone interview.

PRESIDENT RULES BY DECREE

Last Dec. 13, President Costa e Silva, a retired army marshal, dismissed the Brazilian Congress and assumed the right to rule by decree.

Since December, there have been reports from Brazil of widespread arrests and press censorship designed to silence opposition to the Government. A month ago, by Presidential decree, 68 professors were involuntarily retired without explanation from the country's two largest universities.

Dr. Gordon's first public protest over the course of events in Brazil is viewed here as a personal echo of a slow change in United States policy toward Brazil that has been going on since the former Harvard economist left the embassy in Rio de Janeiro.

United States officials say the policy of drawing back from close identification with Brazilian Governments since 1964 began under John W. Tuthill, Dr. Gordon's successor, and has accelerated since last December.

PERSONIFIED U.S. SUPPORT

For many Brazilian politicians and political observers, Dr. Gordon personified thor-

ough U.S. support for the austere reformist government of Humberto Castello Branco, another army marshal, who assumed the presidency after a military-civil revolt toppled President João Goulart in 1964.

Dr. Castello Branco died in 1967. Dr. Gordon's present open opposition to President Castello Branco's successor, Mr. Costa e Silva, would be likely to arouse wide interest in Brazil, but the organizers of the cabled protest said they did not believe the informally censored press would be encouraged to report their cablegrams.

According to reports from Brazil, there has been no press comment on the forced retirement of such internationally known professors as Florestan Fernandes, a sociologist; Isaias Raw, a biochemist; and José Leite Lopes, a physicist.

The same reports said that the 68 professors as a group had no common political denominator, but that all had been interested in the reform of university structures transplanted to Brazil from Europe.

These reforms, according to the reports, are opposed by other professors with personal access to members of the Costa e Silva Government.

The telegram signed by Dr. Gordon was drafted by a committee of the Latin American Studies Association, an academic association with more than 700 members, and signed by Prof. John J. Johnson, chairman of the committee on Latin-American studies at Stanford University, and Prof. Charles Wagley of Columbia University, among others.

It urged President Costa e Silva "immediately to remove the restrictions that your Government has imposed upon scholars and permit them to return to their institutions and to work in a free and open intellectual environment."

The second cablegram was drafted by a committee including Prof. Alex Inkeles of Harvard University and Myron J. Weiner of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It was signed by 283 scholars at 23 American colleges and universities, including Max Milikan, the director of the Center for International Studies at M.I.T.

HONEY PROMOTION AND RESEARCH BILL

(Mr. LANGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a self-help bill to aid honey producers of this Nation. Not only would this bill enable honey producers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for honey, but it would also protect their markets through sensible import controls.

The promotion and research features of this measure reflect a most commendable desire by our honey producers to promote their own industry at their own expense. They are not asking us for money. All they want is the enabling legislation that merely makes it possible for the honey industry to move ahead with its promotional plans at no expense to the Federal Government.

Our honey producers, wanting to maintain their markets and experience a desirable industry growth pattern, wish to assess themselves in an orderly manner in order to raise the funds necessary to carry out promotion and research. This bill would allow the produc-

ers to assess themselves at a rate that would not exceed 15 cents per 60-pound can of honey. The funds collected would be used for research, development, advertising, and such other expenses as would be deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Any promotion plan devised under the terms of this bill would have to be submitted to the producers in a referendum. It would go into effect only if two-thirds of the voting producers approved the plan. Individual producers who did not wish to participate at all could demand and receive a refund of his assessment. Thus, any plan would be voluntary on the part of the producers.

One feature of my bill differs with other honey promotion bills that have been introduced. Under this legislation, realistic import controls would be imposed. It would not prohibit foreign honey suppliers from shipping honey into this country, but it would hold imports generally at past percentage levels. The import section of this bill is needed. It would make little sense to encourage the American honey producers to spend their own money to expand and promote markets for their product, only to permit foreign suppliers to usurp that market at no expense to the foreign producer.

Mr. Speaker, when any industry such as our honey growers want to assess themselves to promote their own products, we should give them the opportunity. And in giving them the opportunity, we should also give them some assurance that their efforts will not be dissipated in the glut of imports. I believe this bill, which I have titled the American Honey Promotion and Research Act, will accomplish both purposes.

MILITARY JUSTICE ACT OF 1968

(Mr. PIRNIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. Speaker, the crisis in the military lawyer ranks continues critical. No one who is aware of the low retention rates of the four services can question the validity of that statement. However, despite the fact that this is a recognized problem which can reach desperate proportions, action by the Department of Defense on my bill, H.R. 4296, has been delayed. Congress created the urgency by passing the "Military Justice Act of 1968"—a landmark law which becomes effective on August 1 of this year. We are, therefore, particularly obligated to see that it is implemented.

Several times in remarks to the House, I have referred to the "Military Justice Act of 1968" and the effect it will have on the military justice system. I have noted that an additional 800 military lawyers will be required to carry out the mandate of that act. In order to more fully comprehend the scope of the crisis, I suggest the reading of an article which appeared in the May 1969 edition of the American Bar Association Journal, entitled "The Military Justice Act of 1968." The authors, both career JAG officers, have detailed the changes which will occur as a result of the act. The last sen-

tence in the article characterizes the legislation as follows:

It is a tribute to the American ideal of justice and a true demonstration of democracy in action that in the midst of war, we should see fit to extend rather than diminish the due process rights accorded to members of the armed services.

Yet this will be a hollow gesture or a terrific embarrassment if we do not provide the machinery to insure that experienced legal officers are available to carry out the requirements of the Military Justice Act of 1968. My bill seeks to do just that by providing professional pay and a continuation bonus for career military lawyers. I invite every Member to study the appended article:

THE MILITARY JUSTICE ACT OF 1968 (By James A. Mounts, Jr., and Myron G. Sugarman)

The Military Justice Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-632), which President Johnson signed into law on October 24, 1968, makes the most sweeping changes in the Uniform Code of Military Justice¹ since that code was enacted in 1951. The Uniform Code of 1951 gave the services a uniform system of due process. Now the 1968 legislation places the military system of criminal justice well ahead of most civilian systems insofar as the accused's due process rights and benefits are concerned, and it conforms much of the military procedure to the civilian. The 1968 act brings added benefits to the military accused, while at the same time increasing military efficiency by eliminating much of the need for line officers to spend time handling military justice matters.

The 1968 act represents a combination of various positions advocated by the services and by members of Congress.² It makes extensive changes in the Uniform Code in five areas; use and authority of military judges; court-martial procedures; accused's right to legally qualified counsel; release of accused from confinement pending appellate review (military "bail"); and appellate review.

The new law makes extensive changes in the procedures of general courts martial. The first involves the use of judges in the administration of military justice. Currently a law officer, who must be a trained lawyer, presides over a general court martial. The act changes the name of the law officer to military judge, makes the military judges of general courts martial part of an independent judiciary and authorizes an option of trial by military judge alone without court members. The act also brings about procedural changes, long advocated by The Judge Advocate General and the United States Court of Military Appeals, designed to allow the military judge to assume a true judicial role.

The act's provisions for trial by military judge alone will benefit the accused by giving him another option within the system and will increase efficiency in many cases. The accused will have the right, knowing the identity of the military judge, in all general courts martial, except capital cases, to request trial by a military judge alone, just as in the federal court a defendant may waive his right to trial by jury. The accused's request will be granted if the military judge approves. The prosecution has no right, as it has in civilian practice under Rule 23a of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, to veto the accused's request, but it is limited to making arguments to the military judge as to the appropriateness of trial by a one-officer court.³ The one-officer court option will increase efficiency by releasing many line officers from court-martial duty for their

primary duties. Proceedings will move faster in those cases tried by a judge alone.

The military accused will reap a benefit from this option. If he feels a trained lawyer will hear and decide his case more effectively than a panel of his fellow service members, he may request trial by a judge alone, as did one third of the defendants in contested federal criminal cases in fiscal year 1967. If an accused fears that line officers who would make up the panel of court members might be biased against him, he will now have the option to be tried by a judge who is completely independent of the command.

A system of independent judicial officers has been prescribed for the Army since 1958 by administrative regulation; now the independent judiciary is a statutory requirement. Judges of general courts martial will be responsible only to The Judge Advocate General, or his designee, for direction and fitness reports. They will not be responsible, for example, to the Army area or post commander in whose area the trials at which they preside are conducted. The purpose of this provision is to prevent commanders from exercising any indirect influence over the procedures and results of cases.⁴

The changes in the Uniform Code increase the powers and prerogatives of military judges. These provisions will save the time of court members and improve the internal efficiency of the military justice system. They will place the military judge on a par with judges of federal district courts in many respects. When these changes are coupled with changes in court-martial procedure brought about by the act, the result will be a court martial closely resembling a federal criminal trial. The military judge will have the authority to hold pretrial and other sessions without the necessity of assembling the court martial and members. He will be able to rule on interlocutory motions raising defenses and objections; for example, on the admissibility of evidence or a confession. If the regulations of the individual services permit, he will also be able to conduct the arraignment and take the accused's plea.

Under current practice the court martial must be formally assembled and the members present before these procedures can take place—court members are excused from the courtroom while many of the above procedures take place. Now they will be able to utilize this time performing their primary functions. There will be no need to assemble the members of the court merely to have jurisdiction to proceed with the business of the court. The military judge will be able to hold posttrial sessions to adjudicate remands from appellate agencies; the act eliminates the inconvenience of gathering together court members for these sessions.

The military judge will be able to rule finally on challenges to court members on all questions of law and all interlocutory questions, including motions for findings of not guilty and for continuances, other than the factual issue of the accused's mental responsibility. No longer will these decisions be subject to being overruled by the court members. As in the federal courts, the military judge, when sitting alone, will determine all questions of law and fact arising during the proceedings and will adjudge an appropriate sentence if the accused is convicted. He will make a general finding unless requested to find the facts specially. The act also gives the military judge the authority to forbid the taking of depositions if this should become necessary.

The act streamlines court-martial procedure in many other respects. Regulations of the service secretaries may prescribe that oaths need not be administered to counsel and military judges in every case, as is currently required. Rather they may provide, for example, that the oath may be taken once for all cases in which the counsel or judge is to serve. Additionally, except in capital cases in which a guilty plea may not

Footnotes at end of article.

be accepted, the judge may enter a finding of guilty after a plea of guilty without the formality of a vote by the court members.

In the view of many, the most significant changes in military justice brought about by the new law involve the special court martial. The special court martial is the military equivalent of a civilian court that can try only misdemeanor cases. A special court martial has jurisdiction to impose a maximum of six months' confinement and a bad-conduct discharge.⁵ Current law provides the accused in a special court martial with counsel who must be a commissioned officer but who need not be a qualified lawyer.⁶ The services have made efforts to staff these courts with legally qualified officers, although not required by law to do so. The Air Force, for example followed a policy of providing all defendants at special courts martial with legally qualified defense counsel. All the services have permitted the accused to be represented by his own attorney at courts martial.

The act amends Article 27 of the Uniform Code to require that an accused be afforded the opportunity to be defended by legally qualified military counsel unless such counsel cannot be obtained because of "physical conditions or military exigencies". This right to qualified counsel may be waived, and it may not apply, for example, where hostilities or geographic location makes it impossible to provide a lawyer. However, under these circumstances the officer who convened the court martial must indicate in a written statement attached to the trial record the reasons that necessitated trial at that time and place.

The act also amends Article 19 of the Uniform Code to provide that a special court martial may award a bad-conduct discharge only if the accused has been afforded legally qualified counsel. In this situation the law does not permit a waiver of the right to counsel by the accused, and physical conditions or military exigencies do not excuse the requirement for representation by qualified counsel. The consequences of a bad-conduct discharge are so significant that Congress felt that servicemen should be represented by counsel in those cases.⁷

These changes in the Uniform Code place the military significantly ahead of most civilian jurisdictions. Few states and federal circuits require that counsel be appointed where the possible punishment is six months' confinement or less. The new legislation provides that counsel will be appointed at the accused's request without regard to his financial status. He also may employ his own lawyer, who need not be a member of the Armed Forces, if he desires. The act does not require that the prosecutor (trial counsel) in a special court martial be a qualified lawyer. However, the Uniform Code has required that the defense counsel be legally qualified if the prosecutor is so qualified.⁸

The act permits a convening authority to detail a military judge to a special court martial at his discretion. The intent is to permit a trained judge to preside at those special courts martial that involve complicated issues of fact and law.⁹ The act requires that a military judge be assigned to a special court martial authorized to award a bad-conduct discharge, unless he cannot be detailed because of physical conditions or military exigencies. If this requirement is not met, the reasons must be stated in writing and appended to the record of trial for review on appeal. A verbatim record of trial also is required if a special court martial adjudges a bad-conduct discharge. If a military judge has been detailed to the court martial, the accused will have the same right to trial by military judge alone as does the accused before a general court martial.

The act also makes changes affecting the summary court martial, the military equivalent of the civilian magistrate or commissioner court. No counsel is required or ap-

pointed; one commissioned officer, generally not a lawyer, acts as judge, jury, prosecutor and defense attorney. Under present law an accused may refuse trial by summary court only if he has not previously been offered nonjudicial punishment under Article 15 of the Uniform Code. The act amends Article 20 to permit an accused to refuse to be tried by summary court martial in any case, even if he has refused punishment under Article 15.

This change will permit an accused to be represented by a lawyer free of charge, if he wishes fully to litigate his case, every time he is faced with the possibility of punishment, no matter how minor.¹⁰ He may refuse Article 15 punishment and trial by summary court. The convening authority may then bring charges at special or general court martial, where the accused will be defended by a qualified lawyer. It should be noted, however, that depending on the maximum sentence possible for the alleged offense, an accused who chooses to move his case to a higher-level court may thereby increase his risk of punishment.

The act provides a method for release from confinement pending appeal. A convening authority or other authority having jurisdiction over the individual will have discretion to release an accused from confinement pending appeal of his court-martial conviction. Unlike most civilian release on bail, no bond or monetary deposit will be required. This provision is a significant step forward. In some cases an accused has served his entire term of confinement by the time his case is reversed on appeal. Those released pending appeal will be required to serve their sentences when the sentences are approved on review and ordered executed. They will obtain no credit against their sentences for the time during which they were released.¹¹

The act makes significant changes in appellate procedures. The Uniform Code currently provides for at least one review of every court-martial decision. More serious cases are given additional rights of review. Under the new act the right to review is broadened in cases involving minor offenses, and the stature and independence of military appellate judges are increased.

The act changes the name of the boards of review to courts of military review and the titles of the board members to appellate military judges. Civilians may be appointed to these courts by The Judge Advocate General of an armed service. Provisions on command influence similar to those applying to military trial judges apply to members of the courts of military review.

The act amends Articles 69 and 73 of the Uniform Code to broaden the jurisdiction of The Judge Advocates General to grant rehearings and to review cases not otherwise reviewed by the courts of military review. Whereas this review is now limited to general court-martial cases not involving punitive discharges or sentences of more than a year's confinement, the new act extends it to all court-martial cases. Furthermore, the time for filing petitions for rehearing is enlarged from one to two years. The Judge Advocates General are given the power to review and either to vacate or modify in whole or in part the findings or sentence, or both, in any court martial which has been reviewed finally but has not been reviewed by a court of military review. Application for review under the new provisions must be based on grounds of newly discovered evidence, fraud on the court, lack of jurisdiction over the accused or the offense, or error prejudicial to the substantial rights of the accused.

It is important to note that, with the exception of the amendments to Articles 69 and 73, the provisions of the act do not take effect until August 1, 1969. During the intervening period a joint service committee will rewrite the *Manual for Courts-Martial* to implement the act. The new manual will have the title *Manual for Courts-Martial, 1969,*

Revised Edition. In addition, regulations implementing the law in each armed service will be written. Until these regulations and the manual are completed, it will not be possible to spell out with detailed certainty just how the changes in the Uniform Code will operate in practice. It is clear, however, that the act is a major step forward for military justice. It places the military, once again, ahead of most civilian jurisdictions in terms of the rights afforded to an accused. It is a tribute to the American ideal of justice and a true demonstration of democracy in action that in the midst of war we should see fit to extend rather than diminish the due process rights accorded to members of the armed services.

FOOTNOTES

¹ 10 U.S.C. §§ 801-940.

² The act passed the House and Senate as H.R. 15,971, 90th Congress, 2d Session. It was originally introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative Charles E. Bennett of Florida. The Senate amendments were sponsored by Senator Sam Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina. The substance of the act is drawn in large part from earlier bills introduced by Mr. Bennett (H.R. 226, 90th Congress, 1st Session, and H.R. 12,705, 90th Congress, 2d Session) and Senator Ervin (S. 2009, 90th Congress, 1st Session) and from a series of bills introduced in the 88th Congress. Other parts of the act derive in large measure from a series of Department of Defense proposals.

³ S. REP. NO. 1601, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. 4 (1968).

⁴ *Id.* at 9.

⁵ 10 U.S.C. § 819.

⁶ 10 U.S.C. § 827(c).

⁷ *Supra* note 3, at 5.

⁸ 10 U.S.C. § 827(c).

⁹ *Supra* note 3, at 4-5.

¹⁰ There is one minor exception. A service member attached to or embarked in a vessel may not demand trial by court martial in lieu of nonjudicial punishment under Article 15. 10 U.S.C. § 815.

¹¹ *Supra* note 3, at 14.

ROTC—NASHUA EDITOR, CLAIRE BARRY, WRITES A RINGING DEFENSE

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, Claire Barry, managing editor of the 1590 Broadcaster, a weekly "shopper" published in Nashua, N.H., has written a first-rate, ringing defense of the ROTC. The editorial makes the interesting point, that if ROTC is done away with, the military would be forced to increase its reliance on officer candidate schools, which, in turn, would deplete the enlisted ranks by several thousand and tend to force larger draft calls. The very ones who cry against ROTC are, in fact, increasing their own vulnerability to draft, that is, assuming any of them are in fit mental or physical shape to be worthy of serving their country in the first place.

I commend Claire Barry for an excellent editorial which I offer at this point for the RECORD:

ROTC VITAL TO NATION

It seems incredible that some members of the New Hampshire State Legislature would seriously consider abolishing ROTC as a part of the curriculum at the University of New Hampshire. The ROTC training program has, for many years, supplied junior officers to all

branches of the service at very little cost to the taxpayers.

The ROTC program is not compulsory. It is available to those students who wish this in-college training. The backbone of the Army is its junior officers, and when there is a shortage of these men, they must be obtained elsewhere. One source is Officers Candidate School, which, in turn, depletes the regular ranks of the enlisted men.

This necessitates a larger call-up to fill out the required number of personnel. Eliminating ROTC as a college-connected subject will only increase the number of men called up in the draft.

There is a great deal of talk about ROTC college credits, and the seemingly handing-out of these credits just for appearing in uniform at a class.

A student enrolled in the ROTC program at the University of New Hampshire receives only two credits for this class. This class consists of training, field trips, drill, and logistics, and military science, for which they are tested and receive grades. The course is not a "gut" course, as the easier courses are called by those not taking them. It also teaches the young men the value of self-discipline and working for the betterment of their country.

Is there a conspiracy afoot? First, gun laws are being passed daily which will prohibit the law-abiding peaceful citizen from obtaining and using guns of any kind. Now, an effort to undermine the basic officer supply potential by downgrading and eliminating ROTC as a college subject. For many years, members of ROTC have served their country honorably and well.

These students are willing to add this to their curriculum, and not at the expense of other subjects, which means they must work just a little harder than the non-ROTC enrollee.

There is certainly nothing wrong in the student who does not wish to participate in this course. That is his prerogative. But the choice should be left up to the individual, and made available to all students who wish to participate in this program.

ROTC trained officers have been a major supply of officers to fight with the troops in Vietnam. They have also been a part of the military scene in other major conflicts. They have been readily available and willing to serve their country.

It is a well-known fact that there are more junior officers needed than any other rank, and every year there are thousands who are graduated from college, and immediately enter into service, already trained and of immediate worth in the service of their country.

Were it not for these ROTC officers, many of the "protestors" would be drafted into service, and unable to carry out their campaign against eliminating ROTC from the college curriculum.

It is almost understandable why the cowards of the country are protesting ROTC, but for members of the venerable State Legislature to also voice this opinion is completely incomprehensible.

REPORT OF CONGRESSIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE MILITARY BUDGET AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES

(Mr. KASTENMEIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the Record the full report of the Congressional Conference on the Military Budget and National Priorities. The proposals contained in this document came out of the Confer-

ence on the Military Budget and National Priorities held here in Washington last March 28 and 29. In 2 days of broad ranging deliberations the congressional participants, academicians, former Government officials, weapons experts, and economists discussed such major issues as deployment of the ABM and MIRV, settlement of the Vietnamese war and the burgeoning military budget. The substance of their comments is reflected in the report issued by the congressional sponsors. The report emphasizes that the fundamental problem is not military, but civilian.

The report concludes:

It is not the uniformed military which has created the present situation, but the civilian leadership and the institutions they have created to centralize and expand the performance of national security functions.

The list of distinguished participants included the following:

Richard Barnett—Co-Director, Institute for Policy Studies, Washington, D. C.; former Consultant to the Department of Defense and State Department.

Richard Falk—Professor of International Law, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, Calif.; former consultant to Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

General William Wallace Ford, U.S. Army, ret.

John Kenneth Galbraith—Professor of Economics, Harvard University; former Ambassador to India.

Richard Goodwin—Author and writer; former special assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

George Kahin—Professor of Government and Director, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

George Klitlakowsky—Professor of Chemistry, Harvard University; former science adviser to President Eisenhower.

Arthur Larson—Director, World Rule of Law Center at Duke University, Durham, N. C., former special assistant to President Eisenhower and Director of USIA.

Hans Morgenthau—Professor of History, Government and International Relations, University of Chicago.

Fred Warner Neal—Professor of International Relations, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, Calif.; former consultant in Russian affairs to the State Department.

Gerard Piel—Publisher and editor of *Scientific American*.

Marcus Raskin—Co-Director, Institute for Policy Studies, Washington, D. C.; former staff member of the National Security Council, White House.

George Rathjens—Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; former special assistant to the President for science and technology; former Director, Weapons Systems Evaluation Division, Institute for Defense Analysis.

Leonard Rodberg—Professor of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.; former Bureau Chief, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Charles L. Schultze—Professor of Economics, University of Maryland; senior fellow, Brookings Institution; former Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Jeremy Stone—Professor of Economics, visiting scholar, Stanford University; former member of The Hudson Institute.

Herbert York—Professor of Physics, University of California; former Director of Research and Engineering, Department of Defense; former Vice-chairman, President's Science Advisory Committee.

Adam Walinsky—Former legislative assistant to Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

I am also pleased to list the names of the 45 congressional signers of this report:

SENATORS

J. William Fulbright (Ark).
Harold E. Hughes (Iowa).
George S. McGovern (S. Dak.).*
Walter F. Mondale (Minn).
Gaylord Nelson (Wis).*
William B. Saxbe (Ohio).
Joseph D. Tydings (Md).
Harrison A. Williams, Jr. (N.J.).
Stephen M. Young (Ohio).

CONGRESSMEN

George Brown, Jr. (Calif).*
Phillip Burton (Calif).*
Hugh L. Carey (N.Y.).
Shirley Chisholm (N.Y.).
William L. Clay (Mo.).
John Conyers, Jr. (Mich).*
Charles C. Diggs, Jr. (Mich).
Bob Eckhardt (Tex.).
Don Edwards (Calif).*
Donald M. Fraser (Minn).*
Jacob H. Gilbert (N.Y.).
William J. Green (Pa.).
William D. Hathaway (Maine).
Augustus Hawkins (Calif).
Ken Hechler (W. Va.).
Henry Helstoski (N.J.).
Robert W. Kastenmeier (Wis).*
Edward I. Koch (N.Y.).
Robert L. Leggett (Calif).
Allard K. Lowenstein (N.Y.).
Abner J. Mikva (Ill.).
Patsy T. Mink (Hawaii).
William S. Moorhead (Pa.).
Robert Nix (Pa.).
Richard L. Ottinger (N.Y.).
Bertram L. Podell (N.Y.).
Thomas M. Rees (Calif).
Henry S. Reuss (Wis.).
Benjamin S. Rosenthal (N.Y.).*
Edward R. Roybal (Calif).
William F. Ryan (N.Y.).*
James H. Scheuer (N.Y.).
Louis Stokes (Ohio).
Robert O. Tiernan (R.I.).
 Lester L. Wolff (N.Y.).
Frank J. Thompson, Jr. (N.J.).

Mr. Speaker, I commend the contents of this report to all of my colleagues. The basic issues discussed at the conference go to the core of congressional control over our military budget and the wisest allocation of our Nation's resources.

The report follows:

REPORT OF CONGRESSIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE MILITARY BUDGET AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On March 28, 1969, two separate but ironically related events occurred which insistently pointed to the most urgent public issue of our time: the role of the military-industrial establishment in the United States.

The first event of that day was the death of Dwight David Eisenhower, himself a hero of the American military heritage. As a departing President he had startled the nation by his Farewell Address, in which he had warned of the rise of a military establishment supported by an immense arms industry which "has the potential for a disastrous rise of misplaced power." In the eight years following President Eisenhower's speech, at least \$500 billion dollars has been sunk in military expenditures, including a disastrous war in Vietnam, a misguided intervention in the Dominican Republic, and more than forty-two treaty commitments to as many countries to intervene "in case of aggression." In the same period of time, acute problems

* Indicates original sponsors of conference.

of poverty and distress have remained unresolved within the United States itself.

These misplaced priorities were the basis for the other event of March 28, the Congressional Conference on the Military Budget and National Priorities, which brought together in Washington, D.C., former government leaders, foreign policy scholars, experts on weapons technology, economists, Congressmen and Senators to investigate the actual enormity of that "misplaced power" of which President Eisenhower had warned. The non-Congressional participants in the Conference were the following:

Richard Barnett—Co-Director, Institute for Policy Studies, Washington, D.C.; former Consultant to the Department of Defense and State Department.

Richard Falk—Professor of International Law, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, Calif.; former consultant to Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

General William Wallace Ford, U.S. Army, ret.

John Kenneth Galbraith—Professor of Economics, Harvard University; former Ambassador to India.

Richard Goodwin—Author and writer; former special assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

George Kahin—Professor of Government and Director, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

George Kistlakowsky—Professor of Chemistry, Harvard University; former science adviser to President Eisenhower.

Arthur Larson—Director, World Rule of Law Center at Duke University, Durham, N.C.; former special assistant to President Eisenhower and Director of USIA.

Hans Morgenthau—Professor of History, Government and International Relations, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, Calif.; former consultant in Russian affairs to the State Department.

Gerard Piel—Publisher and editor of *Scientific American*.

Marcus Raskin—Co-Director, Institute for Policy Studies, Washington, D.C.; former staff member of the National Security Council, White House.

George Rathjens—Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; former special assistant to the President for science and technology; former Director, Weapon Systems Evaluation Division, Institute for Defense Analysis.

Leonard Rodberg—Professor of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.; former Bureau Chief, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Charles L. Schultz—Professor of Economics, University of Maryland; senior fellow, Brookings Institution; former Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Jeremy Stone—Professor of Economics, visiting scholar, Stanford University; former member of The Hudson Institute.

Herbert York—Professor of Physics, University of California; former Director of Research and Engineering, Department of Defense; former Vice-chairman, President's Science Advisory Committee.

Adam Walinsky—Former legislative assistant to Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

The Conference was initiated by members of the House and Senate in the conviction that Congress must reassert its control of military policy and that it can raise the level of congressional analysis of these critical issues by making more effective use of available technical and scholarly expertise. Our purpose was to articulate the basic issues of the militarization of American society and to make concrete proposals for restoring democratic control over the military budget.

Our country is in danger of becoming a national security state. Since the end of World War II, we have spent more than one trillion dollars, or two-thirds of the total

expenditures of our Federal Government, on armaments and armed forces. Today 80 percent of our Federal expenditures go for defense and defense-related costs—an amount greater than all Federal, state, and local outlays for social security, health, education, housing, and agriculture. And yet the military budget continues to increase each year, spurred by a seemingly self-propelled mechanism which operates with little or no attention to merit or national need.

In spite of these vast expenditures, and in spite of the creation of a security establishment which today dominates much of our national life, Americans feel less secure than ever before. While external threats have receded in importance, many of our countrymen believe their nation has lost its way, and they feel a growing threat from within our cities. Many now ask whether the major threat to the security and well being of this country arises from the possibility of attacks from without, or the possibility of decay and disintegration from within.

The deepening concern

It is often said that our nation is becoming a welfare state. We are much closer, in terms of the money we spend, to becoming a warfare state. Enormous military budgets are approved with the most superficial criticism and evaluation by either the Congress or the public. They have defaulted, alleging that the military knows best and that the military budget is a purely technical matter. In reality, however, that budget involves the most fundamental political choices, providing the ability to intervene around the world and setting the direction of the economy and national priorities within our own country.

As the military budget continues to rise, with strong pressure to make it rise still more rapidly in the next few years, Americans are manifesting a growing concern with the size of the defense budget and its pervasive social effects. Members of Congress and the public are alarmed at the growing militarization of our society and the extent to which we are supporting a national security establishment, while neglecting the desperate needs of many of our people for housing, health care, education, and the other elements of basic human existence. They question why new programs for missiles and anti-missiles are proposed while funds for education and job training are cut. They show growing impatience with the Vietnam war, which continues even after being thoroughly discredited.

The military establishment is losing its former image of infallibility. Clearly the disastrous war in Vietnam is responsible for this changed attitude. There is a new feeling that Congress must play a larger role in the determination of foreign and military policy, if the voice of the people is to be heard effectively and if future military disasters are to be avoided.

The ABM issue has brought before the American public the central issue of an unnecessarily-escalating technology and the relation between this technology and the arms race. It has raised questions about congressional control over matters of national security, about the uses and abuses of secrecy, about the possibility that decision-making may be passing from human beings to machines in this technological age. But this new questioning attitude is not yet sufficiently widespread to have led to any decrease in the military budget or transfer of funds to more pressing domestic programs.

The national security establishment was created in the late 1940s and early 1950s in response to what we perceived as an immediate threat to our nation's survival. Today we are learning that, much as we may differ in economic and philosophic terms with Communist countries, they are as interested in coexistence, and as concerned with economic development, as we. No other

country has extended its military influence around the world in the way we have, and yet we continue to feel insecure—but now this insecurity reflects deep concern for the internal fabric of our own country. While we have been at our most powerful, in a strictly military sense, during the past few years, our prestige around the world and our influence with foreign governments have diminished markedly, as our position of leadership and our reputation for wisdom have suffered under the impact of a misguided intervention in Vietnam.

The world has been radically transformed since our national security policies were set in motion in the late forties. We believe that in an age of nuclear weapons, ABM, MIRV, chemical and biological weapons no government can any longer guarantee the safety of its citizens. We see a growing recognition that nuclear weapons can be used only to deter their use by others, and cannot be translated into effective political influence or even military power in a local conflict. We are learning that the power of our country to influence the course of world affairs is more limited than we had believed and is dependent on more than our military strength. And we see intense conflicts breaking out within what we once viewed as a monolithic Communist bloc of nations.

It has come as a painful fact to recognize that today security from attack depends on preventing conflict, not on having the ability to win it. No one can win a nuclear war, and the existence of nuclear weapons must lead us to look beyond weapons and alliances to the more fundamental demands of our national security. However, it is a sad fact that we are today no closer to establishing the conditions for enduring peace than we were twenty-five years ago, when the nuclear age began. The policies we have been pursuing have instead led to growing nuclear arsenals on both sides, the forfeiture of our influence with countries around the world, the rise of military dictatorships in many of the nations we have been supporting, and our first military failure since the War of 1812. In the eyes of many of our own people, especially the young, this country has forfeited the right to leadership of the forces of liberty and justice. While this tragic disaffection can be attributed to many sources, surely our overreliance on military power is one of the principal elements in the discontent we see around us.

Much of this discontent must focus on budgetary questions, for it is the way we spend our public resources that reflects our national priorities and determines our nation's future. We used to believe that our country was wealthy enough to afford both guns and butter, both extensive military expenditures and investments in our domestic needs. We have now learned, through the bitter experience of Vietnam, that this is not possible. The American people will not accept substantially higher taxation, and so our national needs must be met from a Federal budget which represents a relatively constant portion of our national income. This implies, of course, that if we are to increase substantially our expenditures on domestic needs, we must correspondingly reduce our expenditures on the military. While it is proper to say that our boys overseas must have anything they need, we are now recognizing that our children at home should have the things they need too.

The Founding Fathers recognized that among our national goals were "to form a perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility" and only then, fourth on the list, "to provide for the common defense." What they understood, and what we are remembering again today, is that our national security is composed of more than the inviolability of our territory. It requires that we become a free and united society, enlarging the liberty and welfare of our peo-

ple and extending justice to all who make this country their home. Should we be diverted from these pursuits, we will have lost our national security and our reason for existence as a nation, even though our military strength be the greatest on earth.

Whither America?

Senator J. William Fulbright has pointed out that for twenty-five years we have been thinking of our nation as a world power, losing sight of the fact that it must also be a national society. We must reassert the prime importance of achieving a viable society within our land, before we can expect a moral influence upon the rest of the world. One psychoanalyst has described our national malady as necrophilia. We put billions of dollars into killing while we talk as if we love life, in effect, to death. The result is a growing alienation of our young people from such a society and rising despair among all segments of our society.

The youth of America, both black and white, is starting to react against the militarization of our economy and our nation. We will either bring the military-industrial complex under control or, once this new generation starts voting and taking an active leadership in the politics of this country, we will have a new President and a new Congress who will.

The young people see that the institutions we have created are destroying the livability of the world. They question why they are being asked to make senseless sacrifices for meaningless policies. They look at the way we are killing each other in war and on our highways, expending vast sums of money in military enterprises that create problems instead of solving them. They see the way we are destroying the environment in which we live, polluting the air and the fresh water, killing the animals and the birds, destroying the forest and the beauty of the world, all in the name of progress and profit.

The young people know this and they are not prepared to tolerate it. Either our generation will respond to them, or there will be major changes in this country when the new generation comes to power.—Senator GAYLORD NELSON

Our country has become not only a great power but a great empire. Are we prepared to pay the price of that position? The Swiss historian Burkhardt said, "A great nation has only one purpose, and that is to get more power. But what it gives up in the process is freedom." What is actually at issue, then, is the transformation of the United States into a different sort of civilization—into a national security state. The country and the Congress must ask themselves whether they can ever regain control of the agencies which form that state without reducing them substantially in size and restructuring them so that they serve national purposes more clearly. Can we ride this tiger, attempting to control it here, and setting budgetary limits there, or must we instead undertake the long and difficult task of dismantling the national security establishment? And can we simply replace one bureaucracy with another—the national security establishment with, perhaps, the domestic welfare bureaucracy? Or must we, instead, be examining how to make democracy work again, how to give people in their communities the ability to make the necessary decisions on the way their money is spent and the way they live their lives?

Congressional leadership

The Report which follows is a distillation of the discussions of the Conference and includes direct quotations from the comments of the participants. Although the recommendations of the conference generally express our views, as sponsors we do not necessarily adopt as our own each and every statement and conclusion stated in this Report.

The sponsors regard the proposals made in this Conference as important contribu-

tions to their own thinking about the formulation of American foreign policy. They believe the report deserves the attention of their congressional colleagues, members of the Executive branch, and the American people. Our responsibility goes far beyond partisan considerations.

The most urgent challenge confronting Congress today is to reassert control of the military bureaucracy and the policy decisions it has preempted. This can only be accomplished by effective congressional leadership backed by a broadly-based, informed, and concerned public constituency. Toward this end we propose:

(1) Creation of a congressionally authorized Defense Review Office, similar to the General Accounting Office, to provide authoritative information and analyses for Congress in the defense area.

(2) Establishment of a Temporary National Security Committee, on the model of the Temporary National Economic Committee of the 1930s, composed of members of Congress and private citizens. This committee should conduct a critical examination of the institutional structure of the military-industrial establishment and provide the necessary information which the Congress and the nation can use to restore balance to our national priorities.

(3) Formation of a Congressional Joint Committee on National Priorities to provide a continuing forum for the review and evaluation of existing and planned Federally-supported programs.

(4) Reduction in the use of security classifications in order to open public access to relevant information and reduce the tendency to concentrate decision-making powers in the hands of those having access to classified information.

(5) More active use of hearings in the States and Congressional Districts to help shape new perspectives on national needs and priorities and elicit views at the grassroots level. Such hearings could provide the basis for a full congressional debate on the State of the Nation.

(6) Encouragement of privately funded research centers competent to subject defense programs to critical examination. These steps would provide some of the necessary institutional support for the reshaping and prudent reduction of the defense establishment that must occur if we are to free resources and reverse the trend towards a "national security state."

In the nuclear age, our prime objective must be to prevent conflict and establish the international conditions for an enduring peace. The United States will make a larger contribution to this work if it lessens its reliance on military power and works more vigorously at the task of building and strengthening its own society.

II. THE NATURE OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY ESTABLISHMENT

President Eisenhower's death has reminded us of his warning to "guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex."

Under the National Security Act of 1947, a group of institutions, including the Department of Defense, the National Security Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, part of the Agency for International Development, and the Atomic Energy Commission, have established and developed the bureaucratic base for an extensive national security apparatus. This apparatus is supported and buttressed by the new breed of federally-subsidized corporations which produce hardware for the military. The labor unions too have been brought into this structure. Today more than 3.5 million civilian workers are directly involved in national security programs.

Vast and varied armaments have been built—seaborne forces, airborne forces—all in

the name of flexibility and greater action. We have failed to recognize that the ability to wield this force generates a powerful temptation to use it. The very existence of these forces places greater demands upon our civilian leadership for wisdom and restraint, qualities which, as we have sadly learned in Vietnam, are sorely lacking in our political system today. And, through the system of security classification, this apparatus has been liberated from the normal restraints of public debate and congressional judgment, even as its power grows and its ability to intervene in new conflicts increases.

The Kennedy Administration took office in 1961 with the avowed aim of establishing greater civilian control over the military. Yet the harsh fact is that military considerations today play a greater role in determining American policy than at any time in our national history. In the name of efficiency we unified the operations of the armed services, introduced the techniques of computer management, and encouraged closer interactions between the military and industry. As a result, power once checked by rivalries and inefficiency is now wielded as a single force, defying effective democratic control. From this perspective we can see the present ABM fight as a test of whether or not the national security state is sunk in concrete for this next generation. If the ABM or the war in Vietnam cannot be stopped, Congress may well become no more than an ornamental debating society, and the impotence of our political institutions will be manifest.

Our problem is essentially one of uncontrolled bureaucratic power which, in the manner of all bureaucracies, governs in its own interest and in accordance with its own parochial view of not only that interest, but of the world.

The principal instrument of power of this bureaucracy is fear. It is fear that gave it this enormous power and autonomy in the '50s and '60s and caused us to consolidate and delegate power. This power was born in an age of fear, and it will be curbed only as we resist fear, only as we look upon the world, communist and noncommunist, with a certain calm intelligence.—John Kenneth Galbraith

We built the national security establishment to meet what was felt in the late '40s to be an important national need, but we now see that these institutions reinforce each other and eliminate the possibility of effective countervailing institutions. Unless we see our continued military buildup as an institutional problem, we will not be able to make any lasting change in the direction of our society or our foreign policy.

We should be clear on one point: It is not the uniformed military which has created the present situation, but the civilian leadership and the institutions they have created to centralize and expand the performance of national security functions. The military has been asked to make decisions and accept responsibilities for which it was not prepared, either by professional background or by the structure of military organizations. Too often responsibility has been abdicated to the military to make broad policy choices, to define the threats—and therefore the priorities—facing this country, and to determine the proper response to these threats. This far exceeds the more specific traditional tasks of developing battle plans and training men to carry them out. It is the abdication of civilian responsibility and the loss of balance in the exercise of national choices that have produced the dangerously distorted situation in which we find ourselves today.

It is customary for military leaders to plan on the basis of a "greater than expected threat." They assume that the Soviet Union will produce more ICBMs than one might ordinarily expect, a larger ABM system, and so on. Having made these conservative as-

sumptions, it is not surprising that they propose enormous appropriations and gigantic procurement programs. It is at the civilian policy-making level where there has been repeated failure. It is the civilians who should look beyond the projections of the military to the impact of the proposed measures on our domestic society, as well as on our foreign policy. They should be the ones to arrive at a realistic total perspective, rather than expecting it of the military.

Today, however, these civilian policymakers have become an intrinsic part of the military apparatus, more attuned to its viewpoint than to a wider national perspective. Just as the introduction of sophisticated weapons technology has civilianized the military, causing colonels to become the purveyors of abstract analyses and the silent partners of corporate managers, so the availability of these weapons in larger quantities has militarized the civilian hierarchy, leading it to seek answers to political problems in military hardware and enabling it to "project our power" over much of the globe.

The problem to which we must address ourselves is how to resist this interwoven bureaucracy, so large and entrenched, so zealous and parochial, so unrestrained by any effective counter-balancing force in our society. This vast establishment conjures margined or imagined "threats" to justify its continued existence. It is itself a threat to our society, disturbing its tranquility and threatening the survival of freedom within it. Just as we have built up this apparatus over the past twenty-five years, we must now begin the task of reducing the size and influence of the institutions which make up the national security establishment.

Growth with decay

Our prosperity and pattern of growth are built upon an industrial complex which relies on the defense budget to maintain high rates of employment and to support the bulk of technological innovation. Closely aligned with the great corporations involved in the defense establishment are labor interests and the interests of the new social classes built on education and technology.

We have created a series of new "pension classes" who are directly dependent on the national security establishment and on expenditures voted by Congress for old wars and new. The new educated class is dependent on the national security structure through the universities, which have received a large portion of their support from military-related agencies. Half of the trained engineers and scientists in this country are working for the national security establishment, providing the driving force for new weapons expenditures and generating a demand that we "keep the laboratories hot" even as tensions cool. This technical apparatus cannot easily fit into the civilian sector of our economy, and so becomes a permanent force for high defense expenditures. And the elevated status of their "high technology" has drawn our brightest minds away from the more mundane—but more urgent—problems of our domestic economy.

We have been using the new economics, with its emphasis on the use of the Federal budget to maintain economic stability and prevent cyclic depressions, without also recognizing that not all Federal expenditures are of equal value to the country. By placing the largest portion of our budget in the defense sector, we have deeply disturbed the balance which societies must maintain between the civilian and military sectors of their government and between their public and private outlays.

In our mistaken application of Keynesian economics, we have failed to recognize that the nature of our public expenditures will determine the kind of society we build with the resulting economic growth. Some expenditures contribute to a betterment of the society and enhance the quality of life for

all our citizens, while others, although they may seem to contribute to the growth of the economy, in fact have detracted from our national well-being. Perhaps we need to make a more accurate accounting of our economic growth, recognizing that some expenditures subtract from the nation's welfare, even as they add to its economy.

It has been pointed out that in today's accounting both the production of cigarettes and expenditures on cancer research add to economic growth, when in fact, of course, they cancel each other out or, as at present, subtract from the health of our society. If we go ahead with the ABM and MIRV programs, they will appear in our accounting as economic growth, when in fact they will be destructive to the society, demanding further wasteful expenditures and making inevitable further decay in our cities and alienation of our people.

One must then ask whether our massive defense budget is in fact a way of dealing with foreign problems, or whether it has become instead a way of preserving a pattern of advantage within the United States. Is the defense budget a means of avoiding a confrontation with a series of domestic problems we have never solved, rather than merely a reason why we have not solved them? The swollen military budget gives us a ready-made excuse to avoid facing, as individuals and as a society, our failure to achieve justice and equality for all our citizens.

The question we must face is not what the Chinese or Vietnamese or Russians are, but who the Americans are and what kind of country this is, and what it is in our society which is leading us to go further in this direction.—Adam Walinsky

III. VIETNAM AND THE LESSONS OF INTERVENTION

The killing in Vietnam goes on. The war must be ended, and at the earliest possible date. We have put more than half a million troops into South Vietnam but have not been able to beat down the opposition of the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong. Dr. George Wald has said they have a secret weapon: they are more willing to die for their cause than we are to continue killing them.

The Vietnam war is destroying that unfortunate country and eroding the foundations of our society as well.

We are engaged in a war 10,000 miles away for aims we can't define and which we can't win and don't seem able to end but which has contributed enormously to a malaise in the U.S. so severe that for the first time in our history the validity of some of our most cherished institutions has been called into question.—Fred Warner Neal

Even our military position has been undermined. As General William Wallace Ford has noted, "the war in Vietnam has divided our people and weakened our military strength because of that division. You cannot create disenchantment among nearly all the youth of the country and expect to have a strong military posture."

Toward a Vietnam settlement

Because of misconceptions and misunderstandings about the war, Congress has a special responsibility to begin now to tell the American public the political realities facing us and the possibilities for bringing the war to an end. Today's discussions of the war or peace aim of this country, or of the relationship the United States will have to Southeast Asia when peace comes, remain obscured by obsolete and empty rhetoric. There must be specific discussion now of our national security interest in that area. If the President is truly interested in negotiating an end to the war, such a discussion by the Congress will in fact help him, since one cannot reverse a set of assumptions on which our entire policy has been based without wide discussion by the public.

If Congress is to make such a responsible contribution to ending the Vietnam war, it must unshackle itself from the erroneous assumptions and faulty judgments of the past. Any reasonably viable political settlement in Vietnam will require a change in the underlying premises of the war, not a mere alteration in tactics. We will have to recall that it was the United States which, in contravention of the Geneva Accords, helped create and sustain a separate South Vietnamese state and chose the leadership of that state.

The myths that must be overcome include the allegation that what is basically a civil war is a case of outside aggression, that an unpopular and narrowly based military clique in Saigon can enlist the support of a majority of South Vietnamese people and that the National Liberation Front is a puppet of Hanoi without significant popular backing in South Vietnam.—George Kahin

At this point our primary national interest is in extricating ourselves from Vietnam. The present military leaders in Saigon, however, have had a personal interest in continuing the massive U.S. military presence in Vietnam and are reluctant to see genuine progress toward a settlement that would allow our withdrawal.

As a result of past American policies in support of this military leadership, most non-communist South Vietnamese are without political representation and are cut off from working out their own accommodation with the NLF. Many of the moderate political leaders of South Vietnam are in jail. (It was reported on the floor of the Vietnamese Senate that 16,000 new political prisoners were incarcerated during 1968.) If meaningful negotiations are to go forward, the currently unrepresented elements must participate in working out a settlement.

If we are to exert the kind of pressure that will force the present Saigon regime to accept a peace settlement, we must begin now to withdraw our troops from Vietnam.

The creation of a coalition government for South Vietnam must be considered as a necessary transition stage, as well as a possible pattern for the final settlement achieved through national elections or a referendum held under the aegis of an interim transitional coalition. The transitional stage has been neglected in most public discussion, but it is a vital period if the government which emerges from the settlement is to be a lasting one. It is manifest that neither the Saigon government nor the NLF trust the other to carry out an election, and an initial period of shared power must precede the holding of any elections to create a permanent government. Such an interim coalition could also maintain basic administrative functions during the period of withdrawal of foreign troops.

Avoiding more Vietnams

If we are not to find ourselves drawn into more Vietnams, the national security institutions which led us into the present quagmire must be reshaped and refocused. A new foreign policy must be evolved. Our national defense policy should be built around those core interests which are so vital that if they were violated they would threaten the very existence of the nation itself. In areas removed from our own interests, we can afford to seek or support settlements based on neutralization or on internationally agreed upon solutions which will avoid big-power intervention and eventual conflict.

Many of the "threats" for which we maintain military forces exist not because of a core interest, but because we have taken a particular historic position in a particular part of the world (for instance, in Berlin and Korea). We must now reconsider the extent to which the maintenance of these positions is appropriate. It is questionable, for instance, whether our decision to defend the Vietnam demarcation line ever had any

validity in the face of the Geneva Agreement. Nevertheless, it has been used to justify our military intervention.

We have believed that military and political policies that succeeded in one era of history were applicable to all places at all times. The apparent success of the policy of containment in Europe led us to believe that containment would also be successful in Vietnam, the Middle East, and elsewhere. But relations between the major powers have changed so radically, and conditions in these areas are so different from those in Europe, that entirely new perspectives are necessary. In particular, a policy directed at maintaining the status quo in the name of containing communist influence is futile.

We have learned that internal forces will control the development of new nations to a far greater extent than any elements over which we or the Soviet Union have any control. We must now accommodate ourselves to this realization and remove earlier vestiges of our misunderstanding of this country's role in the world. We can no longer permit military perspectives to obscure our perception of political realities.

A basic alteration in our policy of intervention and our foreign military commitments will be needed to correct the results of past mistakes. The defense establishment has evolved these commitments by making small, incremental decisions; these then develop a momentum of their own which involves us ever more deeply in internal disputes over which we have little control.

There is, for instance, a series of dangerous situations today in the Southeast Asia area, all attributable to decisions made without adequate knowledge of relevant political factors, without the knowledge of Congress, and apparently inconsistent with either immediate or long-term American interests. Kuomintang forces remain in Burma, Laos, and Thailand, supported by us and exacerbating the internal problems these countries face. It has been reported that our country has transported large numbers of Cambodian South Vietnamese to the Thai frontier, where they have carried out regular intrusions into Cambodian territory. (Indeed, in the recent past there have been three times as many military incidents on the Thai-Cambodian border as on the Cambodian-South Vietnamese frontier.) Such entanglements are reminiscent of those which led us into Vietnam.

Many of our overseas installations were originally created to serve military needs that no longer exist. But the Defense Department has developed new rationalizations for keeping these bases—particularly the desire to maintain a U.S. military presence as a base for political influence. Recognizing the drive among the peoples of these countries for national independence and greater democracy, we do not want our primary relationship defined by military bases or advisory missions. Our interests would often be better served if the bases and the military advisors were gone.

Away from intervention

If any branch of government is to force a re-examination of past commitments, it must be the Congress. But if Congress is to play a responsible role in our policy in the Third World, it must be informed of these situations and must play a role in creating or halting them. Secrecy in the initiation of new U.S. interventions is futile and self-defeating, and the Congress must insist on full, open, and current information, and must create mechanisms for reviewing our foreign commitments.

Congress should also insist that we begin to reduce the number of men in our standing army to a level more suited to peacetime. There are few world situations in which this country would not have adequate time to build from its large reserves and enormous productive capacity, should danger arise. The maintenance of a constantly accelerating

level of technology, and of enormous armies which sit around waiting for a crisis to occur, are themselves important elements of instability and a prime cause of conflict and American intervention. We should take into account not only the risk of war, but also the need in Senator William Saxbe's term, to "take a gamble for peace." While we cannot guarantee against a disruption somewhere in the world to which we cannot instantly respond, there are other needs for these resources and more effective, multilateral approaches which this country can use to advance toward a peaceful world.

IV. ABM, MIRV, AND THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

The last clear chance

The strategic balance, which is now at its most stable position in years, is about to be thrown askew. The United States is beginning to deploy an anti-ballistic missile system and to install multiple, independently targetable warheads on its long-range missiles. Together, these will add new fuel to the arms race and create an environment of uncertainty and tension that will decrease our safety and make nuclear war an ever larger threat.

Today both the United States and the Soviet Union possess large, invulnerable strategic forces of nuclear weaponry. Each is confident that it has an effective deterrent to nuclear attack. Most Americans feel secure from the danger of nuclear war, and threats of nuclear bombardment, such as were uttered during the late '50s and early '60s are no longer heard. Through improved satellite reconnaissance, each side is confident that it knows what strategic forces the other possesses, and it can infer that its own deterrent is secure from destruction in a surprise attack.

This relatively stable situation can be preserved through an agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union to refrain from the further construction of ICBM bases, and from the inauguration of ABM and MIRV deployment programs. Such an agreement could be an early result of the much-delayed strategic arms limitation talks between these two countries. The possibility that irrevocable steps will be taken before such an agreement is achieved lends the gravest urgency to the initiation of those talks. Once large-scale ABM deployment begins and MIRV testing has been completed, the nuclear genie will be out of the bottle, and it is unlikely that the stability we now enjoy will ever return again.

In spite of the sense of urgency felt by all informed observers, the Administration has delayed in responding to apparent Russian willingness to begin these talks. We continue, instead, to develop and install these new and dangerous weapons, apparently still operating on the obsolete notion that we can find security in a continuing arms race.

Military thinking as it still prevails in the main body of the military establishment, is obsolete; it operates with categories which were appropriate for a conventional war but are completely inappropriate for a nuclear war.

Within the framework of conventional war, the arms race was a perfectly rational instrument of national policy. The more machine guns you had, as compared with your enemy, the better off you were. When it comes to nuclear weapons, the arms race becomes a complete absurdity, once you have the ability to destroy your enemy several times over, even under the worst of circumstances. But we seem still unable to understand this basic difference.—Hans Morgenthau

We should attune our thinking to the realities of the nuclear age. Now we imagine the worst the Russians can do during the next decade, and then respond to it. We should, instead, forestall these further steps by an agreement which would halt what Robert McNamara called this "mad momen-

tum"—while there is still time. And while these talks are proceeding, we should delay deploying the Safeguard ABM system and halt the MIRV program. This will give us the last clear chance to stop the arms race.

The search for a first-strike capacity

Halting the nuclear arms race should be the first defense and foreign policy goal of this country. Instead, we have been setting the pace in the arms race since the nuclear age began.

Since the 1950's the Defense Department has operated on the assumption that, while the Soviet Union might start a war through a ground attack in Europe, we would be the ones who would start the strategic nuclear exchange. Under this scenario our missiles would reach the Soviet Union before theirs could get off the ground. This strategy, though, requires that we buy many more weapons than the Soviet Union, since we cannot be sure that each of our weapons will function properly and strike its target accurately. The Defense Department has spent billions of dollars in an attempt to maintain such a first-strike posture.

To obtain the weapons needed for this purpose, the Defense Department has fostered three different "missile gap" scares in the last ten years. The first was the original missile gap of 1960. At a time when there was not a single Soviet ICBM deployed, this country was led to near hysteria over the prospect that the Russians might have large numbers of missiles within a very few years. Later we learned that they actually built only three percent of the missiles predicted by 1963, and they took seven years to close the missile-gap-in-reverse which we had opened up in the interim.

Then came the anti-missile gap. The impression was created by civilian officials in the Department of Defense that the Soviet Union was building an ABM system throughout their country and that we had to increase the number of warheads targeted on the Soviet Union to ensure we would penetrate it. The result was the MIRV program. We are, at a cost of more than \$5 billion, introducing new types of missiles with multiple warheads, each capable of being directed with high accuracy at a separate target. The number of targetable warheads in our arsenal will increase from 2,400 to between 8,000 and 10,000, if the MIRV program is completed.

Now it has been revealed that the Soviet Union was not deploying an extensive ABM system after all, but has stopped with a small (and now obsolete) system deployed around Moscow. Nevertheless, the MIRV program continues to move forward.

This year we have been presented with a third missile gap involving the SS-9, a large Russian missile which the Pentagon is now describing as a first-strike weapon against our Minuteman force. In response to this newly-discovered gap, based on an exaggerated description of the capacity of such missiles to threaten our ICBMs, we are told we must proceed with construction of an ABM system. Since our ABM system will be at least ten times larger than the one the Russians have deployed, there will thus again be a gap in reverse, this time an anti-missile gap.

The Defense Department has seized on the buildup of SS-9 missiles to argue that we must have a defense of our land-based missiles. Even without our land-based force, we would have a sufficient deterrent, since each of our 41 invulnerable Polaris submarines can destroy more than a dozen Russian cities and inflict awesome loss of life, not to mention the destruction which could be inflicted by our fleet of B-52 bombers and the tactical aircraft we have deployed around the world.

The Soviet Union has at this time only a small fleet of missile-launching submarines, and the Safeguard ABM system will diminish still further the effectiveness of this deterrent. Faced with the imminent threat of

accurate, independently-targetable multiple warheads and a U.S. ABM system, the Soviet Union will have to multiply its missile force as quickly as possible if it is to maintain an effective retaliatory capacity.

What is the pattern here? It is one of undermining the Soviet deterrent while complaining that the other side may, in the future, undermine ours. The techniques of the Department of Defense go far beyond their traditional underestimate of costs of U.S. weapons and their over-estimate of effectiveness. The Department invariably exaggerates the Soviet threat and uses these exaggerations to get public and Congressional support for weapons that will undermine the Soviet deterrent. This means a permanent arms race.—Jeremy J. Stone.

The MIRV threat

We will not repeat here the well-known arguments regarding the dangers of deploying an ABM system that will accelerate the arms race without providing greater security for anyone. However, the dangers of MIRV are not so widely appreciated.

With missile accuracy increasing, it will soon become possible for one missile, carrying up to ten independent warheads, to destroy several of the opponent's missiles on the ground. Either side can then, by striking first, destroy the other's missile force and his ability to retaliate. To the extent that he relies on land-based missiles, his deterrent will be gone.

The MIRV issue is an immediate one compared with the ABM. The latter will take many years to be fully operational, but, once MIRV is fully tested by either country there will be no way of determining whether that country has deployed them, or in what numbers. Once testing has passed the point where deployment is possible, we can no longer have a self-policing arms agreement with the Russians. The place to halt the MIRV program is in the test phase, which began in this country in the fall of 1968 and is continuing.

We can halt our testing of MIRVs because we know that the Russians have not proceeded to deploy their ABM system, nor are they testing MIRVs themselves. The Soviet Union has been testing multiple warheads, but theirs are not yet independently targetable. Their warheads do not appear to have independent guidance and so do not pose a threat to our Minuteman missiles, which are protected in concrete underground silos and must be attacked with high accuracy to be destroyed.

Our MIRV program began in response to the threat of a Soviet ABM system. Now that the Russian ABM system no longer appears to be a significant threat, the Pentagon has adopted another and far more dangerous rationale for MIRV—that it will allow us to attack missile sites in the Soviet Union. The Defense Department wants to develop just the first-strike capability we are told to fear from the Soviet Union. Just as we have reacted with both missile and anti-missile deployments to the suggestion that they may be building a first-strike force, so they will surely respond if we should continue to seek a capacity.

We should, instead, suspend our MIRV program by halting the flight testing of MIRVs, and should consider resuming this testing only if it appears that the Russians are again pursuing an extensive ABM program. The testing of MIRVs intended for penetration of an ABM system would take no more than eighteen months, as compared to the five to seven years required to deploy an ABM system. We would know in the very early stages if they were going ahead with such an ABM program, and there would be no danger that the Russians could achieve a significant lead.

The testing of MIRVs can be easily detected by our unilateral intelligence. Long-range flight tests of ICBMs can be observed

with radar and other detection devices, and the multiple warheads can be seen as they descend. In addition, the accuracy of the individual warheads must be determined by use of an extensive detection net in the target area, and this can also be observed through reconnaissance satellites and other means. Thus, if we were to halt our MIRV testing and then agree with the Soviet Union that neither side would resume such tests, this would be a self-enforcing, easily-policed agreement.

TOWARD THE MISSILE TALKS

If the Russians perceive that, through our MIRV program, we have developed the ability to destroy a substantial portion of their missile force in a first strike, they will not be able to agree, during the upcoming missile talks, to halt the further buildup of their deterrent. Just as we cannot tolerate their achieving a first-strike capability, so they cannot permit us to achieve one. If we want to halt the buildup on both sides, it is most important that the MIRV and ABM programs be halted on our side, while the talks proceed, and the Soviet Union should be asked to halt deployment of its SS-9 missile. It is of equal importance that the missile talks begin as soon as possible, before these programs have proceeded further.

The irony of the situation is that, in the forthcoming missile talks, we hope to persuade the Russians to abstain from the very weapons programs which are now being irrevocably set forward by our own Defense Department. While the talks go on, there should be a moratorium on both sides, with a halt in the further installation of new ICBMs and in the introduction of MIRV and ABM. The fears expressed by the Defense Department regarding Russian capabilities involve possible developments in the 1970s, and an agreement to halt the buildup now would insure that such fears could be put aside.

V. MILITARY EXPENDITURES

The continuously rising budget of the defense establishment provides vivid testimony that neither the Executive nor Legislative Branch is exercising proper control over our military programs and commitments. Defense expenditures have risen from \$13 billion in 1950, to \$43 billion in 1960, to more than \$80 billion this year. There is every indication that military spending will continue to rise, unless a major change in national priorities and budget practices is effected.

This year, the Armed Services budget requests to the Secretary of Defense totalled \$110 billion; these were reduced to \$80 billion in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. When the Vietnam War ends, there will be strenuous pressures from the military to purchase the items omitted from this year's budget, including a large number of new ships, a new strategic missile, a new manned bomber, a battle tank, an anti-submarine aircraft, an Air Force interceptor, and a variety of other new weapons for an already bloated arsenal. Programs now approved will generate pressures for expansion as well. For instance, not only will the Army-developed Safeguard ABM system be augmented with additional radar sites and interceptor missiles, but the Navy is advocating development of its SABMIS system, a ship-based anti-ballistic missile system estimated to cost at least \$6 billion, and the Air Force is working on an airborne missile defense system, to cost about \$16 billion. It is clear that unless military spending is limited as a deliberate decision of national policy, the momentum of these institutions will carry the budget upward to ever higher levels.

A cessation of hostilities in Vietnam and a withdrawal of troops would make available budgetary savings of about \$20 billion which could be available for domestic programs or other purposes. Considering only the present costs of approved systems and such fixed

items as pay increases for military and civilian employees of the Pentagon, Charles Schultze has estimated that the fiscal 1971 military budget for non-Vietnam purposes will be \$12 billion to \$13 billion higher than the current budget. By fiscal 1973 or 1974, the military budget will rise by \$20 billion to \$25 billion, on the basis of approved programs and pay increases alone.

It has not been widely noticed that this process of absorbing Vietnam savings in other parts of the military budget has already begun. The fiscal 1970 budget submitted by the Johnson Administration included a reduction of \$3.5 billion in the estimated costs of the Vietnam War. However, this first installment in the "Vietnam dividend" was more than offset by an increase of \$6.8 billion in non-Vietnam military spending. This includes \$4.1 billion in new defense programs and \$2.5 billion in military and civilian pay raises. Thus the first opportunity to transfer our Vietnam spending to civilian programs was passed up in favor of additional spending for defense.

Thus it is clear that in the absence of any change in our defense plans the non-Vietnam military budget will rise by an amount sufficient to replace what we are spending in Vietnam. Indeed, there are reasons for thinking that actual spending will rise even higher. First, there will be an inevitable cost escalation as already-approved systems go into production. These programs include the procurement of Minuteman III, Poseidon, the Safeguard ABM, four nuclear-powered aircraft carriers, 40 destroyers, a new class of fast attack submarines, and a Navy fighter interceptor, at a total cost of at least \$3.6 billion for this fiscal year alone. And the costs of these systems are certain to rise. During the last 15 years the average cost of a missile was three times the original estimated cost while the cost of aircraft averaged a little over twice as much as had been expected. Recent experience with the F-111 fighter-bomber and the C-5A cargo plane shows that these "unexpected" rises are still normal.

Second, the new weapons proposed by the Armed Services not yet approved by the Secretary of Defense, will cost large sums of money, if they are accepted in succeeding years. Further, if we go ahead with ABM and MIRV, there will be an escalation in the cost of our strategic forces as the Soviet Union reacts to these weapons and we respond to these reactions.

The future budgetary consequences of present strategic policy may prove to represent an unstable equilibrium. Either decisions will be made to reduce those expenditures, or they may themselves create a situation in which further expenditure increases will occur. To the extent that this evaluation is correct, the post-Vietnam fiscal dividend will either be significantly increased by policies that reduce military spending, or it will be significantly eroded by further additions to that spending. There may be no intermediate position.—Charles Schultze

The American economy will continue to grow even without significant inflation, generating \$15 billion to \$17 billion a year more in Federal revenues. Five years from now the total growth or "fiscal" dividend will provide \$100 billion in Federal funds over and above those being spent today. However, the various claims on this dividend, including those from the military will make this gain illusory, at least under present circumstances.

If we assume that the income tax surcharge will be dropped once the Vietnam War is over and that existing Federal programs will increase in cost even without program improvement simply to take account of a growing population, then the \$100 billion fiscal dividend by fiscal year 1974 will be reduced to about \$30 billion. The increase in weapons system costs described above can easily con-

sume the \$30 billion leaving nothing for new or expanded domestic programs.

Estimates such as these assume unchanged tax rates except for a dropping of the surcharge. Clearly, from the point of view of logic and economics, a United States which every five years adds to its productive output the equivalent of the output of West Germany, can do anything out of that growth it sets its mind to, including transferring a large portion of it to public uses rather than private consumption. However, as a practical political matter there seems little likelihood of raising existing tax rates very much. If we believe that domestic programs must have substantially more funds, these must come from the bloated budget of the Defense Department.

Robert Benson, a former Defense Department official, has suggested that even without any change in our foreign policy or military objectives, the Pentagon could save at least \$9 billion by eliminating such programs as the manned orbiting laboratory (which duplicates work already being done by NASA), reducing inefficient turnover in the assignment of military officers and effecting other efficiencies in the use of military manpower, changing contracting practices so that greater performance and economy is required of defense contractors, eliminating unneeded and obsolete weapons systems, and cutting back some of our unnecessary overseas troop deployment. A careful and critical examination of the military budget, including a review of the purposes of our armed forces in relation to the goals of our foreign policy as well as a review of the impact of the defense establishment on the country, could result in substantial added savings. But Congress must develop the will and the structure for doing this.

A study group at Columbia University, under the direction of Professor Seymour Melman, has estimated the savings that could be achieved from such a critical study. In particular, they noted that present force levels assume we must be prepared to fight three wars simultaneously—a major nuclear war in Europe, a major conventional war in the China area, and a small war elsewhere in the Third World (for instance, in Latin America). With such an assumption, of course, almost any force level could be justified. If more realistic contingencies are assumed and the defense of our own shores is taken as the primary and proper role of our armed forces, substantial savings can be made.

Our armed forces could be cut by at least a million men. Reductions in the cost of maintaining these ready forces, as well as savings from a halt in our strategic arms buildup—and, of course, a halt in the Vietnam conflict—could lead to a reduction in defense expenditures of more than \$50 billion. That would reduce the defense budget to pre-1960 levels. Clearly, a fresh examination of our defense expenditures is badly needed to enable us to substantially re-allocate our resources to pressing domestic needs.

VI. STRENGTHENING THE CONGRESSIONAL ROLE—RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

The Congress of the United States has failed to exercise its constitutional function of supervising the raising of our armed forces and overseeing their use in foreign wars. Instead, a vast national security apparatus has been created with the silent acquiescence of the Congress.

Tens of billions of dollars are appropriated for the Defense Department with little or no debate, and the views of the public on our defense programs are seldom sought. In one series of hearings before the House Armed Services Committee, covering 3,000 pages of testimony, 300 witnesses appeared; 298 came from the Defense Department and two from the National Rifle Association. With this imbalance in perspective, it is not surprising

that there has been only the most superficial questioning of defense expenditures.

If the trend toward increasing militarization of our society is to be reversed, Congress must challenge the assumptions and the programs of the Executive Branch and assume responsibility for the future military affairs of this country. To do this it must have not only new institutions that will permit it to gather the information and the insights it needs, but a new view of itself and its role in American society.

Is there an information gap?

Since the defense budget sets the direction of our economy and foreign policy for years to come, its size and content should be the subject of the deepest congressional study and debate. At present, however, the budget receives only the most superficial attention from most Congressmen and Senators. Congress does not have the capacity today to make detailed comparisons of weapon systems and military programs. Furthermore, even such analyses will not provide the necessary raw material for the exercise of Congressional authority. Technical decisions on the design of weaponry can properly be made by military officers and defense officials, but the desirability of individual weapons systems cannot be assessed without examining the foreign policy objectives they are supposed to serve. With respect to ABM and MIRV, for example, the questions do not involve the specifics of hardware, but must focus on whether we are prepared to accept a situation of mutual deterrence and relative parity with the Soviet Union, or whether we are to continue to seek an offensive first-strike capability. Similarly, the issues raised by the existence of our overseas bases go far deeper than the desirability of air conditioning in the officer's quarters (an issue which has occupied a considerable portion of the time of the Armed Services Committees).

Many members of Congress feel an urgent need for more facts if they are to deal effectively with the military. With greater information, they could question more competently and persuasively the funding requests for weapons and standing forces. However, additional information alone will make it no easier for the Congress to control the military, as witness the performance of the Armed Services Committees. These committees are deluged with technical data and evaluations. Having failed, however, to develop an independent basis for judging relative priorities, they have been unable to make effective use of their surfeit of information. It is not the classified facts which the Congress needs, but a world view which can challenge the analysis of the military.

The Congress has been "mousetrapped" over the last 30 years, as the Executive Branch has evolved into a technology-based institution and developed methods of analysis which have tended to focus attention on the technical means, with the policy ends lost in a maze of figures and charts. Congress must develop its own perspective, using an independent set of operating assumptions, not those of the military.

The United States now has military installations around the world, including 429 major and 2,972 minor overseas military bases staffed by a million men. These cost us billions of dollars, disturb our international balance of payments, and create implicit commitments to the countries involved which return to haunt us when crises erupt. And yet most of these bases are maintained simply because they were set up long ago, not because a public evaluation of our national objectives indicates they are needed.

Congress should be asking why such bases should be established and what national commitments are involved in their maintenance. Such basic decisions are now made by the Executive Branch in a context which minimizes debate, avoids consideration of

the costs as well as the benefits, and often does not even bring before Congress or the American people the fundamental decisions at the time they are made.

As another example, we are currently going into procurement of the F-14 aircraft for the Navy and Marine forces. Over the ten-year period in which that aircraft will be operational, the total cost of the program will be at least \$20 billion. Nevertheless, Congress has not adequately examined the contingencies and military assumptions on which this new aircraft was based.

We spend \$10 billion to \$12 billion a year maintaining forces sufficient to fight China in a land war in Asia. This is an explicit assumption on which our military strength is based, and yet such a national policy has never been debated. (In fact, most people do not even know that it is a specific assumption with respect to our military budget.)

There is now no framework for such a debate, except that developed within the Pentagon. No other national institution is capable of performing such analyses and providing an adequate counterweight to the Pentagon assessment. A major overhaul of the congressional committee structure may be needed before such a counter-institution can develop. The current committee structure of Congress evolved before the Executive Branch adopted the tools of technology and modern economic analysis. It thus tends to look for direction inward towards the Executive Branch, with its complex programs and advanced technology, rather than outward towards the country and the world, discovering our country's needs and providing some of its own answers. The existing committee structure could be made to work if Congress wished to take hold of the issue, recognize the need for fundamental questioning of the defense establishment, and reestablish its authority in the military area. It could then confront the Executive Branch on how well it was meeting the needs of the country. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in its recent examination of the ABM issue, has shown that this can be done on a single, well-focused issue. In general, though, the rigid committee framework has prevented such boundary-crossing.

When the institutions exist for confronting the Executive and the military they will provide a focus for those private citizens and research institutes which now possess information that Congress could use for its independent critique. These groups now can contribute their knowledge and insights only to individual Congressmen and Senators who become concerned about particular, discrete issues. New Congressional institutions would provide a continuing base for gathering such information and for developing the critical perspective that will permit its effective use.

Renewing the dialogue

An effective dialogue must be restored within this country on our foreign and military policies. New mechanisms must be created within the Congress to provide the kind of institutional support needed to support this dialogue. The present structure tends to compartmentalize decisions, and it must be surmounted to see the direction the country is going.

Congress can successfully challenge the military establishment only if it develops an authoritative perspective for questioning the judgment of the Defense Department. At the present time it tends to abdicate its judgment in the face of military expertise. However, the decisive questions in the field of national security are not scientific or managerial but moral and political—and on such questions the people and the people's representatives are as qualified to pass judgment as the so-called experts. Even if they do not know the technical intricacies of a piece of military hardware, they can assess the likely consequences of the use of that hardware.

And they will not be burdened with the pressures, felt within the bureaucracy, to produce any new weapon, just because it can be built.

The introduction of modern techniques of systems analysis has allowed the Pentagon to support a request for almost any weapon system and has curtailed the inter-service rivalry which formerly allowed the President to balance one service against another in restraining such requests. Congress cannot decisively win an argument on an individual program, for there is no limit to the ingenuity which can be used to justify a particular weapon or a particular base or a particular program. Instead, general policies and national priorities should be set by Congress, and requests for individual items should be required to conform to these guidelines.

For the Congress to escape from the present bureaucratic trap, it must have new ways of considering the budget. It should begin to hold local budget hearings in Congressional Districts and in the States, asking the American people how they want their money spent, whether they want to continue spending the largest portion of their tax dollar on the Vietnam War and future wars. Such grass-roots hearings in each of the Congressional Districts around the country would provide a forum for exposing social conditions in the country and mobilizing the public to insist that tax dollars be spent on the real needs of the people of our nation.

These hearings could take place each fall and winter. Then, rather than passively receiving the President's State of the Union message and waiting for his program, Congress could engage in extended debate early in the spring, conducting its own State of the Nation examination. Through this State of the Nation debate, Congress could develop its own perspective on priorities for the nation, with which it would provide directives to the various committees that apportion the Federal budget among the agencies of the Executive Branch.

Congress could develop a new kind of national budget, divided not along agency lines but apportioned according to national needs. It could insist that the Executive Branch, and particularly the Defense Department, present its budget request in terms of objectives or "missions," rather than in an agency or "forces-in-being" framework. It could ask how well our military programs serve the foreign policy objectives of the country, rather than how sophisticated hardware we are buying. It could ask how well we are doing as a nation in educating our populace and providing for the health needs of the country, and so on.

From this examination could come new views of national priorities, yielding guidelines with which the Congressional committees would confront the requests from the Executive agencies. In this way Congress would place the military budget in a setting where it would be compared with other national programs, providing the transfer mechanism presently lacking in the budget process.

One advantage of such a broad look would be a clearer understanding of how specific Federal programs affect each locality. If a particular defense program were cut back, Congress could see which areas of the country would be affected and what other Federal programs might be increased to minimize severe economic dislocations. Congress would thus open to public discussion the entire question of the Federal role in facilitating such conversions from one set of priorities to another.

Sources of expert advice

Congress and the public will need the assistance of many experts and independent research centers around the country who can bring the expertise and informed analyses of the academic community to bear on our defense budget and foreign policy. These should be funded by private foundations, so they

may attain an independent view of Government programs and provide a variety of views and judgments. They need not have access to classified information to do useful work, and, indeed, they might benefit by not having this particular restraint upon their ability to criticize the defense establishment.

However, such outside centers cannot, alone, provide the full resources which Congress will need for a successful encounter with the military. There should also be a permanent Defense Review Office, analogous to the General Accounting Office, providing Congress with independent reviews of Defense Department programs. Such an agency could, for instance, alert Congress to such programs as the MIRV project and the extensive chemical and biological warfare program of this country, which many members are only now discovering. This agency would have access to top secret information and would be as informed as the advocates of these weapons programs within the Defense Department. Democracy cannot function properly in a technological age if only the Executive Branch of the Government has access to detailed technical analyses. Congress, being directly responsive to the public, must have equal means of evaluating and understanding the implications of government programs.

A Defense Review Office would provide a group of independent, well-informed civilians who would examine, on a full-time basis, the desirability of particular budgetary decisions. It might also have associated with it a senior consulting board as an advisory arm to Congress, available for informed judgement as one equalizer to the present disparity in expertise between Congress and the Executive Branch.

Breaking the secrecy barrier

Congress will have to deal more directly with the problem of military secrecy. The security classification system which has developed since 1947 must be drastically revised. Very much less information must be kept behind the bars of secrecy, in order that information will be available for the political judgments Congress and the public must make. Decisions which today are removed from public view must be brought before Congress for its overall policy judgment.

Serious examination of the entire question of classified information is needed. Congress should take a fresh look at why information is classified. From whom is the information being kept? (The Russians clearly know far more about our military operations than do the American people.) Can very much more information be made available to the public? Just whom is the classification system protecting? Can we do away with the system altogether? It is, after all, a relatively new institution in American life, and it plays a major role in protecting the national security apparatus from public criticism and control.

As one example of the misuse of classification, the MIRV program was developed and carried on for three years without the knowledge and awareness of most members of Congress. While the Armed Services Committees were informed, they did not appear to question the value or desirability of the program, nor was the rest of the Congress informed about its significance. Only when there were press leaks, long after the program had begun, did the public become aware of its existence. It is only now that its significance is becoming clearly understood.

Congress should insist on its right to know what the defense establishment is doing. It has allowed the Pentagon full discretion in using security classification, forgetting that there is a diminution in our freedom each time an additional matter of national policy is kept from the public. The deployment of major U.S. Air Force units to privileged bases in Southeast Asian countries ought to

have been reported to Congress before it happened; in fact, these units were only discovered later, when they became obvious to local observers. It is not enough that such actions were reported to a select subgroup of the Congress, for this type of committee has tended to be unrepresentative of the Congress and the country as a whole.

Undoubtedly some information will always remain classified, but defense officials should not be allowed to hide policy decisions behind the assertion that national security prevents them from revealing the necessary information. Secret details are seldom essential to understanding any of the larger issues. Herbert York, a former director of Defense Research and Engineering, has suggested that "critical decisions" with respect to the triggering of nuclear devices are "passing from statesmen to technicians, from high to low levels, and from human beings to machines." After he made this remark, Pentagon officials asserted that it was unfortunate that those who made such statements had not been briefed on our most recent ideas about the national command and control system. No doubt there are secret details about this system, but the issue raised does not depend on such details but rather on the simple fact (arising from the curvature of the earth and the flight time of ICBMs) that today the time available for decision is no more than twenty minutes. The generalization that the authority in these life-and-death decisions in passing to low-level authorities cannot be hidden behind claims of secrecy. As in this case, Congress should be able to question defense officials more closely, not just about details but about fundamental policy, and not just about public issues such as the ABM system but about many other policies and weapons systems as well.

While in principle the absence of information need not prevent Congress from exercising its proper function of oversight, in practice no Congressman feels equipped to take on defense problems unless he is buttressed with full and authoritative information. The Congressman must have an answer to the assertion, by those "in the know," that "if you only knew what I know, you wouldn't feel this way." While rational arguments can be a partial answer to this, only authoritative information can be a full response to it and can effectively deal with the uncertainty which such an approach creates.

Often advice is sought from outside individuals who are believed to have had access to defense information through their security clearances. However, except on narrow issues of military technology, there is almost no information that is presently classified which cannot be obtained as well from a careful reading of the newspapers. Thus, an absence of classified information need not prevent the broad body of Congressmen from making the kind of policy judgments which they should be making.

In particular, more timely information must be available to Congress to enable its members to end the practice of voting funds for programs about which they know nothing. Congress should insist that the Executive take whatever risk is involved in releasing classified information, rather than accept the erosion of the democratic process that results when decisions on the allocation of national resources are made solely on the basis of secret information. Greater disclosure might even improve the information available to the Executive Branch, since some classified information is wrong (e.g., projections on the course of the Vietnam war) but is not subject to debate and challenge because of its classification.

Beyond committee parochialism

Unfortunately, past experience with non-Congressional bodies does not provide much hope that over a long period of time they can remain truly independent in order to provide

fundamental criticisms of the Defense Department programs. There is, indeed, serious question as to whether any group could maintain the necessary independence, over the long run, except a group of Congressmen. No other group would have the necessary constitutional authority or the base of political support. No other group could speak out without considering the views of its sponsors, nor would it have the authority to demand answers to critical questions from the Executive.

There are places in the Congress now where the access to information and the independent political support exist, and where this type of analysis and criticism should be done. There is no reason, in principle, why the Armed Services committees must spend their time examining the minutiae of military programs. Under present circumstances, though, these committees cannot be depended on to provide useful examinations of broad policy issues. For this the Congress must turn to some other mechanism or body.

A mechanism to overcome the rigidities of the present structure could be based on the precedent of the Temporary National Economic Committee, which functioned in the late 1930s. Congress could establish a Temporary National Security Committee, composed of members of Congress and qualified outside experts. The original TNEC conducted a searching study of the structure of the American economy, one that is still an outstanding source for understanding the national economy as it existed before World War II. A Temporary National Security Committee could look at the institutional structure of the military-industrial complex, at the relation between military policy and the economic interests which depend on the military establishment, and the economic and social impact of this enterprise upon American society. It would provide the American people with a detailed picture of the massive system they have created and the direction in which it is leading the country.

Congress could also create a Joint Committee on National Priorities, along the lines of the Joint Economic Committee set up twenty-two years ago, to conduct continuing, broad investigations of the implications and objectives of American defense policy and of its relative priority in the national budget. The Secretary of State could be asked to deliver a "posture statement" to the Congress, in much the same manner as the Secretary of Defense does now, defining the assumptions and objectives of our foreign policy. These statements could be reviewed and analyzed by this Joint Committee, providing a focus for the annual congressional debate on national issues, as well as material for research institutions to study and criticize.

If we must, indeed, cross the institutional barriers that now exist, it is not clear that new Congressional institutions alone will accomplish this task. Congress must act more meaningfully as a whole, with each member dealing with a much broader field than customarily falls within the domain of an individual committee. The members of Congress could then act more effectively as representatives of the people on broad issues of national policy, rather than as experts on narrow subjects making policy for the entire nation through their committee assignments. Congress as a unified body might then be able to redress the balance of power which is today so skewed in favor of the Executive Branch.

More thorough review by the Congress could generate more careful examination by the Executive Branch as well. The existence of a Joint Committee would, for instance, encourage the Bureau of the Budget to probe more deeply into military policy than it has in the past. Under present circumstances it can question the Joint Chiefs of Staff on technical questions, but not on matters of

overall defense policy. The defense budget is subjected only to a *joint* review, in which Budget Bureau examiners travel to the Pentagon to examine, along with Defense Department officials, the budget submissions of the individual services; the completed budget then goes directly to the President. The Defense Department would, in this new framework, be treated like all other agencies, which must submit an *independent* review by the Budget Bureau, before their budgets are transmitted to the President.

The Congress should also, through the Government Operations Committee or another appropriate committee, begin on its own initiative to propose machinery whereby real issues of social cost effectiveness could be raised within the Executive, particularly where military needs could be compared with nonmilitary requirements of the society. Perhaps the Cabinet must evolve into an operating agency, with the ability to examine issues of national priorities in a way that will not leave the military budget "above the battle," as it is now.

One must look then, to a range of institutions to provide the analytical counterpoise to the Pentagon which is so badly needed. However, the fundamental decisions that must be made if the direction of this country is to be altered will require political actions substantially beyond these institutional changes. Indeed, structures already exist which could be used for the necessary analysis and criticism, if the political will to use them were developed. New institutions will make the task easier, but they will not eliminate the need for a gathering of those political forces which agree that the national security establishment must be brought under greater control and substantially diminished in size and influence.

One possible way of dealing with the power relationship that currently exists, and over a time altering it, would be to apply a steadily decreasing dollar limitation to the military budget, forcing defense officials to limit their operations and cut back the farflung expanse of the armed forces. The magnitude of the reductions would emerge from a re-assessment of national priorities within the Congress. Just as there is no end to the possible weapons that can be sought, and no absolute criterion for deciding whether to purchase them, so there is no authoritative scientific standard which can be used to decide the amount by which the budget should be reduced each year. This is indeed more a political than a technical issue, depending upon both the perspective of the Congress on the place of American military force in the world and the rapidity with which it would like to see a transition to an economy which emphasizes our domestic needs.

WRITER ALLAN BROWNFIELD SEES "GENERATION GAP" A RELIGIOUS QUEST FOR MEANING

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the House and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an excellent commentary on the "generation gap" written by Allan C. Brownfield and published in the May 15 issue of Roll Call.

With sharp perception, Mr. Brownfield puts the gap in perspective, apportioning the blame properly, in my opinion, among all generations.

Of course, man cannot live by bread alone, but our generation has allowed itself and others to forget.

The article is well worth careful reading.

THE GENERATION GAP

(By Allan C. Brownfield)

There are those who say that the gap between the generations is illusionary, purely manufactured by the headline-writers and by those young militants who, being able to boast of little else, boast of their youth. Even there, it seems, they are not totally committed to the concept that "You can't trust anyone over 30." What they seem to mean is that "You can't trust anyone over 30 with whom you disagree." Dr. Spock remains a hero, as does Professor Herbert Marcuse. These men were past thirty before the Depression, yet the alleged "gap" between them and their young admirers seems non-existent.

Many of the critics of the New Left and student activism, especially those in the generation of their parents, attempt to present the view that the rebellion of today is analogous to the youthful rebellion entered into by every generation. There is, such observers note, nothing unique, about what is happening today.

In his recent volume, "The Conflict of Generations," Professor Lewis Feuer expresses the view that student rebels are simply acting out their hostility against their fathers. He considers this history's proof of the Oedipus complex, and does not consider the student rebels of the 1960s different in nature from student movements which have existed at other times in history.

Professor Feuer is, of course, of the generation of the fathers, and he sees the youthful revolt in those terms. His theory should not be dismissed lightly, for there is an important element of the traditional generational revolt in the student rebels of today. But there seems to be a great deal more than that, for the times in which we live are unique and the transitional period we are now going through as we enter a technological age has been repeated only a few times in the world's history. The young people of today stand upon the bring of a new world. Many are looking romantically to the old and are challenging the future. Others are attempting to search into the past and discover the essential elements of civilization which must be carried with us into the future. Still others, faced with the challenges of an uncertain age, have turned to destruction and chaos.

Though all of us, young, middle aged, and old live in the mid-twentieth century, only the young, those who have come of age after the conclusion of World War II, are truly of this period. Those who lived through the depression or through World War II, have been frozen by the dramatic and intense experience of those days.

The Southern writer, Walter Hines Page, wrote this with regard to the generation which lived during the Civil War in the South: "It (the Civil War) gave everyone of them the intensest experience of his life, and ever afterwards he referred every other experience to this. Thus it stopped the thought of most of them as an earthquake stops a clock. The fierce blow of battle paralyzed the mind. Their speech was the vocabulary of war * * * they were dead men, most of them, moving among the living as ghosts; and yet, as ghosts in a play, they held the stage."

The young are the only ones who are, in a sense, frozen with the dramatic and intense experience of these days. They do not relate the upheavals of today to the past, for they know no past, except through the books most of them do not read, to their great misfortune. They live in the present and wonder what kind of future they may hope for in so transient and unstable a world. If there is a generation gap it is of this nature. The generations need interpreters to understand one another, and these seem few and far between.

A young man growing up in Europe one or two hundred years ago would have faced a situation in which the major decisions in his life were pre-ordained. More than likely, he would have been born in the same house in which his father had been born, almost surely in the same town. He would pursue the same means of earning a living as did his father. If the father was a tailor or a butcher, the son would also live his life in this manner. His marriage would be arranged. His own range of choice-making was very slight. Life was circumscribed by religious faith and communal custom. The individual was part of the community, the group. His responsibility was more that of playing out his role than grasping life as a horseman at the reins and riding in whatever direction he willed.

Today, man's situation is far different. Today, young people have almost unlimited choices with regard to career, location, marriage partners, and other basic elements of life style. Certainly, there are restrictions. The draft claims two years out of the lives of many young men. Some start life in humbler surroundings than others, thereby limiting upward mobility. Yet, on the whole, the young man or woman coming of age in America at this time has perhaps a greater freedom to choose his pattern of living than has any individual at any time in history.

Freedom to choose, however, becomes a very difficult task when no one provides any knowledge or information about the basis upon which such choices may be beneficially be made. At one time the family, the school, and the church spent a good deal of time pointing young people in particular directions which they considered to be valid. Today the family is in a state of disarray, the school pursues a "value free" curriculum, and the church doubts its own message, being swept away in the modern tide of relativism. Not too long ago, "The New Yorker" featured a cartoon in which one priest said to another: "I would not be so presumptuous as to tell the congregation what was right and what was wrong."

Young people today are asking the very "ultimate questions" about life, death and purpose which Paul Tillich said was part of man's nature and which the modern world says is no longer part of man's concern. Where they will find answers to such questions in what they view as a materialistic and de-humanized age, is difficult to say. In searching for values, many in the student movement have taken the negative turn toward nihilism and violence. In addition, many seem blind to the dangers of totalitarianism. But it is the nature of every vacuum that someone attempts to fill it. If it is not filled with what is good, it will be filled with what is not.

Because many young people have rejected the past as a vehicle through which the present may be understood and placed in perspective, few realize that others have gone through similar searches for value and meaning. They speak of love as if it were their own discovery. Chesterton noted that "Christianity has never been tried and found wanting, it has been found difficult and has never been tried."

In a sense which few in the older generation realize, much of the student movement is, in fact, a religious quest for meaning. This point was made by English poet Stephen Spender: "The grievances and demands of the students, the issues and confrontations, reasonable or unreasonable as they may in themselves be, excusable or deplorable—express their total rejection of the depersonalizing forces of modern society. The feeling of the young is that the claims, the powers, the 'production' of this world are opposed to the spirit, flesh, imagination, instincts and spontaneous self-realization which are life."

As we enter the technological revolution, as we move further and further into the mass society, we must be as concerned with the quality of life which young people will

face in the future, as we are with the quality of the material things with which they will be able to tinker.

Man, it must not be forgotten, does not live by bread alone. It is the substance beyond bread for which young people seem to be yearning. Despite all of the faults and dangers, there is something in that search which may, in the long run, save our society, and Western civilization itself. The real generation gap may be this very search. Too many in the older generation, it appears, have given up along the way.

THE APOLLO PROGRAM AND BEYOND

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, along with my fellow citizens I am happy about the successful flight of Apollo 10 and excited about the prospects for the Apollo 11 "landing on the Moon" mission scheduled for July. The national psychological uplift we have received from each new, successful space adventure has been of great proportion, but we must not lose sight of the very real problems that exist here on earth that demand our time, talents, and money.

I have just read with some dismay that NASA is now projecting a manned mission to Mars as the next logical step in our Nation's space program. In my opinion, space projections into the 1980's are premature since there is so much we do not know about the environment of Earth and its oceans. What we really need is a reevaluation of inner space goals and priorities established elsewhere.

We have only scratched the surface in terms of problems connected with the proper utilization of our resources, and we have barely resolved the critical issues facing today's human race. Tremendous strides have been made in the technology to support man in space; now is the time to redress our efforts for the progress and salvation of man on Earth.

An editorial in the May 27 edition of the New York Times brings this point very close to home, and I include the editorial following my remarks in the hope that my colleagues will now direct their attention, with renewed interest, at the many problems here on Earth:

AD ASTRA

The triumphant splashdown—right on target and right on time—of the Apollo 10 astronauts after their epochal reconnaissance of the moon was a perfect ending to an extraordinary achievement. This was the most complex and most difficult technological feat in human history.

Yet from blastoff at the preassigned time, through the climactic hours when the lunar module swept within nine miles of the moon's nightmarish surface, to the final precise landing, it all went off almost without a hitch.

The faultlessness of Apollo 10's performance in the neighborhood of the moon was at once a demonstration of what this great country is capable of doing and a reminder of its failure to make comparable application of that capacity to the solution of problems here on earth. If Americans can reach the earth's satellite 250,000 miles away, why can't they all live in decent houses, enjoy adequate diets, receive adequate medical care and ben-

efit from the levels of education that their native endowments permit them to absorb?

The Apollo 10 astronauts were indeed envoys of all mankind, and their triumph was ultimately a triumph for all men. But here in the United States the justified applause for this superlative achievement must be tempered by a quickened realization of the essential tasks still unaccomplished within the nation's borders.

In spectacularly demonstrating the heights this country can reach, Apollo 10 inevitably calls attention to the valleys that still crater the American landscape. This striking contrast only emphasizes the need for more adequate action and more effective efforts here on earth, even while the inspiring assault on the frontiers of space moves forward toward new and ever greater accomplishment.

MEMORIAL DAY 1969

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day is a day set aside wherein we pause to pay tribute to those who have given their lives in the service of their country—men who died to defend this Nation against physical takeover so that its people might live as an example of how free men are able to establish and perpetuate a free society.

The memorialization of our fallen heroes has been a long and honorable tradition since 1869. But today, in the midst of yet another war, there is a tendency by many to forget those who gave their last full measure of devotion to a country in times of national crisis. I cannot reflect upon this day without recalling those of my friends in World War II who, in the performance of their duty, made the supreme sacrifice that we might live a few more years under a system of government that is ever-changing, yet ever free.

And then when we thought world peace was within our grasp, and we believed that all the sacrifices of 292,000 combat deaths in 4 bloody years of war were to be realized, another outpost of freedom was invaded and we had to send men into combat for the fourth time in this century to a far-off place called Korea. In guarding the fragile light of freedom in that small nation, 34,000 Americans gave their lives. We then finally realized, as at no other time, that the maintenance of freedom was going to be a never-ending and frequent task that is not always easily defined or easily understood.

There is no such thing as an "explainable" war, yet if we are to live in freedom, if we are to maintain the moral leadership of the free world, if we are to bend our every fiber to help others in the world enjoy or gain the benefits of freedom, then when forced we must defend the principles of freedom wherever and however they are challenged.

This past Memorial Day must be remembered as a dedication to the youth of this country who have given their lives in defense of the principles of freedom. The majority of those who died in combat in World War II were under 30; the overwhelming majority of those who died in combat in Korea were under 25; and 48 percent of those who have fallen in

Vietnam have been under the age of 21. It is the flower of this Nation's youth that we should dedicate this day, this year.

But today when Americans are falling in defense of freedom, in defense of our commitments to the free world, and in defense of the principle of self-determination, there is an undercurrent of cowardly talk and action by another type of "youth" which denigrates all we have accomplished and all that our fallen heroes have sacrificed. Rather than take up their places in the swamps, forests, and highlands of Vietnam to defend what is right and honorable, the campus cowards tear down the institutions at home that were built and preserved by the blood of an earlier youth. I know one cannot send such people to defend freedom, as defense of freedom is too precious a job to be entrusted to the irresponsible. Instead we have sent the flower of our youth. They fight under impossible restrictions and suffer the indignities and deprecations by those at home lacking the will to fight.

In memoriam to those loved ones who have stayed behind, and to those that face the awful uncertainties of combat with courage, this Nation dedicates this past Memorial Day with the fervent prayer that on the next such day their job has been completed successfully and no more Americans are dying on battlefields.

DRAFT REFORM

(Mr. BURLISON of Missouri was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago President Nixon sent his message on draft reform to the Congress. At that time I expressed serious reservations about the plan, particularly continuation of college deferments as under past Selective Service programs.

In my May newsletter to my constituents, an analysis of the President's proposal and my response to it was stated. Following is the portion of said newsletter which relates to the draft issue, as well as editorial comment by the Cape Girardeau Southeast Missouriian, a prominent newspaper in Missouri's 10th Congressional District:

[From Representative BILL D. BURLISON'S Newsletter, vol. 1, No. 4]

DRAFT REFORM

The President last week sent to Congress a proposal for revamping our military induction procedures. The plan calls for a random selection. Many of you will recall that long ago I advocated such a plan. However, my main complaint has been the special treatment accorded those who are able and willing to attend college. The President's proposal retains this discriminatory policy of college deferment. So Mr. Nixon's plan is not as "random" as we might like to think. Space will not permit an exhaustive discussion of this issue, but let me mention just a few reasons why the college deferment is unfair and unwise.

The most obvious is the advantage given to those best equipped financially. Economic preferment should have nothing to do with

when and whether a young man serves his country. Presently, a disproportionate share of our war casualties are borne by our poorer citizens. The most feasible explanation for this is that the more affluent are less vulnerable to the draft because of the "education loophole."

This system encourages students to go to college who do not have the intellectual capacity nor the motivation and who would not otherwise attend. Those who have had an opportunity to observe these students readily see the unfortunate waste of time and resources of both the families and schools involved.

In conjunction with the last mentioned point, it should be observed that the system discourages marginal students from taking academically rigorous courses, in order to make better grades insuring continued deferments. And it is widely known that some institutions and professors have shown tendencies to lower academic standards rather than send the marginal student to the draft.

A not so obvious inequity is perhaps what some would term a perverted sense of values and priorities. For example, why should a student of Greek Drama be deferred while an apprentice carpenter is not.

The argument is made that abolition of college deferments would stifle education. This is not true. Much evidence is available to indicate that the teenage student has a stronger motivation for formal education after he has a couple of more years of maturity. In addition, he has a more accurate concept of what he desires as his life's work. Maybe it could be said that some of the actions in our campuses today are some reflection of immaturity. The education benefits available under the GI Bill serve to guarantee that service will not impede education—rather the opposite is true.

It is recognized that the position here taken may not be popular. A larger and larger percentage of our people are finding college education possible, and as we parents know so well, it is usually the parents, rather than the students themselves, who most want the college deferment.

Hopefully, shortly and before the draft controversy can be resolved, the war will be over and no draft necessary. Until that time, however, our hallmark should be fairness and equity among all our people.

[From the Cape Girardeau (Mo.) Southeast Missouriian, May 27, 1969]

THE DRAFT AND COLLEGE DEFERMENTS

Rep. Bill D. Burlison has put his finger on a sensitive spot in the nation's draft apparatus and he is eminently correct.

He has called college draft deferment "unfair and unwise" and has cited his reasons.

His principal complaint, the 10th District Congressman said, is the special treatment accorded those "who are able and willing to attend college."

This preferential attention is retained in President Nixon's proposal for draft reforms, Mr. Burlison observed.

He will ask why it is that a student of Greek drama should have deferred status while an apprentice carpenter does not.

The universities and colleges of this country have been a safe haven for many draft dodgers who are afraid to stand up to their responsibility as citizens.

They have used student deferments not only for undergraduate education, but to continue on with graduate degrees, all for the purpose of evading armed forces service at the time of the war in Vietnam.

This does not imply that all are dishonest. But the facts are too clear that a disproportionate number are simply academic draft dodgers, professional students as long as the

war lasts and they can continue to get deferments.

Rep. Burlison is right when he says there is no content to the argument that drafting of students would stifle education.

Walls are bulging in the nation's colleges and universities. Academic life has become impersonal. Classes are huge. There are sufficient quality students that the removal of some under new procedures would not damage the quality of education.

The nation needs men and women who are qualified by education to advance its interests in all fields of endeavor. Of that there is no doubt.

But let it always be remembered that there exists within the mainstream of American life a solid, stable body of men and women who are not qualified for and have no interest in educational pursuits.

These people are just as entitled to deferment because of their contributions to American life as are those who are by temperament and inclination able to go to college. They are no less intelligent than the latter, by any stretch of the imagination.

Rep. Burlison has spoken well. There should be no college deferments anymore than there should be for any other category of American citizen.

FORTAS, A LOGICAL CULMINATION OF NEW DEAL LIBERALISM

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, David Broder, the distinguished political commentator, recently called the Fortas affair "in many ways the logical culmination of New Deal liberalism." It is a striking thought with which I agree.

In his column for May 20 as published in the Washington Post, Mr. Broder concisely traces the tragic lines of reasoning by which New Dealers grew smug and self-satisfied; how their own financial self-interest came, almost miraculously—as if by divine fiat—to coincide with the public interest. Until, at last, we come to Fortas, who appears genuinely not to understand why he should not have accepted \$20,000 a year for life for the good of sweet charity.

I bring this matter to the attention of the House in all sincerity and in no sense at all of victorious, self-satisfied crowing. I do so as a warning—a warning particularly to my own party. The continuing collapse of traditional "liberalism" because of its inability to cope with the needs of our times, makes it more than likely that my party will enjoy a long period of power and responsibility.

It is important to remember that power corrupts. It is vital, especially for those who are coming newly into power, to study the record of this corruption. We are human; we are all vulnerable. It is a great temptation to be both rich and virtuous.

In that spirit, then I offer Mr. Broder's brilliant exposition for the RECORD:

FORTAS CASE DEMONSTRATED A CORRUPT STRAIN IN LIBERALISM (By David S. Broder)

In his letter of resignation from the Supreme Court, Associate Justice Abe Fortas defended his fee from the Wolfson Family Foundation—whose head, a former law

client, had continued to consult with the Justice on his legal problems with the Government—with these words:

“... Its program—the improvement of community relations and the promotion of racial and religious cooperation—concerned matters to which I had been devoting much time and attention... Because of the nature of the work, there was no conflict between it and my judicial duties.”

Official Washington was shocked by the Fortas case, but it should not have been. It has been a long time coming—more than 30 years—but, tragically, it was in many ways the logical culmination of New Deal liberalism.

Two years ago, John Kenneth Galbraith wrote in his book “The New Industrial State” that “only the innocent reformer and the obtuse conservative” can be unaware of the ways in which “the interests or needs of the industrial system are advanced with subtlety and power. Since they are made to seem coordinate with the purposes of society, Government action serving the needs of the industrial system has a strong aspect of social purpose. And... the line between the industrial system and the state becomes increasingly artificial and indistinct.”

All the Fortas case really shows is that Galbraith's dictum applies to the Supreme Court as well as to the other branches of the Government. The evolution has been plain.

The New Deal, which brought Fortas and his friend, Lyndon B. Johnson, to Washington, was a merger of two elements, an old-fashioned political liberalism committed to civil liberties and (later) to civil rights and a new economic liberalism based on the use of governmental power to expand and redistribute the national wealth.

The economic program, which was dominant, was originally directed to the relief of the Depression problems of unemployment and poverty. Though many of its pump-priming efforts failed, the New Deal reaped the economic benefits of World War II and liberalism emerged in the postwar period as a sponsor of a variety of public programs—military and civilian, foreign and domestic—that kept the industrial system prosperous.

Like many others of his generation, Abe Fortas made the transition from public servant in that early war on poverty (he was general counsel of the Public Works Administration at 29) to private practitioner handling legal problems for the industries that profited from the Government-induced prosperity.

As Max Frankel of the New York Times said, Fortas pioneered in the pattern of “brokerage between the rich and the mighty, for both noble and profitable causes.” He was, for many years, both a skilled advocate for his private clients and a cherished counselor to Lyndon Johnson, who shared his view of the compatibility of liberal politics and private profits.

In their world, there was no sharp line between private and public interests. As a lawyer and as a Justice, Fortas was also a White House insider. And the presidential assistants with whom he worked knew they could join the Fortas firm, or others like it, at handsome salaries when their White House duties were finished.

To those who said the system was suspect, the reply was always that it served the cause of liberalism, of freedom and of social justice. Just as the profits of Fortas' private law practice allowed him to serve as indigents' counsel in landmark civil rights and civil liberties cases, so the profits of the war-inflated, Government-subsidized economy permitted Democratic Presidents from Truman through Johnson to pay for the education and welfare programs they passed.

The operating principle of the liberal program from the New Deal through the Great

Society was the purchase of public programs through the guarantee of industrial prosperity. It seemed a perfect marriage—but the blurring of public and private interests at its root was essentially corrupt.

That Fortas' particular involvement was with a businessman indicted and later convicted of stock fraud may be regarded as accidental. But the intimate interweaving of private and public interests symbolized by his dealings with Wolfson is all too typical of the political tradition from which we came.

The New Left campus radicals who are trying to destroy the institutions of liberalism have long contended that liberalism's achievements in the social welfare-civil rights area are simply window-dressing or accidental byproducts of what is essentially a corporate-governmental mechanism for providing profits and protection to the privileged.

By confirming the radicals' view of the system, particularly at this moment, Fortas has compounded a personal tragedy into something of a national calamity.

FARMINGTON—6 MONTHS LATER

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was honored to attend Memorial Day services in the James Fork United Methodist Church in Farmington, W. Va. for the 78 men who lost their lives in the November 20, 1968, explosion and fire at the Consolidation Coal Co.'s Farmington No. 9 Mine. The impressive interdenominational services were attended by the families of the 78 men, President and Mrs. W. A. Boyle, of the United Mine Workers of America; President John Corcoran, of Consolidation Coal Co., my distinguished colleague who represents Farmington, ROBERT H. “BOB” MOLLOHAN, and Dr. and Mrs. Harvey Wells, of Morgantown, W. Va., who have been instrumental in leading the fight to protect coal miners against pneumoconiosis.

The ministers conducting the services were the host pastor, Rev. John A. Barnes; the Right Reverend Monsignor Joseph Wanstreet, of St. Peter's Roman Catholic Church, Fairmont, W. Va.; Rev. Gene Holt, West Farmington United Methodist Church; and Rev. James M. Kerr, Barrackville, W. Va., United Methodist Church.

I insert in the RECORD the memorial services program, which also lists the names of the 78 men who were honored. I also insert a series of excellent articles on the Farmington No. 9 disaster which appeared in the Panorama Sunday magazine of the May 25 issue of the Morgantown, W. Va., Sunday Dominion Post:

ORDER OF WORSHIP: JAMES FORK UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, MAY 30, 1969, MEMORIAL DAY

Prelude.

Hymn No. 440, “Sing with All the Saints of Glory.”

Invocation by Rt. Rev. Monsignor Joseph Wanstreet.

Responsive Reading No. 642, “I will Greatly Rejoice,” Leader: Rev. Gene Holt.

Prayer by Rev. John A. Barnes, Pastor.

Scripture Lesson: Selections from Old and

New Testaments, Rt. Rev. Monsignor Joseph Wanstreet.

Anthem, “Come Unto Me,” by Franz Joseph Handel, by Main Street United Methodist Choir.

Message: “Hope in the Resurrection.”

Hymn No. 439, “Christ the Lord Is Risen Today.”

Memorial Heading, “A Psalm of Life,” by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Read by the Rev. James M. Kerr.

Benediction by Rev. Gene Holt.

Postlude.

Pianist, Mrs. Inez Pitzer.

In memory of—Arthur Anderson, Jr., Jack Armstrong, Thomas Ashcraft, Jimmy Barr, Orvil Beam, John Bingham, Thomas Bogess, Louis Boros, Harold Butt, Lee Carpenter, David Cartwright, William Currence, Dale Davis, Albert DeBerry, George Decker, Howard Deel, James Efav, Joe Feris, Virgil Forte.

Wade Foster, Aulda Freeman, Jr., Robert Glover, Forrest Goff, John Gouzd, Charles Hardman, Ebert E. Hartzel, Simon Hays, Paul Henderson, Jr., Roy Henderson, Steve Horvath, Junior Jenkins, James Jones, Pete Kaznoski, Sr., Robert Kerns, Charles E. King, James Kniceley, George R. Kovar, David Malnella, Walter Martin.

Frank Matish, Hartzel Mayle, Dennis McDonald, Emelio Megna, Jack D. Michael, Wayne Minor, Charles Moody, Paul O. Moran, Adron Morris, Joseph Muto, Randall Ray Parsons, Raymond Parsons, Nicholas Petro, Fred Rogers, William Sheme, Robert Sigley, Henry Skarzinski, John Sotuch, Russell Snyder.

Jerry Stoneking, Harry Strait, Albert Takacs, William Takacs, Dewey Tarley, Frank Tate, Jr., Goy Taylor, Hoy Taylor, Edwin Tennant, Homer Tichenor, Dennis Toler, John Toothman, Gorman Trimble, Roscoe Triplett, William T. Walker, James Henry Walter, Lester Willard, Edward Williams, Lloyd Wilson, Jerry Yanero.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Sunday Dominion-Post, May 25, 1969]

FARMINGTON: 6 MONTHS LATER

(By Wendell R. Cochran)

FARMINGTON—Metal studs for aluminum siding protrude from a house in this small mining town. Odds are that the job will never be finished.

The owner of the house and 77 of his fellow miners are “in the mine,” as the locals say. “In the mine” here is short for dead, short for “trapped six months in Consol No. 9.”

It was last Nov. 20 that Consol No. 9 seared its way into national prominence for the second time in 15 years with a major coal mining disaster.

Since then, many things have happened. The death of the 78 men have focused worldwide attention on mine safety. America poured out her heart to the 78 families, dumping \$290,000 worth of money and materials into this town of 900.

“The community is settling back to normal,” one teacher in the local high school said here recently.

But is it really?

The mine remains sealed. There is still no way to know how the 78 men died or to determine why the mine suddenly exploded early on that November morning.

The same man who said the community is settling back to normal predicted another outburst of raw emotion when the mine seals are broken and the recovery crews begin work.

As I looked at the Llewellyn portal recently I understood why the families might not be able to soberly witness the recovery operation.

I remembered the weekend after the explo-

sion: the knots of women and miners standing around listening to portable radios wishing for hopeful news, news that would not; could not come.

The scene of a mother jerking with sobs as she greeted her son who was called back from Vietnam still is vivid in the brain.

There are no scenes like that today outside Champion Store. But neither are there many visitors to the store. The store owner described the business as "about half" what it was Nov. 19.

The reason: the miners who worked at Farmington were many more than 78. But most of them lived outside of Farmington and only stopped at Champion Store for groceries or a smoke after work.

"They won't come near here now," the owner lamented. Chances are they won't again until the mine reopens.

And while it might appear that Farmington is returned to normal; the opening of the mine is the chief topic of conversation.

Rumors of the reopening have run rampant, right along with the rumors about the cause of the explosion and the distribution of the relief funds.

"First it was Jan. 15—then Feb. 15. Now it's May 15—Hell, we'll be lucky if it's Aug. 15," a man commented wryly.

On the same lot with the Champion Store is the small mine office, moved there since the explosion. Reopening is the only thought there.

A list of the order in which the miners are to be recalled is posted on the wall.

And the occasional visitors ask:
"How's it look?"

The mine officials say:

"From our samples, it look's real good for going in."

The only question of reopening is when. There are 35 square miles of untouched coal still in Consol No. 9. The company can't quit.

And it appears that many of the men who were working at Consol No. 9 in November will go back as soon as it reopens.

Some may be afraid, but they'll go back because mining is what they do.

But their sons may not. In a town where going into the mines was nearly the accepted way of life, that may be the most significant factor to have come out of the Consol No. 9 explosion.

At any rate, it is clear that Farmington and nearby Mannington have not returned to normal.

True, the press of the world is gone, leaving only a crushed film container and a crumpled strip of exposed movie film in its wake.

There are no more public outbreaks of emotion.

But the changes are under the surface and not so noticeable.

One man described it best:

"You look around for someone to go fishing with, an old fishing buddy. He's not there. He's in the mine."

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Sunday Dominion-Post, May 25, 1969]

SEVENTY-EIGHT MINERS MAY NOT HAVE DIED IN VAIN—PERHAPS

(By Ray Martin)

"There can be no question that the health and safety of employes in the coal mining industry must be given first priority"—John Corcoran (Dec. 12, 1968).

When all the coal dust settles and the television cameras turn in another direction as the Cassandras of the typewriter focus on yet another unsolved problem of humanity, the Nov. 20, 1968, disaster at Farmington No. 9 mine at Mannington will go into the annals of history on a par with Ralph Waldo Emerson's verse about the farmers' shot at Concord that was heard around the world.

As mining disasters go, the death toll at the Marion County mine owned by John Corcoran's firm, Consolidation Coal Co., established no records as such—save one: It was the first mine to be the scene of a second disaster. On Nov. 13, 1964, sixteen men lost their lives at what was then the Jamison No. 9 mine.

Explosions of gas and dust in coal mines have caused death and injury to miners and destruction of workings in all countries where coal is mined underground. In the United States the first reported explosion was in 1810; explosions have continued to the present.

The danger to men in a mine when an explosion occurs is not always measured by the violence created or by their nearness to the area through which flame and violence extend. As many, perhaps more, men have died from gases and lack of oxygen (known as "afterdamp") than have been killed by the blast and heat.

Mine explosions often are caused by a combination of factors, including concentration of methane in air, formation of clouds of dust, and the presence of a flame or spark. These explosion factors have varied with changes in mining methods and practices over the years, but the basic causes have always been the same.

Understanding of the causes and acceptance of ways to guard against explosions and their effects have been slow to spread from investigators to officials and then to bosses and miners. To a considerable extent there has been a belief that explosions were a mining risk that might be put off but could be prevented. Such belief is based on the human failure to maintain and observe necessary precautions.

Like the shot heard 'round the world in the 1800s, the disaster at Farmington has set in motion a tidal wave of public indignation that shows little sign of receding. The mere fact that Farmington No. 9, where 78 men remain entombed, is used as a focal point in discussions relative to mine safety and health irks some coal industry officials. As an example, Laurence E. Tierney Jr., chairman of Eastern Coal Corp., rebuked a government speaker at the American Mining Congress coal convention in Pittsburgh earlier this month, in this fashion: "That's in the past," adding that Farmington was "being used to create mass hysteria for political purposes."

A lot of things have happened since that fateful day last November. Things which tend to shatter the long-standing belief that because the miner works below ground and out of sight he and his employer are beyond the bounds of human decency and the reach of laws applicable to society as a whole.

The tragedy at Farmington No. 9, when viewed in the light of the technology required for space and undersea exploration, has spawned a virtual plethora of Diogenes' carrying a multitude of lamps in search of the truth—the truth of how and why miners could be subjected to abuses which no other American worker must endure and who is responsible.

Many of the so-called "instant experts," as the United Mine Workers Journal has labelled them, have succeeded in convincing the bulk of the American populace that the coal miner and his dignity is more valuable than a piece of machinery. This is in stark contrast to the days when coal operators would tell their miners: "Take care of that mule. I can always hire another man, but I have to buy a mule."

The modern day Diogenes' have led Government officials to concede that they have been derelict in their responsibility in enforcing laws and regulations. These concessions have showed a conspiracy with the coal industry which placed greater emphasis

on coal production and the development of new uses for coal than concern for the miner who makes it all possible.

One industry group spokesman admitted that while his group had some "enlightened" members its public position had to reflect the lowest common denominator of the membership.

The current penchant for truth has led educators, such as West Virginia University President James G. Harlow, to call for a new look at the roles of mining schools.

Equipment manufacturers admit that their equipment meets the demands of their customers—equipment geared for increased production. An official of one such company said: "We gave them what they were screaming for—production. The producers could have put more impetus on safety, but they didn't, and now they're paying for it."

Such philosophy has led to language such as this appearing in proposed laws now under consideration in the Congress: "The first priority and concern of all in the coal mining industry must be the health and safety of its most precious resource—the miner."

Although coal industry spokesmen like Stephen F. Dunn, president of the National Coal Association, say: "The industry does not believe profits should be put ahead of the health and safety of mine workers," many "instant experts" and friends of coal miners assert that some members of Congress insist on the passage of legislation which puts the dollar sign ahead of the miners' health and safety.

One thing appears certain, however, and that is that before the first anniversary of Farmington No. 9's latest disaster is marked the nation will have improved mine safety and health laws of some kind. The President and a sufficient number of Democrats and Republicans in the Congress have committed themselves to this goal.

In the six months that have intervened since No. 20, 1968, West Virginia witnessed the passage of a so-called "black lung" law, which makes the disease compensable under workmen's compensation laws. The precedent is now spreading to other states.

Although the UMWA is claiming credit for passage of the law at Charleston, the miners themselves filled the halls of the Capitol and the galleries of the House and Senate chambers until passage of the bill was assured. The miners were criticized for leaving their jobs to exercise their rights and once they succeeded individuals and groups which had opposed them began to claim the victory themselves.

The coal miner and his "friends" are not only concerned about deaths in the mines from explosions. They want something done about the deaths and injuries which occur daily in the mines.

In West Virginia during the month of April, 16 workmen died in work-related accidents and there were 3,894 lost-time accidents. Thirteen of the deaths were recorded in the state's coal mining industry and 999 of the lost-time accidents were in the same industry. The state's industrial fatalities left 14 widows and 22 children under 18 years of age.

Concern has been expressed by many that the monthly report to the State Compensation Director (shown here) doesn't reflect an accurate survey of the unsafe conditions of the state's mines. It records only those cases in which compensation awards are made. The critics maintain that many times an injured employe is returned to the payroll within a 24-hour period to avoid payment of compensation, which in the case of a high accident ratio employer prevents increases in insurance premiums.

The following is a list of injuries, by class, reported during the month ended April 30, 1969:

STATE MONTHLY COMPENSATION REPORT

	Regular subscribers		Self-insurers		Total	
	Fatal	Non-fatal	Fatal	Non-fatal	Fatal	Non-fatal
A-1 Coal mining.....	11	621	1	362	12	983
A-2 Coke manufacturing.....		7		3		10
A-3 Strip coal mining.....	1	16			1	16
B-4 Woodworking.....		56				56
B-11 Sawmills and logging.....	1	62		6	1	68
C-4 Quarrying and ore mining.....		17				17
D-1 Glass manufacturing.....		115		30		145
D-6 Potteries and flat glass manufacturing.....		76		9		85
D-7 Brick and tile manufacturing.....		16				16
E-1 Iron and steel manufacturing.....		46		89		135
E-10 Machine shops.....		259		25		284
E-20 Sheet metal goods manufacturing.....		120		9		129
F-3 Municipalities.....	1	53			1	53
F-4 State and county departments.....		39				39
F-5 State road commission.....		43				43
F-6 Welfare A.D.C.U.....		3				3
G-11 Auto operation and repair.....		166		2		168
G-13 Pile driving and dredging.....		10				10
G-16 Gas works operations.....		18		5		23
G-18 Electric, water, and telephone.....		68		11		79
H-4 Chemicals, manufacturing.....		90		29		119
J-2 Textile and garment manufacturing.....		53		16		69
J-4 Laundry and drycleaning.....		8				8
J-5 Rubber and leather goods.....		47				47
K-3 Building material.....	1	29			1	29
K-4 Retail stores.....		321		8		329
K-6 Wholesale, warehouse, dairy.....		118		1		119
L-1 Tunneling and excavating.....		27				27
L-4 Structural steel.....		24				24
L-11 Electric lines construction.....		22		10		32
L-15 Building construction and repair.....		216				216
L-22 Street and road construction.....		39				39
L-30 Plumbing.....		49				49
L-33 Oil and gas production and distribution.....		36		18		54
L-47 Locks, dams, bridge construction.....		21				21
L-49 Trucking, heavy hauling.....		76				76
L-54 Steel erection, not otherwise classified.....		20		1		21
M-4 Scrap iron, junk.....		15				15
N-2 Paper and paper goods manufacturing.....		19		1		20
N-5 Printing and publishing.....		22				22
O-1 Bakeries, hotels and restaurants.....		97				97
O-4 Agricultural.....		25				25
O-7 Milling, ice manufacturing.....		28				28
P-7 Clerical office employees.....		37		1		38
P-8 Salesmen and engineers.....		8				8
Total.....	15	3,258	1	636	16	3,894
Grand total.....						3,910

Note: Number of widows left by these fatalities, 14; number of children, under 18, left by these fatalities, 22.

The six-month anniversary of the Farmington No. 9 disaster has also seen the seeds of revolution within the ranks of the United Mine Workers of America grow. For nearly 40 years no one challenged the leadership of the UMWA. In 1964, Steve (Cadillac) Kochis of Clarksville, Pa., campaigned for the UMWA presidency against W. A. (Tony) Boyle and lost.

As of the present time three rank and file miners are seeking the UMWA presidency. In addition to Kochis, two Morgantown miners are presidential aspirants. They are Elijah Wolford and Basil A. Callen.

Many miners have expressed dissatisfaction with the alleged lack of aggressiveness of the UMWA in the field of safety and health and a shortage of democracy within the union. The UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund has also come under fire from within the union ranks and as well as externally. There is growing support for a Congressional investigation of the UMWA and its Welfare Fund.

The UMWA has been finding trouble on other fronts, too. Several courts have said the union conspired with large coal companies to drive small non-union coal companies out of business.

As the tidal wave of public indignation rolls onward, many observers hope that the dingy sign at the West Virginia border which reads: "Welcome to West Virginia, the Switzerland of North America!" will begin to have true meaning. An English journalist, seeing one of the signs, declared that it should be changed to read: "Welcome to West Virginia, the Albania of North America!"

Coal mining and its attributes of the past contributed to the Englishmen's observation. Farmington No. 9's disaster has afforded the state and the nation a golden opportunity to break with an oppressive past and join a progressive future—a future that will ad-

vance Appalachia in many respects and allow it to become an equal partner with the other states of the nation.

If this comes to pass the 78 miners who died at Farmington will not have died in vain.

[From the Farmington (W. Va.) Dominion-Post, May 25, 1969]

FARMINGTON NO. 9 AND NOW

(By George A. Crago)

The explosion and mine fire at Farmington No. 9 mine of Mountaineer Coal Co. last Nov. 20, in addition to the tragic loss of life, dealt the community a crippling blow and disrupted the economy of the area.

The mine disaster produced a chain of events which, in some respects, have not changed to any great extent six months later.

Federal and state mine inspectors check the "seals" each week, and Mountaineer Coal keeps an eye on them on a day-to-day basis.

When it was decided on Nov. 29 to seal the mine, it marked the beginning of a long vigil, making sure that the seals were not disturbed by human effort or by natural elements.

Atmospheric pressure has its effect on the coverings over the shafts and portals. In layman's language, the outside pressure and the pressure below the seals can change enough to disturb the seals, so that they must be watched and maintained constantly.

It is the effectiveness of the seals which determines how long the mine must remain closed. Recently, Leslie C. Ryan, state inspector-at-large for the northcentral section of West Virginia, reported that methane in the mine was up to about 90 per cent, well above the explosive point, and that the carbon monoxide content of the mine was "leveling off."

Mr. Ryan said that progress was being made toward the point where atmospheric condi-

tions inside the mine would make an entry into the mine possible.

He hastened to add, however, that no one had discussed the reopening of the mine, and before that can be done, there will have to be complete accord of all parties concerned that it is safe to break the seal on a portal preparatory to entering the mine.

Federal and state inspectors and representatives of Mountaineer Coal and the United Mine Workers of America must agree on reopening the mine, just as they agreed last fall that it was not possible to extinguish the fire short of sealing the mine.

There have been indications that even after all parties are agreed on the feasibility of reopening No. 9 mine that the company will want additional time to make doubly sure that nothing will go awry.

There was the possibility, although not confirmed, that mules and horses might be used in the early stage of re-entry for hauling materials inside the mine, rather than using electrical equipment.

Mr. Ryan had pointed out that there were two possible methods of entering the mine. Using what he described as an air-lock method, workmen would pump air into a restricted section of the mine to determine that there was no evidence of smoldering debris. As each section was cleared, the barriers would be set back and another section would be inspected.

The alternative would be to start up the huge ventilating fans and send fresh air through the mine to dilute the gas and restore normal air conditions in the mine.

No determination has been made on the method to be used, the state mine inspector said.

The No. 9 mine produced 2,198,000 tons of coal in 1967, to put it in the category of the major mines.

According to Keystone Coal Buyers' Manual the mine's equipment at that time included six RT mining machines, 15 mobile loading machines, 12 rock dusting units, 10 roof bolting machines, 14 pumps, eight continuous miners, 19 mine locomotives, 224 mine cars and 21 shuttle cars, along with compressors and other equipment.

Paul Stanek, personnel director for Mountaineer Coal, said recently that there were about 300 men idled by the explosion and fire, and that all of the men now are employed or have been offered jobs in one of the company's mines. Mountaineer Coal is a division of Consolidated Coal Co.

Although not directly related to the Farmington mine disaster, the drive for "black lung" legislation gained public support from persons who had become aware of the hazards of coal mining. "Black lung" legislation was intended to provide greater benefits for miners afflicted with pneumoconiosis.

Mines throughout the state were closed as miners walked off the job in support of the black lung effort. Miners returned to the pits in this county March 9 and 10. Governor Arch A. Moore Jr. signed the pneumoconiosis measure March 11. It was hailed variously as a fair, good, or insufficient measure according to the point of view of the individual.

A related action was the designation of a special study group by W. A. (Tony) Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers, to study dust conditions in the mines of this union district.

Latest reports indicated that the union had not been successful in getting the support of the companies for this study. Company spokesmen were said to have withheld their approval until a number of administrative and operational details were worked out.

The special dust survey group included John Darcus, Carroll Rogers, Burdette Crowe, Harold Tracy and Ronald Meadows.

Still unresolved was another important matter, the distribution of the funds that have been contributed by persons and organizations from all parts of the country,

including special efforts by newspapers and television stations.

The Marion County Disaster Fund, with \$90,776.68 reported in its bank account at the first of the month, and the Citizens Mine Disaster Committee with \$200,003.09 on hand, resorted to a "friendly suit" in Marion County Circuit Court in an effort to determine a fair and equitable manner of distributing the money to the survivors of the 78 men who lost their lives in the No. 9 mine disaster.

The bill of particulars listed 223 persons, the wives, children and next of the kin of the men.

L. Clyde Riley, secretary-treasurer of UMWA District 31, sought the court's assistance in behalf of the Marion County Mine Disaster Fund, while Dominick J. Romine, an attorney, filed the suit on behalf of the Citizens Mine Disaster Committee.

It was reported earlier that the cases might be combined when they were considered by Circuit Court Judge J. Harper Meredith, but this action has not been verified.

The committee, in its suit, suggested two plans for distributing the money.

According to one plan, half of the money would be given on a per capita basis to the widows, or if there were no widow, to the infant children. The other half would go to the children on a per capita basis.

The second plan suggested that one-half of the money go to the widows, as in the first plan, with the remaining half to the widows and children alike. This plan would permit the widows to participate to a greater extent than under the first proposal.

While the problems relating to Farmington No. 9 remained unresolved, coal continues to pour from the other mines of Mountaineer Coal, whose president, David H. Davis, has disclosed that Robinson Run mine now is producing 7,000 tons of coal daily, and by the end of the year should reach 8,500 tons daily with employment increased to 350 men.

The company anticipates production of 10,000 tons of coal per day by 1970, and 14,000 by 1973, with a payroll of 450 workers.

Looking ahead to 1974, the goal is 15,000 tons daily, with a work force of nearly 500 men. This mine will supply coal to the new Monongahela Power Co.'s Haywood plant near Shinnston, using a four-mile-long conveyor belt, longest in Northern West Virginia.

Williams Mine eventually will be joined to Robinson Run to produce an even larger operation.

HUMOR IN SCHOOL CRISIS

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, throughout history, times of great crisis have produced some of our great humor. There is no question but that our schools are in a state of great crisis at the present. Newspapers daily carry the story of the latest strife to a depressing degree. I might be discouraged from reading the papers if it were not for the efforts of some of our excellent satirists who have applied their pens lightly to this subject. Their humorous insights into the turmoil surrounding us have contributed greatly to our understanding of the problems facing higher education.

Satire is the highest form of humor. It releases tension and allows problems to be placed in proper perspective. Its prick punctures self-righteousness and self-importance. Its edge cuts through to the core of our social problems. I believe solution of the problems confronting our campuses would be much more easily arrived at if the parties involved

were able to look at themselves through the eyes of the satirist.

So that others may enjoy some of the excellent humor produced on the problem of campus unrest, I insert in the RECORD at this point several representative articles:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 25, 1969]

OBSERVER: INTERPRETATIONS ON A TUFFET

(By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON, Mar. 24.—Little Miss Muffet, as everyone knows, sat on a tuffet eating her curds and whey when along came a spider who sat down beside her and frightened Miss Muffet away. While everyone knows it, the significance of the event had never been analyzed until a conference of thinkers recently brought their special insights to bear upon it. Following are excerpts from the transcript of their discussion:

Sociologist: We are clearly dealing with a prototypical illustration of a highly tensile social structure's tendency to dis- or perhaps even de-structure itself under the pressures created when optimum minimums do not obtain among the disadvantaged. Miss Muffet is nutritionally underprivileged, as evidenced by the subminimal diet of curds and whey upon which she is forced to subsist, while the spider's cultural disadvantage is evidenced by such phenomena as legs exceeding standard norms, odd mating habits and so forth.

COMMUNICATIONS FAILURE

In this instance, spider expectations lead the culturally disadvantaged to assert demands to share the tuffet with the nutritionally underprivileged. Due to a communications failure, Miss Muffet assumes without evidence that the spider will not be satisfied to share her tuffet, but will also insist on eating her curds and whey. Thus, the failure to pre-establish selectively optimum norm structures leads to . . .

TUFFET SECURITY

Militarist: Second-strike capability, sir! That's what was lacking. If Miss Muffet had developed a second-strike capability instead of squandering her resources on curds and whey, no spider on earth would have dared launch a first strike capable of carrying him right to the heart of her tuffet. I am confident that Miss Muffet had adequate notice from experts that she could not afford both curds and whey and at the same time support an early-spider-warning system. Yet curds alone were not good enough for Miss Muffet. She had to have whey, too. Tuffet security must be the first responsibility of every diner. . . .

Book Reviewer: Written on several levels, this searing sensitive exploration of the arachnid heart illuminates the agony and splendor of Jewish family life with a candor that is at once breath-taking in its simplicity and soul-shattering in its implied ambiguity. Some will doubtless be shocked to see such subjects as tuffets and whey discussed without flinching, but hereafter writers too timid to call a tuffet a tuffet will no longer. . . .

Editorial Writer: Why has the Government not seen fit to tell the public all it knows about the so-called curds-and-whey affairs? It is not enough to suggest that this was merely a random incident involving a lonely spider and a young diner. In today's world, poised as it is on the knife edge of. . .

WHEY-OUT FANTASY

Psychiatrist: Little Miss Muffet is, of course, neither little, nor a miss. These are obviously the self she has created in her own fantasies to escape the reality that she is a gross divorcee whose superego makes it impossible for her to sustain a normal relationship with any man, symbolized by the spider, who, of course, has no existence outside her fantasies. She may, in fact, be a man with deeply repressed Oedipal impulses who sees

in the spider the father he would like to kill, and very well may some day unless he admits that what he believes to be a tuffet is, in fact, probably the dining room chandelier and that the whey he thinks he is eating, in fact, probably. . . .

Flower Girl: This beautiful kid is on a bad trip. Like. . .

MEANINGFUL EXPERIENCE

Student-Demonstrators: Little Miss Muffet, tuffets, curds, whey and spiders are what's wrong with education today. They are irrelevant. Tuffets are irrelevant. Curds are irrelevant. Whey is irrelevant. Meaningful experience! How can you have relevance without meaningful experience? And how can there ever be meaningful experience without understanding? With understanding and meaningfulness and relevance, there can be love and good and deep seriousness and education today will be freed of slavery and Little Miss Muffet, and life will become meaningful.

Child: This is about a little girl who gets scared by a spider.

(The child was sent home when the conference broke for lunch. It was agreed that the child was too immature to add anything to the sum of human understanding and should not come back until he had grown up.)

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star]

STUDENT MILITANTS PLOT IN COMFORT

(By Paul Hope)

The weekly meeting of the SBDFFR (Students for Beating the Draft and Fomenting Peaceful Revolution) was in progress in Ivy Hall.

The SBDFFR used to meet in a dirty basement of a rundown building off the campus but after the last confrontation, the university president said he didn't see why they shouldn't set up shop right on the premises. For one thing, it would be closer to whichever university building they might want to take over next. And it also was convenient to the chemistry labs, which would make it handier to get materials for some of their peaceful pursuits.

The president wasn't always so accommodating. There even was a time when he threatened to have the whole bunch arrested. But, as he said, there was nothing he had ever said or will say that couldn't be modified by circumstances. And, as they say, things change so fast in this modern age.

The university even has taken to having dinner brought in for the weekly meeting of the peaceful revolutionaries. At the last one, the students demanded a pre-dinner martini.

At this particular meeting, one of the leaders called Jerry was talking about the ROTC and another called Mark was instructing in the ways of the peaceful protest.

"Man, we've got to do something about that ROTC. They're out there teaching those guys to carry guns," said Jerry.

"Yeah, that's right," said Mark. "Say, Jerry, would you give me a hand with this fulminate of mercury I just had sent over from the chemistry building."

Turning to the assembled students, who were sitting cross-legged on the floor (the university had offered overstuffed chairs but they liked sitting on the floor), Mark said: "We're going to make some blasting caps tonight. I've told you how much to measure of each ingredient. Now, first mix the alcohol and the acid. Then pour on the mercury. Now put the powder you have left in the empty cartridge cases and, there, you have a dandy blasting cap."

The ROTC cadets marched by outside, their guns clattering.

"It's absolutely immoral, the way they teach those guys to shoot and kill," said Jerry.

"Stoke, for God's sake, will you keep your beard out of the gun powder when you're smoking. You're apt to blow us all up," Mark remonstrated with one of the newer SBDFFR members.

"The way I see it," said Jerry, "any peace-loving students like us have a right to be free of any military influence like the ROTC. They even make them take a bath every day."

"Okay, men," said Mark, "now we're going to talk about incendiary time bombs. You should all have a copy of the New Left Notes we put out in February. If you don't, get a copy of the April 28 Congressional Record; Rep. Cederberg put in the text we passed out at a high school basketball game in Denver; it's on page H3164. Turn to the part on potassium chlorate.

"It would not be advisable to carry potassium chlorate around but we will show you how to make it by using other chemicals which would not be of a suspicious nature and are readily available. You need an automobile battery, either 6 or 12 volts will do, two carbon rods from dry cell batteries, a set of battery cables and clamps, one non-metal pot, one pound of table salt and one pound of potassium chloride. You fill the pot with water and . . ."

"The last time I went home," interjected Jerry, "my old man said I ought to join the ROTC and I told him, 'No, sir, I'm a peaceful man.' I said the only time I'd use a gun is to take over a college or shut down a plant or evict the draft board and things like that. Say, Mark, do you put the fuse in before or after you put the oil and gas in the bottle for this Molotov cocktail?"

Eldridge, another young leader, got to his feet. "I think it's about time for the discussion on instructing fellow students in how to beat the draft," he said.

Just then the university president knocked. "Could I interrupt you new patriots for a moment," he said. "I have your after-dinner smoke . . . marijuana, just as you ordered. If you like, you may retire to the library for that."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 18, 1969]

OBSERVER: BOOM, BOOM, BOOM GOES THE CAMPUS

(By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON, February 17.—With the controversial dynamiting of Oaksapp University's historic old Slingborn Hall by student militants, the crisis of the American campus took a fresh turn last week.

Progressives in the field of higher education had long regarded Oaksapp as a model institution. Curriculum had been abandoned five years ago following protests in which President Dixby Dross was hanged from the historic old Oaksapp oak on the quadrangle, once the traditional site of campus football victory celebrations.

At the same time, Oaksapp instituted a system of student autonomy, gave undergraduates the right to unlimited chapel cuts and granted amnesty to the leaders of S.E.S. (Students for an Exterminated Society) who had led the demonstrations.

RELEVANT CAMPUS

A recent report by the American Association of University Students, an organization established by the National Congress of Campus Activities in 1967 to police the nation's universities, commended Oaksapp for its "relevance to today's world."

In doing so, it pointed to the installation of billiard tables in every dormitory, the licensing of liquor sales in the gymnasium and the decision to divide the school year into two six-week semesters.

Why then, alarmed educators have asked, were the students moved to dynamite historic old Slingborn Hall? The answer seems to be that Oaksapp, for all its "progressive" adaptation to student needs, has failed to

recognize that there is a new mood on the American campus today.

SURLY NEW MOOD

The spokesman for the new mood is the radial SURL (Student Union for Retirement Learning), which was formed last summer at a secret conference held at the Saginaw Blues Festival. The so-called Saginaw Manifesto declares that American universities have willfully and callously disregarded their obligation to prepare the concerned students of this country for retirement."

Hod Cassowary, the 43-year-old chairman of Oaksapp's SURL chapter, put it succinctly the morning after the dynamiting. "Students are tired of devoting 25 years of their lives to universities and then being turned out without so much as a gold watch," Cassowary said.

In meetings with student administrators before the explosion, Cassowary found the president and the trustees, whose average age is 19, "out of it." "I've been on this campus long enough to have earned seven master's degrees and four Ph.D.'s if we hadn't done away with curriculums," Cassowary declared, "and yet my needs are blithely ignored by a power structure of pipsqueaks." "What are you complaining about?" they asked me. "We let you have women in the dormitory any time you want."

It is now agreed that President Burke, who is twenty years old, alienated many of Oaksapp's more decrepit students when he lightly dismissed Cassowary's demands with a quip. "Old Hod's just hod under the collar," he told the press. His prestige was further damaged when SURL seized his office, rifled his mail and discovered that he had been in correspondence with the Y.M.C.A., the 4-H clubs and other youth-oriented arms of the power elite.

To many persons, SURL's demands seem purposely devised to outrage the universities. Its central demand is for a program under which every student would be able to retire, leave college and live on a full pension at the age of 45. Progressive educators argue that there is justice in this demand.

If the universities are not going to prepare the individual to survive in an extra-campus environment, they believe, it is only fair for the universities to provide their own guarantees of post-college security. The university student today, it is argued, becomes perforce a disadvantaged member of society because of a system which denies him an education.

COURSES FOR SUPERANNUATES

SURL also demands that Oaksapp establish a special department of retirement studies with courses in shuffleboard, European touring and checkers. This, of course, would violate the theory of unstructured curriculum.

Finally, Cassowary has demanded that Oaksapp be relocated in Jamaica or a similar environment "more relevant to the needs of retirement education." President Burke is open minded about this proposal. "If there are a few more dynamitings," he says, "we'll have to rebuild somewhere."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post
Apr. 24, 1969]

PROFESSOR'S STAND IS FIRM—BUT BRIEF
(By Art Buchwald)

One of the things that impresses people about the student demonstrations is the strong stand that some members of the faculty are taking on the issues.

I was on the campus of Northamnesty University and ran into a professor who was trying to stop his nose from bleeding. His clothes were torn up and he was walking with a pronounced limp.

"What happened, professor?" I asked, as I helped him search for his glasses.

"The militant students just took over my office and threw me down the stairs."

"Why, that's terrible," I said.

"From my point of view it is, but I think we have to look at it from their point of view. Why did they throw me down the stairs? Where have we as faculty failed them?"

"Are you going to press charges?"

"On the contrary. If I pressed charges, I would only be playing into the hands of the repressive forces outside the University who would like nothing better than to see the students arrested for assault."

"But they did assault you?"

"Yes, I have to admit I was surprised about that. But there was one heartening note. As they threw me down the stairs, one of my students yelled, 'It isn't you, professor. It's the system.'"

"That must have made you feel better."

"As I was tumbling down, the thought did occur to me that at least there was nothing personal in it."

"Say, Professor, isn't that the Philosophy Building going up in flames?"

"I believe it is. Now, why did they have to go and set fire to the Philosophy Building?"

"I was going to ask you that."

"I'm not quite sure, because I haven't seen any of the students since they threw me down the stairs. My guess is that it probably has to do with something the administration and the students are at odds about."

"But that's a terrible thing to do."

"I don't think we should make judgments until all facts are in. I would say burning down a philosophy building could be interpreted as an unlawful act. At the same time, there are moments when an unlawful act can bring about just reforms."

"But the books, the records, the papers are all going up in smoke. Shouldn't we at least call the fire department?"

"I don't believe the fire department should be called until the faculty has met and voted on what course of action should be taken. There are times when a fire department can only inflame a situation. We should also hear from the students who started the fire and get their side of it. After all, they have as much stake in the University as anyone else, and if they don't want a philosophy building, we should at least listen to their arguments."

"I never thought of it that way," I admitted. "Professor, I know you can't see very well without your glasses, but I believe the militant students over at the quadrangle are building a scaffold. They wouldn't hang anyone, would they?"

"They haven't before," the professor said. "But it's quite possible that this is their way of seeking a confrontation with the establishment."

As we were talking, a group of students rushed up and grabbed the professor. "We got one here," the ringleader shouted. "Get the rope."

"Don't worry, Professor," I shouted as I was pushed away by the mob. "I'll get the police."

"I wish you wouldn't," he said calmly as the students led him toward the scaffold. "If we don't let the students try new methods of activism, they'll never know for themselves which ones work and which ones are counterproductive."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 18, 1969]

KEY DEMAND ON U.S. CAMPUSES: THE RIGHT TO BE INCOMPETENT

(By Art Buchwald)

As student demonstrations on campuses continue, the demands of the militants keep escalating. Some of the demands are reasonable, but others have built-in mouse-traps. A few that I question have to do with student demands that universities take in people whether they're qualified or not; that all students who have flunked out be allowed to return to school, and that professors abol-

ish the system of grading students for their courses.

I believe that in the liberal arts departments you might not have to be too concerned about high standards—you've seen one economics professor, you've seen them all—but it's in the sciences and professions that you can get a little tensed up.

If our future doctors, lawyers, engineers and scientists no longer have to face stiff qualifying examinations, or if the schools refuse to grade them on their abilities, some very weird situations might arise.

A patient goes into a doctor's office.

"What seems to be the trouble?" the doctor asks.

"I have a pain in my side, doctor."

"I don't know anything about pains in the side."

"I thought you were a medical doctor. At least that diploma says so."

"Are you some kind of a racist?"

"No, I'm a patient."

"Well, it so happens I am a medical doctor. I just didn't do very well in anatomy. Never cared much for it. As a matter of fact, we locked up the dean of the medical school until he agreed to drop anatomy as a required course. We got him to do away with biology also."

"But if you didn't like anatomy or biology, why did you become an M.D.?"

"A man has to be something."

Meanwhile, across town a man was being tried for first degree murder and his lawyer and he were listening to the prosecutor.

"I want you, ladies and gentlemen, to send this man to the chair."

The defendant turns to his lawyer and asks, "Can he do that to me?"

The lawyer shrugs. "Beats hell out of me."

"But you are my lawyer. Don't you know what the law says?"

"I never told anyone this before, but I never really cared much for law. Matter of fact, all during school I had this girl and she had an apartment and . . ."

"Look, I don't care about your girl. My life is at stake. If I lose, will you at least make an appeal?"

"What's an appeal? You start studying about all this legal mumbo jumbo in college and you won't have any social life at all."

"But the law says . . ." the defendant cried.

"What does the law say? And don't go too fast because I want to write all this down. I never did take notes in school."

The third scene could take place 20 years from now at the new Mayor John V. Lindsay Bridge connecting Long Island with Connecticut.

The engineer is standing on the platform with the dignitaries.

"Well, Mr. Doubleday, you built a mighty fine bridge."

"That's my job."

"It seems to be sagging at one end. Is that the way it's supposed to be?"

"I'll build the bridges—you cut the ribbon."

"Look, there goes the first truck over the bridge—it's falling. Doubleday, the entire bridge is falling!"

"Sorry about that, I never could figure out how to use a slide rule."

CHARITY AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging and gratifying when the private sector of our Nation utilizes its talents and abilities to assist and promote worthy charitable causes.

Such is the case with one of our major motion picture industries, Universal

Pictures, and its outstanding film production of the hit Broadway musical, "Sweet Charity."

On June 7, 1969, there will be a premiere of this motion picture in my congressional district, Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County. The beneficiary of this premiere will be the Nashville Memorial Hospital.

From 1959 to 1962, a group of dedicated individuals began their work which culminated in the construction in June of 1965, of a new hospital to serve the East Nashville and metropolitan area of Davidson County. It is a full service, non-profit, community hospital of 211 beds, effectively meeting the medical needs of a major section of my congressional district.

The Women's Hospital Auxiliary of Nashville Memorial Hospital has a unique history. It was formed in 1962, long before construction even began on the new hospital. These ladies dedicated themselves to fundraising efforts and, in addition to funds raised during their campaign, the more than 200 volunteers have made personal gifts of over \$30,000 to the hospital. Their many hours of volunteer work at the hospital have saved thousands of dollars, helping to keep hospital costs as low as possible.

Universal Pictures is to be commended for their willingness to utilize their production of "Sweet Charity" to such a worthy cause. It is my understanding that "Sweet Charity" has premiered in a number of cities across the Nation for equally worthy charitable organizations.

It should also be pointed out that Scholastic magazine has awarded the production of "Sweet Charity" its coveted "Bell Ringer Award." This award is presented to films of unusual merit which are eminently suitable for secondary school students.

The charity premieres of "Sweet Charity" is an outstanding example of how our motion picture industry is contributing so notably to the good of the community at large and to the cultural heritage of our Nation.

THE 23D ANNIVERSARY OF THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC

(Mr. ANNUNZIO was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today, June 2, marks a stirring event in the rich history of Italy, for on this day, in 1946, the great Italian people gave a resounding vote of confidence for parliamentary democracy as the form of government best suited to lead Italy on the road to recovery and peace.

In the ensuing 23 years, this democratic government has brought the Italians out of war and devastation into a new era of individual freedom, national integrity, economic stability, peace, and prosperity.

June 2, 1946, was, indeed a new beginning. The remarkable achievements of the Italian Republic in the past 23 years have amply shown that the Italians made the right choice.

Italy has succeeded not only in re-

building its economy, but in rendering it extremely competitive in world markets as well. Fiat is one of Europe's largest automobile manufacturers and the Italian electric appliance industry has outpaced all its European rivals. In fact, last year Montgomery Ward bought 100,000 Italian—Ignis—refrigerators and freezers for distribution in America. Of 3,200,000 refrigerators made in Italy in 1967, 2,100,000 were exported. The Italians have captured 28 percent of the French market and 17 percent of the German market. Last year, the Italians manufactured 2,200,000 washing machines and exported over a million of them. This year, Italian manufacturers are moving into the television, dishwasher, and other appliance markets.

Italian textiles and leather goods are exported to markets around the globe. Rome and Florence rival Paris in the world of fashion. Today, Italy is one of the most outstanding and active members of the Common Market, and her gross national product is expected to rise again this year about 5 percent, as it did last year.

Mr. Speaker, Italy, through the centuries, has maintained an advanced civilization and has served as the font of Western culture. History has singled out the achievements and contributions of the Roman Empire, the Italian Renaissance, and the Risorgimento. Today, the Republic of Italy continues in this noble tradition, and its recent contributions in literature, music, the arts and sciences have achieved worldwide relevance, acceptance, and acclaim.

There are special bonds of affection between Americans and the people of Italy, for today there are in the United States over 25 million Americans of Italian descent.

I am particularly gratified this year over the tremendous recognition accorded to the Italians by the Congress of the United States. Last year, the Congress passed and the President signed into law on June 28, 1968, the Monday holiday bill. Beginning in 1971, Columbus Day will be celebrated throughout our land as a national legal holiday on the second Monday in October of every year.

We must fully realize the importance of this official recognition which we can now extend to Christopher Columbus. In America we celebrate as legal holidays Memorial Day, Veterans Day, Thanksgiving Day, and others, but these holidays mark an important event in the history of our country and do not honor an individual. The only person whom we have honored with a national legal holiday is the Father of our Country—George Washington. And now, the second person whom we in America will honor is the father of all immigrants—Christopher Columbus.

On September 8, 1966, the House of Representatives passed legislation to provide for procurement of a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi, the great Italian artist who has come to be known as the "Michelangelo of the Capitol" because he labored for more than 25 years to beautify the Capitol of the United States with his stirring murals, his colorful paintings, his bold and mov-

ing frescoes, and the exquisite bronze stairways which he designed. Evidence of Brumidi's artistic genius can be found everywhere in the Capitol Building which owes its interior beauty to him more than to any other man.

On April 30, 1968, the bust of Constantino Brumidi, which was executed in imported Italian marble by sculptress Jimilu Mason, was dedicated in impressive ceremonies in the Rotunda of the U.S. Capitol. His Excellency, Hon. Egidio Ortona, the Italian Ambassador to the United States, was present and participated in these dedication ceremonies.

Brumidi's bust has now been placed in the Senate wing of the Capitol, and it is there for all to see. This is indeed appropriate recognition for the great Italian artist who once said:

My one ambition and daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country on earth in which there is liberty.

On April 25, 1969, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, informed me of the AEC decision to name the nuclear accelerator at Weston, Ill., in honor of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi.

The accelerator is now under construction, and formal dedication and naming of the Enrico Fermi Laboratory will not take place until major construction work has been completed and the facility is in operation, probably in the fall of 1972. The accelerator will have an energy of 200 billion electron volts—Bev—greater than now available at any accelerator.

Dr. Fermi was an Italian immigrant who came to the United States shortly before he won the Nobel prize in physics. He is regarded as one of the greatest physicists of our time and has come to be known as the Architect of the Atomic Age because his experiments in Illinois led in 1942 to the first self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction ever to take place.

I am delighted over the Atomic Energy Commission's decision to name the Weston accelerator in honor of Dr. Enrico Fermi, for this will be the first Federal nuclear facility in the United States to be named in honor of the eminent Italian physicist who is indeed highly deserving of this recognition.

The outstanding recognition given by the Congress of the United States to the accomplishments that Italians are making not only to America, but to the world, enhances the genuine feeling of friendship that the people of America have for the people of Italy.

I join my colleagues in the Congress in hoping that this friendship shall continue to flourish and that Italy and the United States shall continue to work together to bring peace to the peoples of the world.

I extend my best wishes to the people of the Italian Republic, as well as to the Italian-Americans in my own Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, and throughout our country, who are joining in the celebration of this happy occasion. May the Republic of Italy continue to experience peace and prosperity in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times today. I take this opportunity to commend and congratulate the editorial staff of the Chicago Sun-Times for this outstanding editorial and for their genuine interest in promoting a lasting and meaningful friendship between the people of Italy and the people of the United States. The editorial follows:

PROUD DAY FOR ITALY

This is a proud day for Italy and for all of Chicago's Italian-Americans. It is the 23d anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic.

The end of World War II left Italy in a shambles. There was immense war damage, hunger and misery. But the Italians, a proud and hardy people, were determined to build a future.

Their first and proudest structure was a new government. In April, 1945, the first representative body was given the job of putting together the regulations for the election of a Constituent Assembly. On June 2, 1946, the Italian voters cast their votes for a republic.

Italy's recovery from World War II, its welcome into the Atlantic Alliance by the nations it had fought against, its entry into the United Nations in 1955, are benchmarks of its comeback from the immense damage done by the war. We salute our friends of Italian extraction in Chicago and the people of Italy on this anniversary.

REQUEST TO BUILD AN ABM SHOULD BE DENIED

(Mrs. MINK was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most critical issues pending before the Congress is the President's request that we continue building an ABM system.

The legislature of Hawaii has adopted a resolution petitioning the President and the Congress to reverse the decision to deploy an ABM system and specifically to reverse any plans to locate such a system in the State of Hawaii.

The legislature observes:

The orderly development of the State of Hawaii lies in its potential to create and expand understanding and trade among diverse cultures and peoples rather than its being an armed outpost of American power.

I agree that the request to build an ABM should be denied. Because of its significance, I submit this resolution at this point in the RECORD.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16

Concurrent resolution petitioning the President and the Congress of the United States to reconsider the deployment of anti-ballistic missiles and the location of an anti-ballistic-missile system in the State of Hawaii

Whereas, the United States is devoted to furthering world peace, and to decreasing the tensions of the world's arms race, and to preventing nuclear weapons proliferation; and

Whereas, eminent nuclear physicists, including Nobel prize winners, science advisers to Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson, and scientists who have been active in developing the Nation's weapons systems, as well as personnel of the Department of Defense have stated that no anti-ballistic missile system can adequately protect a country from sophisticated nuclear attack and that the present United States superiority is a deterrent to both sophisticated and simple offensive nuclear threats; and

Whereas, hunger and disease are as great a danger to peace and internal security as hostile arms, and huge military expenditures for quickly obsolete weapons systems prevent the use of funds to alleviate poverty, thereby increasing world insecurity; and

Whereas, the orderly development of the State of Hawaii lies in its potential to create and expand understanding and trade among diverse cultures and peoples rather than its being an armed outpost of American power; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1969, the House of Representatives concurring, that the President and the Congress of the United States be, and they are, respectfully petitioned to reverse the decision to deploy an anti-ballistic missile system and to locate a part of the system in the State of Hawaii; and

Be it further resolved that the President and the Congress of the United States be, and they are, respectfully requested to explore actively all possibilities which would lead to reduction of both offensive and defensive nuclear missile systems among nations, a nuclear non-proliferation treaty and gradual multilateral disarmament, and expanded non-military efforts to alleviate poverty and hunger at home and abroad; and

Be it further resolved that duly certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate Pro Tempore, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary of the United States Department of Defense, Senator Hiram L. Fong, Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Representative Spark M. Matsunaga, and Representative Patsy T. Mink.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, June 2, 1969, on account of official business.

Mr. MCKNEALLY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the week of June 2, on account of official business.

Mr. PRICE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. NICHOLS (at the request of Mr. BEVILL), for today, on account of official business in his district.

Mr. LENNON (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. ADDABBO (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO), for Monday, June 2, 1969, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FLOWERS), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.
 Mr. RODINO, for 10 minutes, today.
 Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 15 minutes, today.
 Mr. RARICK, for 30 minutes, today.
 Mr. COHELAN, for 10 minutes, today.
 Mr. LOWENSTEIN, for 60 minutes, on June 4.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. HASTINGS), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WYLIE (at the request of Mr. HASTINGS), for 30 minutes, on June 4; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey during consideration of the bill H.R. 763.

Mr. PERKINS (at the request of Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey) immediately preceding the remarks of Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey on the bill H.R. 763.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey during consideration of the bill H.R. 2667 today, and to include extraneous material.

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

Mr. HASTINGS.
 Mr. ERLÉNBERG.
 Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.
 Mr. TEAGUE of California.
 Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.
 Mr. PETTIS.
 Mr. LANGEN.
 Mr. WYMAN in three instances.
 Mr. HOSMER in three instances.
 Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
 Mr. LIPSCOMB in two instances.
 Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
 Mr. BOB WILSON.
 Mr. BUCHANAN in two instances.
 Mr. HORTON.
 Mr. ASHBROOK.
 Mr. ESCH.
 Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.
 Mr. POFF.
 Mr. SNYDER.
 Mr. WHALLEY.

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.
 Mr. FISHER in four instances.
 Mr. MARSH in two instances.
 Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
 Mr. POWELL in two instances.
 Mr. CAREY.
 Mr. COHELAN in four instances.
 Mr. HAYS in two instances.
 Mr. BROWN of California in four instances.
 Mr. RARICK in four instances.
 Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.
 Mr. CORMAN in five instances.
 Mr. ROSENTHAL in two instances.
 Mr. OLSEN.
 Mr. JOHNSON of California.
 Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. WALDIE.
 Mr. RYAN in four instances.
 Mr. MINISH.
 Mr. PICKLE in two instances.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. HAWKINS.
 Mr. ULLMAN in five instances.
 Mr. O'HARA in four instances.
 Mr. EDWARDS of California.
 Mr. VANIK in two instances.
 Mr. WOLFF in three instances.
 Mr. EILBERG.
 Mr. MORGAN.
 Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 412. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as wilderness the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark Lolo National Forests, in Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced that on May 28, 1969 he signed enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 278. An act to consent to the New Hampshire-Vermont Interstate School Compact; and

S. 408. An act to liberalize the eligibility requirements governing the grant of assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain service-connected disabled veterans, to increase the amount of such grant, to raise the limit on the amount of direct housing loans made by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 3, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

812. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968 (H. Doc. No. 91-124); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

813. A letter from the Chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report on refunds and credits of internal revenue taxes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 6405 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. Doc. No. 91-125); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

814. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air Force Reserve, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

815. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting notification of the intention of the Department of the Navy to donate a surplus locomotive engine to the East Carolina chapter of the National Railway Historical Society, Greenville, N.C., pur-

suant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 7545; to the Committee on Armed Services.

816. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration and effectiveness of the work experience and training project at the Gila River Indian Reservation, Ariz., under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

817. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for expenses of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

818. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world to achieve economic development within a framework of democratic, economic, social, and political institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

819. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on opportunities for reducing costs of hospitalization, medical services, and drugs provided to Federal employees for job-related disabilities, Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

820. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on legislation needed to avoid servicemen's bearing wartime mortality costs under the servicemen's group life insurance program, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

821. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for expenses of the Office of Intergovernmental Relations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

822. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for expenses of the National Council on Indian Opportunity; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

823. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of a map of "Principal Natural Gas Pipelines in the United States, 1968"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7906. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce (Rept. No. 91-279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ARENDS.
 H.R. 11780. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 in order to provide for a more equitable system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed

Forces under such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 11781. A bill to revise the laws relating to post offices and post roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11782. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce percentage depletion rates for oil, gas, and certain other minerals to 15 percent, and to provide that percentage depletion shall not be allowed in the case of mines, wells, and other natural deposits located in foreign territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 11783. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substance Act to provide for child-resistant packaging to protect children from serious personal injury or serious illness resulting from handling, using, or ingesting any hazardous substance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 11784. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide relief to certain individuals 65 years of age and over who own or rent their homes, through a system of income tax credits and refunds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. AYRES, and Mr. QUITE):

H.R. 11785. A bill to amend Public Law 85-905 to provide for a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 11786. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to encourage shipbuilding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 11787. A bill to clarify and strengthen the cargo-preference laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 11788. A bill to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11789. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 11790. A bill to enable honey producers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for honey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McKNEALLY (for himself and Mr. McCULLOCH):

H.R. 11791. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 11792. A bill to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world to achieve economic development within a framework of democratic economic, social, and political institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 11793. A bill to amend the Agriculture Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 11794. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in ex-

istence and new loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11795. A bill to exempt from the anti-trust laws certain joint newspaper operating arrangements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 11796. A bill to prohibit certain weather modification activities over land areas of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11797. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 11798. A bill to extend the life of the Lewis and Clark Trall Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 11799. A bill to provide that the membership of local selective service boards reflect the ethnic and economic nature of the areas served by such boards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11800. A bill to establish an urban mass transit trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11801. A bill to amend section 592 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C.A. 1592), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. ROTH, Mr. KING, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 11802. A bill to amend section 245 of title 18, United States Code, to make it a crime to deny any person the benefits of any educational program or activity where such program or activity is receiving Federal financial assistance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 11803. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron ore, iron, and steel mill products; Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself and Mr. GERALD R. FORD):

H.R. 11804. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Gateway National Recreation Area in the States of New York and New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.J. Res. 753. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. KEITH):

H.J. Res. 754. Joint resolution to amend section 19(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 755. Joint resolution to authorize appropriations for expense of the National Council on Indian Opportunity; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 279. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLAY:

H. Con. Res. 280. Concurrent resolution

on urgency of arms control negotiations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H. Res. 429. Resolution that the Committee on Science and Astronautics be allowed to conduct certain inquiries; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

200. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to allocating a fixed percentage of the revenue from national forest lands for investment in intensive forest management practices and roads; to the Committee on Agriculture.

201. Also, a Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, relative to appropriations for fiscal year 1969 relative to sections 235 and 236 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968; to the Committee on Appropriations.

202. Also, Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to the collection of sales and use taxes, documentary stamp taxes, and intangible taxes from national banks by the State of Florida; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 11805. A bill for the relief of Carlo Parpan and Pacida Sarda Flores and minor children Carlo, Mark, and Jonathon Flores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 11806. A bill for the relief of Ashwani Kumar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 11807. A bill for the relief of Victoria B. Toia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Res. 430. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 4561) entitled "A bill for the relief of the estate of Capt. John N. Laycock, U.S. Navy (retired)," to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

128. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Councilmen, city and county of Denver, Colo., relative to the presence of chemical and nuclear materials near the city and county of Denver; to the Committee on Armed Services.

129. Also, petition of the City Council, Pittsburgh, Pa., relative to the antiballistic-missile system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

130. Also, petition of Antonio Escalera, San-turce, P.R., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

131. Also, petition of Geraldine M. Vickers, Lawndale, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

132. Also, petition of Cosimo Florillo, Boston, Mass., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

133. Also, petition of the Board of County Commissioners, Ashtabula County, Ohio, relative to the tax exemption on municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.