

Learned, Grace, XXXXX
 Mazlarski, Frank P., XXXXX
 McKinzie, Daniel G., XXXXX
 McLeod, Alva J., XXXXX
 Metcalf, Barbara E., XXXXX
 Mizelle, Anne S., XXXXX
 Nagle, Lillian H., XXXXX
 Nellis, Virginia M., XXXXX
 Odell, Margaret L., XXXXX
 Pelkey, Dwight F., XXXXX
 Pennell, Mildred H., XXXXX
 Phillips, Eugene J., XXXXX
 Reed, Della K., XXXXX
 Riviello, Carmen F., XXXXX
 Robinson, John W., XXXXX
 Smith, Cassandra M., XXXXX
 Taylor, Wilma B., XXXXX
 Thorne, Nevalda T., XXXXX
 Yoder, Dolores W., XXXXX

To be major, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Appleby, Howard A., XXXX
 Davis, Barbara A., XXXX
 McGown, Helyn L., XXXX
 Pfeiffer, Violet R., XXXX

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army, by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283 through 3294:

To be captain

Feuerbacher, Charles, XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenant

Gillett, Michael E., XXXXXXXX

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283 through 3294 and 3311:

To be major

Rumpel, Donald O., XXXXXXXX

To be captain

Akridge, Jimmie H., XXXXXXXX
 Biggio, John E., XXXXXXXX
 Bledsoe, James H., XXXXXXXX
 Butler, Melvin L., XXXXXXXX
 Carey, William R., XXXXXXXX
 Cooke, James K., XXXXXXXX
 Davis, Michael F., XXXXXXXX
 Dean, Nowlan K., XXXXXXXX
 Gates, Davis F., XXXXXXXX
 Gniazdowski, Francis, XXXXXXXX
 Haggett, Edward G., III, XXXXXXXX
 Hendricks, Christophe, XXXXXXXX
 Hinkson, Betty M., XXXXXXXX
 Jenkins, Wilbert L., XXXXXXXX
 Kolke, Kazuo, XXXXXXXX
 Kuchesky, Martin S., XXXXXXXX
 Livengood, Sandy E., XXXXXXXX
 Lyght, William L. D., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Mills, Jon R., XXXXXXXX
 Morgan, George A., XXXXXXXX
 Murray, Joseph W., XXXXXXXX
 Outlaw, Joe E., XXXXXXXX
 Pickett, Donald De G., XXXXXXXX

Powell, Darryl H., XXXXXXXX
 Riggs, Duane B., XXXXXXXX
 Sandall, Richard R., XXXXXXXX
 Schaub, John S., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, Robert K., XXXXXXXX
 Stiles, Gary N., XXXXXXXX
 Tomlinson, Carey G., XXXXXXXX
 Villarronga, Raul G., XXXXXXXX
 Walts, Charles O., XXXXXXXX
 Weedel, Joseph F., XXXXXXXX
 Wheatley, James K., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 White, Billy C., XXXXXXXX
 Wilson, Donald C., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenant

Antonoplos, David J., XXXXXXXX
 Beard, Otis R., XXXXXXXX
 Bergevin, Patrick R., XXXXXXXX
 Bryce, Ronald H., XXXXXXXX
 Byrkit, Richard D., XXXXXXXX
 Cantu, Herman R., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Chole, Hilbert H., XXXXXXXX
 Clark, Solomon C., XXXXXXXX
 Collins, Roger B., XXXXXXXX
 Corn, Vollney B., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Dennis, Kirby E., XXXXXXXX
 Estep, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Gurney, Peter L., XXXXXXXX
 Hackett, John S., XXXXXXXX
 Hamer, Merlin L., XXXXXXXX
 Hammond, Jean E., XXXXXXXX
 Hayden, Lee L., III, XXXXXXXX
 Herrick, James J., XXXXXXXX
 Holaday, Howard E., XXXXXXXX
 Jewel, James S., XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Billy R., XXXXXXXX
 Kappel, Darrel N., XXXXXXXX
 Kennedy, William D., XXXXXXXX
 Kimzey, Reed T., XXXXXXXX
 Lee, Fredrick W., XXXXXXXX
 Lucas, James G., XXXXXXXX
 Mackenzie, Stuart A., XXXXXXXX
 Maize, Roy S., II, XXXX
 Manning, Charles F., XXXXXXXX
 McCarthy, Mary M., XXXXXXXX
 McKinney, Raymond E., XXXXXXXX
 McPeak, William S., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 McSweeney, Dennis D., XXXXXXXX
 Metz, Joseph R., XXXXXXXX
 Murphy, Gary R., XXXXXXXX
 Neilan, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Patnode, Louis G., XXXXXXXX
 Peel, John L., XXXXXXXX
 Petrie, Jon L., XXXXXXXX
 Piel, Thomas G., XXXXXXXX
 Reinmiller, John P., XXXXXXXX
 Rogowski, Kenneth A., XXXXXXXX
 Rosenberg, Ralph G., XXXXXXXX
 Rovig, La Vern D., XXXXXXXX
 Sayers, Larry L., XXXXXXXX
 Scharff, Ronald E., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Snipes, Robert T., XXXXXXXX
 Sporcle, Vincent L., XXXXXXXX
 Stewart, Thomas W., XXXXXXXX
 Swearingen, George R., XXXXXXXX
 Thomas, Cleveland, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Trevey, John L., Jr., XXXXXXXX

Webber, George R., XXXXXXXX
 Whitley, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Wotkyns, Anthony L., XXXXXXXX
 Zdrojewski, Michael J., XXXXXXXX

To be second lieutenant

Blake, Nelson A., XXXXXXXX
 Braun, John E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Cox, William D., XXXXXXXX
 Gibbs, Allen D., XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, David O., XXXXXXXX
 Kuelbs, John T., XXXXXXXX
 Lemonier, Donald J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Lockwood, Burton G., II, XXXXXXXX
 Maksymowicz, Jerald J., XXXXXXXX
 Marble, Louis E., XXXXXXXX
 Marsh, Julian T., XXXXXXXX
 McDonough, James F., XXXXXXXX
 Morrill, Kenneth F., XXXXXXXX
 Narrell, James E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Odom, Charles R., XXXXXXXX
 Olsen, Wesley R., XXXXXXXX
 Porter, Danny S., XXXXXXXX
 Randles, James D., XXXXXXXX
 Reedy, Charles J., XXXXXXXX
 Scotti, Frank P., XXXXXXXX
 Semon, Barry H., XXXXXXXX
 Skiles, James K., XXXXXXXX
 Speelman, James F., XXXXXXXX
 Takao, Victor K., XXXXXXXX
 Welch, Thomas A., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 White, William J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Willenborg, David E., XXXXXXXX

The following-named scholarship students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2107, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Olney, Richard K.
 Santella, Angelo J., Jr.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Wolfe, Daniel F.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, June 5, 1969:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The nominations beginning Peter Thomas Aalberg, to be ensign, and ending John Vincent Zeigler, to be ensign, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 13, 1969; and

The nominations beginning Frederic J. Grady III, to be lieutenant, and ending Winstead K. Nichols, to be chief warrant officer, W-2, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 21, 1969.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 5, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee.—Psalm 67:3

Blessed art Thou, O Lord, our God, who turneth the shadow of night into the light of the morning and giveth to us the glory of another day; we lift our hearts unto Thee in praise and thanksgiving.

Thanks be to Thee for the revelation of Thyself in the light of Thy word, in the beauty of nature, in the orderliness of the universe, and in the splendor of triumphant spirits. Thanks be to Thee for the revelation of Thyself in our own

hearts, for moments when Thy presence has been real and we have known Thou art with us and we are with Thee.

Grateful for this day, send us to do our work as best we can, touching the lives of our fellow men for good. Help us to look at others with the eyes of a brother and endeavor to meet the needs of our people with sympathetic hearts and understanding minds. May we be walking centers of good will in a world of ill will to the glory of Thy name, for the welfare of our Nation, and for the well-being of all mankind. In the name of Him who went about doing good. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution to correct the enrollment of Senate Joint Resolution 35.

SURTAX SHOULD NOT BE EXTENDED

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday morning, the Ways and Means Committee will consider President Nixon's request to extend the surtax until June 30, 1970.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have taken a position against any extension of the surtax and will continue to do so. The enactment of the surtax last year failed to halt inflation and served instead to fuel and perpetuate price escalation which has most critically affected the retired and those on fixed income. The average American consumer who is not responsible for this inflation has been clobbered by these clumsy efforts to contain it.

I have found little support for the administration's plans for extension of the surtax. Time is drawing close for decisive action. From what I can determine, there is grave doubt that sufficient support exists to extend the surtax under any terms.

Under these circumstances, it would seem prudent for the Nixon administration to scale down the surtax extension request to a more realistic period of 90 days ending the surtax on September 30. This would provide the administration with a balanced budget according to its own figures.

It is presumptuous to expect this Congress to provide the Nixon administration with a surplus which it denied two previous administrations.

A D-DAY TRIBUTE

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks a memorable occasion in the hearts and minds of those Americans who were privileged to serve their country in World War II and who participated in the invasion of the European Continent on the beaches of Normandy on June 6, 1944.

Peace has come to a wartorn Normandy; cattle again graze in the placid pastures near Avranches; gentle breezes blow through the many crosses in the cemeteries on the quiet cliffs. Children frolic on Omaha and Utah beaches and the waters of the English Channel have reclaimed the rusting hulks of the old LST's. As Americans we simply do not know how very, very much we owe to so very few.

A quarter century has now elapsed and the brave men who jumped in those early dawn hours with the 82d and 101st Airborne Divisions have long since reverted to civilian status. Many of them now have sons a half world away fighting for these same principles that has built a great America.

No one who was there that day will ever forget the Omaha and Utah beaches nor the small towns of Ste.-Mere Eglise, La Haye du Puits St. Ló and others

which caught the brunt of the war in Normandy. They will never forget the apple orchard nor the hedge rows which gave some measure of protection to our allied forces as we moved to liberate the French people, for the second time in this century.

Brave and dedicated American soldiers under the command of Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, supreme commander of the allied forces, fought, bled, and died to defeat a German Army under Adolf Hitler which was thought to be invincible.

So it is fitting and appropriate that on this June 6, we pause and pay respect to these brave men and to reflect on the many blessings we daily enjoy as free Americans, made possible because American airmen, rangers, sailors, and plain ordinary foot soldiers loved this country and were willing to defend it with their very lives against all enemies.

We Americans owe much to our men who have worn the uniform of our Armed Forces whether they wore it at Valley Forge in 1777, or at some lonely outpost in Vietnam in 1969 and I would commend for the reading of my colleagues, a D-Day tribute by Gen. Omar Bradley, "That We May Learn To Live as Bravely as They Died."

THAT WE MAY LEARN TO LIVE AS BRAVELY AS THEY DIED

(A D-Day tribute by Gen. Omar N. Bradley)

(NOTE.—Gen. Omar Bradley was commander in chief of all American ground forces participating in that campaign which began on the beaches of Normandy on June 6, 1944. Today, at 76, Omar N. Bradley is the country's only surviving general of the Armies.)

Twenty-five years ago next Friday the largest amphibious assault in history invaded the continent of Europe, denying the designs of aggressors who would covet and destroy the free world. I was there that day. I can recall that mist-shrouded dawn, the camouflaged LST's, the strong bodies that hurled themselves across the sands and into the battle on the Normandy beaches.

Many of those earnest young men who left their homes to defend them returned to those homes to live, work and worship in freedom. Too many never returned. They lie buried on the quiet cliffs overlooking Omaha Beach, beneath rain-whipped elms in our national cemeteries in England, or in a hero's grave in their home communities. Our allies, England and France, gave us land on which to bury our dead. They gave us courage and friendship when our need was desperate. And they gave us their sons to fight side by side with our own.

We honor on this anniversary not only those brave soldiers who died on D-Day, but the generation after generation of young sons who have had to die in conflicts visited upon them by issues remote from their everyday lives, in bitter struggles that have scarred the progress of all mankind, wasting the youth and resources of all nations.

We pause today to take comfort and strength from those of our dead who have already given this nation so much. We pause to learn—if we can—how men might live as charitably together in peace as they die for each other in war. We pause to ask why it is that men cannot live as bravely as they die.

Our lost young sons are partly the victims of your folly, and mine. They are the victims of all peace-loving peoples who turn their backs on the ills of the world. And if the United States ever stoops to expedients to avoid the difficult decisions that come with defense, we shall once again run the dangers

of all half-way measures and waste our strength and conscience as a force for good.

If we cringe from the necessity of meeting issues boldly—with principle, resolution and strength—then we shall simply hurdle along from crisis to crisis, improvising with expedients, seeking inoffensive solutions, drugging the nation with an illusion of security which does not really exist.

The United States has matured to world leadership; we must steer by the stars, not by the lights of each passing ship. If we are to scamper from crisis to crisis, fixing principles and policies to the whim of each day, we shall place ourselves supinely and helplessly at the mercy of any aggressor who might play on our public opinion and decimate our resolution at will.

In this 25th anniversary week of D-Day, we pay homage to the strong, the weak, the leaders, the led, the brave, the fearful—to all who perished where only God could witness their charity to their fellow men.

Proudly—but reverently, sadly—we honor them. We pray they will ever rest in peace.

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

Mr. NICHOLS. I am pleased to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, we are at that time of uplifted hearts, bowed heads, and renewed patriotism between Memorial Day and Flag Day, and the distinguished gentleman from Alabama who carries his own scars of Normandy and D-Day, of a bygone day, is to be commended for what he does so beautifully in the remembrance of those who went over the Normandy beaches leading to the conclusion of World War II, and their great and eternal rewards.

It is said that beyond Omaha Beach in the some 9,000 "crosses row on row" of one of the U.S. national cemeteries, there is an inscription left by a parent on the proper cross, simply stating:

Into the great mosaic of victory this priceless jewel is set.

Let all America stop, as the gentleman has so well suggested today, to honor those jewels who were given so that the entire world might be free and that we might have individual liberty still here and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him for calling this day to our attention.

RED TIDES IN SAN FRANCISCO BAY

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, reports of red tides sweeping San Francisco Bay have become more frequent.

These tides, a strange phenomenon, not easily explained, include discoloration of the bay waters and odors, both spreading over many square miles.

The return of these tides is another distasteful reminder of the crisis now facing San Francisco Bay, and all of this Nation's waterways.

Fred Dierker, executive officer of the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board, has outlined what is known about the red tides, and what is not known.

Apparently these tides are caused by minute forms of marine life, and the algae they eat. Mr. Dierker added it is believed the marine life feeds on nutrients, and when nutrients are present in the water in great quantities, the marine life breeds to the point the red tides appear.

These smelly tides have appeared in recent years throughout the bay. They are now surging around the shores of Berkeley, but they more often have been reported in the extremities of the bay in shallow water there, including the South San Francisco Bay.

The tides are a relatively new threat to the bay and their appearance comes at a time when, for at least a short period, the quality of bay waters has been improved. It is clear, however, the improvement of that quality will not last long unless more is done.

In one respect I welcome the appearance of the tides for they give clear warning of the dangers of water pollution at a time when the bay is being endangered by false optimism.

As I speak, the present administration is considering an inadequate scheme to finance water pollution projects.

The scheme would throw an even heavier burden on the already overburdened taxpayers of my district and on taxpayers throughout the Nation.

Simply, the proposal calls for the Federal Government to promise to pay off a portion of the bonds used to finance water pollution projects. At present the Federal Government makes direct grants to the communities involved.

Thus, the taxpayers of my district would have to pay the interest on those bonds, reducing the worth of the Federal money by 50 percent, and through that reduction increasing the cost to the taxpayers with no real savings of Federal dollars.

A representative of the National League of Cities is quoted as saying of this scheme:

We think it stinks.

Even under this scheme the present administration plans to provide an inadequate amount of money for water pollution control projects. Only \$750 million per year would be provided to support—not direct payment—the needs of all communities of the Nation.

Experts have estimated the needed direct funding at \$2 billion a year for the next 4 years.

The administration plan sidesteps the basic problems of water pollution.

But this crisis, the red tides reminds us of, is even closer to San Francisco Bay.

Legislation authorizing the continuation of the San Francisco Bay Commission is still in danger in the State legislature. One of the bills pending would actually demand approval of fill of the salt ponds around the bay, thousands of acres, after 3 years unless the landowner and the State reach an agreement. It is my view such a provision could only lead to further fill.

I hope the bay will be protected by the legislature. If not, then we here in Congress must do what we can to save this great national resource.

Finally, the red tides point out the

danger of the increasing flow of nutrients into the bay. I am requesting the Federal Water Pollution Control Agency to begin immediate studies of the cause of the red tides and to report on possible solutions to the problem.

Only through united and increased efforts can we save the bay and the waters of the entire Nation.

NOT FORTRESS-CHICAGO ISOLATIONISM, NOT MEDDLESOME INTERVENTION, BUT RESPONSIBLE INTERNATIONALISM

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that yesterday President Nixon, in an address to the graduating class at the Air Force Academy, paid tribute to "responsible critics" who, in his words, "reveal waste and inefficiency in our Defense Establishment, who demand clear answers on procurement policies, who want to make sure a new weapons system will truly add to our defense." And I was greatly encouraged by his further endorsement, in his words, "of those with sharp eyes and sharp pencils who are examining our post-Vietnam planning with other pressing national priorities in mind."

This unequivocal statement of support for the position of an increasing number of us in Congress is welcome. I confess, however, to disappointment with other parts of the President's address. The President appears to reduce the great policy alternatives of this Nation to two: a past that very few would return to, and a present that the great majority wish to move away from.

Certainly, the first of these alternatives—isolationism and unilateral disarmament—as the President quite properly points out, would be a dangerous one for this Nation to take. The fortress-Chicago concept is pretty dead nowadays, even in the President's own party.

But the alternative vision the President offers us is surely the status quo—the meddlesome interventionism which has been our besetting sin in recent years. In setting out his belief "that this Nation shall continue to be a source of world leadership and a source of freedom's strength," the President is reaffirming the course of military adventurism which he advocated in Vietnam as far back as 1954, and which has dogged us in Lebanon, in the Bay of Pigs, in the Dominican Republic, and in the tragic stalemate in Vietnam.

Are we now uncritically to accept the many costly foreign commitments undertaken in past years as vital to our security for the indefinite future? Shall we endlessly prepare for arms talks with the Soviet Union and never begin them, endlessly arm ourselves but never parley?

The President has exhorted us to pride in nation and a "resurgence of American idealism," and has cited the achievements of fifth-century Athens and of Renaissance Italy. It may be worth recalling that the glory of ancient Athens was eclipsed by struggles with its neighbors, and that the splendor of Renais-

sance Italy was shadowed by internecine warfare between city-states.

In truth, the interventionism our Nation has practiced on a grand scale has become as unacceptable to the vast majority of Americans as isolationism. Fortunately, Americans are not left with a simple either-or choice—between fortress-Chicago isolationism and meddlesome interventionism.

There is the great middle ground that the President has left unexplored—responsible internationalism. Responsible internationalism believes in military strength, but not in an endless overkill capacity that ends up with no security at all. It believes that if we assign all priority to the unattainable goal of decisive military superiority, we shall leave untackled the great tasks of improving international economic cooperation, of eliminating world hunger, of cleaning up our polluted environment. It believes that if we continue on a course of officious military interventionism in every corner of the globe, we will sacrifice our claim to a respected moral and political voice in the world.

In his next commencement address, I hope the President will explore this third alternative of responsible internationalism. That is a standard to which the great majority of Americans will gladly repair.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 6543

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight, June 5, to file a report on the bill H.R. 6543, to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

FAR EAST AND SOUTHEAST ASIA—ADDRESS OF MRS. ANNA CHENNAULT, VICE PRESIDENT OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS FOR THE FLYING TIGER LINE, INC.

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Anna Chennault, vice president of international affairs for the Flying Tiger Line, Inc., recently returned from the Far East and Southeast Asia, where she discussed with several Asians their reaction toward contemporary American problems. In two recent speeches, she discussed this matter at length.

These speeches deserve the attention and consideration of Congress and the public. The speeches follow:

REMARKS BY MRS. ANNA CHENNAULT BEFORE THE LOS ANGELES BREAKFAST CLUB, MAY 21, 1969

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I am honored to join you this morning to observe

and celebrate "World Trade Week". I notice your theme is "World Trade is a Two-Way Street". I fully agree. I remember not long ago driving in Rome into a one-way street by mistake and was stopped by a policeman. His remark was, "My dear lady, even as pretty as you are, you know you cannot get away with it".

As vice president of International Affairs of the Flying Tiger Line doing business around the world—this is not a commercial—I just want to be sure our president, Bob Prescott is listening—I can think of no better cause in bringing us together. I have heard and read of your organization and consider each one of you here this morning a goodwill ambassador. As an airline executive and a lecturer I have the good fortune to travel and to meet people from all parts of the world. As a resident of the Nation's capital I have the good fortune to observe the practice of politics and the pursuit of power.

One of the many questions asked by my audience in the orient has been, "what is happening in America?" This question expressed their curiosity as well as their hope of America. I have just recently returned from the Far East and Southeast Asia and I can tell you their predominant reaction to our military industrial complex is that they wish they could have one like ours.

We have moved a long way from the Chinese rickshaws to the jet age—from man taking a slow boat to China to man reaching for the moon. Marco Polo traveled a long way and the only thing he brought back to Rome was noodles—today we are still arguing whether the Chinese invented noodles—or the Italians produced the spaghetti.

In the areas where I have traveled, to the people to whom I have talked, the building of a decent world, and the desire for a better tomorrow has become the hope and the dream of the people in all parts of the world. Most of the people in the orient who have experienced totalitarianism are fully convinced the forces of freedom are stronger than the forces of tyranny. This is being demonstrated in Hong Kong, in Taiwan, in Korea, in Singapore, in Malaysia, Japan, Thailand, Indonesia and even in war-torn Vietnam.

In the Orient there is a new horizon. There are many frontiers to be opened. Young leaders with new ideas, progressive businessmen with new enterprises invite the people in the West to work and to share with them the exciting challenge to improve world trade. For the people in the East as well as in the West, both realize in this nuclear age the big powers not only have to share the responsibilities and obligations to establish collective security, but more important, to keep the balance of trade in order to check the balance of power.

Today the free trade between free people is incompatible with world Communism. This is a truth of Asia as it is of Europe. The Communist leaders fear our friendship with free nations and our communication with their captives more than they fear our military strength. Without any doubt economic wisdom on our part sometimes will help accomplish political success.

I came back from the Pacific and Southeast Asia with hope and encouragement. I am much impressed by the show-cases by South Korea, Japan, Free China, Hong Kong, Thailand, Singapore and many others. These free nations in the Orient with their practical and aggressive leaders are making steady progress in their new destiny. Many new hotels are being built in Seoul—the World Fair opening in Osaka—the free port established in Kaohsiung and the tourists in Hong Kong give us the feeling of movement. They might not have our Wall Street or our Hollywood but their willingness to work and their energy and imagination to move forward make us aware of the increasing im-

portance of their trading position with the United States.

To make the trading arrangement between East and West more meaningful calls for new dimensions, new appreciation as well as practical and realistic appraisal. The new dimensions rest in the areas of more education and cultural exchange, rest in the areas of mutual respect and trust between the United States and her friends who are willing and anxious to trade with us.

We Americans need not be ashamed to profess that one reason for our passion for world peace is to protect the materialistic prosperity we have achieved. As intelligent people we are convinced by history that only those who can keep more than enough for themselves are the ones who see to it that the others also will have enough.

Today, we, as a free people have a real function in national security in creating an economic adequacy to support freedom among peoples who are still struggling to be free. That adequate economy can come only from: (1) sound capital; (2) technical know-how, and (3) purchase of products at a trading profit.

As we enter a new era of trade and end a long period of frustration from "aid stage", we as business people are very much aware of the importance of a two-way street. This two-way traffic will help to build a sound foundation of East and West trading for today and tomorrow, and possibly indirectly will help to form important political decisions for this Nation in the future.

All free and sound civilization must be built on the foundation of reality and common sense. And I believe there is a sound basis of common sense in every section of our society. Today the West and the East are both going through rapid changes. Most of the changes are for the better. However, we all realize successful involvement is not through violence or protest to satisfy the minority few but by creative, positive and peaceful actions which benefit the majority many.

We as free people, have the courage to invite the leaders behind the bamboo curtain, behind the iron curtain to be familiar with the system of free enterprise. We challenge them to open their minds as well as their hearts. We challenge them to tear down their curtains. We challenge them to eliminate their walls. We challenge them to dare to experience the practice of individual liberty and political freedom. We Americans are for world peace and we dare to show them world peace can be established through economic development and cultural exchange.

May I ask you to look at the map of the Pacific? For many centuries the Western world has fought against any totalitarian control of the Atlantic by encouraging the nationalistic impulse of their people wanting to be free from the North Sea to the Mediterranean. Today in Asia, Korea is our Norway, Japan our England, Taiwan our Netherlands, and Southeast Asia our Mediterranean. By upgrading the strength of their economy it will be a sound foundation for stability and security for the other parts of the world.

I am most impressed by the performance of the young leaders in Asia with their progressive ideas, and their political wisdom. They have opened new horizons and an exciting era for world trade.

This morning we gather here to exchange information to talk about our common interests on world trade. Let's not be too critical of some of our failures and our disappointments and at the same time not overconfident of our accomplishments and our successes.

The people in the orient need energetic maturity and the people in the west, political wisdom for this new adventure—world trade. Shall we move forward together?

THE ASIAN MIND AND THE WORLD CRISIS

(Remarks by Mrs. Anna Chennault before the Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, Calif., May 23, 1969)

You honor me today to let me speak before this distinguished organization, before which my late husband, General Chennault spoke some years ago. I appreciate this equal opportunity, but I also remind myself it is perfectly harmless to accept a compliment as long as you don't try to inhale.

I have carefully read the information you have sent to me. I noticed you limit the length of the speech to 27 minutes—you certainly know how to stop people from talking. What do you do with some of my politician friends in Washington who take 5 minutes just to say, "hello". I am impressed with all the distinguished speakers who have appeared before this organization. However—I am sure you have never before had a mini skirt appear before you who is not a candidate for anything—not even for president of an airline. I want the President of our flying Tiger Line, Mr. Prescott, to hear—so he will not be apprehensive.

I come to you this morning to talk about the Asians—from Korea to Singapore. I do not claim to be an expert about this—the experts are those who fly around the world in two weeks, return to Washington—and give you a Best Seller!

In this complicated world we all have to become students of international affairs. Continuous awareness, once a luxury for men and women of yesterday, is now a desperate necessity for our own survival as a free people. To contain new forces that are breaking old shells everywhere, we need many new dimensions.

I have recently returned from Asia with the same contrast of hope and concern with which I suppose all well-informed people regard events in this country. My hope is encouraged by a new energy and a modern outlook of Asia. My concern is the help the United States is giving to the Asian Communist's efforts to isolate America, by creating misunderstanding and credibility gaps between the American people and the people of Asia.

Let us make a comparison between the differences of American and Asian psychology. America is a young nation—enjoying glory—strength—and power in an unravaged land. The Asians are much older and homogenous—with much longer traditions. The Asians have known life much longer. They have a more fatalistic acceptance of its tragedy—which we have so far escaped. They know less about applied science, although they invented much of our basic research. They talk less about individual liberty and political freedom, but they are more practical and thoughtful about the nature of man and the pay off of long-term family and group objectives. They still believe in the accumulation of the benefits of work and effort from generation to generation, while we, in this country, believe in quick fortunes and early retirement. They don't have a Los Angeles Times, a Chicago Tribune, or a Wall Street, a Hollywood, a Pentagon, or a military industrial complex—although I am sure they wish they had. They are hard working people and unfortunately their enterprise often has been interrupted by wars and conflicts such as you cannot dream. In substance, the Continent of Asia has been in a continuous war since the British, for opium profit, turned against the Chinese people by using the Chinese's own invention of gun powder. Because of such tragic experiences, the Oriental people are patient—they are used to long wars and patient rebuilding after destruction. I saw that happen in China during the Second World War when I was a little girl—and I saw it happen again in Korea when I visited President Park and Prime Minister Chung of South Korea—and most recently, I saw the rebuilding of Saigon's

destruction after the Tet offensive. Their sense of history runs in deeper currents than ours. They have never substituted short-term solutions for long-term objectives. For that reason, as our enemies, they are always willing to wait us out, and as our friends they are always despairing of our restless itch to cut and run with gains as well as losses.

After talking with leaders from Korea, Taiwan, Japan, the Philippines, and Vietnam, I realize it is difficult for all Asians to understand the confusion and the agony we are going through in the constant reappraisal of our central objective in terms of our mutual interest; namely, freedom and peace in Asia, as indivisible with peace in Europe and the Middle East.

Like all intelligent people—the free people in Asia, in particular—worn by tragedies unbelievable to us—are anxious for peace but they are not willing to settle in terms of "peace at any price"—because they know that isn't peace. They look at Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Korea, with a deeper sense of history that warns them. Specifically, they know in their bones the ultimate difference between a "good settlement" and a "bad settlement" of the Vietnam war. They understand better than we do, that the expansionist Communist objective is to talk, to negotiate a breathing spell with us now and then take over Vietnam and Southeast Asia later, when it will be harder for us to go back. A "good settlement" would discourage further Communist aggression to stabilize a situation in Southeast Asia—the Middle East—the Pacific—or in Europe. A "bad settlement" in Vietnam will not only invite Communist takeover in Southeast Asia in the next couple of years, but might tempt the North Koreans to reopen the Korean war in 1970.

The people in the East who have long experience in dealing with the Communist power which has been trying to take them over since the Russian revolution in the 1920's understand the "name of the game". To them—"Communism tastes the same—raw or cooked—hot or cold". They point out to me that peace and security are established by demonstrating to the aggressors that "aggressions do not pay."

While we, in this country, are concerned and worried about the world problems, our friends in Asia are deeply troubled by our self-doubt and our lack of confidence. They simply cannot understand why we Americans have become so defensive and apologetic for our actions and our demonstrations to preserve peace, security and justice around the world.

A friend pointed out that "each day, the thousands of people from all over the world, seeking entry into the United States, should be an outstanding testimony for the American people—that we who believe in free enterprise surely have something better to offer, that our democratic system is certainly a better one than that being enforced behind the bamboo and iron curtain." And yet—the people in Asia simply cannot understand why the United States, with her wealth and power is so full of self-doubt. Another friend jokingly said to me, "every time the Communists sneeze, the American people catch cold".

In America a psychology of defeat has brought a new growth of isolationism to our people. This is exactly what the Communists want to happen. The Communist's assumption is this—if the American public talk themselves out of supporting freedom in Vietnam—they most certainly will not support freedom anywhere in the Pacific, and therefore, not in Berlin or in the Middle East. They see Asia as a turning point in all our past policy toward supporting freedom.

The Communists in Asia fully realize they cannot compete with us in military strength but they certainly know how to work on so-called "public opinion" and try to outlast our patience. Hanoi and Haiphong realize they

cannot capture Saigon by force. They have tried many times and failed. They know the only way to enter Saigon is to "talk their way in". Unfortunately, for many years the Vietnam war effort has been frustrated by technical decisions based more on the political invention of limited war rather than military practicalities. In Asia people still believe in decorating their heroes and shooting their enemies—while we, in a more comforting position are having difficulty finding the definition of "hero" in our dictionaries. Furthermore, we seem to have entered a space age. We are people in a hurry—we are all so used to instant tea—instant coffee—we are inclined to look for "instant solutions" to the extent we sometimes make the mistake of trying to force our kind of system on other peoples.

Without question, power is a lonely business. But for our own survival, this country cannot afford to be isolated. Hitler of Germany, Tojo of Japan, and Stalin of Russia, have taught us this lesson of history. Only until the other powers who are now feeling their muscles, want peace more than they want power of expansion, will this world be secure from conflicts and threats. The United States' position is to keep the "balance of power" in order to avoid conflict. All our spiritual aspirations will come to nothing if we weaken the physical assurance of our national security—for a stronger national security in this nuclear age is the most effective foundation for freedom and for peace.

At this late hour, it is important for the people of good will and good intentions to have some practical common sense and to be realistic about international problems. We simply have to understand that the aggressors with whom we deal only understand one kind of language—that is, active forces and consistent determination.

I am fully convinced, from my own too realistic experience, that the forces of freedom are stronger than the forces of tyranny. The free people in Asia are making steady progress toward their own destiny. Rising young leaders from Singapore to Korea sincerely believe in promoting political stability and economic advancement. There is new confidence among these young leaders; they are better educated and so more aware of the forces of the future. As the era of colonialism and imperialism comes to an end in East Asia, they know that there is a vacuum—that vacuum cannot be replaced by the most dangerous aggressors. That vacuum must be filled by the free and independent people of Asia with the help of those whose help is welcome because they have no ambitions of territorial expansion. Our consistent—not self-doubting willingness to help—is the message people in this Nation must try to convey to our friends in Asia for our own security.

The leaders of the free people, whether in the west, or in the east, have to accept the burden that successful involvement is not through protest by an uninformed minority to satisfy that minority few themselves, but by creative and progressive actions of an informed minority many, like you, which benefit the majority many. The free Asians do recognize their need for energetic maturity and the west must recognize that without strong friends in Asia there will be no peace anywhere.

As I can see it, our foreign policy has one basic anomaly. That is—we try to prevent any single power to mobilize the people and resources of the entire continent—whether it is in Europe or in Asia. Because that single power would have to be totalitarian, therefore against our freedom in America. Foster their hope—help to protect their independence—for the free loving people is our way to encourage the other people not to make land or their resources available to a single totalitarian master. To do this—we have to depend on a sound military defense establishment. Our defense system, whatever its

faults, is still the envy of the world. Every other nation only wishes it had one too.

The change in Indonesia, the strength in Korea, the land reform in free China, our improved relationships with Saigon, are fruit of our labor.

Today, few young students of history on college campuses appreciate the sense of history. It is fashionable among them to doubt the worth of loyalties and beliefs. They say that they should live merely to express themselves as if the world began today. Because the future is so unpredictable, they would live as if there were no future, and yesterday was already too late. But Nihilism is a noisy luxury of those who have never known the need of self-preservation. There will never be any way for the very young to understand that need until it catches up with them.

I still think the Bible is worth reading for long-term human wisdom and I remember that Gideon said before Armageddon: "By the three hundred men that lapped I shall save thee, O Israel." Which meant he fought his battle for the Lord with the handful of men who knew their business and sent the incompetent and the faint-hearted home.

From Asia I have watched the United States rise from many disasters. Because of the concern of its strong-hearted and competent, the United States will never completely lose the wisdom of a long-term view—or ever fall to be the rallying point of those all over the world who in a famous phrase are "the aristocracy of those who care."

BERKELEY: TROOPS ARE GONE, EFFECTS WILL LINGER

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the physical violence in Berkeley may have ended, but it will take quite some time to end the mental and philosophical damage created there.

To say that the "people's park" incident was the sole cause of recent troubles is rather a grandiose simplification. Of all the major universities in this country, perhaps Berkeley best represents the widening polarizations between youth and adult, between establishment and alienated. The park was no more than a catalyst.

Ever since 1964, and the advent of the free speech movement at the University of California, discontent at Berkeley has ebbed onward; never has there been complete quiet, complete confidence on campus.

In many ways, what happens at Berkeley seems to become a harbinger for other schools across the Nation. It was at Berkeley that outside police first invaded a campus to restore order through mass arrests and violent confrontation—a scene repeated last year at Columbia, this year on many campuses. Student strikes, building occupations, these too resulted from turmoil at Berkeley, and these, too, now have become commonplace.

Since last fall, the Berkeley campus and town have been under an extraordinary emergency proclamation—a proclamation giving State and local officials immense powers in times of crisis. And, then, 2 weeks ago, authorities sanctioned use of firearms and tear gas bombings as the means of repressing the latest demonstrations in Berkeley.

Are these violent reactions also to spread nationwide?

I do not condone irresponsible acts carried out by demonstrators at Berkeley or any other place. But I am also upset by the seemingly thoughtless methods employed by authorities who inflame situations instead of cooling them down.

I am appalled when I hear statements coming from persons such as Governor Reagan and the Alameda County sheriff that not only give countenance to violent reaction but also goad on even further confrontation.

The last troops finally are leaving Berkeley. I pray that the end to this trouble has been reached. But, what about elsewhere? Will Berkeley still be the model for campus unrest? Hopefully, it will not, and the lessons learned at Berkeley—bitter as they are—will not be repeated.

And for another Berkeley not to happen, the onus of responsibility rests heavy upon the alienated youth, upon college administrators, and upon State and local authorities. Violence is no answer, and confrontation should be legal and peaceful. Each side must be willing to hear the other, and both should strive for settlement rather than polarization.

From Berkeley we have also learned that without willingness to completely resolve problems a natural tendency toward escalation follows, with succeeding incidents becoming worse in both instigation and handling.

In the following articles which I am inserting into the RECORD, a vivid picture is painted showing how the latest Berkeley problems arose, and how responses by authorities tended to increase pressures rather than lead to a calm solution. Most of these articles are from the Los Angeles Times, which made a very valuable contribution by its splendid coverage of the Berkeley disturbances.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, May 30, 1969]

THE CONFRONTATION: BERKELEY—BIRTH, GROWTH OF "WAR"

(By John Kendall and William Endicott)

BERKELEY.—"Look out, here comes the jeep!"

That's when Dan E. Porter, 18, was enveloped in the zone of turmoil and violence south of the UC Berkeley campus on the afternoon of May 15.

Porter, recuperating in his home from gunshot wounds in his legs, recalls the warning was shouted by someone who hurried past him and his friend, Fred Campbell. They were on the way to pick up Fred's sister from high school.

"We stopped and turned around and looked," Porter says. "A jeep came toward us, spraying pepper gas. We ran into an alley. I got about half way down the alley when my right leg just came into the air.

"I fell against a wall to my right. I tried to get back to my feet but I couldn't. It was just too painful. Fred came back to help me but by this time the jeep was gone. They just shot and left.

"I didn't see who shot me, but people there said the shotgun was fired by a sheriff's deputy riding in the jeep. I was hit four times in the right leg and once in the left with what I think was double-aught buckshot. The doctor says I may have suffered some nerve damage.

SPRAYING GAS, SHOOTING

"It was really cold. They could have told us to halt but they just pulled up and started spraying gas and shooting."

Young Porter returned home from Albany Hospital last Saturday, 10 days after about a hundred persons were injured, a man was mortally wounded and another probably was blinded in an afternoon of violent confrontation between authorities and Berkeley's radicals, "street people" and students.

Some of the demonstrators who streamed off the UC Berkeley campus toward a "people's park" fenced by the university threw rocks, bottles, and—police say—pieces of steel reinforcing rods.

Helmeted law enforcement officers, wearing flak jackets, heavily armed and looking like a paramilitary unit, responded with shotguns—a new bench mark for violence at the nation's troubled universities and colleges.

For the first time at US Berkeley, cradle of the student movement, and perhaps anywhere in America outside the south, shotguns were used to control student crowds.

For the first time anywhere in the nation, tear gas to control a crowd was delivered, not with grenades or sprays, but from a helicopter.

For the first time, UC Berkeley students went to class watched by national guardsmen carrying gas grenades and rifles with fixed and unsheathed bayonets.

The "people's park" incident is the fifth time since last July that UC Berkeley has been disrupted in one way or another by controversies leading to arrests and—sometimes—to violence.

Next to the campus has grown up a hippie-style youth culture with political activists who talk about "revolution." This, and student differences with the UC administration, produces an atmosphere of simmering controversy.

ALMOST ANYTHING AN ISSUE

Almost anything can be an issue, from the closing of Telegraph Ave. for a dance to the demands for an ethnic studies center by the Third World Liberation Front. The "people's park" seemed tailor-made for the activists.

They believed the "clumsy, inflexible administration" was taking away a spontaneous park built by the "people" for a soccer field. The administration faced the problem of completing plans of a decade and of establishing clear control.

This time, when the predictable demonstrations developed, authorities came down hard with massed police forces, guns, national guardsmen and helicopter techniques more familiar to a war zone than to an American college campus.

The park controversy began April 18 with an announcement in the Berkeley Barb, an underground newspaper.

"Hear ye, hear ye," it said. "A park will be built this Sunday between Dwight and Haste. The land is owned by the university, which tore down a lot of beautiful houses in order to build a swamp . . .

"We want the park to be a cultural, political, freak out and rap center for western world . . .

"The university has no right to create ugliness as a way of life. We will show up on Sunday, and will clear one-third of the lot and do with it whatever our fantasy pleases."

The "people's park" was born at a meeting of Berkeley street activists a few days earlier in a second-floor mod clothing shop just off Telegraph Ave. near the campus. The shop, called the Red Square, is owned by Mike Delacour.

On Sunday, April 20, several hundred of the street people who haunt the fringes of the university campus, aided by many students, turned up dragging trees, plants and rolls of sod.

They produced a rented bulldozer, and a young man in a sporty cowboy hat professionally graded the lot.

By 2 p.m., what had been a rutted eyesore that morning was a shady glen set in a small grove of trees at the northeast corner of the lot. It was an instant "people's park."

All kinds of people were attracted to the

park. There were genuine hippies looking for a piece of turf to, as they put it, "do their thing." There were students. There were, in the vernacular of the hippies, "straight people."

There were mothers looking for a place for their children to play.

SCENE FOR CONFRONTATION

And there were radicals seeking a confrontation.

It soon became clear that the park would be the focal point for conflict among a wide range of viewpoints.

The park land unquestionably belonged to the university. It was first designated for university use as long ago as 1956, but there had never been money to acquire and develop it.

In June, 1967, the university finally paid \$1.3 million for it with the announced intention of either making it into a soccer field and recreation area or building student apartments and dormitories.

Buildings in the area—most of them older dwellings occupied by students and street people—were demolished last summer, and students began to use the empty lot as a parking area.

On April 30, eleven days after the park came into being, the university issued a statement saying the area would be cleared soon for work on the recreation field.

WAR ON UNIVERSITY

On Thursday, May 8, UC Chancellor Roger Heyns asked his advisory committee on housing and environment, headed by Prof. Sim Van der Ryn, to assist in further modification of the plan and to discuss ideas with students. The following day, a proclamation appeared in the Barb. It promised a "war of retaliation against the university if it begins to move against the park."

Unsigned, it continued, "If the university attempts to reclaim \$1.3 million worth of land now claimed by the people, we will destroy \$5 million worth of university property."

Art Goldberg, a leader in the park movement and oft-arrested activist in the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley five years ago, called the park effort "the beginning of resistance."

But Van der Ryn maintained that even the hard core activists did not want a confrontation over the park and that with patience everything could be worked out.

NEIGHBORS' DEMAND ACTION

Some 48 neighbors had signed a petition, however, demanding that the police and the university put a stop to all-night bongo drumming, shouting, dancing, love-making and alleged dope-peddling at the park.

The university was in a bind.

Heyns had directed Van der Ryn to serve as an intermediary with the park people, primarily to urge them to stop work and produce a representative committee for negotiations.

The committee was not forthcoming, and on Tuesday, May 13, Heyns issued a long, definitive statement that made it clear a showdown was inevitable.

He said discussions with park people had failed because they had refused to organize a responsible committee with which the university could consult.

A fence would be put up, he said, "to re-establish the conveniently forgotten fact that the field is indeed the university's, and to exclude unauthorized persons from the site."

INVOLVEMENT GROWING

A university spokesman said more and more people were becoming involved in the park "and it became clear that eventually, if we waited any longer, the confrontation would become even larger."

Van der Ryn said the park people were reluctant to elect a committee for several reasons:

"First, because their values and philoso-

phes stress individual participation rather than the forms of representative government; second, because they felt that any such committee would be drawn into the routine of campus planning; third, because the people working on the park suspected that a committee might strengthen the influence of the militant political people among them who were accustomed to committees and bargaining."

He also said the chancellor's demand that the people stop developing the site during discussions was similarly unrealistic.

"It assumed that somebody there was . . . in charge and could order everyone to lay down their hoes and stop planting shrubs," he said. "There was, in fact, nobody with that authority."

GETS NEGOTIATING TEAM

On Wednesday, May 14, Van der Ryn had succeeded in putting together an 11-man negotiating team. However, the chancellor had by then left for the East on business, and Van der Ryn said there was no one for the committee to talk to.

Thursday morning, the 15th, the struggle began.

The university had ordered a San Jose fence company to put up an eight-foot Cyclone fence in one day, and security arrangements had been turned over to the chief of the campus police, William Beall.

Expecting trouble, he asked Alameda County Sheriff Frank Madigan for help to protect the construction crew.

An estimated 250 Berkeley and campus police, sheriff's deputies and California Highway Patrolmen approached the park site at 4:45 a.m.

Lt. Robert Ludden of the Berkeley police advised about 75 people sleeping at the park that they were on university property and would be arrested for trespassing if they did not disperse.

There were three arrests. All the others left peacefully and the fence crews went to work.

OFFICERS TAKE OVER

There was no trouble in the morning. Law enforcement officers occupied the park, lounging on equipment and even swinging in the children's swings. Authorities were ready, but relaxed.

However, trouble developed out of a Committee for a Progressive Middle East rally at noon in front of UC's Sproul Hall. The committee relinquished its time to be devoted to observance of Israel's anniversary of independence for a discussion of the "people's park."

About 2,000 to 2,500 students had gathered when the student body president-elect, Dan Siegal, began to speak at 12:36 p.m. from the Sproul steps.

Later, after he had been charged with inciting a riot, the 24-year-old law student said he had not finished his speech when he invited the crowd to "go down and take the park."

But, finished or not, hundreds in the gathering—as if by signal—surged across Bancroft Way, bordering the southern edge of the campus, and flooded south on Telegraph Ave., walking in the street against the one-way traffic going north.

At 12:42 p.m., the marchers chanted, "We want the park. We want the park." The collection of activists, hippies and students walked toward Haste St., on the north edge of the university's land.

Almost immediately, demonstrators turned on a fire hydrant at Telegraph Ave. and Haste, spraying water across the street.

Police reported rocks, bottles and other missiles were being thrown by the marchers and spectators on tops of buildings along Telegraph.

Police used tear gas at Dwight Way and Telegraph Ave. at 12:48 p.m. to drive demonstrators back up Telegraph Ave. to the campus, four blocks north.

During the next 45 minutes, a highway patrolman, Albert Bradley, suffered a superficial knife wound in the chest, a city car was overturned and set afire at Parker St. and Telegraph Ave., police squads had run out of tear gas and were overrun.

And officers had used their shotguns.

FIRST GUNFIRE

The first report of gunfire came at 1:15 p.m.

Exactly where and under what circumstances a shotgun was first used is still not publicly known.

But the results of the gunfire became evident shortly at nearby Herrick Hospital, the city's emergency treatment center.

Hospital authorities received word at 1:15 p.m. to stand by because there had been trouble on the campus. Forty-five minutes later, they realized the usual emergency procedures would not do. They ordered the hospital's disaster plan into effect.

Staff members moved cars from the parking lot behind the emergency entrance and set up folding tables and sawhorses holding litters. Two doctors and several nurses manned the area.

The injured from the eight-square-block area south of the campus arrived on foot, in ambulances, by taxis and in private automobiles.

During the remainder of the afternoon, Herrick doctors treated more than 50 persons, 24 of them for gunshot wounds, including five who had been hit with double-ought buckshot.

One man had the main bone from his knee to ankle shattered with the double-ought. Another had the bones of a hand shattered. Birdshot penetrated the lungs of at least two persons. One had a pellet in his heart.

FORTY-THREE REPORTED HIT

In all, city officials report, 43 persons were hit by gunfire. Scores of others were treated for tear gas irritation, cuts, bruises and other injuries.

"The area was like a battle zone," said Daryl Lembke, a Times reporter hit by birdshot pellets from the rear as he hurried west on Blake St., away from the embattled Telegraph Ave., at about 2 p.m.

Lembke had seen the smoke of the burning city car on Telegraph Ave. and had gone there. When a crowd gathered near the car, police fired tear gas.

Lembke ran north with the crowd one or two blocks to Blake St. and turned west.

"I had gone about 30 to 35 feet from the corner when something went off at my back," he said. "I turned around and saw a policeman in a jump suit with a shotgun pointed at us."

"I tried to flatten against a nearby building, and then I felt something and looked down at my pants leg. It was bloody."

He said he had the impression the police were frustrated in attempts to control the crowd because wind would blow the tear gas away and the demonstrators would come back.

To Vincent Ferrari, 26, a bearded, long-haired free-lance photographer, the police "just blew their cool."

Ferrari, wounded by birdshot, said he was between the police and marchers taking pictures near Haste St. and Telegraph Ave. when police used tear gas against rock throwers.

"A pepper gas bomb went right over my head, and I suddenly became a demonstrator, jeering and cheering and shouting," he said.

MOVED WITH CROWD

"Then I kind of moved with the crowd down Telegraph Ave. to the corner of Dwight Way. It was there that I saw a car driven by a moronic policeman weaving back and forth on Dwight toward Telegraph."

"They were dodging rocks and firing tear gas from the car. The driver would aim his car at people."

Then, said Ferrari, he moved to Parker St. and Telegraph Ave. to watch the overturned car fire extinguished. He saw a crowd there being chased by police.

"The people were extremely frightened," he said. "Some were yelling, 'Guns, they have guns. Watch out.' I ran up Telegraph Ave. to Blake St. and turned left."

"I was about 25 to 30 feet west of Telegraph Ave. I slowed down and turned around. There was a patrolman down on one knee in a military firing position pointing a gun."

"I saw him aim at me. I turned and was shot. When he fired, there was no crowd. I had 48 birdshot wounds in my head, face, legs and arms. A motorist took me to Herrick."

The most deadly effect of gunfire came around the corner on Telegraph Ave. from where Lembke and Ferrari were shot. James Rector, 25, a San Jose carpenter, was fatally wounded. Rector reportedly was on the top of a two-story wooden building at 513 Telegraph Ave. where he was watching the action.

Four persons were struck with birdshot on the roof of the building immediately south. One of them was Allen Blanchard, 29, an employee of the Telegraph Repertory Theater, six store-fronts down. Blanchard was shot in the face.

DESCRIBE HAPPENINGS

The operator of the theater and Blanchard's employer, George Pauley, 30, stood on the top of the building this week and described what happened.

"About 2 p.m.," Pauley said, "there were about 20 or 30 persons on this roof. We had been on the balcony but moved to the roof to watch. Pretty strong winds were blowing the tear gas away and it didn't seem effective."

"Officers were in the street below us when we saw this red-haired kid with a rock. He was standing on that building. (Pauley pointed to a building immediately south of where he was standing)."

"We yelled, 'If you throw that rock, they'll shoot tear gas up here.' He threw the rock anyway. It didn't hit any of the officers in the street, but they fired at least three volleys up here."

EYEBALLS PENETRATED

Blanchard fell, holding his face. Doctors found later that each eyeball had been penetrated by a birdshot pellet. Sight in one eye is gone, and doctors say there is only a slim chance for sight in the other.

Next door, Rector was struck just above the left hip by three double-ought buckshot pellets which lodged in his chest. He died four days later of shock and hemorrhage due to multiple shotgun wounds.

Gov. Reagan told a luncheon in Los Angeles Rector had been shot while on a roof from which steel rods and other dangerous objects had been thrown at officers.

Pauley insists, however, that the only one who threw anything at the police was the red-haired youth. "Except for that," he said, "no one up here threw anything at police."

On the street, law enforcement officers moved against groups of demonstrators who broke up into small groups, scurried down side streets and moved into the downtown area. Twenty-two stores in the area reported windows broken.

Berkeley Mayor Wallace Johnson and City Manager William C. Hanley asked that anti-loitering and antistreet rally measures be invoked and agreed with Sheriff Madigan that the National Guard should be called in.

Between Thursday and Friday, more than 2,000 guardsmen from throughout Northern California moved into the city. Helicopters beat the air, blaring news of a 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. curfew ordered by Gov. Reagan.

Reagan had declared a state of emergency in the city Feb. 5 at the height of a crisis over demands by the Third World Liberation Front for an ethnic studies center. He had never lifted it.

TENSE WEEKEND

The guardsmen and police enforced a tense peace through the weekend. There were minor skirmishes. On Monday, May 19, an estimated 2,000 persons marched on the city's main business district but were routed by guardsmen.

Tear gas was more common than fog. The city was under siege. Movements were restricted. Soldiers with unsheathed bayonets patrolled the streets, as did police, sheriff's deputies and highway patrolmen wearing flak jackets.

Then on Tuesday came the helicopter.

When some 2,500 students and street people attempted to march off campus they were turned back by guardsmen and herded into a tight corral near the Sproul Plaza area.

Finally, an H-19 National Guard helicopter made two passes over the central campus area, spraying white clouds of gas on a screaming crowd.

WAFTS ACROSS CAMPUS

It wafted across the campus, into Cowell Hospital and spread to recreation and residential areas in Strawberry Canyon east of the campus.

Gagging, tearful students sought shelter in university buildings.

The helicopter gassing was ordered by Brig. Gen. Bernard Nurre, 55, commanding general of the National Guard's 49th Brigade, because, he said, guardsmen were being threatened by furniture thrown from windows of campus buildings.

"This was a decision he (the general) felt was necessary because his troops were being hurt and were in danger of being more seriously hurt," said a National Guard spokesman.

"This way people got their eyes burned a little, but no one got seriously injured."

Minor demonstrations and rallies continued through the rest of the week, but there were no further violent confrontations. There was a mass arrest of about 500 people on Thursday, May 22, for failure to disperse and illegal assembly.

Guardsmen, however, remained on duty throughout the downtown area, and streets leading to "people's park" were blocked off.

ISSUE UNSOLVED

By the weekend, the curfew had been lifted, but the issue of the park remained unsolved, despite proposals and numerous public and private meetings by city councilmen, citizens' groups, student groups, street people and university officials.

Although the Berkeley City Council called for removal of the National Guard at a special meeting last Saturday, Gov. Reagan has refused.

Guardsmen will remain on duty in the city through this weekend, he said, in anticipation of a massive Memorial Day demonstration today.

By now, the fencing of the park has become a symbol. To some it represents the legitimate, lawful right of the owner to control his property and for authorities to restore order. To others, it represents oppression by the "establishment" and the overwhelming force to carry out its will.

INVESTIGATION UNDERWAY

Law enforcement officials have been reluctant to discuss their use of shotguns, except to say they were necessary for crowd control.

An investigation is being conducted under the direction of Lowell Jensen, Alameda County assistant district attorney. The Alameda County Grand Jury also has indicated it will conduct an inquiry.

The order to use the weapons came from Capt. Thomas Houchins, the sheriff's field commander here.

He said Thursday, in his first public statement, that officers had been directed to use birdshot, which is much smaller than a BB,

but had resorted to buckshot, a round ball about one-fourth inch in diameter, after the birdshot supply was exhausted.

He added that if there are further disturbances "we might use buckshot," thus indicating that the use of guns will be standard operating procedure in future confrontations.

Two weeks after the initial disturbance over the park, the Berkeley Police Assn., representing 236 Berkeley policemen, also issued a statement Thursday crediting Sheriff Madigan with saving them from the attack of a "vicious mob whose intention was to injure or kill the officers and take possession of property that was not legally theirs."

The officers said the use of shotguns was "totally justified."

The Berkeley officers also said there were 98 law enforcement officers injured in the melee—55 highway patrolmen, 39 Berkeley policemen and four sheriff's deputies. None of the injuries was serious, they said.

Madigan defended the use of guns by saying they, along with the appropriate ammunition, are standard equipment of every deputy sheriff.

The guns reportedly were used by sheriff's deputies, units of the San Francisco police, which were called in along with officers from other cities under a mutual aid agreement, and highway patrolmen.

POLICE ATTACKED

Hanley, the Berkeley city manager, defended their use by saying the law enforcement units were "attacked by hundreds of people hurling rocks, stones, bricks, concrete blocks and bars of reinforcing steel."

He said some officers were down on the street, unconscious from injuries. Sixteen eventually were reported injured, four of them bad enough to require hospital treatment, he said.

The field commander, Houchins, decided the guns were "absolutely essential" to prevent police from being overwhelmed, Hanley said.

Johnson, the mayor, offered another explanation: The demonstrators had become immune to gas or had found ways to offset it.

FLAGS FOR MASKS

For example, one pamphlet handed out on the streets advised that small American flags be used for gas masks. It said to use elastic to hold the flags on and to use cotton inside for a filter.

Although most of the firing of shotguns took place off the campus, at least two buckshot were found near the university library.

Members of the criminology department at the university charged the use of shotguns was indiscriminate and unnecessary as a crowd control tactic.

"It has the undesirable effect of escalating the level of violence in this and possible future confrontations," said a spokesman.

There seemed no doubt among many observers that the threshold of permissible violence by law enforcement agencies had been lowered.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, May 30, 1969]

BERKELEY POLARIZED BY USE OF GUNS AND GAS—EVEN THOSE UNSYMPATHETIC TO PROTESTS VIEW IT AS OVERKILL, U.S. OFFICIAL SAYS

BERKELEY.—The effect of violence—particularly the use of guns and the gassing of the UC campus by a helicopter—has had a polarizing effect on the city of Berkeley, as well as the university community.

"It was Vietnam in people's minds," said Ray Colvig, UC public information officer. "People unsympathetic with the events on campus still felt this was overkill."

The Rev. Anthony Nugent, a Presbyterian minister assigned to the Berkeley Free Church, saw this effect:

"People on the right continue to be on the right and take a harder line than before. People mildly conservative, moderate or liberal have been radicalized.

"They may not like the kind of young people that are coming to Berkeley, but they realize this massive show of force isn't going to solve anything," he said.

CROP DUSTING

Even Mayor Wallace Johnson, who has not questioned the use of guns and who initially concurred in the call for the National Guard, said he felt it was a mistake "to use a helicopter to spray gas on the campus like a crop-dusting operation."

He said a friend "had his wife and infant daughter at a swimming pool in Strawberry Canyon and that stuff drifted up there and nearly caused a panic."

The mayor also said there was no doubt the use of guns and the helicopter has had a "very definite polarizing effect" of students and faculty and many residents towards public authorities.

At a special Saturday City Council meeting, an elderly man and a middle aged woman were engaged in a heated conversation in the corridor outside the council chambers.

"You've got to have order before you can have law," he was saying. "The faculty and students up there are the villains."

PALE, SHAKING

The woman responded: "No, no. Men with guns are the first villains."

Mrs. Berenice Decker, a 20-year Berkeley resident and mother of three, returned to work in the planning department at City Hall after lunch last Friday, pale and shaking.

She said she had seen a sheriff's deputy arrest a young Negro girl by grabbing her and twisting her arm behind her back.

"That's brutality," Mrs. Decker said. "I don't know what that girl had done, but she didn't deserve that kind of treatment. It's more than frightening, it's horrible."

"What's going to happen to us? How can you govern a city when this kind of thing goes on?"

Mrs. Decker turned up Sunday at a city-wide meeting called by the Citizens Committee to Restore Civic Unity and donated \$1 to the bail fund for people who had been arrested during the disturbances.

The atmosphere also has touched children. Richard Foster, superintendent of Berkeley schools, said "you can see fear" in their faces.

And a substitute teacher in the city schools, Miss Elizabeth Whitaker, said the children at the height of the crisis were in a near state of hysteria.

"Third-graders were wondering when the gas was going to come down on them or if they were going to be shot," she said.

On the university campus, the guns and helicopter have organized students as few issues ever have.

Eighty-five per cent of the 14,969 students who voted in a referendum last week approved of the preservation of the "people's park" which precipitated the current crisis.

Charles Palmer, UC student body president, also scoffs at the theory that students were used by revolutionaries.

"Sure there are a couple of heavies who rub their hands and look for trouble," he said, "but the students are not so naive as to be manipulated."

The 22-year-old Palmer, a political science honors student from Los Angeles, said the long-term effect on the university is "apt to be very bad."

"There's so much distrust. A university should be a community, but in Berkeley people are divided into interest groups. There just isn't a will to solve the problems.

"The park is a symbol of something we built ourselves . . . We were never con-

sulted about whether we wanted an athletic field there.

"Students want to see a university that is flexible, but we're locked in with a university that isn't flexible. The park is just another indication."

A university spokesman offered this observation:

"The park somehow symbolized something for a lot more students than you would realize. It's part of a trend. A lot of non-radical students just like to thumb their noses at the establishment a little bit, and this was a chance."

The question of legal ownership of land doesn't really touch them, he said. "Maybe in 10 years when they are out of school and buying their own home they will feel differently about it."

William Beall, campus police chief and former chief of the Berkeley police said the radicals, students and street people wanted a cause.

"They don't care about the park," he said. "The park is irrelevant. The city has one near it. It's the cause celebre. We've had five blow-ups in a year. Each one is getting worse. These people want revolution."

"What really is happening," continued the chief, "is that the street people are trying to induce students to join them because they need bodies."

Most observers agree that while the park has become the issue to the emotionally aroused, it is not that simple.

Both sides in the dispute reluctantly concede that the crisis has raised the basic question: Who will control institutions and property and for what purpose?

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, May 30, 1969]

CHRONOLOGY OF VIOLENCE: WHAT HAPPENED THE AFTERNOON OF MAY 15

12:36-12:40 p.m.: Student Body President-elect Dan Segal speaks to crowd of about 2,000 to 2,500 gathered before Sproul Hall. When Segal says "Go down and take the park!" they set off.

12:42 p.m.: Chanting "We want the park! We want the park!" the activists, hippies and students walked toward Haste St., bordering the north edge of the disputed ground.

Rocks, bottles and missiles are being thrown at police.

Fire hydrant turned on at Telegraph Ave. and Haste.

12:45 p.m.: Missiles reported coming from buildings along Telegraph Ave.

12:48 p.m.: Tear gas used at Dwight Way and Telegraph Ave. Officers report they are under missile assault.

12:50 p.m.: California Highway Patrol officer reported knifed and down in street.

12:53 p.m.: Gas being used.

12:55 p.m.: Call for help by citizen.

12:59 p.m.: Police squad overrun. Crowd takes gas equipment.

1:09 p.m.: Officers reported running out of supplies (presumably tear gas).

1:10 p.m.: Nonviolent crowd moving north on Telegraph Ave. toward campus.

1:12 p.m.: "Wild" crowd moving west on Haste St.

1:15 p.m.: Gunfire reported.

Herrick Hospital told to stand by.

1:16 p.m.: Traffic tied up throughout south campus area.

1:17 p.m.: Officers pinned down at Parker and Regent Sts. Assistance on way.

1:26 p.m.: Call for help from officers at Parker St. and Telegraph Ave.

1:27 p.m.: Officer down at Haste St., east of Telegraph.

1:28 p.m.: Car overturned at Parker St. and Telegraph Ave. (city vehicle driven by two reserve policemen, out of auto directing traffic).

1:30 p.m.: Fire in street west of Telegraph Ave. (Presumably the burning car.)

2 p.m.: Herrick Hospital goes on disaster plan. Emergency center set up in parking lot for patients arriving on foot, in taxis, by ambulance and in private cars.

12:40 p.m.-4:40 p.m.: Sixteen officers reported injured, 22 store windows broken, one city vehicle overturned and set afire. All police lines overrun by crowd.

6:30 p.m.: First call goes out for members of 49th Infantry Brigade of National Guard to report.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, May 24, 1969]

REAGAN SHARPLY ASSAILS ADMINISTRATORS OF UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

(By Carl Greenberg)

Gov. Reagan unleashed one of his sharpest attacks so far on the University of California administration Friday.

He said there would be no statewide strike on the University of California campuses next Monday and Tuesday, as has been proposed. "If the university administration would spend less time deploring violence and worrying about police on the (Berkeley) campus, which they had to send for . . . and tell the student body the true facts of the situation . . ."

The governor was referring to police and guardsmen called out last week when violence erupted as chanting crowds of youths demanded control of university land near the Berkeley campus for a "people's park."

"Just sickening, just sickening" was Reagan's reaction when he was told that James Meyer, chancellor-designate at UC Davis, had not opposed a two-day strike against "repression" by police and guardsmen.

"This is the very kind of thing that precipitates more trouble," Reagan told newsmen at the Dorothy Chandler Pavilion of The Music Center, where he addressed the Independent Colleges of Southern California.

"When those in charge and those with the responsibility—adults—can, without apparently any knowledge or understanding of the true facts, further incite this kind of activity, I just can't find the words for my contempt for them and for what they're doing."

Reagan said the UC regents and administration must lay down policy lines and conditions that will provide for automatic punishment if the rules are violated.

In his speech, Reagan said the students have some legitimate complaints about lack of communication and defended "legitimate dissent and ferment" as the "yeast of change and improvement."

But, he continued, "let's not be naive—let's look squarely at those others who hide behind legitimate dissent while they plan riots and orgies of destruction."

A "new phase" of trouble making, said Reagan, is going to be "an assault on the very ownership of property, particularly of land." He did not elaborate.

"Today, too many in the academic community are challenging all the timetested standards. They're telling our young people to make their own rules . . . that the discipline of the past no longer binds us."

"Personally, I am sick and tired of those who on our behalf would assume the collective guilt for all of man's inhumanity to man since the beginning of time."

"The breasts they are beating are not theirs—they're ours. It is time to say to the revolutionaries 'one dose of Hitlerian storm-troopery is enough for this century.'"

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, May 24, 1969]

AUTOPSY CONFIRMS UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PROTESTER WAS KILLED BY BUCKSHOT

BERKELEY.—The 25-year-old demonstrator who died Monday of shotgun wounds he received in a disturbance here May 15 was shot with double-aught buckshot, an autopsy report confirmed Friday.

The autopsy, prepared by the Alameda County Coroner's office, said the death of James Rector of San Jose was caused by "shock and hemorrhage due to multiple shotgun wounds with perforation of the aorta."

Alameda County Sheriff Frank Madigan said Thursday that the shot that hit Rector was fired by law enforcement personnel.

Rector and about 70 other persons, including five policemen, were wounded in a clash between police and demonstrators, who were occupying the "people's park," a formerly empty plot of land near the Berkeley campus which student radicals and the non-student "street people" of the community had taken over and transformed into a small park.

ATTEMPTING TO CLEAR AREA

Police and sheriff's officers were attempting to clear the property, owned by the University of California, when the shots were fired.

After the incident, Madigan said his officers were authorized to fire shotgun shells loaded with light, fine birdshot as a crowd-control measure.

Madigan added that his officers were authorized to carry buckshot, but he did not give an explanation of how his officers were instructed to use the heavier ammunition. He has issued a statement assuming full responsibility for the use of weapons, but he has refused to see newsmen or answer further questions.

Double-aught buckshot, according to a Los Angeles ammunition producer, is a round ball about one-fourth inch in diameter. There are nine in an ordinary shotgun shell.

Double-aught buckshot, the ammunition expert said, "will kill a man—or an animal as big as an elk."

The kind of birdshot used to hunt quail, he continued, is much smaller than a BB. "It would sting the hell out of a man," he said, "but if he had a coat on, he wouldn't even know he was hit."

A spokesman for the Los Angeles Police Department said officers use double-aught buckshot "only when we're playing for keeps."

An investigative team in Berkeley, headed by Asst. Dist. Atty. Lowell Jensen, reportedly is conducting an inquiry into the use of shotguns in the incident.

The autopsy report said three shotgun pellets lodged in Rector's chest. The point of entry was the left side, just above the left hip.

The coroner's files list Rector's occupation as "laborer," but questions have been raised over the dead man's background.

At a luncheon in Los Angeles, Gov. Reagan said "electronic surveillance equipment" and a rifle that could be broken down and easily concealed had been found in Rector's car.

He said Rector had been shot while on a roof from which steel rods and other dangerous objects were being thrown at officers.

"It's apparent he must have arrived to participate in this thing that was going on," Reagan said.

Berkeley police Friday confirmed Reagan's report, adding that the electronic equipment was a sophisticated telephone bugging device.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, May 29, 1969]

BUCKSHOT MAY BE USED ON UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DEMONSTRATORS, SHERIFF WARNS

BERKELEY.—The Alameda County Sheriff's office said Thursday if it is faced with further disturbances at UC Berkeley it will use shotguns and "we might use buckshot."

Capt. Thomas Houchins, the department's field commander here, also said sheriff's officers used heavy buckshot in policing "people's park" demonstrators May 15 after the officers ran out of birdshot.

One man was killed by the buckshot, which is about one-fourth inch in diameter, and others were wounded.

Houchins' statement was the first from the sheriff's office that buckshot had been used in the disturbances. He said law enforcement officers were dealing with a "full-blown riot." Sheriff Frank Madigan said, "We either had to use shotguns or retreat and surrender the city to the mob."

The outbreak occurred after the university fenced in land it owned and which had been occupied by both students and nonstudents for a "people's park."

Madigan also said he would produce witnesses who would testify that James Rector, 25, of San Jose, who was fatally shot while on a rooftop, was hurling objects at officers.

In answer to charges that arrested demonstrators were mistreated at a county jail, he said: "We have young deputies back from Vietnam . . . and they think these people should be treated like Viet Cong."

But he said he had ordered an investigation of the charges.

Meanwhile, the Berkeley City Council Thursday night debated a proposed compromise for ending the two-week struggle over the "people's park."

UC Berkeley Chancellor Roger W. Heyns outlined the suggested compromise at a press conference Thursday afternoon. It calls for the university to lease nearly one-half of the property to the city at a nominal fee.

The city would then presumably allow continuation of "do it yourself" development of the park by residents of the Telegraph Ave. area.

The leasing arrangement would require approval by the UC Board of Regents.

Board of Regents Chairman DeWitt A. Higgs and several other regents met throughout the afternoon Thursday with Heyns, University President Charles J. Hitch, Berkeley Mayor Wallace Johnson and other university and city officials in an effort to reach a settlement in advance of a mass march today on the people's park.

The council listened to a lengthy succession of speakers, some of them warning against "appeasement" of demonstrators and others accusing Gov. Reagan, Heyns and law enforcement officers of repressing the urge of citizens to create something beautiful.

Leaders of the march, in which students from throughout California are expected to participate, emphasized Thursday that it will be well-monitored by its organizers to avoid violence.

Spokesmen for the organizers said the plan is to march to the park, located three blocks from the university campus, and ask authorities to remove the fence around the property. They said that if the fence is not removed, the crowd will form its own "fence" of human bodies around national guardsmen and police guarding the property.

The students voted 12,719 to 2,175 recently to endorse "continued use and development" of the property by citizens of Berkeley and students.

Heyns refused, however, to consider removing the 8-foot fence around the property at this time. He said this would be possible later when management, design and control of the proposed park have been worked out.

Preceding Thursday evening's lengthy deliberations by the council, Mayor Johnson reiterated his opposition to overcoming the crisis by city lease of the land. He called instead for the regents to hold a special meeting within the next two weeks to "recognize the validity of student demands for a user-participation" in developing the park.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, May 30, 1969]

LAW ENFORCEMENT AT BERKELEY

Issue: How should authorities respond when faced with deliberate provocations, as in the so-called "people's park" situation?

The vicious battle over the so-called "people's park" in Berkeley has demonstrated again a fact of primary importance: the strength and danger of young radicals lies not in their number, which is relatively small, but in their ability to rally popular support by creating situations that arouse the sympathy and backing of moderates.

Overreaction by police and National Guardsmen on and off the Berkeley campus gave rise to the issue the revolutionaries had really sought. The indiscriminate use of buckshot and tear gas, which victimized the innocent more than those who were violating the law, represented a victory for the radicals in their continuing challenge to authority.

The Berkeley radicals, students and non-students alike, wanted a confrontation over the park. They wanted one because, in this instance as in others, their goal was not the achievement of a specific objective, but rather the creating of circumstances that hopefully would breed new revolutionary converts.

To this end they were prepared to—and did—escalate violence to any level that would suit their purpose.

This is something the authorities should have understood and been ready to meet, with a cool and measured response. Instead, they played into the hands of the revolutionaries by a use of repressive force beyond any order of magnitude required. As a result those whom the law was supposed to protect were given cause to distrust and fear the law.

The attempt to thwart the university from reclaiming its private property—the "people's park" area—was undeniably a challenge that had to be met. The land had been illegally occupied and, whatever else was done, converted into a nuisance to the surrounding community. Action was needed to reassert primary rights.

But past experience with the tactics and aims of the radicals should have made clear that such action would have to be most carefully considered and applied. This might have been the university's aim. The situation, however, rapidly went out of control. A riot ensued and, as always, the innocent were done the greatest harm.

A fight over the "people's park" probably was inevitable, given the radicals' deliberate efforts to provoke one. But certainly the authorities should have understood just what the militants were up to, and understanding that, been far more selective in the use of necessary force.

We must face up to the fact that dedicated radicals will continue to foment trouble whenever they can, on whatever pretext. We must also face the fact that authorities will have to be far more discriminating in their response than they have been, to avoid harming those who have done no wrong.

Failure in this area makes constituted authority the unwitting ally of violence-prone militants. When that happens, where does it leave the rest of society?

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 29, 1969]

LATEST BERKELEY BATTLE CALLED CRUSHING LOSS FOR MODERATES

(By Joseph Kraft)

BERKELEY, CALIF.—"Welcome to Prague," says one of the signs protesting students have put up here on the campus of the University of California. And while the comparison with the Soviet rape of Czechoslovakia is far-fetched, the sign is not all black humor.

For the latest battle of Berkeley is an event far more grave than generally supposed, particularly back east where it has been grossly under-reported. What is happening here signifies a major intensification in the academic civil war and a crushing loss for the dwindling band of moderate men holding the narrowing strip of ground that is the middle.

The bare bones of the latest conflict are simple. A group of students and local hippies built a "Peoples' Park" on an unused piece of university land. University authorities, to assert their title, fenced off the plot and brought force to bear.

But the amount of force has been absolutely staggering. More than 2500 troops of the National Guard have been bivouacked on and around the campus. They have been carrying naked bayonets, manning machinegun emplacements, and moving around in heavy weapons-carriers.

Police from Alameda County, Oakland, and other Bay area forces have been brought up, tricked out in helmets and flak jackets. Photographs show them firing with pistols and with shotguns loaded with buckshot. One apparently innocent bystander has been killed.

About a thousand students have been arrested and roughly handled. At the Alameda County prison farm in Santa Rida, hundreds were held for several hours facedown on an asphalt pavement before even being booked, among them a reporter for the San Francisco Chronicle.

Helicopter surveillance of the campus has been constant, and because of the damage they might do to the choppers, kites, according to the students, are not allowed to be flown in Berkeley. In the most dramatic episode, heavy tear gas was released over the campus without warning and in a manner so indiscriminate that the gas enveloped the university hospital and a children's wading pool as well as the demonstrating students.

The application of so much force has brought the students together in almost unanimous opposition to the authorities. Last week 15,000 students—as against 10,000 in the best days of last year's Vietnam protests and about Speech Movement of 1964—called for withdrawal of troops and reopening of the park.

Included in that overwhelming majority is every campus organization from the rah-rah boosters to the left-wing hippies. Particularly bitter are the students who in the past have been deliberately moderate in their politics.

Charles Palmer, a senior going on to the Yale Law School and retiring head of the student government who spent most of the past year combatting left-wingers, is a good case in point. "I used to think it was stupid and offensive to call the cops Pigs," he said. "But for the rest of my life, when I see a blue uniform I'm going to feel bitter."

Perhaps saddest of all is the position of the responsible men supposed to run this university. Charles Hitch, president of the whole California university system, and Roger Heyns, chancellor here at Berkeley, are supreme examples of the new breed in college authorities. They are not so much academicians or fund-raisers as experienced and canny politicians, skilled in accommodating a wide range of conflicting interest groups.

Both men understand that coddling left-wingers and hippies could set in motion against the university a wave of right-wing, reaction. Accordingly, they have gone along with Gov. Ronald Reagan and his increasingly conservative Board of Regents in applying disciplinary sanctions to unruly students. In the past, through elaborate procedural maneuvers, Hitch and Heyns were able to isolate the troublemakers. And thus they held faculty support for disciplinary action.

Now the string has run out on that technique. Gov. Reagan and the Regents have the initiative. They, in effect, forced Hitch and Heyns to start the present confrontation by fencing off the park.

As a result, these sensible university authorities find themselves applying overwhelming force, not against a minority of dissidents trying to shut down the university as in the past, but against an overwhelming majority trying to keep open the park. Not surprisingly, the university authorities have,

for the first time, lost the support of the faculty.

Maybe Hitch and Heyns can still come up with a compromise to avert the new and far more bloody violence that is now shaping up. But their position has been irreparably weakened.

They and all other responsible university officials need a far wider range of alternatives than are presently available. They should not have to surrender to radicals and hippies. But neither should they have to go along—or be willing to go along—with men who have as little sympathy for the life of the mind as the Governor of California.

READING OF NAMES OF AMERICAN DEAD IN VIETNAM ON CAPITOL STEPS

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at 12 noon, I and two of my colleagues joined 12 members of a Quaker action group on the steps of the Capitol in reading the names of the honored American dead in Vietnam from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On Memorial Day, I had the honor of paying similar tribute to these brave men at ceremonies conducted by the American Legion post of my hometown of Monterey Park, Calif.

There was a difference in the two events. In my hometown, before an American Legion honor guard and representatives of every civic organization, I spoke of the ideals these men died to preserve, and the responsibility of the citizens, and their elected representatives, to insure that no American soldier died in a cause that was not just, did not protect freedom, did not promote the welfare of the oppressed people of the earth.

On the steps of the Capitol, speaking only the names of the American dead, I was confronted with a platoon of armed policemen who ordered a halt to the reading of the names, and when this illegal order was not obeyed, arrested the 12 members of the Quaker action group and took them to jail. My request to be arrested with them was refused.

I love my country just as much in Washington, D.C., as I do in Monterey Park, Calif. I honor the American men who have died in Vietnam just as much in Washington, D.C. as I do in Monterey Park. I make the same demands for an immediate end of the war while at home in Monterey Park as I do in these Chambers or on the steps of the Capitol. And I will continue to do so.

But in Washington, D.C., there seems to be more fear that these dead, sent to die by the action or failure to act, of the Members of this body, will return to haunt our dreams.

If we sent these men to die in a mistaken cause, as I believe we did, their deaths will not be absolved by sending even more to die with them. Their deaths will be absolved by rectifying the errors of past policy, by confessing that we sinned, and by choosing the path of righteousness in the future.

I urge this course on my colleagues. I include herewith my own statement

issued yesterday in connection with this event:

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.,
JUNE 4, 1969

I am joining A Quaker Action Group on the Capitol steps today because I share their concern, and I believe that they have an absolute Constitutional right to do what they are doing. I have asked the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate to instruct the Capitol Police not to interfere with the group's efforts to read the roll call of the Vietnam dead from the Congressional Record. I have advised the police that I feel the arrests are unwarranted.

I am in wholehearted agreement with the group's feeling that the Vietnam war is an unnecessary, illegal and immoral war that must be ended. It is a tragic error perpetuated by a stubborn and arrogant bureaucracy.

Over the past five years I have stated many times that I believe there is no chance of a military victory and the 35,000 names of these young Americans who had died bear irrefutable witness to the monstrous cost of this monumental mistake in our foreign policy.

The new Administration is not moving toward peace any faster than the previous Administration. The opportunity to admit past mistakes, with humility, is being lost and the perpetuation of old policies is rapidly making them the new policies, as well—which President Nixon's Administration will be forced to defend.

If we recognize, admit and move to rectify our past mistakes, it would follow that we would have no reason to illegally suppress the efforts of this group. Therefore, I cannot sit idly by and be a party to this suppression by ignoring the arrest and imprisonment of sincere, patriotic and concerned Americans whose only crime is to remind us of the hideous side of the war which we too often tend to forget.

NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, 6 weeks ago, I introduced what I consider to be one of the most urgent measures before Congress—the National Timber Supply Act of 1969. Passage or failure of this measure will in large part determine whether we realize or fail in reaching the national housing goals of 26 million units over the next decade, as established by statute in the National Housing Act of 1968.

Rarely, in my 30 years in this distinguished body, have I seen an agriculture bill which has aroused more fervent and dedicated support among Congressmen representing urban constituencies. In the 6 weeks since I responded to the investigative housing hearings conducted by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) and his Banking and Currency Committee and introduced H.R. 10344 to put our national forests to work to meet the housing goals, 57 other members have cosponsored like legislation. These Members are from the North and the South, the East and the West, the Midwest, and from urban and rural communities alike. They represent both parties and all degrees of attitudes within the parties.

The reason for this cross section of

earnest support is obvious. Congress is genuinely concerned with fulfilling its obligations to the people it is designed to serve. Among these obligations is our statutory commitment to meet the need of every American for a decent place to live.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Forest Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee held 3 days of hearings on H.R. 10034, the Timber Supply Act on May 21, 22, 23. Because so many of the sponsors and cosponsors of the act are members on the Banking and Currency Committee concerned with housing and because these and many other sponsors could not participate in the hearings due to their other obligations, I want to take this opportunity as chairman of the subcommittee to report publicly on my impressions of the hearings.

I think it extremely urgent to report on the many constructive suggestions, to help correct misinterpretations of the intent of this proposal.

I am sure that the many Members of Congress who have publicly expressed endorsement of the Timber Supply Act will be receiving mail expressing the concerns of people that have learned of the hearings. I want to make this report so that a maximum of interested Members and citizens will be fully informed.

I expect that the Forest Subcommittee will hold executive sessions to mark up the bill rather soon and I would like to be sure that there is a maximum of opportunity for accurate understanding of the risks in the alternatives.

It was clearly established in the Banking and Currency Committee hearings in March that the high cost and limited supply of softwood lumber and plywood, which are essential building materials, was the result of limited access to the more than 60 percent of the Nation's total softwood sawtimber which stands on the national forests administered by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture. It was further established that failure of these forests to produce their fair share of the Nation's logs to meet present and projected housing and other wood products requirements is due to inadequate funding of timber management and its related activities.

In this instance, correction, of an obstacle to achievement of national housing goals was the responsibility of the Subcommittee on Forests of the House Agriculture Committee. We have undertaken to fulfill this obligation in the most responsible and expeditious way we know how. The Nation requires 2.6 million housing units each year for 10 years. This requirement comes from population growth, from the formulation of new families, from the number of people in dilapidated housing, and from the displacement of families for highways, airports, and other public works. It will not diminish nor go away simply because we might decline to act promptly. To the contrary, delay in providing adequate supplies of raw material for the manufacture of lumber and plywood can only further intensify and prolong the discomfort—and I might add—discontent of our people who are ill-housed or not housed at all.

URGENCY OF HOUSING GOALS

There is no Member of this Body who does not recall the emphasis placed upon lack of housing as a source of civil unrest. People deserve the opportunity to acquire or to occupy a decent dwelling as a renter or even as a public charge. None of us, I trust, will argue with that fact of life.

Nor is this just an urban problem. As a percentage, of all dwellings, there is more substandard housing in rural than in urban communities. Poor housing in rural communities is a major reason for migration to the cities. The urgency of better housing must concern every part of the country.

I might say, therefore, that I was mightily concerned when the Secretary of Agriculture took the position that no legislation influencing the availability of lumber and plywood should be passed until after the President's task force on lumber and plywood price and availability had completed its findings. The earliest date for the completion of that report that I heard was late in the summer and I was also told it could not be prepared before October—5 months away.

Let it be known throughout this House that Republican members of my subcommittee and other Republican Members have contributed as much to the work on this critical legislation as have my Democratic colleagues. There has been unanimity that so far as within our powers we will correct the deficiencies which have plagued management of our national forest commercial timber and thus relieve the building product restraints, affecting accomplishment of our national housing goals.

Any administration must expect to act promptly to carry out a national goal as expressed by statute. I cannot think of any other areas where Congress and the American people are asked to wait 9 months until the administration decides how and whether to meet a national commitment.

Some of us have differed in small ways as to the language of the enabling legislation to put our national forest timber management on a businesslike basis. None of the Members with whom I have discussed the bill, or who have testified in hearings conducted the week before last, have expressed any doubts as to the necessity and wisdom of the concept we have designed to meet the housing goals in terms of timber availability to do the job. It is my considered opinion that we will have a bill reported out promptly and that it will reflect the views of both the Members of the House and the organizations which testified before our subcommittee so skillfully and so knowledgeably.

NEED FOR NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER

Despite the Administration's preference for delay in the legislative process to accommodate the findings of the task force, I am happy to report that the Department of Agriculture and its principal witness, the Chief of the Forest Service agree with the concept of intensified management of commercial timberlands within the national forests.

They acknowledge the need for more houses, more wood products, and more

timber from the national forests. They expressed, however, reservations about certain aspects of H.R. 10344 and submitted a substitute bill. I have examined the bill carefully as I have the testimony before the hearings and have come to the conclusion that the interests of housing for our people might best be served by the introduction of a new bill.

ADMINISTRATION SUGGESTIONS

The Department of Agriculture substitute bill made certain amendatory suggestions while, as I indicated, embracing the worthy purposes of the proposed act. They suggested amendments which would alter the original bill to first, provide that money from the proposed high timber yield fund would be applied nationwide for more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial forest land; second, add timber management costs, including sales preparation and administration, as a purpose for which the fund may be used; third, we affirm and continue congressional policy emphasis on "multiple use" as the fundamental concept; and, fourth, make permanent the high timber yield fund.

The Department also suggested retitling the bill to "National Forest Timber Supply Act of 1969" since the measure applies only to national forests.

Supporters of the bill in its original form were the vast majority in the testimony heard by the subcommittee. Many Members of Congress either testified personally or submitted supporting statements. The committee is grateful to them all for the tremendous contribution they made to the legislative record since each reflected not only his personal concern for the total national well-being but a complete awareness of the benefits which would be derived either as a consequence of improved timber management or housing availability for his own constituency. These views have been given considerable weight in evaluating the hearings and will have a direct bearing upon the bill which finally emerges from the subcommittee.

While recording the overwhelming support of the bill from the majority of witnesses such as National Association of Home Builders, Home Manufacturers Association, Associated General Contractors, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Society of American Foresters, National American Wholesale Lumber Association, National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, and American Pulpwood Association, it is important to note the major contributions of two non-timber-related witnesses who also supported the measure.

TESTIMONY OF HOUSING EXPERTS

These were Nathaniel S. Keith, president of the National Housing Conference, and Commissioner Walter Washington of Washington, D.C. Mr. Keith testified that—

Housing goals set for the next ten years should not be jeopardized because of insufficient management of our national timberlands.

Commissioner Walter A. Washington

of the District of Columbia, who appeared as an authority on housing and as chief executive of a major American city with which Congress is intimately familiar, stated:

I appear not as an expert on the problem of timber yield, but as the Chief Executive of a large urban center whose population desperately needs more housing. This is my urging to this Committee.

Commissioner Washington then ably detailed the residential construction requirements of the District of Columbia over the next 20 years, and indicated that we must not be concerned only with dwelling units to meet rising populations but with the replacement of units removed for other public works purposes. His testimony, based upon his personal experience in housing and in his evaluation of District of Columbia needs over a projected period was most constructive.

With his usual candor, Commissioner Washington interpolated in his prepared testimony:

I know that there is no doubt but what, if every mayor of every large city had the opportunity, he would be here not only to certify but to speak as I am about the need for wood in relation to the need for added construction of housing.

He added, parenthetically:

It is possible that many of our poor and needy families that may never be able to get to the scenic beauty of our great trees would be able, rather, to get the exposure by looking at cabinets and walls of wood in a decent home in a decent environment in the cities of America. It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is part of our American dream, and it would seem to join one of our great natural resources with human resources to assure a healthy city and a healthy America.

I was deeply moved by the Commissioner's testimony, Mr. Speaker, because as chairman of the District Committee I am painfully aware of the inadequacy of housing availability in our Nation's Capital City. I was moved as well to know that an essential link exists between the needs of our teeming cities where people must live, and the great forests of our Nation where few people live but where science and technology can convert them to serve the needs of our city dwellers both for houses and for recreation.

National forests, Mr. Chairman, are a rare asset of this great Nation for they can serve so many masters and serve them well. As a renewable crop, forests properly fall within the purview of the Agriculture Committees of Congress; as a national resource to be managed in the interest of all the people they properly fall within the interest and responsibility of all Members of the Congress of the United States dedicated as we are to meeting the national needs. Our national forests afford a means to meet our housing obligations, both present and future. It is our obligation to make certain that they do. It is equally our obligation to make certain that their management will not, for one minute, deny to other citizens, already well housed, or to future generations, the opportunity to use our national forests for their own spiritual and recreational enjoyment.

As anticipated, there are those who oppose certain aspects of the measure. Most significantly, however, no criticism merit to the objective or even the means to attain that objective. It related to anxieties for their own use of the national forests. Our subcommittee is determined to fulfill the basic objective for all the people and at the same time allay the fears of those who support the need for housing but do not want timber requirements to interfere with orderly management of other forest values.

TESTIMONY OF WILDLIFE AND RECREATION
WITNESSES

It was heartening to me and to the subcommittee to hear learned testimony from dedicated wildlife, recreation and preservation enthusiasts endorsing the concept of intensified forest management on commercial timberlands in the national forests so that the Nation can fulfill its housing needs. This is positive citizenship of the highest order.

Mr. J. W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America, for instance, testified:

The League for many years has called for an accelerated program for intensified management of national forest resources including the production of timber. . . . We would be happy to see the Congress enact a method of funding which would assure an on-going program, year in and year out, to bring National Forest production of all renewable resources up to full potential on a sustained yield basis.

He expressed concern, however, that the present measure singles out timber production among the several multiple uses of the national forests and thus might be detrimental to the other uses. The subcommittee offered reassurances on that score and indicated that the intent of the measure was to operate the national forests fully within the provisions of the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act of 1960, and the final bill would reaffirm that statutory obligation of the Forest Service.

Mr. Penfold also held that solution of the housing problem should not depend wholly upon increased yields from national forest timberlands but, he said:

Intensified forest management should be applied to all commercial forest lands—Federal, State and private with particular attention to small private holdings which aggregate a substantial portion of our total forest acreage.

The subcommittee is not insensitive to this aspect of increasing national wood product production. It has examined the "Southern Forest Resource Analysis," a comprehensive study of all timberlands in the South with recommendations as to achieving maximum timber management on the nonindustrial private lands. The analysis, privately and cooperatively funded by responsible organizations at considerable expense, is wholly directed to the evolution of precisely the kind of timber management relationship among public and private owners which Mr. Penfold seeks. Legislation enabling Federal participation in this public-private program will undoubtedly be of future concern of the Forest Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee. But the current bill must properly concern itself only with the commercial timber-

lands on the national forests since they are the only ones under congressional management. We cannot wait upon others to do with their forests what we know should be done with public forests.

Further, Mr. Penfold expressed doubts about the allocations of funds from the high timber yield funds to the forest of origin, pointing out that this would deny funds to forests where neglect over the years has reduced their yield. As I indicated earlier, the Department of Agriculture substitute bill suggests that flexibility should be provided for application of available dollars, irrespective of the forest that produced the dollars. I think the subcommittee sense is that this is not an unreasonable approach and several members so expressed themselves during the hearings.

Mr. Penfold also expressed some concern that assignment of timber sale receipts to the high timber yield fund would stimulate the Forest Service to harvest areas which might have higher value for other purposes than timber.

But section 7(1) states clearly that the proposed act is intended to apply only to areas which are classified by the Forest Service as commercial timberlands. Lands so designated are already susceptible to timber harvest and form the basis of existing harvesting rates. Passage of this legislation will not in any way alter the present statutory obligations imposed upon the Forest Service to consider multiple use and wilderness values in its timber management planning. No doubt, the subcommittee will want to further specify that intent by including specific language.

Mr. Penfold further tended to misinterpret, I believe, the intention of section 7 of the bill which might be termed the policy section instructing the Secretary of Agriculture in his responsibilities with respect to administration of the act. The section directs the Secretary to revise allowable annual harvesting rates in National Forests to take into account rotation ages that will produce the most efficient tree sizes at the expected time of harvest. Mr. Penfold and some others I fear, misread the directive referring to tree sizes "appropriate for conversion technology and anticipated market requirements" to mean that the Secretary would be obliged to anticipate future markets and adjust cutting rates to accommodate to them. This is not the intention. The bill stipulates that rotation ages for harvest are variable and that as improved methods of conversion and utilization are developed, it may be desirable to revise the plans in regard to age—size—at time of harvest to accommodate to that change.

It is necessary to explain that revision of allowable harvesting rates would continue to be at the discretion of the Secretary and could be downward as well as upward depending on the effectiveness of regenerative measures.

I am most sensitive, however, to the honest misunderstanding which could occur in the language of the bill and will submit new language to eliminate every possible ambiguity to overcome this difficulty of interpretation.

I have dwelt at some length on Mr. Penfold's concerns because, in sum, they

have stated well the basis for opposition by some in this recreation community. The same general tenor was contained in the testimony of the National Wildlife Federation, the Wilderness Society, and the American Forestry Association. It would appear that these groups had given careful cooperative consideration to the bill and had generally agreed on the areas requiring clarification before they could endorse the bill.

I have earnestly considered their valid objections and have, where no violence is done to the basic purpose of providing greater timber yield through better forest management practices, accommodated to them in the revised bill I am about to introduce.

OPPOSITION WITNESSES

Both the Sierra Club and Citizens Committee on Natural Resources were wholly opposed to the bill in its present form. They suggest that pressures for production of timber would result in extensive overcutting on National Forests. The Sierra Club further expressed anxiety that the Forest Service would be obliged to harvest on lands now classified as commercial timberlands and would be constrained from reclassifying such lands as wilderness or primitive areas in the future. This is not the fact, as I have said, since the provisions of existing statutes with respect to management of the national forests would in no way be altered by this bill.

Dr. Edward C. Crafts, former Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of Interior, represented the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources and afforded the subcommittee the benefit of his long experience. His presentation was thoughtful and thorough. I believe, however, as in the case of other conservation witnesses and organizations he had read into the language of the proposed bill certain hazards to forest use which are not intended nor contemplated, nor provided for in the original bill.

While I have touched upon many of Dr. Crafts' arguments against the bill in my earlier remarks I think it might be beneficial to analyze his objections in detail since they were so well stated and represent the broad views of those concerned with recreation matters. I trust that my analysis of his statement is sound and that my response to his objections will win the support of his group.

Dr. Crafts stipulated five basic objections: First, he said:

The bill ignores and appears to override the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960.

He argued that a special fund, for timber management only, places timber in a first priority position and objected to the phrase "optimum timber productivity" as implying a priority of timber use.

Comment: The question raised by Dr. Crafts, rather than relating to the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960, appears to be directed toward the effect of the bill on contests for land use priority. As I stated earlier, the bill makes absolutely no alteration in land-use priority relationships as to timber and other national forest uses. This priority was established in the Organic Act of 1897, and the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act

of June 12, 1960. The current bill would establish policies and provide funds to improve yields on lands the Secretary or Congress determines are available for timber production. The determination of the lands thus available resides where it has always resided and is unchanged by the bill. Changes will be made through an entirely separate decision making prices wholly outside the province of this bill.

PRECEDENT OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Dr. Crafts appeared to have made an unwarranted assumption that the act of establishing a special fund for timber management would therefore place timber in a first priority position. It was Dr. Crafts who basically originated and obtained passage of the Land and Water Conservation Act which established such a special fund for recreation, part of which is used by the Forest Service. I am sure that he would not have argued against the Land and Water Conservation Act on the grounds that such an act would place recreation in a priority position over other values.

While I totally differ with Dr. Crafts as to the impact of H.R. 10344 on multiple use priorities, I see no objection to specifying within the bill that the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act is in no way altered, and that the objective of "optimum timber productivity" would apply to lands available for timber production subject to such constraints as may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Second, Dr. Crafts also took exception to the policy section, section 7 on the grounds that it "could be used against the Forest Service to pressure it to do things the bill intends even if the money is not appropriated." His thought is that Congress might not appropriate the moneys necessary to grow trees at rates the Department would be pressured to harvest.

Comment: While upward revision of allowable cuts beyond that supported by sound forest management is not intended in this bill, it is possible to conceive the situation as Dr. Crafts suggests. In corrective language, I have drafted an addition to the end of section 7 which will, I believe completely eliminate that eventuality.

Third, Dr. Crafts also raised the concern that—

A special fund for timber purposes will make it harder to obtain regular appropriations for other purposes.

Comment: This bill was developed as a positive means to cope with critical lumber and plywood shortages in the face of national housing commitments over the next decade and, in view of population projections, beyond. It does not detract or borrow from any need or justification for other national forest activities. The suggestion that this provision to increase timber supplies will cause Appropriations Committees to curtail amounts which might otherwise be appropriated for other purposes is, I am certain, a misreading of the responsible approach which characterizes these Committees. I think it further underestimates the power of the recreation, wildlife and preservation lobby efforts.

Fourth, Dr. Crafts took issue with the provision which places money in the fund for only 2 years. He stated:

This means the Forest Service will be under continuous pressure to make the cut as high as possible in order to have money in the Fund for appropriation.

Comment: This method of disposing of unappropriated funds was patterned after the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and it originated there as an amendment to overcome objections to establishment of a special fund. To my knowledge no difficulties have arisen from it in the administration of that act. It was, frankly, adopted as a means to avoid unnecessary difficulties related to "earmarking." There is no valid reason to expect that this provision will put pressure on the Forest Service.

ALLOTMENT FORMULA

Fifth, Dr. Crafts criticized, as did some other groups as mentioned earlier, and members of the subcommittee as well, the allotment formula for the high timber yield fund. He asserted that it "would interfere with good forest management."

Comment: The provision that allocations from the fund will be made to national forest in amounts substantially proportionate to contributions to the fund from each forest during the preceding 2 fiscal years, as indicated, has been questioned by members, and the department as well as Dr. Crafts. The system in the bill which is criticized is a guide but the critics overlook the fact that a variance is also provided which allows complete discretion in allocation between forests so long as expenditures are in accordance with the purposes of increasing timber growth. A full discussion of why this procedure was specified is contained in Senator SPARKMAN's statement with respect to the bill printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 18. He stated the premise so clearly that I include the appropriate portion of his remarks at this point in my remarks:

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT OF SENATOR SPARKMAN

Section 6 of the bill specifies that allocations from the fund will be made by national forests in amounts substantially proportionate to contribution to the fund from each forest during the preceding two fiscal years. This provision will put 65 per cent of timber receipts back for expenditure on the forest where they were earned. (Twenty-five per cent of each forest's receipts are turned over to the counties in which the forest is located and ten per cent are available for forest roads and trails within the State in which the forest is located.)

Timber receipts are the product of the volume of timber cut and its average unit price, subject to minor annual variations due to changes in the level of advance deposits maintained by timber purchasers. The provision for use of a two year average will iron out effects from fluctuations in advance deposit levels.

Volume cut and its average unit price are guides to the areas with better rates of growth and better quality species. Hence timber receipts by forests are a simple and reliable index of opportunities and needs to increase timber yields.

Other simple indices, such as commercial forest area or volume cut, would result in some diversion of funds from areas with better growth potential for preferred quality species to areas where unit timber values are

low and where intensive management measures would result in less than average yield increases.

The bill establishes allocations in proportion to receipts as a basic guideline, but recognizes that variations may be necessary in a few isolated cases to justify a larger proportion of funds going into a forest that has outstanding potential for increased yield. Thus, if the allocation by receipts formula should fail to meet the needs and opportunities on any forests, it can be modified without amending the basic act.

There were 50 forests which had receipts of less than \$100,000 in fiscal year 1967. Forty of these forests are in eastern Montana, the Rocky Mountain and Intermountain states, in southern Arizona and in New Mexico. All of these forests have a low proportion of commercial forest land and their commercial lands are relatively arid and of low productivity. The opportunities and needs for intensive timber management on these forests is roughly proportionate to the low level of receipts they have attained. In addition to this group of 40 forests there are ten other forests with less than \$100,000 annual timber receipts. These are: a) the four southern and one east side Sierra forests in California where timber production is minor and incidental to watershed and recreation management; b) three acquired forests in Missouri, Illinois and Indiana-Ohio. Two of these have the two smallest areas of commercial forest land (except for extremely arid western forests) in the national forest system. The Missouri forest is made up primarily of acquired hard cut lands which because of low growth rates have been slow in recovery to full productivity; and the two forests in Alaska. The Chugach Forest is still close to marginal operability and has very limited opportunities for intensive management in the immediate future.

The Tongass forest in Alaska is a special case because under the Tongass Timber Act of 1946, all timber receipts are deposits into a special fund to be held for disbursement until Indian claims on the Tongass forest are adjudicated. Hence there are no deposits from timber cutting into the national forest receipt fund. While the cut on this forest is now close to 500 million board feet annually, the opportunities and need for intensive management measures are neither large or pressing. It is probable that either a portion of the Tongass timber fund will be released to national forest receipts by special authorization or that the Indian claims will be adjudicated before it becomes urgent to have funds available for intensive management measures on this forest.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me despite the perfectly adequate justification for this method that an acceptable compromise wording of this allotment formula should be included in the bill submitted for floor action.

Everyone agrees that the high timber yield fund moneys should be allotted where needs and opportunities for increasing timber growth are the greatest. I recognize the desire of the agency to have maximum discretion as to where to use this money but Congress knows that without guidelines it will be doubtful if its use will have highest effectiveness in meeting current timber supply problems. It is evident to the subcommittee and to the majority of foresters who testified that our first responsibility is to recently cut areas. That means prompt and full stocking if we are to have high timber yield, plus spacing control. Forest Service Chief Cliff wisely said:

We would expect, as a matter of regular prudent expenditure of funds to complete work on highly productive sites before commencing work on sites of less productivity.

I consider it necessary to include such wording in the act for the guidance of our Appropriation Committee, otherwise I fear the fund in future years there is danger that pressures unrelated to the Nation's wood needs could divert its use to other purposes. I am asking the department to supply the subcommittee with wording that will make clear that the fund will be: first, used only for increasing timber yields; second, used first on cut over areas for quick regeneration and spacing control; third, used on every national forest that sells timber; and, fourth, used on each national forest on the sites that will have the best cost benefit ratio from the standpoint of increasing timber yield.

Actually, the present wording would accomplish the above in my opinion. It has the unique virtue of guaranteeing funds for high yield forestry to each timber selling forest even though it may be less productive than another. Forests are not compelled to compete for funds on the basis of productivity. I don't think critics of the present wording realized its virtues. On the basis of the chief's testimony I have concluded there are no differences in objectives between the timber supply act sponsors and the Department of Agriculture.

Dr. Crafts did the subcommittee the courtesy of suggesting several constructive suggestions for other ways in which to meet the timber supply problem as it influences housing. While these proposals were generally well intentioned the record shows that they were considered in the Banking and Currency Committee hearings. The consensus was that this legislation is the best feasible means to overcome existing restraints on improved management of national forest commercial timber lands.

It is the purpose of this legislation with which I am directly concerned to accomplish this purpose.

REVISED BILL

Therefore, having had the benefit of superior testimony from a number of highly qualified and properly motivated members, private citizens, public officials and other interested parties, it is my intention to within the near future introduce a revised bill entitled "The National Forest Timber Supply Act of 1969." This measure reflects and responds to the many corrective suggestions made by the witnesses including the administration and by the subcommittee members. It adopts the department's new wording for the first five sections and for the title of section 6. It retains the wording of H.R. 10344 for sections 6 and 7 with changes that I have mentioned.

It will, with the concurrence of the subcommittee, be the bill subjected to intensive review and consideration in executive session. As its sponsor, I plan to introduce it within the next few days for myself and for those cosponsors of the original bills who wish to join me on the amended version.

GOVERNMENT ADMITS ILLEGAL WIRETAPPING

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I was dismayed to read in this morning's Washington Post a story which indicates that during 1964 and 1965 the U.S. Government, through the instrumentality of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, was engaged in a deliberate, protracted, conscious course of conduct which it now admits was illegal—tapping the telephone of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. What are the citizens of this Nation to think—what is the rest of the world to think—when it is revealed that a winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, a leader of the nonviolent civil rights movement in America, who was respected by blacks and whites alike, a man who had become a symbol of hope and racial reconciliation for an entire nation, had his telephone tapped and his privacy invaded by the Nation's foremost law enforcement agency?

Of all the Orwellian possibilities which race through the mind, in light of these revelations, two observations seem particularly appropriate in light of the mood which seems to prevail in our Nation today. First, the King wiretapping revelations point out once again what civil libertarians have known for years—that there can be no such thing as "a little wiretapping." A little wiretapping is like a little pregnancy. It is then too late to start drawing lines and making nice distinctions. This incident, in short, should serve to point out to Congress once again how big a step was taken when the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, and particularly title III of that act, authorized law-enforcement wiretapping on a broad scale.

An anecdote may serve to illustrate how dangerous the single-minded dedication of confirmed wiretappers can be. It is reported that when Gestapo records from Berlin were captured after the fall of the Nazi capital, those records revealed that on the day Berlin fell, Gestapo agents were still tapping the telephones of German housewives and arresting them for antiregime statements. On the day Berlin fell. Truly such dedication to wiretapping qualifies those who participate in it as, in Justice Brandeis' words, "men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding." In the face of disclosures such as that made yesterday, we can only question whether the men who authorize and participate in such activities really understand the far-reaching implications of what they are doing. There are societies where all social and political leaders must anticipate that their telephones will be tapped; but they are not free societies. America has never been such a society. But can we be certain, in light of yesterday's disclosures, that it is not becoming one.

A second point deserves to be made about the King wiretapping revelations. We have heard much talk recently of the need for law and order in America. Do these words not turn sour in our mouths when we hear that the Nation's chief law-enforcement agency, the agency which for years has been held up to citizens and other police departments as the shining example of integrity and law enforcement probity, has been guilty of activities which it is now admitted are

illegal? It is difficult to talk of law and order to the citizens when the FBI engages in illegal wiretapping. It is difficult to talk of having confidence in one's Government when that Government is illegally invading the privacy of its citizens. It is difficult to ask the black people in America to keep faith with our country and its ability to solve their problems when that country subjects America's foremost black leader to the indignity of having his telephone tapped.

Mr. Speaker, one of the FBI operatives associated with the King wiretapping told the Washington Post that the Bureau "did not follow regular policy on this particular—King—surveillance." What are we to make of this disclosure? Does this mean that the Bureau undertakes wiretapping on its own authority? Does it mean that anyone the Director thinks is a troublemaker or a malcontent is subjected to surreptitious electronic surveillance? Director Hoover and Attorney General Mitchel need to reassure the citizens of this Nation. They should state categorically that no wiretapping is being carried on by the Federal Government except in conformity with existing Federal law. They should state publicly that all the judicial warrant procedures written into law last year are now being complied with in every respect.

Finally, Congress ought to review again the sweeping wiretapping authorizations which were enacted into law last year. These broad authorizations, which give the Attorney General virtual carte blanche in any case which is determined to affect "the security of the United States," will be the source of continuing distrust of the Government by citizens of this country. Until these vague and unduly broad authorizations are reduced in reach and scope, everyone who hears this or reads this has reason to fear an encroachment on their liberties. If Dr. King is the first revelation, there will be others, there will be more—unless we act to restrict the presently almost unlimited authority of the Attorney General to tap telephones upon no more than a belief that national security is involved. I hope soon to introduce for myself and such other Members of Congress as are interested a bill to reduce the scope of last year's broad wiretapping law. In the meantime, I ask my colleagues to contemplate the results of the King wiretapping revelations on our citizen's attitudes toward their police and their Government. Such thoughts cannot be reassuring.

The article referred to follows:

CLAY HEARING REVEALS FBI TAPPED KING

(By Nicholas C. Chriss)

HOUSTON, June 4.—A Federal District Court hearing today into an effort by Cassius Clay to overthrow a 1967 draft-evasion conviction turned into a startling disclosure of FBI eavesdropping methods and secret surveillance reports.

The summaries of four "top secret" and illegal FBI wiretapped conversations Clay had with the late Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and various Black Muslim leaders in 1964 and 1965 were publicly revealed for the first time over Government objections.

It was also the first time it had been spelled out officially that the FBI actually had eavesdropped on Dr. King.

The revelation of the conversations, the times and places and the introduction of the documents as evidence were made in a six-hour hearing that also produced details on how active the investigative agency was in monitoring the telephone conversations of various Black Muslim leaders.

The former world heavyweight champ's attorneys contend that the wiretap evidence is relevant to the case because it might have been used to prejudice his attempt to declare himself a conscientious objector to the draft. The monitored conversations were not revealed by the Federal Government until the boxer's conviction had reached the U.S. Supreme Court, which ordered the hearing.

Federal lawyers contended the conversations took place in 1964 and 1965 and therefore could not have affected the 1967 draft-dodging conviction against Clay, nor the 1966 ruling exempting him from a conscientious objector status.

Clay's telephone apparently was not tapped in any of the four conversations, but the telephones of those persons who called him or received calls from him were monitored. His lawyers called Clay "the innocent third party."

John S. Martin, an attorney in the U.S. Solicitor General's office and a member of the prosecution team here, said the revelation of Dr. King's conversation was the first time it had been officially revealed that the civil rights leader had been under FBI electronic surveillance. Martin also acknowledged that the four FBI wiretaps were illegal and that the Government did not choose to contest the legality of them.

Most of the information about the FBI wiretapping and surveillance came as Clay's attorney, Charles Morgan Jr. of Atlanta, southern representative of the American Civil Liberties Union, pressed an FBI agent who had once been in charge of monitoring Dr. King's conversation in Atlanta.

Richard Nichols, now based in Valdosta, Ga., testified that the FBI "did not follow regular policy on this particular (King) surveillance." He did not elaborate.

Nichols said two "investigative clerks" recorded the conversations. Then, he said, they either penciled notes on the contents of the tapes or logged a summary and then destroyed the tape. He said all the King-monitored tapes had been destroyed.

The contents of the four conversation summaries included talks with Dr. King, Elijah Muhammad, head of the Black Muslims; Herbert Muhammad, a Black Muslim and Clay's former fight manager; John Ali, Black Muslim national executive secretary, and Chauncey Eskridge, a Chicago attorney who represents Clay. Eskridge, at the time, also represented Dr. King.

Clay was convicted here June 21, 1967, of refusing induction into the U.S. Army. An all-white jury convicted him after deliberating 20 minutes. Judge Joe Ingraham then sentenced him to the maximum penalty—five years in prison and a \$10,000 fine.

The most interesting of the four FBI-monitored conversations included a 45-minute telephone talk Clay had with Dr. King Sept. 4, 1964. The conversation was recorded in Atlanta and on the Miami end of the line were—alternately—Eskridge, Elijah Muhammad and Clay. Although the conversation lasted some 45 minutes, according to Eskridge who testified in the courtroom later, the summarized conversation consisted of little more than 12 lines.

The summary stated:

"Chauncey (Eskridge) to MLK (King), said he is in Miami with Cassius, MLK spoke to Cassius, they exchanged greetings, MLK wished him well on his recent marriage, C (Clay) invited MLK to be his guest at his next championship fight, MLK said he would like to attend. Cassius said that he is keeping up with MLK, that MLK his brother, and with him 100 per cent but can't take

any chances, and that MLK should take care of himself, that MLK is known world wide and should watch out for them whites (sic), said that people in Nigeria, Egypt and Ghani (sic) asked about MLK."

Clay had been a guest and visited in the three African countries earlier in 1964.

Other secret conversation summaries introduced in the court took place on Oct. 22, 1964; March 24, 1964, and April 22, 1965.

MEANING OF THE LIFE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on May 28 I addressed myself to the remarks made by my colleague from Louisiana which implied that the late Dr. Martin Luther King was an agent of the Communist conspiracy. At that time I strongly disputed those insinuations. In answer to my remarks, the distinguished Congressman from Louisiana inserted numerous articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD supposedly proving King's Communist connections. For the most part, the insertions were hearsay, gossip, and allegations from dubious sources.

I do not dispute the fact that Communists have attempted to use the civil rights movement for their own purposes. The gross discrimination that has previously existed in this country is a breeding ground for discontent. Martin Luther King and his followers dedicated their lives to the removal of this discrimination, and the fight for equal justice under the law. The Communists seized upon this issue to foment destruction and violence. It is the Martin Luther Kings who have tried to keep the disgruntled minorities within the system and achieve progress within the concept of democracy and freedom. In this respect King was a leader in the fight against communism. Martin Luther King did not fight communism with empty words and spurious denunciations. He fought communism with action. Martin Luther King showed his people that progress and racial justice can be achieved within the American system. King rejected the foreign ideologies that would seek to destroy our country.

I now insert a number of commentaries by Members of this body on the meaning of the life of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.:

A statement by Hon. HENRY HELSTOSKI, April 10, 1968;

A statement of Hon. DON EDWARDS, April 11, 1968;

A statement of Hon. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, April 11, 1968;

A statement by Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., April 10, 1968;

A statement by Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH, April 11, 1968;

A statement by Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN;

A statement by Hon. PHILLIP BURTON;

A statement by Hon. ROBERT N. NIX;

A statement by Hon. PATSY MINK;

A statement by Senator Gruening, April 10, 1968;

A statement by Senator Long of Missouri;

A statement by Senator JAVITS, April 10, 1968;

A statement by Hon. BERTRAM L. PODELL, April 9, 1968;

A statement by Hon. MELVIN PRICE;

A statement by Hon. WILLIAM D. FORD, April 9, 1968;

A statement by Hon. BEN REIFEL, April 8, 1968;

A statement by Hon. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, April 9, 1968;

A statement by Hon. VANCE HARTKE, April 17, 1968;

A statement by Hon. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, April 8, 1968;

A statement by Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO, April 9, 1968;

A statement by Hon. THADDEUS DULSKI, April 9, 1968;

A statement by Hon. HASTINGS KEITH, April 9, 1968;

A statement by Senator BROOKE;

A statement by Senator WILLIAMS, April 19, 1968; and

A statement by Senator PROXMIRE, April 19, 1968.

The material follows:

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(By Hon. HENRY HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey, Apr. 10, 1968)

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, a span of 5 years is a very short time in the annals of history, yet in that short span we have seen two assassinations of two great leaders, each in his own field of endeavor. John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., were the unfortunate victims of what surely must have been a demented mind.

These senseless killings were both American tragedies, and devoid of any meaning. The murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in Memphis, is an event of horror and shame to America and a shock to the world.

Martin Luther King dreamed of an America without racial prejudice where each man, woman, and child would be judged by their character and not by the color of their skin.

It is sad, indeed, that the death of Martin Luther King, Jr., a leader of nonviolence in the movement to obtain equality for his people, stirred up so much violent reaction in the cities of our country. If Dr. King could speak, he probably would continue to ask his people to stop this lawlessness and terror, and continue their efforts to obtain equality through peaceful and sensible means.

Many have fallen in the same cause as Dr. King. However, it is a great misfortune that this apostle of nonviolence and a winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, himself became a victim of a violent act which need not have happened.

Although Dr. King spoke of nonviolence, violence often attended his actions. And, at the last, he himself met a violent end.

A great man was taken away from us. This terrible tragedy has removed one of the most inspiring leaders that this country has produced.

STATEMENT OF THE CALIFORNIA FARMER-CONSUMER INFORMATION COMMITTEE HONORING THE MEMORY OF REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(By Hon. DON EDWARDS of California, April 11, 1968)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, all of us feel the shame and despair from the terrible murder of Martin Luther King, a man who deeply and sincerely felt the peace and hope for justice to which we all aspire. His life was an inspiration to the socially concerned who have dedicated their efforts to making a decent world a reality and his death, a shocking stimulus to quickened action.

Such are the sentiments behind the statement I just received from the California Farmer-Consumer Information Committee on the death of Dr. King and I now place this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

"STATEMENT OF THE CALIFORNIA FARMER-CONSUMER INFORMATION COMMITTEE HONORING THE MEMORY OF REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

"CALIFORNIA FARMER-CONSUMER INFORMATION COMMITTEE,
"Santa Clara, Calif., April 6, 1968.

"Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
"President of the United States.
"Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives:

"The California Farmer Consumer Information Committee, on the basis of policies which have guided us since our formation in February, 1941,

"Joins all dedicated groups in the United States and throughout the world in honoring the memory of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., *Negro leader of the oppressed of all races.*

"Sacrificed to the unquenched and unrestrained forces of bigotry which betray real 'Americanism', Dr. King's assassination on April 4, 1968, places upon each of us new responsibilities to wipe out forever every form of racial discrimination, north and south, east and west, nationally and internationally.

"This is no time for recrimination nor partisanship. It is time for action: 'a time to lift our nation from the quicksand of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood', as Dr. King stated in Washington, D.C., on August 28, 1963.

"A Nobel Prize Winner, Dr. King moved into the world arena in his quest for an end to war, as a means of settling international conflicts, as he stood for an end to violence to settle the burning grievances of unshackled slaves, still shackled legally and illegally in this nation their labor unstintingly helped to build.

"Legislation to assure a greater measure of civil rights for all minorities is now before the Congress. It must be vigorously supported and passed at once.

"As our Committee said in June 1944, quoting Justice Robert W. Kenny, then State Attorney General, when he addressed 65,000 San Franciscans on the occasion of the May 21, 1944 'I am an American Day':

"The Battle of Americanism is not completely won. It will never be completely won. It is a live thing. It grows. It improves. It wants the children to have a better and fuller life than the parents had.

"Like Liberty, Americanism can be had only at the cost of eternal vigilance . . .

"The strength of America depends upon conviction. The struggle for Americanism is one of education and example.

"The lash, the concentration camp, the book-burning orgies—implements of a Master Race, dare not meet the challenge of thinking men. . . .

"Americanism today is at half mast. During the past quarter century it has deteriorated to a new low.

"Only we, the people, can again raise its banner to its full potential.

"The time is now!

"In the name of the half million members of our Committee's affiliated farm, cooperative, labor, consumer, church, resources, professional and community organizations and individuals, rural and urban.

"Respectfully submitted,

"Mrs. GRACE McDONALD,
"Executive Secretary."

THE KING IS DEAD

(By Hon. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, of Maine,
Apr. 11, 1968)

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, in cities across the country, teams are in the streets

to assess the material and physical damage left in the wake of civil disturbances spurred by the tragic death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. In those same cities, teams of distressed, concerned citizens are attempting to make a different, a more difficult assessment—trying to determine the extent of the damages inflicted upon the civil rights movement by the violent death of their non-violent leader and the violent repercussions.

On April 16, 1963, Martin Luther King wrote from his jail cell in Birmingham:

"Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly affects all indirectly."

Dr. King's words will echo for years as man searches for ways to express his philosophy of brotherhood. Dr. King's words of 1963 emphasize what we fully realize today—no one in the country escaped the sad, agonizing causes and effects of this senseless tragedy. The killing of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., has affected all our destinies. It has affected the destiny of the civil rights movement and the brotherhood for which Dr. King struggled. The shape of that destiny lies resting now—not without anxiety—in the hands and the hearts of all Americans.

Reasons failed humanity when Dr. King fell dead. In lieu of reason, emotion took hold and violence erupted. The sting of tragedy is gone but the solace of tragedy remains. The reality of the death of a great American leader is with us—and reason must return. In the aftermath of violence, in the aftermath of the lack of reason, Americans must pull together, come to grips with some grim realities. Americans must reason.

Prior to the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., there were no curfews in American cities—but all was not well in America. Citizens went normally about their daily lives—but all was not well in America.

On the day before his death, Dr. King was clinging to his efforts toward a nonviolent revolution to equality for American citizens. He faced a court injunction, a new generation of Negro leadership bent on violent revolution; he faced the possibility that the U.S. Congress would not write justice into the law of the land, he coped with the serious lack of funds for urgently needed domestic programs. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., 1 day prior to his death knew—all was not well in America.

But it was hope and not despair that King preached as he prophetically spoke of the top of the mountain, the promised land of harmony, peace, respect, and dignity for all Americans. One day following the death of Martin Luther King, agony echoed the truth he had known—that all was not well, indeed not well, in America.

Not long ago, we were reminded by a great American President of a Chinese proverb, "a journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step." The Nation watched as that President, John F. Kennedy, joined by Martin Luther King, took those first steps toward the brotherhood of man. The Nation watched as John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King fell from assassins' bullets. Both great Americans gave this country hope. Americans need not despair but cleave to that legacy of hope as we continue the journey.

Eight years ago—when the late President Kennedy took office, the journey looked long. Prior to the historic march on Washington led by Dr. King in 1963, the journey was long. Prior to the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the journey looked long. Prior to this week's passage of the fair housing law, the journey looked long. Now, we are on the way to the mountaintop.

When every man who wants to work can receive training and subsequent employment, when no man is refused a job because of color or faith, when every man has an equal chance to a share of this economy—then Americans will be closer to the mountaintop.

When we Americans have insured full educational opportunities to every child in this Nation, when we can point to as well as profess that education is the key to understanding—we will be closer to the mountaintop.

When this Nation of plenty has fed the hungry within its own boundaries, when the shame of starvation in the United States of America no longer dons our visage, then we will be nearer the top.

When Americans insist that no baby in this country will die of rabbit, that rats are not a laughing matter, that slums are not for living but for clearing, then we will have sight of the mountaintop.

When Americans say, "This has gone far enough, something must be done"—and you learn they are referring to the injustice of prejudice and not to the civil rights movement, then we will be on the threshold of the mountaintop.

When the conscience of America demands full funding for programs developed to erase the blight spreading as a result of our negligence, we will have stepped on the mountaintop.

When every American is proud of his manhood, when he enters a community without fear of disgrace or embarrassment, when he is described by his character, integrity, and personality, when Americans join hands and walk through open doors together—then we will be on the top of the mountain.

Out of respect for those who could see that mountaintop from a great distance, surely Americans will commit themselves to finish that long journey. Martin Luther King asked for a commitment which began with laws but which must end with love. If out of his dream and his death, we can salvage the understanding and love necessary to shape the destiny he envisioned for all Americans, then Martin Luther King shall not have died in vain.

A MAN FOR ALL SEASONS AND ALL PEOPLE

(By Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr., of
Massachusetts, April 10, 1968)

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., has been characterized in many ways. He was called a man of God, a man of peace, a man of love, and a man of right. He was all these things and more.

He had a vision of what America could and should be, and he devoted his life to make our Nation fulfill its own promise and its own heritage. His dream for America was a land where freedom, justice, and equality were not words or slogans, but fact, and a way of life.

He was among the most eloquent of men, for his words came from his loving soul and his brilliant mind. And he seemed to have grasped the truth that so often evades us.

His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing and the Honorable Kevin White, mayor of Boston, addressed 30,000 mourners on the Boston Common on Monday. They were there to find comfort and courage, and perhaps some of that faith that served Martin Luther King throughout his life.

Cardinal Cushing and Mayor White provided solace, but more importantly, they charged America with a task and a road to follow toward equal opportunity for all.

His Eminence said:

"Dr. King summons us now to a march that has no ending, to a dream from which there is no waking, to a task that will consume all of the hours of all our days."

Mayor White spoke to all of us when he said:

"Let us pledge ourselves in this holy hour, before God and our neighbor, that we will build a new world of dignity and justice, of hope and opportunity, from which no man will be excluded."

Mr. Speaker, I include the complete texts of these statements in the Record:

"[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald Traveler, Apr. 9, 1968]

"ADDRESS OF CARDINAL CUSHING AT CEREMONIES ON COMMON

"Our age may not seem to be an age of saints, but, it surely is an age of martyrs. God's mysterious Providence has now summoned from among us one more of our heroes, leaving the memory of a great soul who sought only the love of his own brother.

"Living men will not forget the rousing beauty of his voice, the courage that disdained all danger, the burning charisma of his silent heart. We are bruised and saddened by a loss more profound than we can yet realize, we are bewildered by a cruel act of violence that has snatched from our midst a man of peace.

"We know that Dr. Martin Luther King was not afraid of death; he had faced its threat so many times, he knew its features well. He was a man of God, and so too a man of faith, for whom this world held promise of another where among the blessed he lives this day.

"From his faith came the grace and inspiration that gave meaning to his every action, that made bearable the long and lonely nights, the miles of marching, the days in prison cells, the heaped abuses of the law, and all the troubles of a people scorned.

"This faith in God gave wings to his words, summoned to his side strong Christian souls, rallied the conscience of millions, changed the laws of a land, and gave new meaning to human brotherhood.

"This was a faith that, literally, moved mountains, melting the accumulated prejudice of generations, and making the way straight for justice too long delayed.

"It is this faith in whose promise this afternoon Dr. Martin Luther King finds all his longings fulfilled, all his pains soothed, all his struggles resolved, as he rests eternally in the bosom of God.

"But this was another faith, similarly powerful and moving, which was part of the character of this gentle man of God. As he had an unquenchable faith in God, so too he had an unfailing faith in his fellow man. Like any great leader in human history, he summoned to himself kindred spirits, those who shared his ideals and aspirations, and who were willing also to share his anxieties and trials.

"Even those who watched from afar caught something of the confidence and trust he felt in man's ability to see the right to follow the star, to choose the better path. The 'non-violent way,' which he preached and practiced, saw no merit in forcing the human spirit; man could be brought to goodness by example and persuasion, and one day the righteous would overcome.

"Dr. King has left us a legacy that is rich beyond all counting, it is a new expression of the ancient faith that is summed up in the love of God and love of neighbor.

"Let us challenge what men call impossible, endure what seems unbearable, penetrate what appears to be impassable, and create in this very generation what has been man's dream since the dawn of time. It will not be Camelot, it will not be Utopia; it will be real, and it will be ours.

"We have trifled too long, all of us, with words and admonitions; we have done so little when so much was required. In this dark hour, with our whole nation in mourning, we must judge ourselves, and take the measure of our failings. We were all in Memphis, one way or another, on Thursday night and the violence and death there must touch the conscience of every citizen.

"Nothing that we can do will bring back the life that was lost, but what we can do will assure that it was not spent in vain.

"Dr. King summons us now to a march that has no ending, to a dream from which there is no waking, to a task that will consume all of the hours of all our days.

"Let us go forward together, with God's grace, and conscious of his judgment upon us."

"TEXT OF WHITE'S STATEMENT

"We have come together today to honor the life and work and prophecy of the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr.

"The Boston Common is an appropriate place for our purpose. It is deeply involved in the history of freedom.

"Thousands of memorials like this are taking place—today, tomorrow and yesterday—throughout the nation, indeed throughout the world. Millions of words are being said and sung in tribute and in sorrow—and in the hope that words can somehow make us whole again and better than we were before.

"Words can do some of this. They can give us instruction and insight, faith and hope and charity. But they cannot give us all of what we so desperately need to make Dr. King's dream of equality and freedom come true in this city.

"That will take work and patience and understanding. That will take dedication and personal sacrifice.

"Perhaps the most important work of all is commitment. The right things are being said publicly and privately, personally, and in gatherings like these. But the right things must be done, and that will take commitment of the highest order. What must be done cannot be accomplished in a day or two, a month or two, even a year or two. Good works cannot come as immediate and miraculous acts of will. They must come through the long, hard processes of man and his government on earth.

"There is no excuse for delay. There will be days ahead when, weary of the stress and bitter with the struggle, shrill voices will grow prominent again, preaching hate and revenge—attempt once again to kill Dr. King's dream of love and redemption.

"Then as now, we, black and white alike, must ignore those voices. We must keep to our tasks. We must do our work.

"Tomorrow the right thing must be done.

"It is to this work that I pledge this city and our generation in it.

"But he also left us a dream. And now we must make that dream come true. Bought in his own blood, paid for with his own life, it can no longer be denied. Let us pledge ourselves in this holy hour, before God and our neighbor, that we will build a new world of dignity and justice, of hope and opportunity, from which no man will be excluded."

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.
(By Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, when any man dies, all mankind is diminished, but that is especially true of the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The conduct of his life gave an added dignity to this Nation, because he so trusted our maturity and justice that he chose to strive for change through non-violent means. Violence cannot end an injustice; it can only bring scars and harden injustices. Nonviolence not only brings justice to those who patiently endure; it ennobles all those involved in the effort. Dr. King paid our Nation a great compliment by expecting the best of us.

Our people sincerely feel the loss of this American, and tributes have been and are being paid across the land. The flags in my home state, considered by most to be a Southern State, flew in half-mast in unprecedented tribute to a civil rights leader. I have asked the Postmaster General to order issuance of a stamp which would symbolize the fact that Dr. King now occupies the status that has been reserved for our Presidents and philosophers, military leaders, and artists, writers, explorers, and scientists.

Mr. President, on Thursday, April 9, I was in the Ebenezer Baptist Church at Atlanta,

Ga., at the funeral services for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. It was my privilege to march in the funeral procession from the Ebenezer Baptist Church to Morehouse College in Atlanta, Ga., and there to be a witness to the great outpouring of humanity which paid tribute to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Though I have been in many cavalcades of Presidents, in great campaigns with hundreds of thousands present, the throng that gathered to pay last respects to Martin Luther King was larger than any other throng that I have ever seen at any other place in my life.

The occupant of the chair [Mr. MUSKIE] was there and was a living witness as we marched the 4½ miles side by side from Ebenezer Church to Morehouse College, over the rolling hills of the beautiful city of Atlanta. From the top of the hill one could look back at the successive waves of humanity rolling down valleys and up hills, from sidewalk to sidewalk, in a massive movement such as I have never before witnessed, though I have witnessed vast throngs of people and movements of history in America and overseas.

I think any account I have seen of the number of people present wholly underestimates, by hundreds of thousands, the number of people participating, and the many hundreds of thousands who stood on the sidewalks but did not actually engage in the march.

Dr. Martin Luther King died at the age of 39, but before he was 35 he had already written the classic "Letter From the Birmingham Jail" which ranks with Thoreau's and Mahatma Gandhi's expositions on the dignity of nonviolence, of civil disobedience in opposition to discrimination or wrongs to a portion of the population.

Dr. Martin Luther King's beautiful oration, "I Had a Dream," given at the freedom march in Washington in August of 1963 from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, will rank with the alltime great orations in American history. This oration and this classic essay on the right of man to protest an injustice in the law itself, his winning of the Nobel Prize, all mark him as an American whose reputation will live through the ages.

The civil disobedience expounded by Dr. Martin Luther King did not preach or create anarchy. It is not born of a disrespect for law or a belief that any man is above the law. Dr. King felt that when a law was unjust, one could show his respect for the legal process by disobeying that law in a nonviolent way and then willingly accepting the penalty of that infraction to demonstrate the injustice. He worked within our system of laws. He carefully tried not to injure anyone. And he did not claim he was above the law by refusing to abide by its penalty.

Those who do not understand this concept of justice do not understand the bases of the nonviolence protest. Dr. King once wrote:

"I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negroes' great stumbling block in his stride toward freedom is not the White Citizen's Council or the Ku Klux Klan men, but the white moderate, who is more devoted to order than to justice."

At this time of civil disorder, some argue we must delay any further actions until order is completely restored. But continuing delays are what have caused the disorders. Justice delayed becomes justice denied.

Civil disorders cannot be tolerated. Neither can we tolerate indifference to the racial problems that threaten our future as a nation. After the Birmingham march, Dr. King said that the ultimate tragedy was not the brutality of the bad people, but the silence of the good people. We will compound the tragedy of this recent assassination if we do not attack complacency and silence with the truth. As John F. Kennedy put it in 1963:

"We are confronted primarily with a moral issue. It is as old as the Scriptures and is as

clear as the American Constitution. The heart of the question is whether all Americans are to be afforded equal rights and equal opportunities. Those who do nothing are inviting shame as well as violence."

It is time for us to do something—not just by passing legislation on such matters as open housing which is long overdue, but by recognizing the right of every child to an education, and the right of every man to a job.

The finest brief sketch of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s life that I have read was published in this week's National Observer. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the sketch of the life of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., entitled "My Man, Be Sure To Sing 'Precious Lord' Tonight, and Sing It Well," ably written by Jerrold K. Footlick, and published in the National Observer for Monday, April 8, 1968.

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

"MY MAN, BE SURE TO SING "PRECIOUS LORD" TONIGHT AND SING IT WELL"

"One spring day in 1965, the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., led his group of marchers into the Negro quarter of Montgomery, Ala. He turned a corner to stride down a dirt street past decrepit little shacks. Old women stood on their tiny porches or in their grassless yards, sort of half-smiling, half-crying, holding their hands in front of them, prayer-fashion, clapping like little children. For the first time in their lives, perhaps, they knew pride. And ecstasy shone on their faces.

"No one could have shaken these people from their certain belief that a prophet walked among them.

"A prophet is what Dr. King was often called. Sometimes it was by his friends, who expected to follow him to the promised land. Sometimes it was by his enemies, who mocked his grandiose dreams of a better society and his methods for reaching it.

"Dr. King believed he was a prophet. And it may be true. For he fulfilled the criteria. In the Old Testament sense, he was a man driven by an inner fire, the conscience of his people. He railed against injustice. He held out hope of a better life. He trusted in God to bring this about. He preached that this would happen through love, not hate; through witness, not violence.

"And like other prophets, he was derided for fomenting the evils—violence, for example—that he preached against. Like other prophets, he was not an organizer; his campaign often depended on his mystical presence and faded to nothingness without him. He failed in specific projects as often as he succeeded. He aroused hatred in many.

"Finally, like other prophets, he died a martyr, almost predictably so, when he was felled by a single bullet on April 4, in Memphis, Tenn. He died within an hour.

"Dr. King had won the Nobel Peace Prize and he died while preparing to lead a protest march on behalf of garbage collectors. He already had led one such march and it had degenerated into violence. He was ready to lead another, despite threats to his life and a court prohibition, although nonviolence and law and order were what he preached.

"He looked to a Higher Law. So, probably, did the man who shot him.

"The immediate reaction to Dr. King's death, besides that of shock and horror 'among all Americans of good will,' as President Johnson put it, was violence in some places. In scores of cities, looting, arson, and rioting took place.

"It is a measure of Dr. King's impact on the nation and of our times that the nation was not merely shocked but frightened. It was shocked at the senselessness of it all, at one more illustration of the hatred that seems to lie so near the surface of American society. It was frightened by the reaction, the possibility that his death could set off new violence by Negro militants.

"Here was a hand-delivered weapon for the vicious among them. 'Get the gun, baby,' they chanted. 'King said, "turn the other cheek," and look what it got him.'

"But the Rev. Walter Fauntroy, Dr. King's chief aide in Washington, D.C., and the vice chairman of his city's Council, pleaded with tears in his eyes: "To use this as an excuse for violence is to dishonor the memory of Dr. King."

"Not that Dr. King was a stranger to violence. He was arrested dozens of times and spent weeks in various Southern jails. His home in Montgomery had been bombed; a motel in which he was staying in Birmingham had been bombed; he had been stabbed by a Negro woman in a New York department store; he had been struck by a hurled rock in Chicago. And he had seen his followers bitten by police dogs, belted by clubs, drubbed by streams from fire hoses, and pummeled by fists.

"To the cries that violence must be met by violence, he shouted, by firelight, in Yazoo City, Miss.: 'I'm tired of shooting. I'm tired of clubs. I'm tired of killing. I'm tired of war. And I'm not going to use violence, no matter who says so.'

"To the fears for his own safety, he said, in Memphis, with 24 hours to live:

"I don't know what will happen now. We have got difficult times ahead, but it doesn't matter with me because I've been to the mountain top. Like anyone else I would like to live a long life. But I'm not concerned with that.

"I just want to do God's will, and He has allowed me to go up the mountain. I see the promised land. I may not get there with you, but I want you to know tonight that we as a people will get to the promised land. I am happy tonight that I am not worried about anything. I'm not fearing any man. Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord.'

"Those words were spoken by a minister who was the son of a minister and a school teacher, born to relatively comfortable circumstances in Atlanta on Jan. 15, 1929. Skipping three grades, he completed high school at 15 and was graduated from Morehouse College in Atlanta at 19. At Crozer Theological Seminary in Chester, Pa., he was valedictorian of his class and earned his bachelor of divinity degree at 22. At Boston University's Methodist seminary, the nation's largest he earned his Ph.D. at 26. There were always those who smirked at the 'Dr.' unaware of his brilliant academic record.

"While in Boston, he met Coretta Scott, who had grown up near Selma, Ala., and who was studying for a concert career at the New England Conservatory of Music. They were married in 1953; they had four children, the oldest now 12, the youngest 3.

"Upon graduation, Dr. King was offered three college teaching positions and three pastorates. He accepted a call to the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church, on the main street of Montgomery, Ala., two blocks from the state Capitol where the Confederacy was born. The man who first befriended him there was another Negro Baptist minister, the Rev. Ralph Abernathy. He became Dr. King's closest friend and chief adviser, and has now succeeded him as president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

"Dr. King's pastorate was uneventful until Dec. 1, 1955, when a Negro seamstress named Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat to a white man on a Montgomery bus. ('I don't know why,' she said later. 'I was just tired.') Dr. King called a mass meeting of the complacent Montgomery Negroes. He told them:

"If you will protest courageously, and yet with dignity and Christian love, when the history books are written in future generations, the historians will have to pause and say, "There lived a great people—a black people—who injected new meaning and dignity into the veins of civilization." This is

our challenge and our overwhelming responsibility.'

"The boycott was called for one day; one day led to another, and it was met by stubborn refusal to compromise, with arrests, firings, and bombings. It ended 382 days later with the U.S. Supreme Court declaring this kind of racial segregation unconstitutional.

"No Negro boycott had ever been so successful, and Dr. King became a national figure. He spoke around the country, all the while searching for some new approach to his cause, without success. He made a pilgrimage to India to visit the grave of his hero, Mahatma Gandhi, the apostle of nonviolence and the victim of an assassin.

"In 1962, he chose as a desegregation target the city of Albany, Ga. His campaign lasted a year; hundreds, including Dr. King, were arrested, but the authorities keep cool, and Dr. King retired with no trace of achievement.

"The contrast with Montgomery was clear. And the pattern in Dr. King's career was outlined, never to change where whites resisted blindly and violently, he succeeded. Where they maintained order without violence or offered a modicum of co-operation, he failed.

"The lesson was not absorbed by Eugene 'Bull' Connor, police commissioner of Birmingham, Ala. His answer to a King demonstration in the spring of 1963 was police dogs, cattle prods, and fire hoses; others unknown bombed a church, killing four Negro children in Sunday school. The nation's answer to Connor and the others was the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

"Between those two events, Dr. King's stature as a spokesman against injustice was sealed in history. On Aug. 28, 1963, the March on Washington drew 200,000 people from all over the nation, 60,000 of them white, who blanketed the Mall from the Lincoln Memorial to the Washington Monument. They, and millions more watching on television, were electrified with his phrase, 'I have a dream,' which is sure to live in Americana. Then he offered another phrase, 'Let freedom ring,' and closed his oration:

"And when that happens, and when we allow freedom to ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual:

"Free at last, free at last. Thank God Almighty, we're free at last."

"The next year, already an international symbol, Dr. King was awarded the Nobel Prize in recognition of his nonviolent efforts to secure human rights. He was the third Negro, the twelfth American, and the youngest man ever so honored.

"Not long afterward, Dr. King moved to Selma, Ala., to begin a voting-rights campaign. Here for the first time—and still far beyond what anyone could expect—divisiveness permeated the Negro movement.

"Already in Selma was the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) organized by young people in 1961 as an outgrowth of the sit-in movement and with the blessing of Dr. King, who felt that Negro students should take a more active role in civil rights. SNCC had struggled for months in Selma with little success. Dr. King's entrance drew national support and considerable money; the militant SNCC leaders, James Forman and Stokely Carmichael among them didn't like it. Dr. King spent as much time negotiating with them as he did with white authorities.

"But again Dr. King's success was assured by white authorities. Dallas County Sheriff Jim Clark made hundreds of arrests in two months, and when a protest march was first attempted toward the capital, Alabama state police checked it with failing clubs, tear gas, and trampling horses.

"That inspired the historic march from Selma to Montgomery. Thousands of whites and Negroes, many of them prominent Americans, flocked from around the nation to join. Fifty miles in four days, it culminated in the gigantic parade up Dexter Avenue, past the church of Dr. King's first pastorate, to the Capitol. And he shouted again and again, a new phrase: 'We are on the move now.'

"Selma produced the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

"Never again was Martin Luther King to know such a triumph. He was, indisputably, a national leader. But there were no more such victories.

"Dr. King moved his efforts to Chicago in 1965 and 1966. But he discovered, 'Religion does not exercise the same restraining influence in the Northern ghettos as it does in the South.' And in Chicago he was faced with the savvy of Mayor Richard Daley. Every program, from job training to low-income housing, that Dr. King proposed, Chicago already had or suggested it could develop. The campaign died with a whimper.

"In these days, too, the civil-rights movement, if such it still was, took on a new, uglier tone. The ghettos of New York City, Rochester, and Philadelphia exploded in 1964, and in 1965 the Watts section of Los Angeles was in flames.

"The young militants were listening to the different drummers. Dr. King came to Rochester to preach about Jesus, and a young voice at the rear yelled, 'What is this Jesus crap?' He went to Watts to calm the community and they laughed at him.

"In 1966 James Meredith was shot on the second day of his Freedom March through Mississippi, and Dr. King arrived to take over. But his presence was all but forgotten when a handsome young Jamaican named Carmichael stood in the eerie light of a Grenada bonfire and screamed, over and over and over again: 'Black power! Black power!' Here was an addition to the lexicon that Dr. King could not eradicate.

"Dr. King and other Negro leaders of his persuasion openly disavowed the calls to violence, but they were aware that their diminishing influence could be wiped out if they spoke too harshly. Not only was this a dilemma that endured to his death, but the very fact of his death added fuel to the militant fires.

"What is often overlooked is that this man, Martin Luther King, civil-rights leader and Nobel Peace Prize winner, was also a learned and devout Christian minister. Out of his studies of Christian doctrine emerged many of the principles that guided him in the civil-rights movement.

"It has been said that Dr. King perverted the Christian message for his own purposes. It has been said, too, that he captured the very essence of the teachings. He always insisted that his actions were based on Christian convictions.

"The essence of the Christian gospel is love,' he once told Lee Dirks, a news editor of The National Observer. And that word, love, flowed freely in his conversations. For him the traditional issues of theology—sin and salvation, the divinity of Christ, His virgin birth, His bodily resurrection—were peripheral. Love was central.

"By love, Dr. King meant neither romantic love nor love for friends, but good will and understanding for all men. The Greek New Testament, he once noted, uses three words for love: *eros*, romantic or esthetic love; *phila*, affection between friends; and *agape*, a redeeming good will that 'cleanses' both the person who is loved and the one who loves.

"*Agape* is the highest form of love, Dr. King maintained. 'It's completely unselfish; it seeks nothing in return.' To illustrate, Dr. King would cite the experience of Christ on the cross. 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' This was real re-

demptive love, Dr. King would explain. 'Here was a symbol of crime, the cross. Yet redemptive love transformed it into a symbol of salvation.'

"Dr. King shied from some other beliefs of the fundamentalist Baptist tradition in which he was reared. He rejected, for example, the idea that men are innately sinners. He insisted that men have potentialities for both bad and good.

"Many of Dr. King's religious ideas were not original. He wasn't a creative theologian but a clergyman, not an originator of ideas but a messenger of them.

"Dr. King conceded that the ideal of Christian love might never be completely fulfilled. 'Men have a tragic inclination to yield to selfish impulses,' he said. 'But one always has the capacity to strive for love. It remains the regulating ideal.'

"He took this ideal from Christ's words on love. 'This is my commandment,' John reports Christ as saying. 'That ye love one another, as I have loved you.' Luke quotes Jesus: 'Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you.' In Matthew's account of the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus tells His disciples: 'Resist not evil: But whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.'

"These words Dr. King took quite literally. In doing so, he made what many clergymen consider a singular contribution to modern religious thought. Using the words of Christ and the example of Gandhi, he was the first to really articulate the concept of nonviolent resistance for Christianity in America.

"With such convictions, it was not surprising last year that Dr. King voiced strong opposition to the Vietnam War. What was surprising, even to his colleagues and friends, was the vehemence of his criticism. In unfriendly circles, it was suggested that Dr. King latched onto the Vietnam issue to steal the thunder from the fast-rising advocates of black power in the civil-rights movement. But his colleagues, rejecting the notion of opportunism, had their own worries. They feared that Dr. King's activity on the Vietnam issue would divert his attention from the main cause and that it would alienate many friends of the civil-rights movement, which it did.

"Dr. King's most recent efforts were directed toward his projected Poor People's March on Washington this spring. He planned to bring thousands to the capital, where they would live in a shantytown and would remain indefinitely to lobby in Congress for job help, better low-cost housing, open-housing legislation, and improved welfare plans.

"Whatever the burdens on his time, however, Martin Luther King was not too busy to answer a call from desperate friends in Memphis, who feared that without a gentle word the bitterness engendered by the long garbage strike would erupt into violence. In preparation for his next march, as was his style, Dr. King planned a rally for last Thursday evening to inspire his followers. As he prepared to go to dinner, he stepped onto the balcony of his motel for fresh air. He turned to his music director:

"My man be sure to sing *Precious Lord* tonight and sing it well."

"They were his last words; seconds later a bullet crashed into his neck.

"This is the hymn the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., who was 39 years old, who wanted to live but who feared no man, would have heard:

"*Precious Lord, take my hand, Lead me on, help me stand;*

I am tired, I am weak, I am worn;

Through the storm, through the night,

Lead me on to the light;

Take my hand, precious Lord, lead me home.

When my way grows drear, precious Lord,

linger near;

When my life is almost gone;

Hear my cry, hear my call, Hold my hand

lest I fall;

Take my hand, precious Lord, lead me

home.

"—JERROLD K. FOOTLICK."

A TRIBUTE TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.
(By Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York)

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days, from one end of this earth to the other, Dr. Martin Luther King has been memorialized in a manner befitting the life he led and the cause for which he strove. The senseless act of murder that stilled his voice cannot kill his words nor dim his dream.

Applying his symbolic philosophy of non-violence to attain goals of equal justice for all, Martin Luther King was a champion of justice, a revered leader whose vision and indomitable spirit gave profound meaning to the cause of human rights.

From the moment he first led the Montgomery bus boycott in 1956—through the Albany, Ga., demonstrations, the renowned 1964 March on Washington, the march from Selma to Montgomery, the jail terms in Birmingham and Albany—through all this Dr. King counseled peace and justice—and in so doing served not only the cause of equality but the American cause as well.

Out of the intensity of Dr. King's crusade sprang the civil rights bill of 1957, 1960, 1964, and 1965, proclaiming the equality of opportunity as it affected voting rights, public accommodations, employment, and education.

In tribute to his work for justice, coupled with his appeals for peace, in 1964 Dr. King was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. The tribute was well deserved, for if ever a man had fought for reform, in defiance of those favoring oppression on the one hand, and those favoring revolution on the other, it was Dr. Martin Luther King.

It is ironic, tragically ironic, that the memory of a man who lived and died dedicated to achieving reform by nonviolent means, should be used as a mask for the violence that has swept the country these past 6 days. Let those who have defiled and who would defile the greatness of Dr. King, know that they act in their own name and not in his.

Yesterday, I was among those who journeyed to Atlanta to pay our last respects to Dr. King. It was one of the most moving experiences of my life, one I shall never forget. From every walk of life, every color, every religion, came people to do homage as much to a single principle as to the man who so eloquently gave voice to it—the principle of justice.

Let it be our hope that true brotherhood among all men will be the most lasting memorial to Martin Luther King.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(By Hon. PHILLIP BURTON of California)

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to add my word of commendation to our distinguished colleague, my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS). His efforts made it possible for the congressional delegation, some 70 or so members, to attend the most moving and impressive services for Dr. King in Atlanta yesterday.

I was happy to join with him and my colleagues in this personal expression of sympathy to Dr. King's family and of respect for all that this heroic man stood.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a man of peace, a man of God, a leader of his people and of this Nation is dead. He was taken from among us cruelly and stealthily by an assassin's bullet. Yesterday, I was in Atlanta, Ga., where he was laid to rest "free at last."

Our Nation mourns him but we do not despair because his words of hope still ring in our ears.

Our Nation is touched again by tragedy and loss but his courage binds us together and leads us on.

Our Nation's sight is blurred with tears and sorrow but his vision is clearly before us, summoning us to the cause for which he gave his life.

Our Nation is sleepless in its grief and shame because his dream is still to be accomplished.

Martin Luther King spoke of that dream on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in 1963. His words rang out then and the echo of those words can be heard even now.

"Let us not wallow in the valley of despair. I say to you today, my friends, even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal.'"

Martin Luther King would not have mourn, "as those who have no hope." He would have us carry on the quest for peace, for human dignity, the quest to fulfill his dream. The first step toward fulfillment of that dream must come now with the speedy enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, but more must follow. Jobs, education, training, better housing, expanded public assistance, and health services administered with concern for human dignity must follow.

More than that, the quickened conscience of the Nation must harken to the words of Dr. King and understand the motivation of this heroic figure. He said:

"More than ever before, my friends, men of all races and nations are today challenged to be neighborly. The call for a worldwide good-neighbor policy is more than an ephemeral shibboleth; it is a call to a way of life which will transform our imminent cosmic elegy into a psalm of creative fulfillment. No longer can we afford the luxury of passing by on the other side. Such folly was once called moral failure; today it will lead to universal suicide. We cannot long survive spiritually separated in a world that is geographically together. In the final analysis, I must not ignore the wounded man on life's Jericho Road, because he is a part of me and I am a part of him. His agony diminishes me, and his salvation enlarges me."

Dr. Martin Luther King could not ask the Biblical question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" For him, the answer was as obvious as it was forcefully affirmative.

He was involved in mankind. He was concerned and that concern extended from collective bargaining rights for sanitation workers in Memphis where he gave his life to the right of Negro men and women to sit on buses in Montgomery where the cause of human dignity first propelled him into the national spotlight.

His concern for humanity and the dignity of the person made his advocacy of the nonviolent confrontation inevitable. A man of reason, he challenged men to act reasonably. A man of justice, he challenged men to act with justice. A man of God, he saw clearly and challenged others to see the spark of divinity in each man which makes sacred human life and gives dignity to our humanity. This concern caused him to be jailed. It also caused him to be honored with the Nobel Peace Award.

It was natural that this man of peace who sought justice at home should speak out so clearly and eloquently against the injustice and brutality of the war in Vietnam. Dr. King lived the Sermon on the Mount and lived the words, "Blessed are the peacemakers."

Martin Luther King was the apostle of nonviolence and peace, and his life, his words, his deeds and his martyr's death gave witness to his creed. He is no longer with us but in the forefront of every struggle

for human dignity, for peace, his spirit will march on.

Men will continue to dream his dreams and in the words of the song of the movement:

"Black and white together,
We shall overcome!"

We shall overcome injustice and enslaving poverty.

We shall overcome bigotry and prejudice.
We shall overcome the vestiges of hatred which have led us to tragedy.

LET US WALK TOGETHER—TRIBUTE TO REV. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(By Hon Robert N. C. Nix, of Pennsylvania)

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, last week, for the first time in modern history, the world witnessed the extraordinary death of a distinguished American of African descent, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

As an advocate of one of the basic principles of a society of law and order—nonviolence—he nonetheless died in the advocacy of that creed.

While many may have disagreed with the tenacity of his faith and its uncompromising pursuit, his death did command for 5 full days the undivided attention of one of the most powerful nations in the world. For 1 full day, the smoothly lubricated wheels of government creaked to a halt. The anguish of millions was carried to Atlanta by hundreds of thousands who left a multiplicity of occupations from janitor and sharecropper to Vice President and millionaire to make their pilgrimage of respect.

All were there—U.S. Senators, U.S. Congressmen, Governors, mayors, foreign dignitaries alongside the unnamed, the lowly and the unemployed. Indeed the measure of this slightly built blackman's greatness is calibrating by the thousands of messages of condolences and public expressions of grief from heads of state, His Holiness Pope Paul VI and citizens of the world.

And why did they all pay tribute?

In my judgment, this was the first time in this century or any century when an Afro-American, by what he said, by what he lived for touched the conscience of America. By his advocacy of nonviolence and the quality of his life, he even touched the hearts of his enemies who disagreed with his tactic, but respected his sincerity.

As Members of this highest and most respected legislative body, we are to consider today the 1968 civil rights bill.

I ask no one to vote for this piece of legislation or any piece of legislation solely out of the public notice and affectionate esteem accorded Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Rather, I would ask my distinguished colleagues to examine their consciences. Can they espouse the same principles by which Reverend King lived? The love of all races, the forgiveness of your enemies and the oneness of the family of man?

Or are they prepared to abandon these principles and instead permit the unreasoned laws of the jungle to engulf us all?

This is not a threat, but an invitation to each man to determine himself what steps we shall take or what steps we shall not take to preserve the United States of America.

Whatever steps we do take must be based upon the law of reason.

For we cannot expect reason to triumph in the streets of this Nation unless reason survives in the Halls of this Congress.

And this particular law is an appeal to reason. As that great jurist, Sir Edward Coke, once wrote:

"Reason is the life of the law; nay, the common law itself is nothing else but reason . . . The law . . . is perfection of reason."

We who would appeal to all Americans to accept the law of reason and forgo the call of the violent—are we prepared to take that first step?

Reverend King took more than that first step. In heeding the injunction of another man of fellowship that "whosoever compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain," Reverend King walked that last mile to give his last breath of life for a country in which he believed, a country which he loved, and a country in which he never lost faith.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(By Hon. Patsy Mink, of Hawaii)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, tribute to a great man like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., is difficult to express in mere words. Yesterday I participated in the funeral procession in Atlanta, Ga., to express my esteem and respect for this great religious and spiritual leader and to underscore my own personal determination to make his life's dream of freedom and equality for our fellow Americans a reality.

Our Nation is not likely to see soon the emergence of such a leader among men who by the sheer strength of his teachings and the magnetism of his words could capture the conscience of all men of good will and dramatize the work that we must do in order to make real the American's creed of freedom from oppression.

His words stung deep into the hearts of Americans, and we must now rise to his challenge to create a society where all men may enjoy the blessings of liberty and opportunity.

An eloquent voice for justice has been silenced. Those who will now count among the living will be those who will be willing to transform their regard for him into actions which will achieve the goals to which this Nation has been since its inception dedicated.

The tragedy is that men must still die to win freedom and equality in America. Dr. King is dead; so long as he lived he bore the cross of our conflict, of our conscience and of our guilt. Sad that he should have died before his dream came true. Sad that his dream had to be only that, when America's pride was in its ideals of liberty and justice for all.

The time has come for America to free its soul of hate and begin to rewrite the chapters of our noble history so that human dignity can be the basis of our mode of life and the creed of our country.

UNITY: THE LEGACY OF MARTIN LUTHER KING

(By former Senator Ernest Gruening)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, slightly more than 4 years and 7 months ago—on August 28, 1963—it was my privilege to be present at the Lincoln Memorial at ceremonies marking the conclusion of the march by 200,000 Americans for jobs and equality of opportunity. One speaker on that historic occasion was Dr. Martin Luther King.

Those listening—and we numbered millions—remember his description of the America he sought—the America in which the words "free" and "equal" mean the same for every American.

Last Friday, in Alaska, I made a statement I never wanted to make when I commented on the assassination of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King. This is the statement. It is very brief.

"This is one of the most tragic events in all of American history. This is a tragedy comparable in scope to the assassination of Abraham Lincoln and John F. Kennedy. The loss is irreparable. We can only hope that the mission of Martin Luther King in life—of seeking to assuage passion and hate with kindness, dignity and principle in pursuit of his great objectives of equality and fairness, regardless of race—will in some way live on stronger in death.

"This tragic event should call for implementation of the recommendation of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders and an application of the recommendation made some time ago by Hubert Humphrey of a Marshall Plan for our cities in order to get rid of civil strife and all the other

underlying causes of discrimination, poverty and degradation."

Dr. King, in 1963, spoke of the need to transform the "jangling discords of our Nation" into what he described as "a beautiful symphony of brotherhood."

His words apply not only to our land but to all lands. During his brief 39 years on earth, he communicated, perhaps better than any other individual, the real meaning and the real need for the brotherhood of man—our common goal.

Violence of any kind—a bombing in Birmingham, a murder in Angola, or a napalm burning in the denuded hills of Vietnam—saddened him, because he realized that peace and civil rights are also brothers.

Martin Luther King watched the noble goals of the Great Society eviscerate as our tragic involvement in Vietnam deepened. As he wrote:

"I knew that America would never invest the necessary funds or energies in rehabilitation of its poor so long as Vietnam continued to draw men and skills and money like some demonic, destructive suction tube. So I was increasingly compelled to see the war as an enemy of the poor and to attack it as such."

Part of the tragedy of April 4 in Memphis is that the destructive act by the sniper has prevented Martin Luther King from being here to help the President in his renewed quest for peace.

Martin Luther King marched in the mantle of nonviolence. He led a peaceful attack. If we believe in the brotherhood of men, we must make certain that his peaceful attack continues. To do less is to destroy everything he has built as well as ourselves.

Let us now prove beyond doubt that the peaceful approach is the correct approach. Let us make certain the goals he sought are attained by the utmost speed.

We have made some progress today.

Congress has approved, and sent to the President, amendments to the Civil Rights Act which include a fair-housing section.

Newspapers this morning carried the welcome announcement by Levitt & Sons that it was eliminating segregation "any place it builds, whether it be the United States or any other country in the world," and that its policy was "effective at once." Levitt & Sons made clear that this was its tribute to Dr. King.

And the Senate has indicated its desire to fund such worthwhile programs as Headstart by its vote today on the conference report on supplemental appropriations.

We will, I believe, find new ways during this coming Easter recess which will enable us to build a living memorial to the man who, more than anything else, thought of himself as a drum major for justice, peace, and righteousness.

Throughout the executive and legislative branches of Government, men and women are working right now to put together the ingredients for the peaceful marching band of enlightenment which our fallen drum major sought.

The instruments of that band must include jobs, houses, schools, food, funds, and equality and compassion for our fellow men. That band will exclude bigotry, fear, sorrow, illiteracy, pestilence, and hunger.

That band will create the music Martin Luther King called a beautiful symphony of brotherhood.

These views, Mr. President, I have held for some time. They are likewise expressed in the two leading editorials in today's New York Times. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE VISIONS OF DR. KING

"The heart of the city and of the nation stood still for a little while yesterday morning. The normal pace of life visibly slowed;

the thinly peopled streets, the shuttered stores, the silent schools of this metropolis gave token to the fact that there was just one place toward which the eyes of the American people were turning: to a simple brick church in Atlanta, Ga.

"To this church had come many of this country's distinguished leaders; to it had come some of its humblest citizens; to it had come a widow, whose poignant dignity masked her sorrow, with her four young children, whose father had just given his life for the American dream. To this church came the thoughts and the prayers of the American people.

"Seldom in its history has this country been so deeply moved, so shamed, so shocked, as it has been by the death of Martin Luther King. Seldom in its history has this country had a leader of such transcendent spirit combined with iron will, of such integrity of purpose combined with a magnetic appeal, of such devotion to a great cause combined with the courage to pursue it.

"Martin Luther King, the man of peace, evoked the very best in Americans of every race and creed; and the tremendous outpouring of silent and spoken grief that centered yesterday in Atlanta gave expression to the overwhelming sentiment of a stunned and united nation. United? It must be united.

"This is the legacy of Martin Luther King, as it was his vision. The people of this country cannot fail him now. The concept of racial inferiority and racial discrimination is intolerable if the United States is to survive. It is the fundamental question, and Dr. King, apostle of brotherhood, understood it as such. In all its power and all its majesty these United States must move to make his vision a reality."

"THE NEEDED COMMITMENT

"What is most needed in this hour of national trial is a program that offers realistic promise of swifter advance toward a society of equal opportunity. The dimensions of that program are clearly set forth in the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders; the absent factor is a long-term commitment by the American people to make the sacrifices necessary to assure good schools, housing and jobs for all.

"It is obvious that no full commitment is going to be made while the Vietnam war is raging and higher taxes are required merely to keep the dollar from collapse. But the apparent imminence of talks to seek a beginning to an end of that wasting conflict provides both an opportunity and an obligation to demonstrate to the millions now shut out of any real participation in American society how genuine is this country's resolve to give substance to the guarantees of equality that are their birthright.

"When President Johnson makes his deferred address to Congress what more constructive monument to Martin Luther King could be suggested than a pledge that every dollar released through a scaling down of the Vietnam war will be committed to the monumental tasks of social regeneration in urban and rural slums?

"For the first time there seems a simultaneous disposition in Washington and Hanoi to undertake exploration of ways of halting the conflict, with its staggering cost in blood and money. In any event, military spending is not likely to taper off quickly, and certainly the attack on poverty and the horrors of the ghetto must not languish while the search for disengagement in Vietnam goes forward.

"But a great contribution to restored faith in America's humanitarian tradition can be made by coupling such immediate forward steps with a permanent undertaking to use for human betterment the vast sums currently applied to instruments of destruction, just as quickly as the military situation eases. That is the road to true internal security as well as social justice."

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

(By former Senator Edward V. Long, of Missouri)

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, our Nation has lost an important leader. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, and the Kansas City Times have spoken eloquently of his life and service on their editorial pages. Dr. Martin Luther King will live on as a part of our Nation's history. His devotion to nonviolence should be an inspiration to us all. He made it clear that even if all his supporters advocated violence he would stand alone for nonviolence. Such dedication to peace and justice cannot be forgotten.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Apr. 5, 1968]

"A NATIONAL TRAGEDY

"'Martin Luther King had more faith in America than America has in itself,' Whitney Young of the Urban League said sadly after the assassination of his old friend in Memphis.

"It is true. The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. spoke for the best in this nation. He spoke for the continuing process of securing liberty and freedom of individuals, and he spoke for this in the context of nonviolence. Those should not be aspirations of Negroes only. They should be the aspirations of the American people.

"The trouble is that America has been too often a violent nation. What a spectacle our form of civilization must seem today to many peoples not blessed with it. The most powerful, the richest nation, steeped in abundance; the nation that early spurred the world to ideals of democracy; the nation in which only too short a time ago was killed a President to whom even other nations looked hopefully; the nation which now has seen the senseless destruction of a man to whom the world looked up as rightful winner of the Nobel peace prize. And a nation which continues to spend far too much of its wealth on a war in a little Asian country, rather than spending anywhere near enough to repair its racial ravages at home.

"Still, it needs to be said that this nation grieves for the Rev. Dr. King, and this is true for whites as well as Negroes. The atmosphere of violence is not one which most individual Americans welcome; it is one which increasingly troubles them.

"They are more troubled now. Troops have been moved into Memphis, too late to protect Martin Luther King. Clearly they are there to protect the city against Negro wrath. What of that righteous wrath? Is it now to take the form of the violence, already indicated in some cities, that the Rev. Dr. King despised and that would undo the great progress he brought to his people and to all Americans?

"What of the eventual reaction of the white majority? Is that majority to heed its prophets of doom and be heedless of the growing despair of the minority? A greater tragedy than the death of the Rev. Dr. King would be the transformation of the United States into a garrison state, sealing off the Negro ghettos, creating apartheid by counter-power and counter-violence.

"The nation faces a choice now, a choice no different from the one it has confronted all along, but heightened by the effects of tragedy. Grief is not enough, and when it passes, what then?

"Then there is only one way for this country to atone, not for the death of one man, but for all the wrongs that have been done for centuries to too many Americans. That is for the President and the Congress and the public to resurrect the report of the

National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders and to act on it.

"That means creating millions of new jobs, providing substantial compensatory public assistance to schools for children handicapped by their cultural history, and sweeping out an outmoded and often inhumane welfare system to replace it with one that guarantees every citizen a decent living. That certainly means quick House acceptance of the Senate's civil rights bill, including open housing.

"That means spending billions for social reconstruction instead of for war. So be it. The alternative would be a greater calamity than the one the nation has now suffered. It would signify a more depressing lack of faith in America. If Martin Luther King had faith in his people and their ideals, it is time for the people, white and black, to have faith in themselves."

"[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Apr. 6, 1968]

"LEGACY OF MARTIN LUTHER KING

"The brutality of an assassin has struck down Dr. Martin Luther King, the most effective leader Negroes had in their difficult drive for equal rights, equal citizenship. No man exerted more influence for racial justice during the last dozen years, among his own people and throughout the nation.

"All America is shocked and deeply distraught that such savagery could happen, and to such a man. The act was utterly senseless, an outcropping of violence that has spread its malignancy in a democracy we assume to be civilized.

"Dr. King was a compassionate and dedicated spokesman for the rights he sought. A magnetic personality, he possessed a compelling eloquence, especially in the earlier days of his demonstrations, such as the Montgomery bus boycott which raised him to national prominence.

"Modeling his philosophy and leadership on India's Mahatma Gandhi, he became the apostle of non-violence in the Negro cause. What an ugly irony that violence destroyed him. It was because of his non-violent successes that he received the Nobel Peace Prize.

"The last few years, hectoring by young Negro militants who often preached mayhem and shooting, Dr. King became more emotional in his appeals and his demonstrations brought violence. He became an outspoken opponent of the Vietnam war, which alienated other Negro leaders who felt such an attitude harmed the rights movement.

"But his voice never lost magic for his people. Crowds centered wherever he went. He sacrificed all to the cause of his minority's rights—in the end himself.

"His martyrdom must not be lost in a resentment of his people, stirred to blind anger. It would be a great tragedy if the death of Dr. King were to spark extremist uprisings—a repudiation of his life teaching.

"The killing of Dr. King is lamented and mourned by the millions of white folk as well as Negroes. This assassination was certainly not an act of the white community which has been as stricken with revulsion as any of his supporters.

"Just as in the murder of President John F. Kennedy, the shot that killed Dr. King was from the hand of a mad or very sick man. Against such an assassin there is really no protection. Martin Luther King knew this as his public words indicated the night before his death.

"The aftermath of the King tragedy must not be a national rash of new violence, steeped in murder, looting, arson and rioting.

"President Johnson, who has done more than any other White House incumbent for Negro needs and equality, has asked every American citizen to reject the blind violence that has struck down Dr. King, who lived by non-violence. We can achieve nothing

by lawlessness and divisiveness among the American people."

"There is no such thing as national guilt for such an act as the slaying of Dr. King. But the fact such bloody things recur must give pause to our people—including minorities—to sift out causes of the violence cancer, then seek remedy.

"Martin Luther King became known worldwide not simply because he was a leader of Negro disadvantage. He will hold a niche in history because of his philosophy of activist non-violence. That is his legacy to his race and to his country. What a tragedy were this legacy to be dissipated."

FUNERAL SERVICES FOR DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

(By Senator JACOB K. JAVITS)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the most impressive services yesterday at the Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta, Ga., for Dr. Martin Luther King, and then the long march to Morehouse College, where the afternoon services were held, and the very impressive services which took place there, a number of things were said which would be very worthwhile to have before us.

I ask unanimous consent that a very impressive statement by the mentor of Dr. Martin Luther King, who was Dr. L. Harold DeWolfe, dean of Wesley Theological Seminary, which was made as a tribute, at the Ebenezer Baptist Church, together with the eulogy delivered by Dr. Benjamin Mays, retired president of Morehouse College, be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the eulogies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE TRIBUTE BY DR. L. HAROLD DE WOLFE

"This is our prayer. Grant us thy gracious benediction.

"It was my privilege to teach Martin Luther King, to march with him in Mississippi, agonize and pray with him in the midst of the worst violence at St. Augustine, to spend many hours counseling with him, to go through great volumes of his private papers organizing them, to spend many days and nights in his home. I know the innermost thoughts of this man as deeply as I know that of any man on earth. It has been the highest privilege of my life, this personal friendship.

"Martin Luther King spoke with the tongues of men and of angels. Now those eloquent lips are stilled. His knowledge ranged widely and his prophetic wisdom penetrated deeply into human affairs. Now that knowledge and that wisdom have been transcended as he shares in the divine wisdom of eternity.

"Lighthouse of hope

"The Apostle Paul has told us that when all other experiences and virtues of humanity have been left behind, faith, hope and love remain. But the greatest of these is love.

"Martin exemplified all three in the rarest intensity. Amid the tempestuous seas and treacherous storms of injustice, hate and violence which threatened the very life of mankind, his faith was a solid, immovable rock. He received hundreds of threats upon his life, yet for 13 years he walked among them unafraid. His single commitment was to do God's will for Him; his trust was in God alone.

"On that rock of faith God raised in him a lighthouse of hope. No white backlash nor black backlash nor massive indifference could cause him to despair. He dreamed a dream of world brotherhood and unlike most of us he gave himself absolutely to work for the fulfillment of this inspired hope. In that lighthouse of hope God lighted in Martin a torch of love. He loved all men. Even the hate-filled foe of all he represented he tried sympathetically to understand.

"He sought to relieve the slavery of the op-

pressors as well as that of the oppressed. While overborne by incredible pressures upon his time and energy he yet had time to bring comfort and counsel to a bereaved boy he had never seen before or to park a car for a confused woman who was a complete stranger.

"What a legacy of love is left to his faithful and gifted wife and these four dear children. They now share his dream, his faith, hope and love. They and the faithful little band of nonviolent crusaders who have been unfaithfully with him from Montgomery all the way to Memphis. They are too few, they who have already made such a costly sacrifice.

"It is now for us, all the millions of the living who care, to take up his torch of love. It is for us to finish his work, to end the awful destruction in Vietnam, to root out every trace of race prejudice from our lives, to bring the massive powers of this nation to aid the oppressed and to heal the hater-scared world.

"God rest your soul, dear Martin. You have fought the good fight. You have finished your course. You have kept the faith. Yours is now the triumphant crown of righteousness. Your dream is now ours. May God make us worthy and able to carry your torch of love and march on to brotherhood. Amen."

"THE EULOGY

"Members of the bereaved family, distinguished citizens of the world, ladies and gentlemen.

"To your great delight I'm cutting about five minutes off of this eulogy.

"To be honored by being requested to give the eulogy at the funeral of Dr. Martin Luther King is like asking one to eulogize his deceased son, so close and so precious was he to me.

"Our friendship goes back to his student days here at Morehouse. It is not an easy task. Nevertheless I accepted with a sad heart and with full knowledge of my inadequacy to do justice to this good man.

"It was my desire that if I predeceased Dr. King he would pay tribute to me on my final day. It was his wish that if he predeceased me I would deliver the homily at his funeral. Fate has decreed that I eulogize him. I wish it might have been otherwise for after all I am three score years and 10 and Martin Luther is dead at 39.

"How strange.

"God called the grandson of a slave on his father's side and the grandson of a man born during the Civil War on his mother's side and said to him—Martin Luther—Speak to America about war and peace. Speak to America about social justice and racial discrimination. Speak to America about its obligation to the poor and speak to America about nonviolence."

"Let it be thoroughly understood that our deceased brother did not embrace nonviolence out of fear or cowardice. Moral courage was one of his noblest virtues. As Mahatma Gandhi challenged the British empire without a sword and won, Martin Luther King Jr. challenged the interracial injustice of his country without a gun. He had faith to believe that he would win the battle for social justice.

"Courage is hailed

"I make bold to assert that it took more courage for Martin Luther to practice nonviolence than it took his assassin to fire the fatal shot. The assassin is a coward. He committed his dastardly deed and fled. When Martin Luther disobeyed an unjust law, he suffered the consequences of his action. He never ran away and he never begged for mercy.

"He returned to Birmingham jail to serve his time. Perhaps he was more courageous than soldiers who fight and die on the battlefield.

"There is an element of compulsion in their

dying. But when Martin Luther faced death again and again, and finally embraced it, there was no external pressure. He was acting on an inner urge that drove him on, more courageous than those who advocate violence as a way out, for they carry weapons of destruction for defense. But Martin Luther faced the dogs, the police, jails, heavy criticism, and finally death, and he never carried a gun, not even a pocket knife to defend himself.

"He had only his faith in a just God to rely on and his belief that thrice is he armed who has his quarrels just—the faith that Browning writes about when he says: 'One who never turned his back but marched to press forward never doubted that clouds would break, never dreamed that right, though worsted, wrong would triumph. . . .'

"Belongs to Posterity

"Coupled with moral courage was Martin Luther Jr.'s capacity to love people. Though deeply committed to a program of freedom for Negroes, he had a love and a deep concern for all kinds of people. He drew no distinction between the high and the low, none between the rich and the poor. He believed especially that he was sent to champion the cause of the man farthest down. He would probably have said: 'If death had to come I am sure there was no greater cause to die for than fighting to get a just wage for garbage collectors.'

"This man was suprace, supranation, supradenomination, supraclass and supra-culture. He belonged to the world and to mankind. Now he belongs to posterity.

"But there is a dichotomy in all of this. This man was loved by some and hated by others. If any man knew the meaning of suffering, Martin Luther knew—house bombed, living day-by-day for 13 years under constant threat of death, maliciously accused of being a Communist, falsely accused of being insecure, insincere and seeking the limelight for his own glory, stabbed by a member of his own race, slugged in a hotel lobby, jailed 30 times, occasionally deeply hurt because his friends betrayed him.

"And yet this man had no bitterness in his heart, no rancor in his soul, no revenge in his mind, and he went up and down the length and breadth of this world preaching non-violence and the receptive power of love.

"He believed with all of his heart, mind and soul that the way to peace and brotherhood is through nonviolence, love and suffering.

and to the war in Vietnam. It must be said, however, that one could hardly expect a prophet of King's commitment to advocate nonviolence at home and violence in Vietnam.

"Nonviolence to King was total commitment not only in solving the problems of race in the United States but in solving the problems of the world.

"Surely, surely this man was called of God to his work. If Amos and Micah were prophets in the eighth century B.C., Martin Luther King Jr. was a prophet in the twentieth century. If Isaiah was called of God to prophesy in his day, Martin Luther was called of God to prophesy in his day. If Hosea was sent to preach love and forgiveness centuries ago, Martin Luther was sent to expound the doctrine of nonviolence and forgiveness in the third quarter of the twentieth century.

"If Jesus was called to preach the Gospel to the poor, Martin Luther was called to bring dignity to the common man. If a prophet is one who interprets in clear and intelligible language the will of God, Martin Luther Jr. fits that designation. If a prophet is one who does not seek popular causes to espouse but rather the causes which he thinks are right, Martin Luther qualifies on that score.

"Not ahead of time

"No, he was not ahead of his time. No man is ahead of his time. Every man is within his time. Each man must respond to the call of God in his lifetime and not somebody else's time.

"Jesus had to respond to the call of God in the first century A.D. and not in the twentieth century. He had but one life to give. Jesus couldn't wait. How long do you think Jesus would have had to wait for the constituted authorities to accept him—25 years, 100 years, 1,000 years, never? He died at 33. He couldn't wait.

"Paul, Copernicus, Martin Luther, the Protestant reformer, Gandhi and Nehru couldn't wait for another time. They had to act in their lifetimes. No man is ahead of his time.

"Abraham staying with his country in obedience to God's call, Moses leading a rebellious people to the Promised Land, Jesus dying on a cross, Galileo on his knees recanting at 70, Lincoln dying of an assassin's bullet, Woodrow Wilson crusading for a League of Nations, Martin Luther King Jr. fighting for justice for garbage collectors, none of these men were ahead of their time. With them the time is always right to do that which is right and that which needs to be done.

"Too bad, you say, Martin Luther Jr. died so young. I feel that way, too. But as I have said many times before, it isn't how long one lives but how well. Jesus died at 33, Joan of Arc at 19, Byron and Burns at 36, Keats and Marlowe at 29 and Shelley at 30, Dunbar before 35, John Fitzgerald Kennedy at 46, William Rainey Harper at 49 and Martin Luther King Jr. at 39.

"It isn't how long but how well.

"PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE

"We all pray that the assassin will be apprehended and brought to justice but make no mistake, the American people are in part responsible for Martin Luther King's death. The assassin heard enough condemnation of King and Negroes to feel that he had public support. He knew that there were millions of people in the United States who wished that King was dead. He had support. The Memphis officials must bear some of the guilt for Martin Luther King's assassination.

"The strike should have been settled several weeks ago. The lowest paid man in our society should not have to strike to get a decent wage a century after emancipation and after the enactment of the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments. It should not have been necessary for Martin Luther King Jr. to stage marches in Montgomery, Birmingham, Selma and go to jail 30 times trying to achieve for his people those rights which people of lighter hue get by virtue of the fact that they are born white.

"We, too, are guilty of murder. It is a time for the American people to repent and make democracy equally applicable to all Americans.

"What can we do? We and not the assassin, we and not the President, we and not the apostles of hate, we represent here today America at its best. We have the power to make democracy function so that Martin Luther King and his kind will not have to march.

"Did not die in vain

"What can we do? If we love Martin Luther King and respect him as this crowd surely testifies, let us see to it that he did not die in vain. Let us see to it that we do not dishonor his name by trying to solve our problems through rioting in the streets.

"Violence was foreign to his nature. He warned that continued riots could produce a Fascist state. But let us see to it also that the conditions that cause riots are promptly removed as the President of the United States is trying to get us to do. Let black and white alike search their hearts and if there

be any prejudice in our hearts against interracial or ethnic groups let us exterminate it and let us pray, as Martin Luther would pray if he could: 'Father forgive them, for they know not what they do.'

"If we do this, Martin Luther King Jr., will have died a redemptive death for which all mankind will benefit. Morehouse will never be the same because Martin Luther came by here and the nation and the world will be indebted to him for a century to come.

"It is natural, therefore, that we here at Morehouse and Dr. Foster would want to memorialize him to serve as an inspiration to all students who study in this center.

"I close by saying to you what Martin Luther King Jr. believed: 'If physical death was the price he had to pay to rid America of prejudice and injustice nothing could be more redemptive.' And to paraphrase words of the immortal John Fitzgerald Kennedy, permit me to say that Martin Luther King Jr.'s unfinished work on earth must truly be our own."

Mr. JAVIRS. Mr. President, one thing that was said, in a most modest way, by the assistant pastor of Ebenezer Baptist Church, Rev. Ronald English, and when I say modest, I mean it; the capacity of that church is under 250, and it has a relatively small congregation—I shall never forget. Listen to what this very fine young assistant pastor said. I hope I never forget the words, and I hope the Senate never forgets the words.

He said:

"He who would blaspheme the name of Martin Luther King will do violence in the streets."

I repeat:

"He who would blaspheme the name of Martin Luther King will do violence in the streets."

I have hardly in my lifetime ever heard anything so well put, carrying so much meaning, as that. Indeed, this was the whole life of Martin Luther King, and the assistant pastor said it in a way that, it seems to me, all the world can understand. I think it deserves to rank in modern terms with, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," and other short, famous expressions, as, in my faith, "Behold, I have given you a good doctrine. Forsake it not," and many statements of the same kind. I repeat it on the Senate floor so that somewhere it may be preserved, I ask that the full text of Reverend English's prayer be printed in the RECORD.

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

"PRAYER BY ENGLISH

"Let us bow our heads in a moment of solemn utterance.

"Eternal and everlasting God Our Father.

"The height of our aspirations, the depth of our existence, Thou who are the giver and sustainer of life, from Whom all things have come and to Whom all things shall return we beseech Thy comforting presence in this hour of deepest bereavement.

"For our hearts are heavily laden with sorrow and remorse at the removal of one of history's truest representatives of Thy will and purpose for mankind.

"While we pray for comfort we pray for wisdom to guide our thoughts aright at this hour. For we, oh God, in our limited vision cannot begin to comprehend the full significance of this tragic occasion.

"And so we raise the perennial question of Job: 'Why?' as we weep for the moment.

"Yet we are reminded by the best of the Christian tradition that in the total economy of the universe good will ultimately triumph. Though sorrow tarries for the night, joy comes in the morning.

"We know, oh God, that even in this little while of sorrow we need not weep for the deceased, for here was one man truly prepared to die.

"No fear of death"

"In his last hours he testified himself that he had been to the mountaintop, that his eyes had seen the glory of the coming of the Lord. We know he had no fear of death.

"Help us to find consolation in the fact that his life was a gift given to us at this crucial juncture in our history out of the graciousness of Thy being.

"And so we had no real claims upon him. In the fullness of time he came and in the fullness of time he has gone. He knew where he came from and he knew where he was going.

"And so as we abide in this knowledge our gratitude will abate our sorrows.

"We know, oh God, that life is but a moment in eternity and that he who lives for the moment will surely die, yet he who lives for eternity and dedicates his life to those ultimate principles of truth, justice and love as this man has done will never die.

"Inspire us to accept the imperative that his life so fully exemplifies—that we would not judge the worth of our lives by their physical longevity, but by the quality of their service to mankind.

"He has shown how to live, oh God. He has shown us how to love. Yet the manner of his teaching and the manner of his being was so strange and unfamiliar in our world, a world that abounds in war, hatred and racism, a world that exhausts the wicked and crucifies the righteous, a world where a word of condemnation is familiar while a word of kindness is strange.

"So this man was a peculiar man. He taught a peculiar teaching. So he was not of this world. So in the course of human events the forces of time, faith and the hopes of the oppressed converged upon a single man.

"Though once in a century the midwife of oppression snatches from the womb of history a child of destiny, the record of events testifies to fact that history cannot bear the truth.

"We have witnessed the life of the crucified Christ and we have seen the slaying of Martin Luther King. So like a wild carnivorous beast that turns upon and devours them, history has turned once more upon its own because it could not bear the truth that he spoke or the judgment that he brought.

"Challenge status quo"

"And so, like Jesus, not only did Martin Luther King challenge the status quo, but he challenged our mode of existence. Therefore, like Jesus, he had to die as a martyr for a cause that challenged the world's assumed posture of security.

"The light came into the darkness but the darkness knew it not.

"Oh God, our leader is dead. And so now the question that he posed during his life finds us in all its glaring proportions: 'Where do we go from here? Chaos or community?'

"We pray, oh Merciful Father, that the removal of this man will not nullify the revelation given through him.

"Undergrid our feeble efforts with Thy strength and renew our courage to devote the full weight of our being to the ideas that he has thus far so nobly advanced.

"Deepen our commitment to nonviolence so that this country will not be run asunder by a frustrated segment of the black masses who would blaspheme the name of Martin Luther King by committing violence in that name.

"Grant that the Congress and President of this nation who have been so generous and gracious in their memorial tributes will be guided by the memory of this suffering servant and return to the legislative halls determined to pass without compromise or reservations legislation so vitally needed to preserve domestic tranquility and prevent social disruption.

"Prayer for peace"

"Grant, oh lover of peace, that we will effectively negotiate for a peaceful settlement in Vietnam to end the brutal slayings and communal atrocities committed in the name of democracy.

"Turn our hearts, oh God, to hear and respond to the echoes of this undying voice of the ages, a voice of love and reconciliation in the present, a voice of hope and confidence in the future.

"Grant that in response to his sacrificial death we will work toward that day when the long and tragic tune of man's inhumanity to man will resolve into a chorus of peace and brotherhood. Then love will tread out the baleful sighs of anger and in its ashes plant a tree of peace."

A TRIBUTE TO MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(By HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL, of New York, Apr. 9, 1968)

MR. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, there is tragic irony in the circumstances that at the very moment when America glorified in its brightest hopes for peace in Vietnam, it was plunged into the depths of despair by alarms of civil disorder.

The insensate violence, arson, and looting, which erupted across the Nation in the wake of the execrable assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, demonstrate the fragile character of the strands which knit the fabric of a peaceful social order. On the other hand, the death and destruction wrought by wanton riots in our National Capital, in Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Chicago, and in other cities fall far short of justifying descriptions, by many public spokesmen, of America, as a "sick society."

The health of a society cannot be measured by the aberrational conduct of those to whom the killing of Dr. King has been an excuse, rather than a cause, for lawlessness. Those who participated in the violence of arson and looting are those who have not been touched by the preaching and teaching of Dr. King. The target areas of these apostles of violence were liquor, clothing, and appliance stores, and the guiding impulse of these looters was burglary of products offered for sale in these establishments, not vengeance for the death of a beloved leader. On the contrary, the toll of death they have caused, the homeless refugees they have created, desecrates the memory of Dr. King and affronts his philosophy.

Our social health should, in fact, be measured by the millions of people in America from all walks of life who responded to President Johnson's designation of Sunday as a day of prayer and dedication, by the thousands of black and white people who joined in prayer at the Central Park Mall, by the special services conducted in churches, synagogues, schools, and other institutions throughout the land, by the millions of countless and unsung ways that our people have demonstrated their profound grief and dismay. Indeed, the gentle threnody composed by our flags at half staff waving in the breeze more profoundly expresses the mood of our people than the raucous violence in the streets. In the critical days ahead, America will be guided by the simple message brought to his congregation by Dr. King's father:

"Don't lose your way, and don't ever let it get so dark that you can't see a star."

Ideas that move men and nations have an organic quality that sustains them beyond the span of life to their creator, and Dr. King's ideal for progress through nonviolence, will inspire those who survive him. His dream of a society of social justice, a society that knows no bigotry and prejudice, a society that knows no hunger, no poverty, no war, is the essence of the Judea-Christian ideal to which civilization has aspired for 2,000 years.

In the critical days ahead, we shall miss

his inspiring leadership. Through the sheer force of his personality and dedication, he bridged the chasm between those who envision America as a united people and those who contend for racial separatism; between those who seek progress toward attainable goals through creative protest and those who proclaim violence, rather than liberty, throughout the land. As a student of the Bible, Dr. King spoke in simple, vivid Biblical imagery and through his words touched the finest instincts of people throughout the world.

Dr. Martin Luther King has now taken his place in the history of our Nation and in the history of civilization. There is perhaps no better way to express our loss than in the gentle, moving words of Shelley's elegy to Keats:

"And thou, sad Hour, selected from all the years to mourn our loss, rouse thy obscure compeers and teach them thine own sorrow; say: With me died Martin Luther King; till the Future dares forget the Past, his fate and his fame shall be an echo and a light unto eternity."

REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(By HON. MELVIN PRICE of Illinois)

MR. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, an apostle of nonviolence, Dr. Martin Luther King, is the victim of a wanton act of violence. This cruel twist of irony will not be erased from our Nation's history, nor easily forgotten.

As in the tradition of his mentor, Mahatma Gandhi, who fell victim to the venom and hatred he worked so hard to extinguish, Dr. King has been denied seeing the fruition of his efforts. His personal tragedy is a national loss. We deeply mourn his death.

"I have a dream," he once said. That dream of racial harmony in America has been shattered temporarily by a cowardly assassin's bullet. But the vision of which Dr. King spoke will endure and will one day be fact. His legacy to this Nation will sustain its people in these trying times.

We must heed his plea for nonviolence, as we must follow President Johnson's call for national unity. It speaks ill of this Nation that Dr. King has been slain. But his martyred spirit will prevail.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(By HON. WILLIAM D. FORD of Michigan, Apr. 9, 1968)

MR. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I join today with my fellow Americans, and with people of good will throughout the world, in mourning the tragic death of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

To his family, to his friends and to his associates, I offer my heartfelt sympathy. It is they who bear the brunt of the grief that is shared by so many millions of people.

Columnists and commentators have already pointed out the great irony of his death—that this good and sincere man, who preached love and nonviolence, should be struck down by an act of hatred and violence.

We must go beyond this to appreciate the full tragedy of the assassination. To people of good faith in both races, Dr. King had held out the hope of a peaceful end to the prejudice and intolerance which have shackled this Nation and kept us from achieving the American dream of true freedom for all.

The real tragedy of Dr. King's death will come if Americans of both races use his assassination as an excuse to continue the hatred and violence against which he fought and preached, and because of which he died.

Dr. King would be the first to plead for the better alternative—that his death should hasten the day when all Americans share in the dreams and visions that he saw from the mountain top.

The assassination of Abraham Lincoln brought a reaction of hatred that racked this Nation for a decade, and cursed the already anguished South with the agonizing period known to history as the Reconstruction.

The assassination of John F. Kennedy, by contrast, ushered in an era of hope. The legislation and social progress for which he fought and died became a reality in part because of his death.

This would be a more fitting memorial for Dr. Martin Luther King.

It is not important or significant that the assassin was a white man. This was an accident of fate. It is more significant that he was an evil man, whose mind had been warped by the very hatred that Dr. King sought to eliminate.

There are both white and black Americans who preach violence as the answer to our Nation's problems. In the first angry reaction to Dr. King's death, these people had their way. Death and destruction, grief and ashes, stand today as eloquent testimony to this senseless venting of hate.

A counterreaction to this violence would only pile tragedy upon tragedy.

Dr. King's death will not have been completely in vain if we let this grievous week launch a new day of hope for the United States and for the world.

Let us pray that all Americans, black and white, will recognize the true wisdom and hope of Dr. King's philosophy. Let us strive together that his dreams may be realized, and that hatred based on the color of skin may be erased from our way of life.

DR. KING'S SPIRIT CAN BE KEPT ALIVE

(By Hon. BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota,
Apr. 8, 1968)

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, South Dakotans have never been troubled with the type of civil rights agitation and discord that has befallen many States in recent years.

South Dakotans believe that a man should be judged upon his character and integrity rather than on the color of his skin or the church he attends. Were it otherwise, I as a member of a minority group—the American Indian—never would have had the opportunity to serve this body.

Living in such a State, it is difficult for many to comprehend the type of conditions which the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King was trying to correct. Yet, I believe most South Dakotans held a deep respect for what Dr. King was trying to accomplish and particularly for his insistence upon the principle of nonviolence in moving toward those objectives.

One of the finest newspaper tributes to Dr. King that I have seen came from the contributing editor of the *Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader*, Mr. Fred C. Christopherson.

The editorial follows:

"DR. KING'S SPIRIT CAN BE KEPT ALIVE

"While Dr. Martin Luther King was alive, he was an articulate and effective spokesman for the Negro. His memory and the nature of his death can be even more instrumental in promoting the welfare of his race if his followers respect his spirit and his attitude.

"But it can be the other way if the occasion of his assassination becomes the spark that ignites riots and destruction. In that case, he will have died in vain.

"As the record clearly demonstrates, Dr. King warrants deep and earnest respect for all who subscribe to the principle of human equality without regard to creed, color or race. His efforts in this field were extensive and productive. He was constantly at work doing what he believed should be done. But always he sought to stay within the framework of dignity and non-violence. That is one reason why he accomplished so much and why he was so widely accepted as a constructive leader in a humanitarian endeavor.

"He was conscious of the risks involved in

what he was doing—fully aware that he might be struck down at any moment by an individual with a warped mind, as was President John F. Kennedy. He realized, too, that there was strong organized opposition in some areas to his programs and that this could result in a violent reaction. Such considerations, however, didn't alter his course. He did what he believed should be done and did it very well.

"The finest tribute to his memory will be a continuance of his program in the manner he advanced it. That, one may hope, will be the prevailing response."

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(By Hon. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, of California,
Apr. 9, 1968)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, a young San Diego girl has captured, in a short but lovely poem, the essential meaning of the life—and death—of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Liz Clarke's touching poem was brought to my attention by her classmate, Mary Ruth Jarrell, president of the junior class at Our Lady of Peace Academy in San Diego.

Miss Jarrell has asked me to help disseminate the poem, believing it should be "shared by all men, black and white."

I agree, and I also feel that Miss Clarke's untitled eulogy is an especially appropriate tribute to Dr. King on this, the day of his funeral.

The poem follows:

(By Liz Clarke)

"It was growing;
It was growing so well,
That someone thought it would overrun his garden.
So he cut it down.

"It was a beautiful ebony flower.
Dark as the night and the ground it came from.
But he cut it down.

"It was so hard for it to survive.
So many hated its dark color.
So many tried to stifle it.
Finally he cut it down.

"His garden doesn't need that ebony blossom.
His garden doesn't want that ebony blossom.
His garden is of weeds.
So he cut it down.

"But that blossom hasn't died.
It's sprouting again.
Its beautiful ebony blossom has flowered—again.

"The roots are deep and firmly entrenched.
It has the determination and vigor.
It will grow and destroy the weeds by its love."

A MEMORIAL SERMON IN TRIBUTE TO REV. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(By Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana,
April 17, 1968)

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, for several years I have known and been associated with a fine young minister who is also employed by the Senate Post Office. He has held that employment during student days, including work at the Wesley Theological Seminary here in Washington. I know that many others here in the Senate know Ron Winters, although perhaps many who know him here are not aware of his dedication to service in the ministry of a small Baptist congregation in Floris, Va.

Mr. Winters, on April 7, preached a memorial sermon in tribute to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. I ask unanimous consent that this sermon, entitled "What Price Freedom?" may appear in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the sermon was

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"A MEMORIAL SERMON IN TRIBUTE TO REV. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.: WHAT PRICE FREEDOM?"

"(Delivered by Rev. Ronald Winters, Sunday, April 7, 1968, Mount Pleasant Baptist Church, Floris, Va.)

"In the stirring language of the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America, we are reminded 'that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness'. Next to life itself, man has always listed freedom as a prime motive and goal for living a happy, secure and meaningful existence. In the history of every great nation of the world, and at an appointed time when freedom and social justice were threatened, someone would cry out with a voice that could be heard around the world: 'I'd rather die than lose my freedom.' In the memorable words of that distinguished statesman and orator of our country, Patrick Henry, men still say 'give me liberty or give me death'. In the fight for political, social and economic freedom in India, Mahatma Gandhi demonstrated that freedom was more dear to him than life itself. In the story of America, men like Abraham Lincoln and John Fitzgerald Kennedy gave their lives in the pursuit of freedom. Once more in America and in our time, the voice of another, that of Martin Luther King, Jr., was raised in the struggle for social justice and freedom for all men. Again the supreme price for freedom was required—his life. What is freedom? What price is further required if we are to realize this eternal truth?

"Freedom implies the absence of hindrance, restraint or confinement. Freedom of speech and religion are among our most cherished rights in America. In his book, *Strength to Love*, by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., we find these words:

"Man is man because he is free to operate within the framework of his destiny. He is free to deliberate, to make decisions, and to choose alternatives. He is distinguished from animals by his freedom to do evil or do good and to walk the high road of beauty or tread the low road of ugly degeneracy."

"The price of freedom is more than enjoying the right to act and move in one's own way. The price of freedom is not looting, rioting, killing or pitting man against man. We need to go to the inspired teachings of the Bible for the correct meaning of freedom and its price to mankind.

"Psalm 8:4-5 states: 'What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? And the Son of Man, that Thou visitest him? For Thou has made him a little lower than the Angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour.'

"Christ as a free agent for God freely came to earth and freely gave so that we might become joint heirs with Him. Nevertheless, Christ was despised and rejected of men, for men love darkness rather than the twinkling of a candle light. Since the time of Christ, the history of mankind will attest to this fact. The world has come to realize that America must take a good long look at her dark blot on the pages of history—her growing cancer—her stigma of assassinating a man of peace, non-violence and freedom. How long can America continue to assassinate great men of history in her attempt to assassinate truth?

"Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was the most noted Civil Rights leader this nation has ever known. Winner of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964, he was the very symbol of peace and non-violence in America and the world. He believed deeply in freedom and justice and in obtaining them through non-violent means, yet he died violently.

"His life was pricked by the modern day

Judas, an assassin who sold out himself to the anger of an unguarded moment.

"Dr. King stated on last Wednesday night in Memphis, 'Well, I don't know what will happen now. We've got some difficult days ahead. But it really doesn't matter with me now because I have been to the mountain top, and I don't mind.'

"God grant that we may go forth from this day with new hope, new love, new awareness, new understanding and new forgiveness. Let us go forth from this day not with hostility but with holiness in our hearts. May our prayer of petition be to let the spirit of the Living God fall afresh on us. Let these words ring out within our souls today: too long have we, in America, sat on the side lines and watched injustice subdue justice. Too long have we reaped the fruit from the tree after it has fallen simply because we were too unconcerned to nurture and cultivate the seeds of justice, freedom and equality. How long will the seeds of hate and violence continue to erode the principles of human rights and freedom? How long, oh Lord, how long? How long? Too long.

"But one day we shall scale the mountain top and see the glory of a nation fully clothed in love, brotherhood, freedom and righteousness. We know that if we walk not in the counsel of the ungodly, we shall be blessed. Like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., we shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water that bringeth forth his fruit in his season.

"What price, freedom? The price is whatever man is willing to pay—it's whatever you can afford to pay. Yes, even if one's very life is required in exchange for freedom. Dr. King once said, 'A man who is afraid of dying doesn't deserve to live.'

"In Proverbs 29:25, these words of wisdom may be found: 'But who so putteth his trust in the Lord shall be safe.'

"Yes, the King is dead—the Rev. Martin Luther King is dead, long live freedom's holy light; protect us by Thy might, Great God, Our King!"

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(By Hon. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, Apr. 8, 1968)

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, not since November 22, 1963, has our Nation been so shocked by a senseless, a mindless, an insane assassination. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., symbol of peace and nonviolence, equality and brotherhood among men has been taken from us by violence.

Martin Luther King had a dream for America and as he said, it was "a dream deeply rooted in the American dream."

America should rededicate itself to Martin Luther King's dream. As a symbol of that rededication, I am today introducing a bill which would direct the striking of a medal honoring this great American, Martin Luther King, Jr. and the presentation of this medal to his courageous widow.

I first met Dr. King and heard his eloquence at a Freedom Now rally at Forbes Field in Pittsburgh. In later years and on many occasions I worked with him and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference on civil rights legislation. He became my friend.

I have often marveled at his eloquence but particularly in August of 1963 at the Lincoln Memorial here in Washington. The March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom will live long in the memory of those who participated in it and those who saw so much of it on television. It was, perhaps, the single greatest demonstration of unity for justice that this Nation has seen.

Unquestionably the outstanding event that day was Dr. King's speech, "I Have a Dream." The text of that stirring and prophetic speech follows:

"I HAVE A DREAM

"(By Martin Luther King, Jr.)

"I am happy to join with you today in what will go down in history as the greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our nation.

"Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came as the great beacon light of hope for millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice. It came as the joyous daybreak to end the long night of their captivity.

"But one hundred years later the Negro still is not free. One hundred years later, the life of the Negro is still badly crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination. One hundred years later, the Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity. One hundred years later, the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself an exile in his own land. So we have come here today to dramatize the shameful condition.

"In a sense we've come to our Nation's Capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, should be guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

"It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check, a check which has come back marked 'Insufficient Funds.' But we refuse to believe the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation. So we have come to cash this check, a check that will give us upon demand, the riches of freedom and the security of justice. We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of now.

"This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice. Now is the time to lift our nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood. Now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God's children.

"It would be fatal for the nation to overlook the urgency of the moment. This sweltering summer of the Negro's legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn of freedom and equality. Nineteen sixty-three is not an end but a beginning. Those who hoped that the Negro needed to blow off steam and will now be content will have a rude awakening if the nation returns to business as usual. There will be neither rest or tranquility in America until the Negro is guaranteed his citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our nation until the bright day of justice emerges.

"But there is something I must say to my people who stand on the warm threshold which leads them to the palace of justice. In the process of gaining our rightful place we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence.

Again and again we must rise to the majestic height of meeting physical force with soul force.

"The marvelous new militancy which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to a distrust of all white people, for many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny. They have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom. We cannot walk alone.

"And as we walk we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back. There are those who are asking the devotees of civil rights: 'When will you be satisfied?' We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities. We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro's basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one. We can never be satisfied as long as our children are stripped of their self-hood and robbed of their dignity by signs stating: 'For Whites Only.' We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro in Mississippi cannot vote and the Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote. No, no, we are not satisfied and we will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like the waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.

"I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations, some of you have come fresh from narrow jail cells, some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom left you battered by the storms of persecution and staggered by the winds of police brutality. You have been the veterans of creative suffering. Continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive.

"Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to South Carolina, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities, knowing that somehow this situation can and will be changed. Let us not wallow in the valley of despair.

"I say to you today, my friends, even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal.'

"I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

"I have a dream that one day even the State of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice. I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. I have a dream today.

"I have a dream that one day down in Alabama with its vicious racists, with its Governor having his lips dripping with the words of interposition and nullification—one day right there in Alabama, little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.

"I have a dream today. "I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain and the crooked places will be made straight, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.

"This is our hope. This is the faith that I go back to the South with. With this faith

we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope. With this faith we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. With this faith we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.

"This will be the day when all of God's children will be able to sing with new meaning:

"My country 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing;
Land where my fathers died,
Land of the pilgrims' pride,
From every mountain-side
Let Freedom ring."

"And if America is to be a great nation, this must become true. So, let freedom ring from the prodigious hill tops of New Hampshire. Let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York. Let freedom ring from the eighteenth Alleghenies of Pennsylvania. Let freedom ring from the snowcapped Rockies of Colorado. Let freedom ring from the curvaceous slopes of California. But not only that, let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia.

"Let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee.

"Let freedom ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi. From every mountainside, let freedom ring. And when we allow freedom to ring, when we let it ring from every village, from every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual: 'Free at last! free at last! thank God almighty, we are free at last!'"

"The apostle of nonviolence has gone. What must we now do? I submit that this Congress must pass the civil rights bill, with the open housing amendment intact, as a memorial to Dr. Martin Luther King. We must not do this, however, because we have been intimidated, cowed, frightened or out of expediency. We must do it because it is the right thing to do; we must do it because it is our responsibility to help make Dr. King's dream come true.

In Bob Dylan's words:

How many roads must a man walk down
before he's called a man?
How many seas must a white dove sail
before he sleeps in the sand?
How many times must the cannon balls fly
before they're forever banned?
How many years can a mountain exist
before it's washed in the sea?
How many years can some people exist
before they're allowed to be free?
How many times can a man turn his head
and pretend he just doesn't see?
How many times must a man look up
before he can see the sky?
How many ears must one man have
before he can hear people cry?
How many deaths will it take 'til he knows
that too many people have died?"

(By Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO, of Illinois)

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the wanton, brutal, and senseless assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., is another dark page in the history of America. These meaningless slayings in our free society must be brought to a halt.

Every American, regardless of race, color, or creed has the right to protest, has the right to petition his Government, has the right to equal justice under the law, and the right to be heard when an injustice is being perpetrated against him.

Our Founding Fathers were aware of the need for these inalienable rights and incorporated them in our Bill of Rights in order that our Government should remain free and strong for posterity. We no longer can tolerate mob rule—we no longer can tolerate rule by the gun. We want a government based on law and the orderly process of the ballot box. Either we wholeheartedly believe in and stand behind these fundamental principles, or our Government is doomed to failure.

I represent the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois which is an integrated district where people of all nationalities, all races, all colors, and all religions reside, and I have an understanding of the problems that confront all of them.

Is it asking too much to give them the right to live in decent housing? Is it asking too much to provide a decent education for his children? Is it asking too much from the greatest democracy on earth that human rights be respected before property rights?

I share the grief and shock felt in the hearts of millions of Americans across the Nation over the brutal slaying of Dr. King. This great tragedy denies the very principles which our Founding Fathers espoused in establishing our democratic form of government.

Dr. King's brilliant elocution, his international renown, his great courage on the firing line of civil rights have established him as a powerful force for sanity in race relations. He was universally hailed by almost all men and he had become for a broad mass of Americans the symbol of hope for reconciliation.

Dr. King had become the bridge of communication between whites and blacks alike in the United States, and his tragic assassination has struck grief, shock, numbness, and above all, a great sense of emptiness into the hearts of all of us. Together we mourn the passing of a great man whose life, though short, for he died at 39, has changed for the better the face of our social structure in the United States. Our country is a far different and better place today than when Martin Luther King first began his crusade for equality a little more than a decade ago in Montgomery, Ala. His death shall lead perhaps to even greater change. I am confident that we shall yet win the battle he courageously began for equal rights and equal economic opportunity.

It is expected that the civil rights bill will reach this Chamber for action on Wednesday. This bill would strike down racial barriers in housing. It would provide Federal protection for Negroes and civil rights workers, and it would make countless other improvements in our civil rights laws. By insuring the prompt passage of this landmark legislation, we keep faith with Dr. King's dream of unity, nonviolence, and social justice.

President Johnson has urged this Nation to "move with urgency, resolve, and new energy." Our opportunity to do so will come tomorrow, and I hope my colleagues will vote unanimously for the civil rights bill. Dr. King's death must be the unifying force we need as a Nation, and the best tribute that can be paid to him is for all of us to exert every possible effort toward wiping out discrimination, inequality, and the ravages of poverty.

By international consensus, Nobel Prize winner Martin Luther King was a symbol of racial peace in the world and his passing is a great loss not only to all Americans but to a world that had come to love, honor, and respect him.

On behalf of the residents of the Seventh Congressional District, I express my heartfelt condolences to his widow and to his family. I know that we shall always remember his courageous fight and the great cause for which he has given his life.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the Record the following editorials about

Dr. King from the Washington Post and the Chicago Sun-Times.

"[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 6, 1968]

"HE SAW THE PROMISED LAND

"In his last and eerily premonitory speech, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. envisioned a promised land of equality and social justice for all American Negroes. But, he said, 'I may not get there with you.' He talked of threats from 'some of our sick white brothers.' Within 24 hours the premonition came true; he was dead, the victim of a white assassin.

"There is in this last sermon a message for all Americans and particularly those of both races who reject his credo that Christian brotherhood can and must be achieved in peace.

"The promised land he saw cannot be reached by his people through violence. Nor can violence such as that which struck him down Thursday night prevent America's Negro citizens from inevitably reaching the promised land he now will never see.

"More violence has followed the wanton act of violence that has put the entire world in mourning for this man who believed deeply that his dream of equality could never be achieved through violence. Stokely Carmichael has urged bloodshed in the streets in retaliation for the assassination of Dr. King. This is the road away from Dr. King, away from his promised land. He will have died in vain if sanity does not prevail in our cities.

"A warning against violence has come from the man who has stepped into Dr. King's post as head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The Rev. Ralph Abernathy was with Dr. King when the assassin struck. Dr. Abernathy cradled the fallen leader's bloodied head in his lap.

"'While he lived,' said the new leader, 'he taught us we should not let violence turn us around. . . . We (have) determined to continue down that road . . . in support of the dream he left with us.'

"Later he told a crowd at the Memphis airport, gathered around a plane in which Mrs. King sat, 'Let us not do anything at this time to discredit Dr. King.'

"President Johnson spoke for all reasonable men when he called on people of all races 'to stand their ground to deny violence its victory.'

"The killer of Dr. King must be found quickly and brought to justice. But neither the ends of justice nor the great goals of Dr. King are served if the hate and sickness the killer personifies rage across America.

"Let all Americans work toward that promised land that Dr. King saw so clearly. Let his death bring that land closer—and not its destruction."

"[From the Washington Post, Apr. 6, 1968]

"MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

"To each generation of mankind is given one or two rare spirits, touched by some divinity, who see visions and dream dreams. Committed to something outside themselves and beyond the orbit of ordinary lives, they serve their fellow-men as the movers and leaders of social change. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was one of these, a man whose extraordinary gifts were committed to humanity. Perhaps his tragic death was the means requisite to make real the purpose of his life.

"An apostle of nonviolence, Dr. King was, nevertheless, a militant activist. He thought of nonviolence not as mere abstention from strife but as a vital mode of action. 'We need an alternative to riots and to timid supplication,' he once said. 'Nonviolence is our most potent weapon.' There was something at once mystical and pragmatic about his conception of nonviolence. In that great and moving letter he wrote from the Birmingham jail, Dr. King said: 'Just as Socrates felt that it was necessary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of myths and half-truths to the unfettered realm of creative analysis and ob-

jective appraisal, we must see the need of having nonviolent gadflies to create the kind of tension in society that will help men rise from the dark depths of prejudice and racism to the majestic heights of understanding and brotherhood.'

He was a pacific man but an impatient one; and his impatience was the mark of his humanity. He burned with indignation at the indignities and humiliations and injustices that were the common lot of Negroes in the South and at the frustrations and inequalities and poverty that were their portion in the North. And he knew that 'we have not made a single gain in civil rights without determined legal and nonviolent pressure. History is the long and tragic story of the fact that privileged groups seldom give up their privileges voluntarily. . . . We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed.'

And he added to this a bitter, painful truth—a truth no less opposite today than when he uttered it five years ago: 'For years now I have heard the word 'Wait!' It rings in the ear of every Negro with a piercing familiarity. This 'wait' has almost always meant 'never'.'

'Yet, somehow, impatience and indignation were married in this man to gentleness and compassion. Hate was altogether alien to him. The dream he dreamed embraced his white as well as his black brothers. For he recognized that 'the Negro needs the white man to free him from his fears. The white man needs the Negro to free him from his guilt. A doctrine of black supremacy is as evil as a doctrine of white supremacy.'

'His dream, so stirringly recited at the Lincoln Memorial at the time of the great March on Washington of 1963, was the oldest and noblest of man's dreams—the dream of universal brotherhood among the children of God. 'I refuse,' he said then, 'to accept the idea that man is mere flotsam and jetsam in the river of life which surrounds him. I refuse to accept the view that mankind is so tragically bound to the starless midnight of racism and war that the bright daybreak of peace and brotherhood can never become a reality.'

'So he has been struck down by the very bigotry he sought to exorcise—and before the dream could become a reality. If the dream embraced both white and black, the grief and bereavement are shared by them as well. It is meet that there should be mourning in the land. The flags belong at half-staff for the loss of a great American. The schools ought to be closed on the day of his funeral in remembrance of one who so loved little children that he gave his life to set them free.

'But the joining of hands in sharing sorrow must be more than ceremonial, more than momentary. The only true tribute to Martin Luther King, lover of life and lover of mankind, is a renewed dedication to his dream. He belongs now to all of us. The rich legacy he leaves can be enjoyed only as it is shared by all men alike. The legacy lies in his faith that 'unconditional love will have the final word in reality.'

'The only way we can really achieve freedom is to somehow conquer the fear of death. For if a man has not discovered something that he will die for, he isn't fit to live.

'Deep down in our non-violent creed is the conviction that there are some things so dear, some things so precious, some things so eternally true, that they are worth dying for.

'And if a man happens to be 36 years old, as I happen to be, and some great truth stands before the door of his life, some great opportunity to stand up for that which is right and that which is just, and he refuses to stand up because he wants to live a little longer and he is afraid his home will get bombed, or he is afraid that he will lose his

job, or he is afraid that he will get shot . . . he may go on and live until he's 80, and the cessation of breathing in his life is merely the belated announcement of an earlier death of the spirit.

'Man dies when he refuses to stand up for that which is right. A man dies when he refuses to take a stand for that which is true. So we are going to stand up right here . . . letting the world know we are determined to be free.' (Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., in a 1965 speech.)"

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(By HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI, of New York)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a leader of his people has fallen. Words are inadequate to express the grief of each of us at the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King.

President Johnson has spoken on behalf of our Nation. Many others, too, have spoken out publicly on this tragedy of our times. Some have elected to express their dismay and sadness privately, often in silent prayer at home or at church.

The common council of my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., is not meeting in regular session this week. But Councilman Horace C. Johnson of the Masten district has filed a formal adjournment resolution to be used at the meeting on April 16.

Following is the text of the resolution which Mr. Johnson has adapted from the prayer of St. Francis of Assisi:

"The Lord made Martin an instrument of his peace.

Where there was hatred, he sowed love.

Where there was injury, pardon.

Where there was doubt, faith.

Where there was despair, hope.

Where there was darkness, light.

Where there was sadness, joy.

He did not so much seek to be consoled as to console.

To be understood as to understand.

To be loved as to love.

For it was in Martin's giving that he received.

It was in his pardoning that he was pardoned.

And, it was in his dying that he was born to eternal life.

"Be it therefore resolved: That when this Council adjourn today, that it adjourn in loving memory of a great man, a loyal American and a true and faithful child of God—Martin Luther King."

SLAYING OF DR. KING

(By HON. HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts)

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker the senseless slaying of Dr. Martin Luther King has deprived America of one of its great leaders. Dr. King preached a philosophy of nonviolence. While it is true that violence often followed this man of peace, he would have been horrified and dismayed by the rioting and looting that broke out upon the news of his assassination. He would have been the first to point out that such violence hurts rather than helps the cause to which he was so devoted. Dr. King taught us all, white and black, the precept of nonviolence in achieving social progress.

We should not tolerate nor condone the criminal lawlessness which is scarring our Nation. It is vicious, destructive, and totally alien to the great traditions of this country and to the teaching of the man in whose name it is being done. There may be reasons for the looting and rioting—but there can be no excuse or justification for them.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, there should be no further delay in the passage of legislation designed to achieve social progress through the lawful processes of government. Martin Luther King believed in America and its promise. He knew and taught the power of peaceful change. Prompt passage of this civil rights legislation is another step in

realizing Dr. King's "dream" that no one be judged by the color of his skin.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 159—INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION DESIGNATING JANUARY 15 OF EACH YEAR AS MARTIN LUTHER KING DAY

(By Senator EDWARD W. BROOKE)

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the renewed outbursts of civil disorder in the cities of America are costly and futile counterpoint to the profound sense of grief which has swept across this Nation since last Thursday. The lasting imprint on this country's conscience and behavior will not be made by the misguided and reckless participants in these disturbances, however vividly we may remember the ugly scenes of these few days. The lasting impressions will be those etched in our memory by the good life and good works of the man whose death last week bound the great majority of Americans together in outrage and mourning.

All over the land people are seeking appropriate ways to express their bereavement at the passing of Martin Luther King, Jr. In these first days of our loss proper tribute has been paid to Dr. King, not in the streets, but in the churches and chapels, the schools and homes of the United States. And I am confident that the greater and lingering tribute will come in further action toward the glorious goals of brotherhood and justice so diligently pursued by Martin Luther King, Jr.

As Americans, individually and collectively, rededicate themselves to these ends, it would be fitting to pay our respects to this noble figure by enduring public commemoration of his life and philosophy.

For this purpose I believe the Congress should declare January 15, the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., an annual occasion of recognition for this man and his mission. To accomplish this I am today submitting the following joint resolution:

"S.J. RES 159

"Whereas the United States of America is deeply grieved by the vicious and senseless act which ended the life of the Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Junior, the country's apostle of nonviolence;

"Whereas the United States of America and its Senators and Representatives in Congress, recognize and appreciate the immense contribution and sacrifice of this dedicated American;

"Whereas the American people are determined that the life and works of this great man shall not be obscured by violence and anger, but rather that they shall remain a shining symbol of the Nation's nonviolent struggle for social progress;

"Whereas it is incumbent upon us to recognize the violence, hatred, and national division do no honor to the man who has been taken from us;

"Whereas mutual respect and a firm commitment to the ideals of nonviolence for which he labored will be the most lasting memorial to the life of the Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Junior;

"Whereas it is fervently hoped that his death may serve to reconcile those among us who have harbored hatred and resentment for their fellow Americans, to the end that our country may at last realize the ideal of equality set forth in our Constitution. Therefore, it is hereby

"Resolved, That, in honor of the Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Junior, who was born on January 15, 1929, January 15 of each year is hereby designated as "Martin Luther King Day". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation each year calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate the life and the service to his country and its citizens of the Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Junior, and to observe that day with appropriate honor ceremonies, and prayers."

This proposal is not one I make lightly, but in the earnest conviction that we need to do all that we can to perpetuate the spirit and example of Martin Luther King, Jr. It is already evident that he occupies a unique place in American history. The values he epitomized are the very values which this country needs to sustain it on the march toward a more humane and equitable society.

I make this suggestion fully mindful of the fact that very few Americans have been so honored. No Negro American has yet been added to that small company of distinguished patriots who have received such tribute. At this time, more than any other, this Nation needs to raise up for itself and its posterity the image of reconciliation encompassed in the person of Martin Luther King. Approval of this resolution would be one measure of our commitment to do so.

Honor is not enough, but it is due. Symbols are not the substance of action, but in the long and complex paths of social evolution, symbols are also necessary. Dedication of a day each year to commemorate Martin Luther King, Jr., and his legacy to our Nation would symbolize in fitting manner our reverence for the man and our devotion to his principles.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I hesitate to speak at all following the eloquent statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

I merely rise to say that I believe that, better than anyone else, the Senator from Massachusetts clearly states the situation and the problems which face this country today.

I had the opportunity to listen to him yesterday on a television program. And it seemed to me that if our Government and its leaders and the people of our country follow the counsel and advice he gave on yesterday, our country could move from this growing alienation of the two great groups in our country and could move to that of equality which our Constitution promises, and, into a reconciliation of the two great peoples and fellow citizens of our country.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for his very kind and very generous remarks relative to my appearance yesterday on "Face the Nation."

AFTERMATH OF DR. KING'S DEATH

By Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, weeks have passed since the awful act that took Dr. Martin Luther King's life. The violence and destruction that followed in its wake has abated. Once again the Nation has been witness to the spectacle of a majestic mass funeral for a fallen great. As the shock and numbness of those first days wore off, the Nation again turned to its everyday affairs.

But the crisis facing the United States, and the dangers, have not disappeared. We, as a nation, are in the midst of convulsive evolution. Not since the period following the Civil War has the United States faced such a domestic crisis.

Full equality under law, now guaranteed all citizens through legislation, must be met by true equality of opportunity. The United States must decide which course it is to follow: whether it will be one of increased violence, further distrust among whites and blacks, and greater polarization of the races. Or one of progress, reconciliation, and hope for the future.

The ideals of Dr. King will be sorely tested in the months to come.

In a series of editorials published earlier this month in the Bergen County Record, the legacy of Dr. King is eloquently described. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"[From the Bergen County Record, Apr. 5, 1968]

"A LEGACY IS OURS

"He had a dream, he said, speaking slowly in that rich deep baritone of his, and a quarter of a million people spread on the lawn that day in Washington listened, rapt.

"The vision he had was so simple, so guilelessly uncomplicated, that one wonders now as then: is it really all that impossible?

"He talked of things as human and natural, as Christian, really, as having little black boys and girls play as equals with little white boys and girls. Is this utopian?

"He spoke of the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners breaking the bread of brotherhood together. Is that as inconceivable as it sounds?

"He first came to national attention, did Martin Luther King Jr., as the organizer of a campaign to let the Negroes in a sun-baked little city in Alabama ride in the front of the local buses. Did that constitute a revolution?

"One would scarcely think so, looking back on Montgomery after 12 years of civil rights struggle. And today even Alabama has grown used to the idea.

"Now it is proposed that Congress pass as a memorial to Dr. King a bill to guarantee black men the right to compete on an equal footing with whites in the private housing market.

"Such a law is needed, as a matter of simple justice. This is why it should be enacted—not because the freshly turned grave of a soft-spoken young minister is in need of a monument.

"He was the least vain of men; but he will be remembered long years after our grandchildren have gone their way.

"To say his death is tragic, to say it's shameful is to demonstrate the feebleness of words on such an occasion. Yet, it is tragic, and sorrowful and hurtful too, a cause for the sort of bone-deep grieving we last knew as a nation Nov. 22, 1963.

"Justice requires that his murderer be found, tried, and held to account, of course. We hope the authorities in Memphis will acquit themselves better in their crisis of law enforcement than the police of Dallas did in theirs.

"The punishment of one lunatic black-guard won't bring Martin Luther King back to us. But he left something behind, something important that with a little cherishing could prove imperishable.

"It's this singularly utilitarian idea he had of brotherhood, a concept drawn partly from his Bible studies, partly from his life model, Mohandas Gandhi, the apostle of nonviolent resistance. It's awfully hard to turn the other cheek when provocations are as thickly bunched and inflammatory as they are in American life today, Dr. King would say. It takes strength to endure, but steadfastness can crumble walls that repel direct attacks.

"Martin Luther King Jr. had strength enough for ten. He endured. And he advanced, too, and he took us with him, a farther way than we perhaps recognize in the bitterness of today's sorrow. We shall overcome."

"[From the Berger County Record, Apr. 10, 1968]

"THE BELLS NEXT TIME

"The somber stillness of that Tuesday in Holy Week spoke for a nation more eloquently than could hymns or tears or tolling bells. What the stillness testified was that at last a whole people understands what Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., lived for and what he died for. The passionate cry of Walt Whitman, prophet of brotherhood, sprang to mind unbidden:

"This dust was once the man,
Gentle, plain, just and resolute, under
whose cautious hand,
Against the foulest crime . . .
Was saved the union of these states."

"It is not untimely now to speak humbly of transfiguration, and it is not naive to suppose the Episcopal bishops of the archdiocese of Newark spoke for all of us, excepting none, when they said, 'Our best memorial to him will be to stand where he stood and to do what he did, to look again at the society for which he died to root out those evils which keep us all in bondage.'

"So be it, but winged words and mute reverence are not an adequate substitute for action.

"In an unescapable way, we are what we do, and the world is what we make it. What remains to be done—and we may as well resign ourselves gladly to the clatter and clamor of it—is to make radical, major, fundamental changes carrying equality beyond the constitutional and statutory guarantees into economic and social certainties: to lift equality out of our books and anchor it in the way we live.

"We know what needs to be done. Next time the bells ring in memory of Dr. King, let them make a joyful sound.

"We have a long way to go. We are on our way."

"[From the Berger County Record]

"DR. KING'S REQUEST TO EACH MAN

"There are two mankind. Within the skin of each man, regardless of its color, there live two men. One is the animal, governed by its appetites and glands and nameless glimmering fears and hatreds. The other is he, a little less than angels, who lets himself be governed by his strange God-given mind.

"Between these two stood Martin Luther King, Jr., rejecting the animal Man, appealing to the reason which tells the new man that brotherhood and peace are the way of the future and the only safe way to the future.

"He stands pleading still. It remains to be seen which Man will emerge triumphant from the silent struggle within us, each of us. It remains to be seen how each, black and white alike, resolves the secret inward crisis which in its totality is the outward public crisis of our time.

"It is quite a responsibility Dr. King has bequeathed to us. Have it your way."

AMERICAN TRAGEDY

(By Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the death of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., as we are all only too sadly aware, has created an enormous void in the ranks of those in this country who symbolize moral leadership and hope. His death is an American tragedy of unfathomable dimensions.

As an editorial in the Milwaukee Journal on April 5 said so eloquently:

"Spiritual leader, orator, man of letters, organizer, national symbol of the civil rights movement, Nobel peace laureate, he helped to poke and pry the nation down the road to greater racial equity—not gently but nonviolently, always within the shadow of the first amendment right to freedom of speech."

There is hope that Dr. King's death, as he himself often predicted, will be a redemptive death; that out of the ruins of his death and our sorrow will come progress toward the goals he so effectively and eloquently articulated.

Quoting again from the Milwaukee Journal's excellent editorial:

"The life of Martin Luther King can be snuffed out, but his ideas cannot; they are immune to jails, cattle prods and snipers' bullets. And ideas are Mr. King's legacy to America."

I ask unanimous consent that the Journal

editorial be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"AMERICAN TRAGEDY"

"The obituary of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., was written Thursday by an assassin's bullet. The nation and the world are sickened and saddened by the outrage. His death is an American tragedy and the guilt is shared by us all.

"Spiritual leader, orator, man of letters, organizer, national symbol of the civil rights movement. Nobel peace laureate, he helped poke and pry the nation down the road to greater racial equity—not gently but non-violently, always within the shadow of the first amendment right to freedom of speech.

"The model of his nonviolence was Mahatma Gandhi, and Mr. King died as the great Indian leader died 20 years ago, cut down by an assassin's bullet.

"Mr. King could speak with the voice of angels or with the fire of evangelism; in the thunder of outrage or the whisper of eloquence. Perhaps his greatest speech was delivered during 1963's historic civil rights march on Washington:

"I have a dream that one day, on the red hills of Georgia, sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood," he said. "I have a dream today that one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low. The rough places will be made plain and the crooked places will be made straight. . . .

"That dream must come true, or life becomes a living nightmare."

"He walked often with death, and he knew it. He was reviled, stoned, repeatedly jailed, most recently last year. Yet he could say: 'Again and again, we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force.'

"The life of a Martin Luther King can be snuffed out, but his ideas cannot; they are immune to jails, cattle prods and snipers' bullets. And ideas are Mr. King's legacy to America.

"Mr. King aimed his message not just at the overt bigot but at the apathetic bystander, black or white. In a remarkable letter from Birmingham jail in 1963 he declared: 'We will have to repent in this generation not merely for the vitriolic words and actions of the bad people but for the appalling silence of the good people. . . . I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negro's great stumbling block in the stride toward freedom is not the White Citizens councilor or the Ku Klux Klanner but the white moderate who is more devoted to order than to justice.'

"Even as Mr. King was cut down in Memphis, he was repeating this theme in form letters he had mailed to homes across the nation as president of the Southern Christian Leadership conference.

"We cannot condone either violence or the equivalent evil of passivity," he wrote. Again he prodded America's white majority to do its duty and help the Negro 'wrest from government fundamental measures to end the long agony of the hard core poor.'

"The letter added: 'A prosperous society can afford it; a moral society cannot afford to do without it.'

"Mr. King's death puts a dual burden on the nation. It cannot, in bitter and frustrated reaction, avenge him 'by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred,' as he put it five years ago in Washington.

"It would be the supreme tragic irony if the reaction to the death of this man of nonviolence were to be a new wave of violence; this way lies civil strife and the massive repression of everybody's rights.

"But it would be a like calamity if the meaning of his life, and his cause, were to be ignored and forgotten by the nation. Essential now is a positive and vigorous effort by America's white majority, from the halls of

Congress to the city halls, to make this country what it proudly proclaims itself to be—a land of equal opportunity, under law, for all men."

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which would require Congressmen, Federal judges, and policymaking officials of the executive branch of the Federal Government to report annually the sources and amounts of their outside income.

Citizens across our country are now questioning the integrity of public officials and are asking for such reports. I believe that public disclosure of sources and amounts of income should increase and restore public confidence. In my opinion, the present legislative requirements concerning income reporting are inadequate and legislation of the type I introduced today should be enacted into law. It is imperative that we take action at once to reestablish the faith of the American people in their national leadership.

In line with this thinking, I desire to make public the sources and amounts of all outside income that I have received while in Congress. When becoming a Member of Congress in 1960, I gave up all law practice in order to devote my full time to congressional duties. I never charge for public speeches.

The property that my wife and I own represents some inheritance and modest savings and investments made during a period of over 35 years. The stocks and bonds were purchased in western North Carolina at market value and most of them represent investments in North Carolina industries. None of my outside income is dependent in any way on my being a Member of Congress. It all comes from property investments, and not from the use of my time, all of which is devoted to congressional responsibilities.

For the calendar year 1968, the total income received by my wife and me, in addition to my salary as a Member of Congress, was as follows:

From a family-owned dairy farm in Leicester Township of Buncombe County, N.C.	\$1,890.09
From dividends from a variety of stocks and taxable bonds (most belong to me, some are owned by my wife)	2,368.20
From capital gains on installment sale of Black Mountain, N.C., real estate	739.29
From interest on purchase money real estate notes; savings deposits; and Swannanoa, N.C., Baptist Church development bonds	986.66
Total	5,984.24

For the calendar year 1967:

Dairy farm	\$2,645.76
Dividends	2,007.75
Capital gains	127.40
Rent	322.71
Interest	1,096.20
Total	6,199.82

For the calendar year 1966:

Dairy farm	\$2,175.00
Dividends	1,743.77
Rent	435.00
Interest	655.10
Total	5,008.97

For the calendar year 1965:

Dairy farm	\$2,192.50
Dividends	1,283.90
Capital gain	158.50
Rent	538.00
Interest	873.20
Total	5,046.30

For the calendar year 1964:

Dairy farm	\$1,966.00
Dividends	1,483.00
Liquidation dividend of interest in Spanish Castle Estates, Inc., a real estate company of Black Mountain, N.C.	1,482.80
Rent	317.30
Interest	893.50
Total	6,142.80

For the calendar years 1961, 1962, and 1963, and the portion of 1960 that I was a Member of Congress, outside income came from the same sources mentioned above, that is farm, interest, rent, and dividends, and amounted to less than \$4,000 each year.

PRESIDENT NIXON SPEAKS OUT FOR A STRONG AMERICA

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

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, in his address at the Air Force Academy yesterday, President Nixon very properly warned the Nation about the mounting criticism that is being heard of every thing military. As stated by the President, this practice can, if not abated, endanger the security of our country at a very critical time in our history.

Much of this ill-considered criticism goes beyond expressions of concern about the size of the military budget or doubt about our involvement in Vietnam. Many of these verbal assaults are against our Military Establishment itself and directed at those segments of our industry that fulfill military requirements.

It goes without saying that every right-thinking person hopes for the time when we can safely afford to reduce military expenditures and divert more of such outlays for other uses—or give it back to the people in reduced taxes.

But this is not the time to cut essential defense expenditures to the extent that has been suggested. The fact is that we are not living in a Garden of Eden; we live in a time of grave peril when we cannot afford to lower our guard and risk becoming a second rate power. Yet policies recommended by some would lead us down that road.

President Nixon is to be commended for his timely and forthright warning. In my judgment he said the right thing, at the right time, in the right place. The American people will, I feel sure, heed this advice and rally behind those policies which will maintain our strength in this great struggle for peace and survival.

CALIFORNIA WATER PROBLEMS ARE NOT SOLVED

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading conservationist voices in the State of California is the McClatchy Newspapers, which publishes the Fresno Bee, the Modesto Bee, and the Sacramento Bee, in California.

Because of their long-standing record of support for strong conservation policies, it may be assumed that their views would be worthy of some attention on the part of everyone who is interested in preserving our land and water resources.

For this reason, I believe it is pertinent to bring to the attention of the Members an editorial which appeared in the Fresno Bee on May 23. It deals with the proposed Dos Rios Dam in northern California, which is badly needed in order to provide additional water supplies for our State.

I insert in the RECORD the full text of the editorial:

STATE WATER PROBLEMS ARE NOT SOLVED

The setback handed state water planners by Gov. Ronald Reagan's order to give more study to water project alternatives to the proposed Dos Rios Dam in Mendocino County places a serious challenge before the conservationists of the state.

They have hailed the Reagan decision against Dos Rios as a victory. But it will not remain a victory if the future needs for more water in California are not met. Conservationists would suffer in such an event along with those who have been promoters of the Dos Rios Project.

Gov. Reagan, in an apparent attempt to modify the impact of his ruling, declared, "I want to make clear that the state will meet its commitments to furnish water under State Water Project contracts."

This is the crux of the matter. The water planners became convinced, after three decades of detailed study of all potential developments, the Dos Rios plan was the best method of making sure the water contracts would be fulfilled.

John Teerink, deputy director of the State Department of Water Resources, said the effect of the governor's directive is to force water planners to re-evaluate plans which were discarded several years ago in favor of Dos Rios.

This re-study should be undertaken with speed because the need for future water supplies to meet the requirements of the State Water Project will not abate. Water shortages could become critical throughout the state if new sources are not developed soon.

It most often takes 20 to 25 years between study of a project and delivery of water, including time for authorization, financing, engineering and construction.

Thus, if the conservationists have the good of all of California at heart, they should be assisting in any way they can to bring the alternative water project surveys to early completion.

COMMUNICABLE DISEASE CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1969

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend section 316 of the Public Health

Service Act—42 U.S.C. 264—to provide financial assistance to the States to prevent the introduction, transmission, or spread of communicable diseases in the United States from foreign countries and from interstate and intrastate sources.

Grants would be awarded by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to States and to political subdivisions of States, with the approval of the State health authority, to assist in financing communicable disease control programs.

The grants would finance the purchase of vaccines or other agents for those population groups determined to be epidemiologically important to the control of communicable disease as well as for personnel and program operating expenses needed for epidemiological activities.

There would be \$60 million authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1970, \$75 million for fiscal year 1971, and \$90 million for fiscal year 1972.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that Congress has, for the past few years, been harboring a false sense of security about communicable diseases.

There seems to be a feeling that we have conquered polio, German measles, and tuberculosis. The diseases which appear to be of more concern today are cancer, and heart disease.

I do not suggest that cancer and heart disease are not serious, but what I do suggest is that we have become too complacent about communicable diseases which are still very much with us, and which will reach epidemic proportions very soon if we do not keep our control programs operating at the necessary levels to realize results.

Each year about 50,000 cases of German measles—rubella—are reported although the actual incidence is estimated to be approximately 2.5 million. This is a disease that brings mild discomfort to children, but when transmitted to pregnant women, it carries with it the risk of death, physical disability, and mental disorder to the unborn child.

It is estimated that approximately 25 percent of the women who have German measles during the first trimester of pregnancy give birth to infants with severe congenital defects.

During the 1964 epidemic, 20,000 children were born with congenital abnormalities. A major German measles epidemic is predicted for 1970-71 and it is estimated that there are now some 50 million children who need protection. This bill would make that protection possible.

Still another communicable disease that can be controlled is tuberculosis. Control has been improving, particularly under project grants under section 314(e) of the partnership for health law—Public Law 89-749.

But, under the administration's proposed budget amendments for fiscal year 1970, \$18 million in project grant money would be eliminated and \$18 million added to formula grants under section 314(d) of the law.

The problem with this approach is that the project grants for TB control were concentrated in States with the highest incidence of tuberculosis, but the formula grants by law must be al-

located on the basis of population and financial need without regard to the extent of the TB problem. Many States with the most severe TB problem will lose substantial sums of money in the shift from project grants to formula grants.

The same problem faces those States with a high incidence of venereal disease, polio or diphtheria.

The bill that I am introducing today would give recognition to the geographical incidence of communicable diseases in the allocation of funds for their eradication. In addition, the project grant would be awarded only after the Secretary has given consideration to the extent of the communicable disease problem and to the levels of performance in preventing and controlling the disease. For example, the Secretary would consider the number of vaccinations performed and the number of cases under control when making the award.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail to act soon to meet the serious problems represented by communicable diseases, we will again have epidemics facing us, and the health gap will have widened, and widened unnecessarily.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH BEFORE THE GRADUATING CLASS AT THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the President of the United States for his statesmanlike speech of yesterday before the graduating class at the Air Force Academy.

I salute him for articulating so well to hear the combination of idealism and realism that should guide our country in its role as leader of that portion of the world that still remains free, though threatened by the forces of aggressive international communism.

The President's speech was a clear-cut statement of America's objectives. It was a statement around which all reasonable men can gather. It was a statement of which the late President Dwight David Eisenhower would have been proud, for it called to the attention of those who belabor the general's warning against the military-industrial complex, his further warning that—

We must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

I am glad that President Nixon emphasized the need to maintain a strong defense force. If we let our guard down, Mr. Speaker, our mistake could be fatal. The men who count in the Kremlin—if their actions in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere are any measure—are not the kind of men who will give us a second chance. As I said on April 21 in a speech on the floor of the house regarding the Soviet takeover of Czechoslovakia, the man in the Kremlin, "respect only force and the willingness to use it, not wishful thinking, no matter how sincere, and unilateral disarmament."

In conclusion, I would like to say a word about Vietnam. Since the Presi-

dent's speech, a number of eminent politicians have violently criticized the President for not having settled the Vietnam war since he took office on January 20. It is interesting to note that many of them were closely associated with the policies of both President Johnson and President Kennedy which led to our deep involvement in Vietnam for reasons with which they themselves were at least at one time in agreement. Yet, now, they expect President Nixon to settle in 6 months a war that has not been settled in 6 years. If such critics really want peace, a real peace and not a surrender, a peace that is honorable and will serve to prevent future Vietnams, then they should show Hanoi that they support the President of the United States. They should demonstrate a national unity, so that Hanoi will negotiate seriously in Paris, instead of prolonging the war and the killing in the hope that its propaganda battle in the frontlines of America will bring them the victory they could not win against American and South Vietnamese boys in Vietnam.

H.R. 10566—A BILL TO PROTECT CITIZENS' RIGHT OF PRIVACY FROM GOVERNMENT QUESTIONNAIRES

(Mr. BETTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, modern government today depends on information-gathering technology to formulate and implement public policy and to promote many worthwhile humanistic needs. Much of this information is calculated on data submitted by private citizens on various Government-sponsored questionnaires. The search for information is frequently carried out with best intentions and is conducted in a reasonable prudent fashion. Yet, all too often the American citizenry has become subject to requests for data which appear to be, on closer analysis, of questionable relevancy and of a highly personal nature. Moreover, as Prof. Arthur R. Miller of the University of Michigan Law School has noted, people are losing control over the flow of information about themselves. In his words:

The value on an individual's informational spigot is now in the custody of an indeterminate and unidentifiable number of administrators and computerniks.

It is becoming increasingly clear that Americans are resenting forms of legal coercion to surrender rights guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

To cite a case in point, I was recently informed by a constituent that upon the death of her mother she received a questionnaire entitled, "National Mortality Sample Survey," from the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare inquiring of her mother's smoking habits. She ignored the questionnaire since her mother did not smoke and because she was disturbed by some of the questions asked. However, soon thereafter she received a second questionnaire by certified mail. Although she did note on this questionnaire that

her mother was a nonsmoker, she refused to answer those inquiries she felt were of a personal nature and completely irrelevant to the questions regarding smoking habits. Among those were included:

First. What was the total money income of the deceased's family during 1965?

Second. What would you judge to be the total value of things owned by the deceased person after any debts or mortgages were paid off?

A third letter was soon forthcoming advising her to fill out the remaining questions. At no time was she advised that the questionnaires were voluntary and in fact by the time she received the third letter she felt it best to seek legal advice. I suggest that the case clearly represents an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy and by the very nature which it was conducted implied threats of coercion.

The omnipresence of government at all levels and their insatiable need for statistical data and information should not be used as an excuse to harass and overburden citizens with surveys prompted by some bureaucrat's desire for information that is justifiable only as far as he or his agency is concerned.

Indeed, we must seek to establish a balance between the individual's desire to be left alone and the Government's need for information.

With this concern in mind, I have introduced a bill, along with Messrs. McCULLOCH, WALDIE, MESKILL, and KYL, to protect the constitutional rights of the individual citizen by placing limitations on the executive branch in its quest for personal data. This bill is a companion to S. 1791, which was introduced by Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., on April 14, 1969.

H.R. 10566 provides that the only mandatory questionnaires the Government may distribute to individuals for statistical purposes must be a result of a specific constitutional provision. It also provides that questionnaires distributed on a voluntary basis must be specifically authorized by Congress through statutory law and that such questionnaires advise the individual that disclosure is voluntary.

In April the Senate Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, under the chairmanship of Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., continued extensive hearings on individual privacy and constitutional rights with respect to Federal questionnaires. This subcommittee has provided a national forum from which concerned citizens of all walks of life have been able to testify regarding their personal experiences in confronting these questionnaires. Also participating have been noted legal scholars who have spoken out against the use of Federal criminal and civil sanctions in order to acquire personal information from individuals. It has been readily apparent that there is little legal precedence in this area and the executive branch has been allowed a free reign to gather information on the personal habits of the American people. This subcommittee is to be commended for its diligent efforts to delve into the complex and relatively untouched subject area of personal privacy and individual

rights in supplying information to the Federal Government.

Citizens of this country have a responsibility to disclose reasonable amounts of personal data in the public interest. What I believe the American people are asking this Congress to do is to strengthen the privacy side of this issue and to minimize the burden of questions requested of the public through the multitude of inquiries generated by Government agencies. Must we accept benignly the words of a high official in the Census Bureau, the largest collector of data in the United States, who stated recently that—

We must lose some privacy as we (the country) grow.

Acknowledging today's trend toward information collection, Dr. Conrad F. Taeuber, the Associate Director of the Census Bureau, made this comment:

We've got to limit the freedom that American pioneers had . . . and a nation has to adjust to differences that exist in a country with 4 million people or 200 million.

Dr. Taeuber's statements are cause for serious concern and are particularly disturbing in light of a letter I received from a Census Bureau employee who resigned "for reasons of conscience" because of the intrusive nature of a program he was associated with. The letter, a résumé of this person's experience with the Bureau of the Census, is intended to shed light on the scope of the Bureau's activities. It accomplishes more than this; it sounds an eloquent warning that should strike responsive chords of disquietude in all of us. Let me provide actual extracts from this statement:

Few realize that the Census Bureau no longer works on a 10 year population survey basis. Instead, they have *continuous* inquiries into every phase of America's homes and businesses.

A plan has been set up dividing the entire nation into theoretical areas of 1,000 addresses. Ten addresses are selected in a given group of homes to be interviewed repeatedly for eight months in a 12 month period. Then 10 more addresses are selected in that same area. It was pointed out to us, that with this schedule, in ten years' time, every family and individual in the U.S.A. will be thoroughly surveyed and investigated. Actually, the family is interviewed for 4 consecutive months, is allowed to rest for 4 months, then interviewed again for 4 more months. In this way, a family's fortunes, misfortunes, and activities are covered for a full year.

As I got further into the program, I saw that this invasion of privacy was reaching appalling proportions. Though the number of questions asked each month was essentially the same, they varied slightly and became more searching until they seemed designed to break down the individual's sense of dignity and a family's normal right to the protection of its privacy.

We told the people that the interviews were entirely confidential, that their identity was of no importance, and that their answers were for statistical purposes only. However, the respondent's name and social security number and those of each member of his household—relative or otherwise—were entered on a large control card with his address and other identifying information while all of the other interviewing forms carried his same control card number so that all of these papers could be kept together in government files, discrepancies checked out, etc. Interviewers were asked to return to homes where answers to questions were in disagreement

with answers in previous months. *This type of recording cannot be merely statistical.* (The records are kept at Jeffersonville, Indiana.) The printed questions, tho prying, may seem innocuous at first reading, but after eight months of repeated questioning, we would ultimately find out everything concerning the family for five years back. To explain a period of unemployment, particularly if employment had not been actively sought, we would learn if a husband, a son, or daughter had spent time in a mental institution, a prison, or reformatory, or if the family had had marital problems or some deep trouble which made it advisable for them to move from one state to another. We didn't ask such questions per se, but with the oft repeated question, "What were you doing?", "What was he doing?", "Why?" brought to light many things that people have a right to conceal or forget.

Some people looked at me aghast and said "Good Lord! Is this Russia?" One woman requested a set of forms to turn over to her attorney. Some women wept because their husbands had stormed at them for having revealed family finances and personal activities in answer to questioning by an interviewer. One male interviewer was pushed down the stairs by an irate householder. For the most part, however, in probably 98% of the cases, people answered all questions resignedly though unwillingly knowing they couldn't fight Big Government. It seems to me that this is the most tragic aspect of the program. People are gradually submitting to all sorts of surveys and investigations if the questioner carries a government identification card.

I could cite pitiful cases where I found elderly, crippled people making out as best they could on small pensions. One was even caring for a deaf mute girl that had been abandoned. But the schedule required that I return month after month to ask if they had sought employment ("Don't you want to work?" "Wouldn't you like more of an income than you have now?") or if they had exhausted all avenues of reeducating themselves to make them more employable, etc., etc. This sort of harassment practiced by an agency of the American government is really shameful.

Mr. Speaker, an individual's right of privacy transcends the rapid growth of technological sophistication in our country and is forever connected with our basic right of liberty. It must never be compromised in favor of well-meaning but nonetheless impersonal intentions of convenience, value, and efficiency.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE TO AMERICAN INDIANS

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech on the Navaho Reservation, the junior Member from Massachusetts, of the other body, made the flat statement that the Indians would get no more money from the Federal Government until the Vietnam war was over. His total disregard for the facts is genuinely shocking. In fiscal 1969 the approximately 300,000 American Indians will receive \$498 million from the Federal Government, and they are budgeted for \$525 million for fiscal year 1970. These programs involve nine agencies of the Federal Government, and probably some have been overlooked by me. One must

draw the parallel of the undermining of the morale of the Indians and the obvious weakening of the morale of our U.N. fighting forces by the same man for what appears to be raw political profit.

That the statement with regard to the Indians is completely without validity, is also paralleled by the lack of validity of the gentlemen's "Hamburger Hill" statement. The complete lack of accuracy in the passionate pursuit of political profit is not limited to the gentleman from Massachusetts, but he certainly is one of its more obvious proponents. Hopefully, the American people will not be deceived.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1969, while I was unavoidably detained at an important meeting with constituents in my district, and personally moving my family from Kansas to Washington, the House took two rollcall votes on H.R. 763 to provide for a study of State laws concerning the governing operations of youth camps, and on H.R. 693 to provide that veterans 72 years of age shall be deemed unable to defray hospital expenses.

I request that it be made a matter of record that had I been present, I would have voted in opposition of H.R. 763 and voted in the affirmative on H.R. 693.

TAX REFORM MEANS RELIEF FROM TAXES

(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, tax reform is not a dead issue. The public is deeply concerned about the proposals that have been made by the administration and the Ways and Means Committee. I share that concern, for it appears to me that there has been a psychological letdown since April 15, and now one hears more about the problems connected with a meaningful tax reform than about the subject of tax reform itself.

Such a letdown is natural—we have experienced it in past years but I submit that this year is different and the public is expecting the Congress to act rather than just promise. The issue of a taxpayers' revolt is very much alive as the people of Philadelphia can tell you. In the recent election, a school bond issue was defeated and the reason, according to the Inquirer, should be of great interest to Members of Congress. In an editorial following the election, the paper noted:

We believe the overriding factor in the bond issue's defeat was the growing wave of revulsion by hard-working, law-abiding people against high taxes and big spending that have become a way of life for government bureaucrats who provide generous pay and pensions for themselves, who dole out money left and right to pressure groups, but show precious little concern for the ordinary wage earner trying to pay his bills, live

within his budget and keep his head above the ever-rising waters of the inflationary tide. That was the big message in the "No" vote on the school bond issue, and it reflects a feeling widespread not only in Philadelphia but throughout America. Public officials who refuse to believe it do not want to see the handwriting on the wall.

At the national level the handwriting spells out a loud and clear demand from the overburdened middle-income taxpayer: provide tax reform, reduce tax rates.

I am heartened by outward appearances indicating a major tax reform bill will be brought before us this year. However, I have been in this House long enough to know that the tax reform tune has been sung before without the middle-income taxpayer benefiting from the music. I do not believe that the American taxpayer is in the mood to suffer a disappointment on tax reform this year. The handwriting on the wall reads "revolt," and no one in this House can view with equanimity the prospect of a massive demonstration against the Government by those now carrying the heaviest burden of taxation.

We are talking about the plight and patience of the middle-income taxpayer. Based on projected statistics for 1969, that is the group that will report between \$7,000 and \$20,000 in income. They will file 33 million of the projected 78 million returns in 1969, and after you exclude the untaxed returns, the middle-income group will end up filing 50 percent of the returns with taxable income. In terms of numbers of returns filed, and in terms of the total amount of dollars reported, it boils down to this: the middle-income group which will report adjusted gross income in the amount of \$351 billion, will carry the low-income group and the high-income group.

Chairman MILLS of the Ways and Means Committee said that he "very definitely" believed the middle-income people were taxed too heavily, but rather than hold out any hope for the burden on this group, he said:

Frankly, I doubt that we will be able to develop sufficient revenues by removing preferences to lower their (middle-income group) tax rates. My recommendation to people who feel they are being taxed too heavily is to insist that some curb be placed upon expenditures of the Government. Not until we do that can we expect significant tax relief for middle-income taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, it is a statement like that, coming as it does from the powerful chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, that prompts my concern about the fate of the plans for tax reform. Whatever the term "tax reform" means to the economists and bureaucrats, it means "relief from taxes" to the middle-income taxpayer. A tax reform that does not grant significant relief to the middle-income taxpayer is not tax reform in my opinion. And I believe I am speaking for the vast majority of America's middle-income taxpayers.

Tax reform should mean many changes in our tax system. Recently a "trial balloon" was sent up stating that our tax system should be changed to the extent that all exemptions, deductions, and

preferences were disallowed, while the tax rates were substantially reduced.

I have long believed that such a revolutionary change is feasible and I am again heartened that a study is underway to gather the statistical and other data necessary to determine if such a change in our tax laws is practical. My own guess is that under such a revolutionary concept more money would flow into the Federal Treasury rather than less. Until recently there has been a reluctance on the part of many to fully explore the possibilities of such a major revision of our tax system. Because of this we have lacked the facts upon which a decision could be made on whether or not to proceed with such changes. My hope, and I am sure it is the hope of all Members, is that the results of the study will be made available to us in the very near future in order that we may consider even more substantial tax reforms than those presently under discussion.

Another change that I believe must be in any tax reform package that comes out of the Ways and Means Committee is our recognition that the middle-income group is made up of more than just married American taxpaying families. The results of a Brookings Institution study made last year revealed that the present law discriminates heavily against single persons. It is long past time for this inequity to be rectified and the easiest and simplest way would be to extend head-of-household benefits to other than married persons who maintain their own homes.

Mr. Speaker, for the past several years I have introduced a bill to rectify this deplorable situation and again in this session I introduced H.R. 2507 which attacks the problem of tax discrimination against the single person.

An excellent article on the subject of the single taxpayer recently appeared in the Washington Star, written by the syndicated financial columnist, Sylvia Porter. Her article, "Single Taxpayer Needs Help," is a very powerful argument in behalf of the kind of change in the law that my bill would bring about, and I am including the article in my remarks because of its timeliness:

SINGLE TAXPAYER NEEDS HELP
(By Sylvia Porter)

Single taxpayers have almost no chance of relief from discrimination in the initial installment of the tax reform bill. The administration did not offer any such proposal in its reform package. And there is no sign that the House Ways & Means Committee is considering this aspect.

In the second installment, there is reason for single taxpayers to expect adjustments in the rates and personal exemption rules which so heavily discriminate against the never-married, the widow and the widower. A Treasury spokesman says, "The need for this reform is very much recognized." A powerful congressman adds that "heavy pressures" from representatives of the single taxpayer "are being felt."

In fact, it could be that if the tax package is delayed until 1970-71, this reform might be part of it. Here, therefore is a progress report.

The discrimination against the single taxpayer is obvious, harsh—and apparent not only in the tax rate structure but also in the system for personal exemptions. To be specific:

1. Rates. The married couple has the enormous advantage of being able to split income for tax purposes. If you are married, you pay taxes at substantially lower rates than if you are single. There is no logic to this and it is unfair.

2. Personal exemptions. The single taxpayer has one personal exemption of \$600. The married couple has a minimum of two, or \$1,200. Again, the logic is questionable; it is nonsense to assume that it costs twice as much for the married couple to live as it does for the single person—and the more children, the more exemptions and the bigger the inequity.

3. Dollar totals. The \$600 exemption was voted in 1948. Relentlessly rising living costs since then have reduced it in effect to under \$400. That is pitifully outmoded—and especially for the single person with few other deductions to claim.

When you get to the details, the injustice is even clearer. To illustrate, an unmarried woman supporting an elderly aunt who raised her in a separate household is taxed at a much heavier rate than an unmarried woman supporting her elderly mother in a separate household.

To illustrate further, the personal exemption system was created to protect very low income people and couples with many children; it ignores the middle-income single person. Income splitting was adopted in 1948 to equalize the situation between community property and non-community property states; it also ignores the single person.

The most popular proposals to erase the inequity would broaden the head of household status, with particular reference to the single individual 35 years of age and older.

But a more intelligent approach might be through the system of personal exemptions. By varying personal exemptions according to marital status and income level, the discrimination might be automatically wiped out.

What should a single taxpayer do? Join a group which already has organized to lobby for this reform or organize one on your own. Sign petitions if you prefer this approach. Mail your protests to your congressmen and senators—and keep mailing. Send copies of your protests and/or petitions to the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. Make your voice heard!

This is what other groups lobbying for tax laws do, and their success may be measured by the extent to which the tax laws favor them. You deserve to win this relief—and if you fight, you will.

You will note that Miss Porter quotes a Treasury Department official as agreeing that such a reform is very much recognized by the Department, but not just yet—maybe later. And with a similar approach, Chairman MILLS has said:

The loss of tax revenues probably rules out such relief for now.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not see how Congress can afford to rule out tax relief to over 22 million Americans of whom over 16 million are women.

A further relief reform which is a "must" for this year is our recognition that it takes more than \$600 per year for any one person to live on, and thus the personal exemption deduction must be raised. I do want to point out, in light of my previous statements that I am in favor with doing away with all deductions, that we are now talking about those reforms that must be initiated this year. Several of our colleagues have suggested that the personal exemption be doubled or more, but to be realistic, I have proposed a bill this year that would raise the personal exemption to \$750. This amount, in my opinion, is attainable

in this year's tax reform considerations and is one of those items with which the public is most concerned—and rightly so.

Another thing that should be done at once is to bring the standard deduction up to date. It is now set at 10 percent of adjusted gross income and it should be made to conform to the itemized deductions claimed by the average taxpayer. Fifty-seven percent of the taxpayers use the standard deduction; our goal should be 90 percent.

Mr. Speaker, before April 15, comment on tax reform was generally based on the necessity for such reform; the "taxpayers' revolt" it was called.

There is a momentum for change and it is urgent for us to move while this momentum exists and not after the taxpayer has forgotten what he paid last April 15.

Since that date, comment on tax reform has revolved around the issue of where the money is to come from to make up for the estimated losses to the Treasury from such reforms. I believe the taxpayer is going to remember his tax bill this year. I also believe that all the talk in the world about the amount of money it takes to run the Government is not going to mollify the taxpayers' demand for a substantial tax reform. The calls for reform have centered on numerous tax loopholes, or preferences that have been built into the system for one reason or another. There is no single source that I can find that can with certainty predict the exact amount of revenue to be gained or lost by the various combinations of reforms versus preference eliminations.

However, there is general agreement that the investment tax credit is one of those preferences that should and could be taken out of the system now, with a substantial gain to the Treasury. The investment tax credit was intended to induce industry to make investments; there is no question that it did the job, but the tax credit was not intended to be a permanent subsidy and it is time it was repealed. I am very happy to note in this regard the results of a poll of businessmen taken at the recent 57th annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce wherein 43 percent of the respondents favored repeal of the investment credit while 26 percent were opposed to its repeal—13 percent opted for repeal of the tax credit with liberalized depreciation provisions, 12 percent called for a reduction of the tax credit, and 6 percent had other suggestions.

Naturally, there are many other potential sources of revenue that would be gained if longstanding preferences were closed. I have seen estimates on potential revenue ranging from a low of \$3 billion to a high of \$20 billion. It seems apparent to almost anyone that there are enough sources of taxable income, presently untaxed, that could offset any or most of the tax reform proposals that are of most interest to the middle-income taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude these remarks with a comment on what I feel was the single issue which created the atmosphere for a taxpayer's revolt, and thus the flurry of activity by the administration and the Ways and Means Com-

committee on tax reforms. That was the previous administration's 10-percent income tax surcharge. That extra burden, coming as it did on top of generally higher taxes paid to local and State governments last year, was the straw that broke the camel's back. And after the camel's back was broken, Members of this House added insult to injury by allowing the unconscionable 42-percent congressional pay raise to go into effect. Moneywise, the latter action of this House was not as costly to the taxpayer as the surcharge, but the flagrancy of the pay raise rightly added fuel to the tax reform fire lit by the income tax surcharge.

I voted against the surcharge last year and I will vote against any extension of the tax this year. We cannot, in good conscience ask the taxpayer to shoulder more burdens when we have not made every effort to eliminate the need for Federal spending which raises the national budget. Last month, the vote on the spending ceiling told the American public that we intend to hold the line on Federal spending. If that is what it takes to get a substantial tax reform measure passed this year, then we should take another look at the remaining budget to see where more Federal spending can be trimmed.

It is beyond my comprehension how we can talk about tax reform in one breath and discuss the size of the income tax surcharge in the next breath. We should face the fact that the surcharge must be repealed. Going back to that chamber of commerce poll I mentioned before, I am sure you will be happy to note that 56 percent of the businessmen polled agreed that the surtax should be repealed.

There is talk of extending the 10-percent charge for 9 months, or a 7-percent extension for 6 months, and any number of other combinations. What this must look like to the middle-income taxpayer who is the one that shoulders the burden, is that Congress is trying to figure out a way to get back the money it estimates the Government would lose from a tax reform ostensibly designed to benefit him. Such hypocrisy will not wash with the American taxpayer this year—nor should it.

RICKOVER VIEWS ON ARMS DEBATE MERIT ATTENTION

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I shall be happy when the great ABM debate of 1969 is finally over. Then we can look forward to hearing similarly profound and knowledgeable views from many who are engaging in it about other subjects in which they become instantly expert.

For instance, they can second-guess the brain surgeons about how their work should be done and the instruments they should have to do it. They can fill the rest of us in on all the mistakes the computer people are making and tell us why computers will never work. We can

be made aware of the threat to the country from the surgery-computer complex.

Having explained why we do not need the ABM, they can turn to telling us why we do not need Minutemen or Polaris, either. Then we will be able to sell the Minutemen for scrap and lay up all the Polaris submarines. After that we can get down to talking disarmament effectively with the Soviets, because we shall be such experienced practitioners of the art.

Meanwhile, one of the world's foremost noninstant experts in nuclear strategy has some views about the ABM which possibly should not go unnoticed. He is Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy. A recently syndicated column by James J. Kilpatrick discusses his views:

RICKOVER VIEWS ON ARMS DEBATE MERIT ATTENTION

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Several weeks ago, Sen. John O. Pastore wrote to Adm. H. G. Rickover. The senator asked for the admiral's views on where the nation is going and what needs to be done in a military way at a time of national debate on preparedness.

Rickover responded with a letter that merits the widest possible reading. Let me give him the floor:

"The first point I would like to make," Rickover wrote, "is that in judging between conflicting views on this matter, the deciding factor must be their relevance to the world as it is, not as we would wish it to be. Granted the hideousness of modern war, can we deduce therefrom that mankind is now wise enough to forego recourse to arms? A look at history should put us on guard against those who claim that humanity has now reached a state where the possibility of armed aggression can be safely disregarded in formulating national policy.

"I am reminded of the intense opposition to the Navy's 15-cruiser bill in 1929. It was argued by many that with the signing of the Kellogg Peace Pact the year before, it was no longer necessary to build new warships. And this in light of the lessons of World War I which erupted despite the various Hague Peace Treaties! These ships were of inestimable value in helping us to win World War II. The war itself was prolonged because the Congress—heading the 'merchants of death' argument—in 1939 prohibited shipment of war materials to Britain and France.

"Then, too, weight must be given to the credentials of those propounding opposite views. Are they public servants, charged with the awesome responsibility to secure our country against foreign conquest? Or are they private individuals not accountable for the consequences of their opinions, who feel free to express their personal abhorrence of war and to agitate for a reduction of the financial burden military preparedness imposes on the taxpayer?

"Would the majority of the electorate accept their argument that, given our unmet domestic needs, we cannot afford an effective defense position vis-a-vis our potential adversaries? Or that war is so horrible that it is better to suffer defeat than to fight?

"As for the high cost of preparedness, it is in fact no greater proportionally to total U.S. output than 10 years ago—8.8 percent of total U.S. goods and services. Omitting the costs of the Vietnam war, and allowing for inflation, our armed forces have less buying power today than a decade ago.

"In the Soviet Union, on the other hand—according to the annual report of the congressional subcommittee on foreign economic policy issued last June—resources have been diverted from the farm sector to defense, where outlays rose dramatically in

1966-67, after remaining static since 1962. . . .

"If history teaches anything, it is surely that weakness invites attack; that it takes but one aggressor to plunge the world into war against the wishes of dozens of peace-loving nations if the former is militarily strong and the latter are not. . . .

"As a lawyer, you are familiar with Blackstone's statement that security of the person is the first, and liberty of the individual the second 'absolute right inherent in every Englishman.' Just so, the first right of every American is to be protected against foreign attack, and the first duty of government is to keep our nation alive. Given the world situation, this calls for maintenance of a defense capability which is adequate to discourage potential aggressors. . . .

"There can surely be no doubt that the overwhelming majority of the American people are opposed to relinquishment of our defense capability, recognizing full well that there will then be no one left to prevent the takeover by Communist power. Whether one takes the optimistic view that a permanent East-West detente can be negotiated, or the pessimistic view that ultimately we shall have to fight for our liberties, this nation has no future if it allows itself to be out-matched militarily."

PAYDAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES WILL DEPEND ON PASSAGE OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

(Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, 14 days from today, on June 19 to be exact, the Post Office Department has a payday for 730,000 employees, and has no funds to meet it. It will not have funds to meet it unless the supplemental appropriation bill becomes law before that time.

I just wanted to remind our colleagues that although the supplemental appropriation bill has passed the House it still must pass the other body and go through conference and be signed by the President. We must hope that this can be accomplished in the next 14 days, else we are going to have chaos in at least the Post Office Department and probably in other Government agencies.

If nothing happens by that time, I think the Postmaster General may be faced with the necessity of shutting down the American postal system.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I join my chairman Mr. Speaker, in urging the other body to act promptly on this proposal so that we will not have a chaotic situation in the Post Office Department. The passage of the supplemental bill is warranted, and I believe prompt action is very necessary.

NIXON AND MUSKIE WARN AGAINST ISOLATIONISM

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Nixon delivered an excellent address at the U.S. Air Force

Academy in which he quite properly denounced those who would force America into a return to isolationism.

Mr. Nixon's courageous warning to those who would have America put its head in the sand and remain oblivious to the problems of the world was most timely.

It is the tragedy of our time that prominent voices in this country have refused consistently to see the uninterrupted danger of Soviet colonial expansion.

I congratulate President Nixon and hasten to add that another impressive voice in this Nation who has demonstrated the same good judgment of understanding the drift toward isolationism in this country is Senator EDMUND MUSKIE of Maine.

It is a most interesting coincidence that a day before President Nixon spoke out so eloquently against the dangers of isolationism, Senator MUSKIE delivered a similar speech in Providence, R.I., but one that got substantially less coverage from the national press.

Senator MUSKIE told the graduating class at Providence College that the real challenge of our time is "how can we absorb the painful lessons of Vietnam without an excessive swing of the pendulum back to isolationism."

Senator MUSKIE told the graduating class and, in effect, all of America that—

This question will tax your imagination for the remaining third of this century.

It should be a source of great satisfaction to all Americans regardless of their political affiliation that there are at least two strong voices here in Washington warning against the drift toward isolation—the same kind of drift that we saw in the middle 1930's in America and which ultimately plunged this Nation and the world into the costly and brutal World War II.

I feel a great deal more confident about the future when I see on the Republican side the impressive voice of President Nixon warning against isolation and, on the Democratic side, the highly respected voice of Senator MUSKIE cautioning likewise against isolation. This could be the beginning of a real bipartisan foreign policy which could restore to America true leadership in foreign affairs.

I include in the RECORD the Associated Press report of Senator MUSKIE's speech:

PROVIDENCE, R.I.—Sen. Edmund Muskie, D-Maine, said today the war in Vietnam marks the end of an era in which the United States sought to maintain international stability by supporting Regional Military Alliances.

"In this sense, the Vietnam war is a watershed in American history," Muskie said in a commencement address at Providence college.

"It marks the end of the post-war era in which we sought to maintain international stability through regional defense alliances support primarily by American military strength," Muskie said.

He said the success of that program in Europe led to its application in Asia.

"There, however, we have learned to our increasing sorrow that the conditions which led to our success in Europe no longer exist," he said.

He said this has led to deep division in America.

"How can we absorb the painful lessons of

Vietnam without an excessive swing of the pendulum back to isolationism?" He asked. "That question will tax your imagination for the remaining third of this century."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader to advise us on the program for next week.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker in response to the question asked by the distinguished minority whip the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day, but there are no District bills.

On Tuesday we have H.R. 11271, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, H.R. 6543, Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act of 1969, which is subject to a rule being granted.

Thursday is Flag Day. Pursuant to a previous order of the House, appropriate ceremonies will be conducted in the Hall of the House of Representatives.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later. We may have a further program to announce later depending on the disposition of the bills on the program.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JUNE 9

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next, June 9, 1969.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT F. KENNEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today Senator Robert F. Kennedy was struck down by an assassin's bullet in the midst of his campaign for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency. The loss suffered on that tragic day—by his family, by his friends, and by the fragmented and confused Nation which he sought to lead—is incalculable. Not only did it deprive us of the leadership of an extraordinarily compassionate and farsighted man, but it laid bare the violence that has become such a prominent feature of our society.

As I said 1 year ago in commenting upon the consequences of his assassination on our political processes:

What is to become of our democratic form of government if candidates for office, civil rights leaders, and Presidents of the United States continue to risk assassination when they seek a dialogue with the people? What is to become of our democratic form of government if those who dare to dissent risk physical annihilation?

The loss of Robert F. Kennedy is no less diminished today. He was a man deeply stirred by the injustices and inequities in our society; and he was in deep dissent with the ruinous policies in Vietnam which have resulted in over 35,000 American deaths and the division and disintegration of our own society. Had he lived, Senator Kennedy might well have been our President today. Were that the case, we would certainly be on the road to ending our ill-advised involvement in Vietnam and toward righting the injustices which minorities in this country have so long endured. We would also be on the road toward re-allocating national resources to that sector of our society most in need of immediate Federal assistance; namely, our large metropolitan cities.

Robert F. Kennedy understood that the real threat to national security comes within our own borders. Pollution of our environment, dilapidated housing, outmoded and overcrowded transportation systems, inadequate educational opportunities, penurious social security benefits, an inadequate and dehumanizing welfare system, racial discrimination—all were issues to which he addressed himself and for which he was ready to offer solutions. All were issues which, if allowed to fester and grow to still larger proportions, he knew, would continue to breed discontentment and resentment. Senator Kennedy offered leadership that promised to turn the resources of this Nation toward reinvigorating our cities and securing the equal opportunity that all our citizens—black and white—deserve.

Perhaps the full weight of his loss will only be measured over the next few years. For today, one year after his death, we are more sorely in need for the leadership he promised than ever before. The war in Vietnam, which was thoroughly repudiated at the polls last year, continues to rage on with undiminished fury, daily increasing its awful toll of death and destruction. The crisis in our cities to which Senator Kennedy addressed himself continues to fester as still more money is allocated to the military. Arms limitation and disarmament, which Robert Kennedy es-

poused, continue to take a back seat to the development and deployment of a counterproductive anti-ballistic-missile system.

In short, 1 year after Senator Kennedy's death nothing has changed.

I supported Robert F. Kennedy's candidacy in New York when he won a seat in the Senate in 1964, and I was the first public official to publically urge him to seek the Presidency in 1968. As his friend, I was deeply grieved of his death. As one who shared his determination to reorder our national priorities to secure peace in Southeast Asia and justice at home, I mourn the loss of his leadership.

As great as the loss of Robert Kennedy is, the cause he represented and the issues he articulated must not die with him. As he assumed responsibility for leadership upon the death of his brother, President John F. Kennedy, so we must assume responsibility for leadership. If the administration will not act to reorient the priorities of this Nation toward the growing domestic crisis, then it is up to Congress on its own to effect that reorientation. Until we face up to that crisis, no amount of weapons and no amount of rhetoric will heal the divisions and hatreds which are tearing the fabric of our society asunder.

As we praise Robert F. Kennedy today, let us not forget what the man stood for, for that is no doubt what he himself would have wanted most to have remembered. Let us not forget that he believed that the crisis of poverty and racism, of inadequate housing and employment opportunities was the real threat to America and that he believed that we must abandon the antiquated assumptions underlying our foreign policy to obtain a lasting and just peace in the world. Congress could do nothing greater to honor his memory than by turning the resources of this Nation toward securing a prompt end to the war in Vietnam and toward resolving the domestic problems which Robert F. Kennedy was so committed to solving.

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

Mr. RYAN. I shall be delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from Long Island.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the generosity of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) in yielding to me on this very difficult day for us all, and for our country.

This is one of those times when it is particularly gratifying to be here, to be able to say a few words that will reflect the feeling of so vast a number of people for whom the wound at the heart, inflicted a year ago today, has not eased with the passage of time. I think Senator Kennedy would in fact be surprised if he could know I am here to say these words. He died before he could help in my campaign or I in his, so I speak independent of political ties. But it is impossible to sit here as if this were just another sad day on the long calendar of sad days in recent American experience. Like so many others who were touched by his prophetic life I wonder every day what he would think I should do, wonder how best to push on toward his goals—goals that are the hopes of all Americans of

good will, goals that came to be personified for millions of Americans in this man as in few others in our history.

The horror of his absence grows worse as the national crisis deepens. The loneliness of his absence deepens as we see each day how inadequate we are to console and inspire as he consoled and inspired, to lead as he led, to pull together and get things done as he pulled things together and got them done.

I will speak more about these things and about Robert Kennedy on Monday, when this House will sit for the first time after the anniversary of his death.

Meanwhile, a stricken nation will mark another weekend in grief, still seeking its bearings and mourning its loss.

We think especially at this moment of two of the most gallant women of our land, Mrs. Rose Kennedy and Mrs. Ethel Kennedy, of Senator Kennedy's father, of his children, of his brother and sisters. We glimpse how total is their loss, because we know it is incalculably greater than ours, and ours seems total to us. We pray for them, for ourselves, for our country, and for this tormented planet.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution, and to commend the gentleman for his keen insight into the many problems to which Senator Robert F. Kennedy addressed himself during his life.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, we mark with great sadness today the anniversary of the loss of Senator Robert F. Kennedy, who loved his Nation so well that he consciously risked his life, day after day, in order to work for her improvement.

Robert Kennedy stood for brotherhood and for love. He stood for an America free of the plight of poverty, free of hate, free of violence. He stood for world peace. He combined an ambition to set things right in America with a full heart, tolerance, and compassion.

Today, as we remember Robert Kennedy—as Attorney General, mourner for his slain brother, loving husband and father, dedicated Senator from the State of New York, and idealistic candidate for his party's nomination for President—our pain and sadness are magnified by the fact that those things which he wanted to correct in American society have not yet been rectified.

The sincere and concerned Americans who loved him, and who met his death with shocked sorrow and feelings of personal loss must recognize that, 1 year later, we have not come much closer to Robert Kennedy's hopes for his country. On this first anniversary of his murder, we can best honor his memory by pledging that a year from today we will have at least taken a few steps toward the realization of that dream, as he might have expected of us.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 10 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

(Mrs. MINK was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation to give agricultural workers the right to organize and bargain collectively with their employers. It is scandalous that these workers are still denied rights given to other workers in nearly all aspects of commerce and industry.

The continued denial of collective bargaining rights to agricultural workers explains in large part why they are among the lowest paid groups of workers in our Nation. While workers in such fields as manufacturing and building trades have fought for and won reasonable increases in their wages, farmworkers continue to exist at the bottom of the economic ladder. Moreover, they have been prevented from effectively demanding rights accorded other workers in such matters as work hours, medical treatment, retirement, and other employment benefits. The shocking treatment of migrant workers shows how far employers will go in exploiting unorganized workers.

Agricultural workers are excluded from participation in the standard of living enjoyed by other Americans because of a clause in the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 which specifically denies coverage to persons employed as agricultural laborers. Thus, the act deliberately makes these worthy Americans second-class citizens by barring them from the ranks of those who can unite to demand improved pay or working conditions from their employers.

As agriculture has evolved to an industrial-type operation dominated by large corporations, the need for removing this exclusion has become obvious. Just as an individual factory worker is powerless to apply pressure on management without joining collectively with his peers, so is an agricultural laborer prevented from bettering his low financial state—unless he can organize with other workers. Not only should he be able to join a union, but employers should be required to cooperate with unions in hiring and dues collections.

We have given the factory worker these rights to take collective action; now we must do the same thing for the agricultural laborer. My bill would amend the National Labor Relations Act to include agricultural employees among those empowered to bargain collectively with employers.

There has been considerable sentiment in this session of Congress for the adoption of national legislation giving farm laborers rights they now enjoy in Hawaii. The relatively high standard of living and other favorable farmworking conditions in Hawaii are evidence of what could happen in other States if this legislation is enacted.

Because of the pressing need for action

in this area, I join my colleagues who have already introduced similar bills and ask that the House give swift and favorable consideration to this legislation.

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY ACT

(Mrs. MINK was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I regret that on Monday, June 2, 1969, the House failed to pass H.R. 763, the Youth Camp Safety Survey Act, under suspension of the rules. The vote was 151 to 152.

From the debate on this measure, it appeared that the basic reasons for its failure to obtain the necessary two-thirds vote were the cost and a belief that the matter is more properly the subject of State and local action.

Mr. Speaker, all that this bill does is to provide for a study of all State and local laws and regulations governing the operation of youth camps. It does not provide for Federal intrusion into this field, but rather for the gathering of nationwide information which can be the basis for State action. Thus, to a large degree, it would eliminate what could otherwise become a need for direct Federal regulation of camps.

The hearings on this bill provided ample evidence of the need for a comprehensive survey of the adequacy of safety standards. They showed that substantial shortcomings exist in the operation of at least some camps, and that States have hitherto done little to correct the deficiencies.

Children have been killed or seriously injured through the inept management of inexperienced or untrained camp personnel. Defects in equipment or facilities have also caused accidents. Disease is a common problem, and many camp staffs lack adequate knowledge or training to effectively combat it.

A few States have attempted to correct the conditions which can permit such hazards. We know that 26 States have regulated sanitation of youth camps, and 15 States have some safety legislation. But only three or four States even make reference to camp personnel. Other States have absolutely no legislation covering these camps. On the whole, it is obvious that much more should be done.

We could simply assume Federal control over camps in the absence of effective State regulation, but I feel that it would be much wiser to allow local levels full opportunity to act before considering such a step. The bill does not attempt to set standards, but seeks to gather the information so that States can be better advised on the steps that need to be taken.

One reason for the lack of State action is that not enough information exists on the conditions in summer camps. Many States simply do not know enough about the deficiencies to legislate knowledgeably in this field. After all, the proliferation of summer camps is a fairly recent thing. Until now, the extent of participation was not so sizable as to create a demand for new camps whose oper-

ators lack the experience and knowledge of long-time camp owners.

Our hearings brought out that some 7½ million children are attending approximately 11,500 camps this summer. This large, nationwide industry will continue to grow as more families become affluent and are able to send their children to such facilities.

Now that the industry has grown to such an extent, there is a greater need for closer scrutiny of the conditions at the camps. I wish that we had a "Ralph Nader" overseeing this important activity, for, as the "consumers" in this case, parents need to know more about these camps to which they send their children. Lacking such protection, however, Congress should at least act to gather full information on this subject.

The Youth Camp Safety Survey Act would provide for a study of all State and local laws and regulations governing the operation of youth camps to determine the extent of such laws, and the effectiveness of their enforcement. The purpose of the bill is to stimulate State action on youth camp safety so as to protect the health and lives of millions of children.

In view of the serious nature of this problem, I strongly recommend House approval of this much needed legislation.

ATLANTIC UNION RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic Union delegation resolution, which calls for the exploration of federation as the answer to the mounting problems confronting free world nations, has been introduced today in the House of Representatives by a bipartisan group of 70 Members.

Four identical bills were introduced with DONALD M. FRASER, Democrat of Minnesota; MORRIS K. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona; F. BRADFORD MORSE, Republican of Massachusetts, and myself as chief sponsors.

It makes the same proposal embodied in a resolution on which extensive hearings were held in the 89th Congress, and which was favorably reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the last days of the 90th Congress.

Hearings included statements of strong endorsement by Richard M. Nixon, former President Eisenhower, and many other prominent citizens. One of the group of bipartisan House sponsors at that time was Robert F. Ellsworth, since selected by President Nixon as U.S. Ambassador to NATO.

Because the man now President of the United States so recently indicated his support, and because intervening events have strengthened the case he made, sponsors of the new resolution are hopeful of early and favorable action.

Cosponsors of Atlantic Union resolution are: JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, Democrat of New York; GLENN M. ANDERSON, Democrat of California; THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Democrat of Ohio; MARIO BIAGGI, Demo-

crat of New York; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat of Minnesota; EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat of Massachusetts; RICHARD BOLLING, Democrat of Missouri; GARRY BROWN, Republican of Michigan; GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., Democrat of California; DANIEL E. BUTTON, Republican of New York.

SILVIO O. CONTE, Republican of Massachusetts; EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Democrat of Connecticut; CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., Democrat of Michigan; THADDEUS J. DULSKI, Democrat of New York; DON EDWARDS, Democrat of California; JOSHUA EILBERG, Democrat of Pennsylvania; MARVIN ESCH, Republican of Michigan; LEONARD FARBSTEIN, Democrat of New York; PAUL FINDLEY, Republican of Illinois; DONALD M. FRASER, Democrat of Minnesota.

RICHARD FULTON, Democrat of Tennessee; BARRY GOLDWATER, JR., Republican of California; GILBERT GUDE, Republican of Maryland; SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican of New York; RICHARD T. HANNA, Democrat of California; JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, Democrat of Washington; KEN HECHLER, Democrat of West Virginia; MARGARET M. HECKLER, Republican of Massachusetts; HENRY HELSTOSKI, Democrat of New Jersey; FRANK HORTON, Republican of New York; JOSEPH E. KARTH, Democrat of Minnesota; HASTINGS KEITH, Republican of Massachusetts; EDWARD I. KOCH, Democrat of New York; ROBERT L. LEGGETT, Democrat of California.

DONALD E. LUKENS, Republican of Ohio; RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, Democrat of New York; CATHERINE MAY, Republican of Washington; ABNER J. MIKVA, Democrat of Illinois; WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat of Pennsylvania; F. BRADFORD MORSE, Republican of Massachusetts; JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat of California; JAMES G. O'HARA, Democrat of Michigan; ARNOLD OLSEN, Democrat of Montana; RICHARD L. OTTINGER, Democrat of New York; BERTRAM L. POEHL, Democrat of New York; ADAM C. POWELL, Democrat of New York.

MELVIN PRICE, Democrat of Illinois; GRAHAM PURCELL, Democrat of Texas; ALBERT H. QUIE, Republican of Minnesota; THOMAS M. REES, Democrat of California; OGDEN R. RED, Republican of New York; HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat of Wisconsin; HOWARD W. ROBISON, Republican of New York; PETER W. RODINO, Democrat of New Jersey; EDWARD R. ROYBAL, Democrat of California; WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, Democrat of Connecticut; JAMES H. SCHEUER, Democrat of New York.

HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, Republican of Pennsylvania; FRED SCHWENGLER, Republican of Iowa; B. F. SISK, Democrat of California; HENRY P. SMITH, Republican of New York; ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Republican of Vermont; J. WILLIAM STANTON, Republican of Ohio; WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Republican of Wisconsin; SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat of New York; CHARLES M. TEAGUE, Republican of California; FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat of New Jersey; MORRIS K. UDALL, Democrat of Arizona; JIM WRIGHT, Democrat of Texas; and JOHN W. WYDLER, Republican of New York.

Text of the Atlantic Union resolution follows:

Whereas, the interdependence of the nations of the Atlantic Community has steadily grown with the increased mobility of capital and goods, while the revolutionizing speed of scientific, technological advance has outstripped the North Atlantic Treaty and made it necessary to forge new bonds to maintain the unity of these nations, so essential to international prosperity, peace and freedom;

Whereas, the defense of the nations of the Atlantic Community against not only war but monetary crash and depression continues to be a mutual concern;

Whereas, the citizens of these free nations are already united also by a common devotion to democratic traditions and the rule of law;

Whereas, this common heritage enables and requires them, when facing such challenges as those now confronting them, to meet and explore together how best to enlarge and extend the rule of law to provide for effective democratic government and regulation of their common concerns;

Whereas, our Original States, when beset by divisive dangers under their Articles of Confederation, sent delegates to the 1787 Convention, who traced the trouble to the confederal structure and to replace it invented the federal system, which has effectively safeguarded member States from domination by one another, equitably apportioned among their sovereign citizens voting power on common concerns, assured each State of independent government of State affairs, met other challenges like those now facing the Atlantic allies and not merely worked but proved that free people can thus work marvels;

Whereas, a joining together for such purposes of the democratic nations of the Atlantic Community to create an Atlantic Union within the framework of the United Nations would reduce the cost of the common defense, provide a stable currency for world trade, facilitate commerce of all kinds, enhance the welfare of the people of the member nations, and increase their capacity to aid the people of developing nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (1) The Congress hereby creates an Atlantic Union delegation, composed of eighteen eminent citizens, and authorized to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty allies as desire to join in this enterprise, to explore the possibility of agreement on:

(a) A declaration that the goal of their peoples is to transform their present alliance into a federal union;

(b) A timetable for the transition to this goal; and

(c) Democratic institutions to expedite the necessary stages and achieve the objective in time to save their citizens from another war or depression, and let them enjoy, as soon as possible, the greater freedom and higher moral and material blessings which federation has brought free people in the past;

(2) The convention's recommendations shall be submitted to the Congress for action by constitutional procedure;

(3) Not more than half of the delegation's members shall be from one political party, and all shall be citizens of high stature and wide influence, representing together a broad range of experience in the various major challenges facing this undertaking, and so conscious of its importance and urgency as to be willing to give it personally the necessary priority and time;

(4) (a) Six of the delegates shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, six by the President of the Senate, after consultation with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and six by the President of the United States.

(b) Vacancies shall not affect its powers and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

(c) The Delegation shall elect a chairman and vice-chairman from among its members.

(d) All members of the Delegation, like the drafters of the United States Constitution, shall be free from official instructions, and free to speak and vote individually in the Convention.

(5) The Delegation shall cease to exist at the expiration of the three-year period beginning on the date of the approval of this Resolution.

This resolution, almost identical with the one eloquently endorsed 3 years ago by the man who is now President of the United States, would establish an 18-member U.S. delegation of eminent citizens.

This group would be authorized to meet in convention with similar groups from other NATO nations for these purposes. First, to seek agreement on federation as the goal of the alliance; second, to fix a target date for achievement of the goal; third, to establish interim institutions needed to keep the developments on schedule.

This resolution contemplates a massive advance in political institutions, one that indeed would be historic. At the same time it is no more massive than the advances in scientific technology we witness almost daily on our television screens.

Conceivably, the convention would explore the possibility of applying the genius of our own U.S. federal system to the broader Atlantic community. A federation of these major nations of western civilization would be formidable indeed. It would result in a political institution large enough to deal successfully with the supra-national problems that now confound us.

Brought together effectively and permanently by means of federation, the people of this broad community would then be enabled to speak and act as one—and share burdens equitably—in all external matters, like aid to underdeveloped nations, filling the requirements of international law and order, halting safely the arms race.

At the same time, this development—by effectively unifying the total strength of these nations—would make possible the safe reduction of internal militaristic influence in our society.

If, as seems to me logical, it would also lead to a unified monetary system and the elimination of internal barriers to trade, it would spur economic progress and reduce to a minimum the danger of economic depression and monetary crash.

During the years since World War II our Government has spent nearly a trillion dollars seeking national military solutions to problems which are fundamentally supranational. We have spent only a pittance of energy and money seeking solutions on an appropriately supranational scale, searching for peaceful nonmilitary means through which our free institutions can be protected, strengthened and advanced to the benefit of ourselves and others.

For years we have known that nationalism in its traditional form is as obsolete as the muzzle-loading rifle, but we do nothing about it. We invest billions in weapons that quickly lose value, but next to nothing in federation, an investment

which our own national experience has shown to increase steadily in value.

If only to assure that America will have the high respect and devotion of its rising generation, it is high time we explore nonmilitaristic ways to deal with mounting problems like world policing and nuclear proliferation. Federation is such a way. It is time-tested. It is practical.

The resolution makes the same proposal—and in practically the same text on all essential points—as the one I and others introduced on October 18, 1965, and again on February 23, 1967.

In the interval, this resolution had gained in 1966 the strong endorsement of the statesman who is now our President, Richard M. Nixon. At about the same time in the spring of 1966, I also received letters endorsing it from former President Eisenhower—who wrote me:

I strongly favor your undertaking; let there be no mistake about this.

And endorsements from BARRY GOLDWATER, Nelson A. Rockefeller, George Romney, and William W. Scranton.

The same resolution was introduced in the Senate in both 1965 and 1967 by Senators EUGENE McCARTHY and Frank Carlson as chief cosponsors. In 1968 it gained the support of the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy who wrote on April 8 to Freedom & Union magazine:

The Atlantic Union Resolution affords us the opportunity to study this intriguing concept (a federal union of the Atlantic nations). I urge the proposal's adoption. * * * To fail to study this concept . . . would be to turn our back on the lessons of history.

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, soon after he announced his candidacy for the Democratic nomination for President, gave the resolution his support in a statement on May 7, from which I quote:

While a Senator, I was among the sponsors, from 1949 on, of all the resolutions for an Atlantic Convention to explore with N.A.T.O. allies a federal union answer to the challenge of how to unite effectively and democratically the great moral and material strength of these free peoples. And so I heartily welcome the impressive support the pending resolutions do to this have gained.

One of the many powerful reasons for the Atlantic Union delegation resolution is the dangerously increasing gap between the amount we have spent since 1949 on strengthening the defense of freedom by national armed force plus "domino" wars, as contrasted with the pittance spent to assemble strength through federal union. To quote Mr. Humphrey, it is high time to explore the "federal union answer to the challenge of how to unite effectively and democratically the great moral and material strength of these free peoples."

Both armed power and federation of free peoples are obviously necessary for the defense of freedom—but consider the gap between the efforts we have thus far made to defend it in these two ways.

In the 21-year period from 1949 through 1969 we have appropriated for armed power a total of \$959 billions. In the same period, we have appropriated nothing at all, as yet, to explore the federal union way to unite the free effectively.

In other words, we have spent, since 1949, almost \$1 trillion more on the strength that comes from arms than on exploring Atlantic federal union. Yet we all know that the immense productive, financial, scientific, and armed power of the United States came from federal union. Our Founding Fathers had the foresight, when the alliance of the 13 States under the Articles of Confederation proved weak and unreliable, as NATO is today, to call the kind of exploratory convention in 1787 we urge today. That convention resulted in the discovery that a federal union was the way to unite the free effectively and democratically, a way which has brought us our great strength.

Think of only one of the consequences of this appalling gap. We are justly concerned by the unrest among our youth, the tumult on campus and in high school, the rising rebellion of students against ROTC and all forms of strength through arms, their growing tendency to echo the communist charge that our country is "imperialistic."

We overlook the fact, that throughout the entire lifetime of all Americans under voting age, the U.S. Government has increasingly sought to defend liberty by spending lavishly on armed power—far more than on education or anything else—to the neglect of idea power, moral power.

We have overlooked this stark contrast so long that, when we try to explain to our youth that armed power and drafting the young to fight far away are needed to maintain our free way of life, we are bewildered to see them brush this off as the "hypocrisy" of older people. Yet, to understand them, their parents and grandparents must remember that no previous generation has ever seen, through their entire lifetime, the overwhelming U.S. accent on armed power that has been the lifelong experience of all Americans under 21. Our youth have seen this gap grow—from a defense budget of \$10 billion in 1949 to one of \$76 billion in 1969—grow seven times greater while the outlook for peace has certainly not grown apace, if at all.

Freedom needs both armed power and the power that comes from federation, as I said earlier—but between the two, federation deserves the higher priority.

We know from experience that rapid technological advance renders modern weapons rapidly obsolete—sometimes obsolete even before the model on which millions were spent can go into production. That's the major reason why armed power is so increasingly costly.

But the passage of time, which quickly scraps our most sophisticated and expensive weapons, strengthens no less quickly the power free people gain from federation. This power grows stronger, instead of weaker, every year, decade, century. Our own history as a federation shows that to be true. And the passage of time makes union grow stronger, not only the total effect of its armed power but in every field—financial, monetary, productive, scientific—and in moral power, too. We know this also from experience. We know how weak our own Federal Union was when it began, and how its power has grown in many ways for 180 years now.

To meet the danger from inflation, the challenges from the campus and the city and others I shall not mention, we should cease depending so exclusively on the kind of strength that costs most, only to turn quickly obsolescent, and seek instead the kind of power that costs virtually nothing, never becomes obsolete, grows only stronger as time goes on. It is this marvelous, priceless, ever-growing, everlasting, many-faceted strength which the Atlantic Union resolution would have us explore now with the other free people of NATO.

Let me now turn to some other reasons that add urgency to the Atlantic Union resolution and make the outlook for it better.

To begin with, there is the departure from power of General de Gaulle. This has removed what to many Americans was so great an obstacle to the proposed convention's success as to make convoking it impractical. At the same time, however, his resignation opens a period of uncertainty in this key country, and the risk of its reverting in a few years to the political instability it suffered through the period preceding the Presidency of General de Gaulle. To avoid this and other risks we need to seize the present opportunity this very year.

The return to the front pages of the chronic threat of a world monetary crash is another urgent reason to explore the Federal answer. A crash could trigger a world depression as did the one of 1929—and this time advance Communist dictatorship as it then brought Hitler to power in less than a year and a half.

There are also other ominous signs: The rising power of the marshals in Moscow, the brutal invasion and stifling of Czechoslovakia, the resulting threat to the German Federal Republic, the expansion of Soviet naval power in the Mediterranean, Moscow's re-arming of the Arab States and the lurking danger of a nuclear confrontation in the Middle East.

I wish I had time to develop these reasons for convoking the proposed convention to explore Atlantic Union. But I must delay no longer to recall in full the statement which President Nixon sent to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on September 1, 1966, urging it to approve the resolution. It merits recall not only because he is now President, but because of the unanswerable case he made for the resolution, and the prophetic insight he showed. Here is what President Nixon said:

It is fitting that the United States, the world's first truly federal government, should be a main force behind the effort to find a basis for a broad federation of free Atlantic nations.

Although the accomplishment of the ultimate goal of the Resolution may well be impossible to attain for many years, recent events of history and numerous scientific and technological advances of the past 20 years point the way in this direction. It would be foolish for us to ignore the fact that science and history are even now fatefully combining to accomplish the same goal. Perhaps, by anticipating the further shrinking of the world, the dialogue which this Resolution contemplates will provide a resourceful tool for coping with the problems of a world which in 20 years will have undergone even more drastic changes than have occurred since World War II.

I have been deeply disturbed of late by the trend of events in Europe. The renewed nationalism of France has for the moment halted the pace at which the nations of Western Europe were moving toward becoming a unified and federated community. By adopting a measure such as the Atlantic Union Resolution we could give new impetus to the spirit of federalism in Western Europe.

To be sure the concept of an "Atlantica" is at present only a dream, but in the age of the rocket, dreams become reality with a speed which is difficult to imagine. The Atlantic Union Resolution is a forward-looking proposal which acknowledges the depth and breadth of incredible change which is going on in the world around us. I urge its adoption.

Consider the accelerating speed at which "incredible change" has continued since 1966 when President Nixon made that statement. He recalled in it how events of history and technological-scientific advances in "the past 20 years" have pointed the way toward Atlantic Union. He stressed the need of not delaying further to use the "resourceful tool" which the proposed convention provides "for coping with the problems of a world which in 20 years will have undergone even more drastic changes than have occurred" in the previous 20 years.

It is not 20, it is less than 3 years since that forecast was made. In that brief period the nuclear power of Red China raised the call for the production of the Sentinel missile system. Before it could be started, the multiple nuclear warhead produced by the Soviet Union has brought the need for the Safeguard missile system—and the current ABM controversy.

As for the advance in space, consider the highlights of only last month: Americans circled the moon repeatedly in Apollo 10, and we saw on TV in our homes the photographs they took of the earth rising over the bleak horizon of the moon—a most impressive proof of the "shrinking of our world."

Truly—to quote the prophetic Nixon statement again:

In the age of the rocket dreams become reality with a speed which is difficult to imagine.

And no less truly, this applies also to the dream of a federation of the Atlantic community—a federal union of the free—of bridging the Atlantic Ocean by the principles with which our fathers boldly began spanning this continent before there were steamboats, trains, telegraph, when the steam-electric period was only dawning, and its marvels were beyond the dreams of even Benjamin Franklin.

Earlier I said we all know that our own federal union has grown immensely in strength since its weak beginning. Let me conclude by citing a timely example of how dark the outlook for it was in this period in 1787. In February of that year the convention to explore how to transform the moribund Articles of Confederation into an effective, democratic government had been summoned to open in Philadelphia on May 14. That was 182 years ago.

George Washington feared the convention was doomed to fail. Nonetheless he had traveled more than 4 days by horseback and carriage to be present when the Convention began. He reached Philadelphia on the 13th, and the next

day he went with Madison and the majority of Virginia's eight delegates to Independence Hall for the opening session. Only one other delegation met them there. It was Pennsylvania's—and only some of the Philadelphia members of its eight delegates. There was no delegation from the four States nearest Philadelphia: New York—only half as far away as Mount Vernon; New Jersey, just across the river; Delaware, 20 miles down the river; and just beyond it, Maryland, another State Washington had traversed in those 4 days.

A lesser man than the Father of our Country might well have gone home, concluding that such apathy—or opposition—proved that his fears were well founded. Moreover, on March 10, just after receiving word that the Convention was summoned for May 14, he had sent the Foreign Secretary of Congress a letter in which he agreed that the Confederation was ready to fall, unless drastically changed, and then added:

But, is the public mind matured for such an important change? . . . My opinion is that the country must yet feel and see more, before it can be accomplished. A thirst for power and the . . . monster . . . sovereignty, which have taken such fast hold of the States individually will . . . form a strong phalanx against it . . . The opposition will be altogether irresistible till the mass, as well as the more discerning part of the Community, shall see the necessity . . . Yet I would fain try what the wisdom of the proposed convention will suggest. It may be the last Peaceable mode.

Despite his misgivings, Washington had made the arduous trip—only to find abundant cause to say, "I told you so" and return home. Had he done so, it is all too certain that the Convention would never have got the quorum of seven States it needed, and no Federal Union would have been constituted. The "fast hold" of the monster sovereignty on each of the 13 States would have scourged them all as it has the nations of Europe. The 13 would have been sucked into the alliances and wars of the 25-year maelstrom which began with the opening of the French Revolution in May 1789—some on one side, some on the other. The New World would have gone the way of the Old.

But Washington did not take apathy or "No" for an answer. Rather, he cooled his heels not merely 1 day, but day after day, hoping for a quorum. On the 18th, Alexander Hamilton and a majority of the New York delegation arrived; on the 21st, the Delaware delegation was on hand—but the Convention was still three States short of a quorum. It did not attain that quorum and open until May 25, when the New Jersey delegation finally crossed the Delaware.

Such was the outlook for effective union of the 13 States 182 years ago this day. During that 11-day period various delegates grew so discouraged that they urged that the Convention, if it ever opened, content itself with half measures. These, they held, were the only changes that would be accepted by the people of the 13 States—and the Articles of Confederation stipulated that any change in it required ratification by all 13.

In these gloomy circumstances Washington did much more than hope and pray for seven States to come. When defeatism grew rife on one of those discouraging 11 days, he intervened and turned the tide from despair to determination with these solemn words to the other delegates:

It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God.

Such was the prospect at this time in 1787 for the first convention in world history called to explore whether allied democracies could agree to constitute an effective, democratic government for their common affairs. Such was the little acorn of courage and wisdom from which our mighty tree of liberty grew. With that spirit we can now arm freedom with decisive moral and material power for peace, by deciding to explore the inspiring possibilities offered by Atlantic Federal Union.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the time clearly has come in the affairs of men for the North Atlantic democracies—those of us who share so much in common tradition, common governmental form, common respect for individual rights—to explore the possibilities of forming more effective common solutions to our most pressing common problems.

The sponsorship of this resolution calling for a convention of these free world nations demonstrates the broad and growing recognition of this need. When I examined the list of sponsors earlier today, I discovered that there were 69. How appropriate Sixty-nine in 1969. It is in every sense a bipartisan group. The list includes Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, hawks and doves—and perhaps a few owls. But it should not be surprising that so broad a spectrum of the politically aware have joined hands in supporting this resolution.

The history of mankind can be seen politically, in the gradual expansion of the unit of government. First, there were families; then nomadic tribes; then small settled communities; ultimately the Greek city-states, and finally under Philip II of Macedonia the first nation. Since then, nations have merged into larger nations for the common well-being of their citizens, and formal groupings and alliances of nations have culminated in formal international organizations.

In each step along this upward civilizing road, people have submerged differences to seek common ends. The merging of the destinies of those with common aspirations has given greater strength to all who share the same dreams. And, in one of history's paradoxes, the voluntary forgoing of unrestrained local autonomy has resulted in greater individual liberty and broader individual opportunity.

Almost 200 years ago, 13 weak and independent little republics banded themselves together on this continent and agreed to survive as one strong nation. There were among our forefathers dif-

ferent cultures, different languages, different religious backgrounds. Yet the things that united them were greater than the things that divided them. They had a common enemy and a common purpose. Thirteen years under the loose alliance of the Articles of Confederation demonstrated the need for stronger ties of unity. When the Articles of Confederation blundered and broke apart on the rock of reality, our American ancestors drew the bonds of union tighter about themselves by means of the Constitution. Thus banded together in a federation, their progeny have known the blessings of a viable government and the ability to come to grips with common problems.

The twin catalysts which drew our forebears together originally were a common enemy and a common purpose. Today the members of the North Atlantic Community—with equally as much in common as the inhabitants of the 13 Colonies—face common external enemies, tyranny, and the threat of nuclear war. They certainly face common purposes in the survival and triumph of humanity itself and of the human values which we cherish in common.

The fantastic compression of time has shrunk our planet. For purposes of transportation or communication, the average citizen in my city of Fort Worth today is much closer to London or Paris—or Moscow or Saigon—than his ancestor was 100 years ago to our State Capitol in Austin. We can travel to any major city of the world or communicate with anyone in any such city with greater ease, speed, and facility than our ancestors could have traveled to Austin or communicated with a resident of that city.

Our human arts of governing our relationships and coming to grips with the common problems that beset us in a civilized and effective way have not kept pace with the movement of events. The explosion of scientific knowledge has far outstripped the development of our social and governmental institutions.

So it seems only plausible and natural that intelligent men and women, sharing aspirations and values in common, should perfect their mutual capacity to assault and conquer the problems of this age in quite the same way that forward looking statesmen of past times have done. Does someone suggest that such an approach is too visionary? I would remind him only of Solomon's warning that "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

It is to be hoped that hearings can be held at an early moment by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and that the membership of Congress may have an opportunity to express the readiness of our people to sit down in a civilized way with our friends and kinsmen of the other western democracies and explore the avenues by which together we may work to build a more secure and hopeful future for our posterity.

ATLANTIC UNION RESOLUTION

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined more than 70 other Members in introducing a resolution calling for an Atlantic Union convention. In addition to the names already listed by the

gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), two more should be added: Congressmen FRANK E. EVANS, of Colorado, and ROBERT O. TIERNAN, of Rhode Island.

I am proud to be associated with this resolution because I have supported the concept of Atlantic Union for more than 20 years. Events occurring through this period have reinforced my conviction.

The rule of law is embraced by nations on both sides of the Atlantic. The people of these nations share a common heritage in their commitment to the dignity of man and in their belief that government must always be the servant and never the master of the people. Sovereignty resides in the people themselves. They confer upon various levels of government the power to regulate and order certain aspects of community life.

Thus the people have it within their power to create a new level of government when this will best serve their interests.

A union of Atlantic nations would be a move toward regulating the international affairs of mankind by substituting the rule of law for traditional diplomacy. We need to regulate trade and commerce including the money supply, to provide for the common defense, and to create relationships with the rest of the world which will be conducive to the pursuits of peace and development.

Passage by the Congress of this resolution does not guarantee that other Atlantic nations will reciprocate. We may find that other nations will be reluctant to engage in this effort with the United States at this time. Nevertheless the mere passage of this resolution will be a clear signal to our friends in the Atlantic community that the United States desires to explore the creation of political and governmental relationships which assure parity with all other peoples who choose to join.

The overwhelming power of the United States is a cause of concern to some in Europe. They question the wisdom with which this power has been used. By joining with us to legislate on common concerns, they will be assured that people rather than economic power or military strength will count in the formulation of common policies.

The risks of nuclear war are growing steadily. While proliferation of nuclear weapons may have been slowed for the moment, experience teaches that nations may too quickly move away from agreements which they find chafing or confining in the protection of their national interests.

The consequences of nuclear war are so enormous that mankind must do all those rational things which are within reach to lessen or eliminate this threat.

The creation of an Atlantic Union is in no way in derogation of the United Nations of which I am a fervent supporter. In fact, it will strengthen the United Nations by insuring that the rule of law prevails over a wider area of the planet. It will enhance the capacity of the developed nations to aid the developing nations.

In short, we have nothing to lose and everything to gain by applying the lessons of history and the fruits of civilization to a wider area of human affairs.

FRAUD IN AMERICA—IV

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, the CBS broadcast "Hunger in America" was as remarkable for what it did not say as for what it did say.

I have already noted that CBS neglected to say that it had failed to check facts, had broadcast flat untruths, neglected to report that it had staged scenes, prompted and paid persons who appeared on the show, and edited out of recognition statements made by others—all to make the "facts" conform to the script that had been written.

CBS also neglected to say a few other things in its broadcast. It failed to say what programs the Federal Government does have, and how they have been improved in recent years, to help assure that everyone can obtain an adequate diet. They neglected to show the very real concern of governments, local and national, about the problems of those who are poor. They neglected to attempt any measurement of what is being done against what needs to be done. Had they done this, the show might have been more devastating than it was—or perhaps it would not; but in any case it would have been a completed story, one that would have enabled the viewers to know the several aspects of a complex and crucial problem, one that would have enabled people to form some kind of rational judgment.

But CBS was not interested in informing people, as much as it was in inflaming them. They wanted shock and sensation, not hard and honest news. It is easier to write a story in the yellow manner than in the honest manner. Besides, the single eye of the lens does better when fed color than when it is fed monochrome; one need not worry about truth so long as one can get it in living color, so seems to run the journalistic credo of the networks. It is not so important to them whether the picture is true so much as whether it sells.

But Mr. Speaker, people can form opinions only on the basis of what they know. Few people are inclined to question what they see in print or on television. Fewer still have the time or resources to perform individual research. And since in the case of television only the networks have access to the broadcast facilities, there is only one view—and that is their view. If it be truthful, then well and good. But if it be untruthful, then all is not so well and good. If we are to permit the networks to have a monopoly on the content of news broadcast, then we are bound by conscience and by good sense—as well as public responsibility—to see that they exercise some responsibility.

If the networks can plunder the air with junk, and can abuse the basic responsibilities of truthful journalism—which they do and repeatedly have done—then it is time that Congress devised some method of bringing accountability to the barons of broadcasting. There must be some way that the public can know that their interests are protected from minds that have a conscience only for high ratings and high profits, and none for good sense, good taste, or even plain old fashioned honest truth.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Congress must act, must explore this problem, and must solve it. No one wants censorship. But at the same time we cannot afford to have wildly incompetent journalism fed into 96 percent of the homes of this country. We are confronted with a dilemma. Does the first amendment cover deception? It did not when the quiz show scandals erupted. It should not when a far more serious issue is at stake. What guarantee have we that future news programs will not take great liberties with the truth, all in the name of ratings and sales, all in the name of poetic license, but all flying in the face of honest broadcasting? We have none. I do not believe that the barons of Manhattan should sell the public trinkets in the place of truths. "Hunger in America" glittered, but it was not the truth that made it glitter, but the false glass of a vidicon tube. When that tube shows blatant disregard for truth, it is time that we acted. It has, and we should.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that "Hunger in America" left many things unsaid, among them what has been done to date to assure that massive hunger is not accepted as a fact of life. I offer to my colleagues an article from the Dallas regional office of the Federal Reserve System, in their monthly bulletin for May 1969:

FEDERALLY ASSISTED FAMILY FOOD PROGRAMS

For many years, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been cooperating with state and local authorities in providing low-income families with supplemental food. Such assistance currently is being furnished through two basic types of programs—the Commodity Distribution Program and the Food Stamp Program. The Commodity Distribution Program is the older of the two types of programs and, until recently, has been the more important. Commodity distribution programs originated in the early 1930's, when surplus foods were given directly to the poor and unemployed.

A food stamp program was in operation between 1939 and 1943 but was discontinued when wartime demands increased incomes and reduced unemployment. This stamp program was directly related to surplus commodities. In 1961, a new food stamp plan was initiated on a pilot basis, and the plan was given more permanent status by the passage of the Food Stamp Act of 1964. The program was established to remedy some of the weaknesses of the Commodity Distribution Program.

Both the Commodity Distribution and the Food Stamp Programs are in operation in parts of the Southwest. The purpose of this article is to highlight the background and growth of these two programs in the United States and in the five states of the Eleventh

Federal Reserve District. One section of the article will discuss how successful each program seems to be in achieving the goals outlined by the framers of the enabling legislation.

COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

As mentioned earlier, the Commodity Distribution Program is the oldest governmental family food-assistance program operating at this time. Under this program, food commodities declared to be in surplus supply, as well as other purchased foods, are shipped by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to various distribution centers throughout the Nation for redistribution to low-income families and to institutions. Presently, the USDA carries out its surplus food donation program to the needy under two authorities: section 32 of Public Law 320, approved in 1935, and section 416 of Public Law 439, approved in 1949. The USDA also distributes food to participants in the school lunch programs under section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, passed in 1946. Sections 32 and 416 are intended to provide food assistance to families and institutions, and section 6 is a part of child nutrition programs. The following article will focus on the family food-assistance programs.

Under section 32, an annual appropriation is provided to the USDA for the general purpose of expanding the demand for agricultural commodities. Specifically, the legislation was to give assistance to agricultural products in excess supply and to producers suffering from low prices. Section 32 legislation permits the USDA to make surplus-removal purchases of commodities, usually those that are in excess supply at the time of peak marketing. The commodities acquired under section 32 generally do not move into Government inventory but are shipped to centers throughout the country for redistribution to eligible recipients.

Section 416 of Public Law 439 provides authorization for the distribution of agricultural commodities that have been acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under price-support programs. Under section 416, commodities held by the CCC that cannot be sold or bartered are made available to school lunch programs and to needy families and institutions in the United States. Any quantities in excess of domestic requirements are eligible for use by needy persons abroad.

The cost of Federal assistance to needy persons and institutions under the Commodity Distribution Program has varied significantly. Federal assistance was at the extremely low level of less than \$2 million in fiscal 1945 but subsequently rose to a record of about \$257 million in fiscal 1965. With the introduction of the Food Stamp Program, the cost of Federal assistance to the commodity program declined sharply in 1966 and 1967, but such cost increased again in fiscal 1968. The slight increase in cost in 1968 reflected the greater variety of foods made available in the program, since the number of participants continued to move downward.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The Food Stamp Program authorized by Congress in 1964 has dual objectives: (1) to improve diets by increasing the ability of needy persons or families to purchase more and better foods and (2) to expand the domestic markets for agricultural products.

Through the stamp plan, participants are able to increase their food-purchasing power by exchanging the amount of money they would normally spend for food for an allotment of coupons of a higher monetary value. These coupons are used by needy persons and families to purchase domestically produced foods from retail food outlets at prevailing prices. Authorized merchants redeem the food coupons for cash at commercial banks, which

present the coupons to a Federal Reserve bank for payment through appropriate collection channels. Food stamps are liabilities of the U.S. Treasury Department, and Federal Reserve banks serve as fiscal agents of the Treasury.

After Congress authorized the permanent Food Stamp Program in 1964, the number of counties and cities participating grew to 324 by 1966, to 838 in 1967, and to approximately 1,550 local governmental units by the first of the current year. The average monthly participation in the program in fiscal 1968 was slightly more than 2.2 million people, up sharply from 1.4 million in fiscal 1967 and from 0.9 million in fiscal 1966. The total value of food coupons issued in fiscal 1968 amounted to \$455 million; \$282 million of this was paid for by participants, and \$173 million was the cost to the Federal Government.

With the authorization of the stamp plan in 1964, the USDA proposed to make the Food Stamp Program the first-line food delivery system in the war on poverty. Consequently, the cost of Federal assistance under sections 32 and 416 declined; and in fiscal 1968, the Federal subsidy under the Food Stamp Program surpassed Federal assistance to institutions and needy persons under the Commodity Distribution Program.

GEOGRAPHICAL PARTICIPATION

By January 1, 1969, one or the other of the two family food-assistance programs was in operation or planned in approximately 2,640 counties throughout the Nation. About 83 percent of the population of the United States resides in these counties. The number of participants in both programs had reached nearly 6.5 million persons, and the USDA estimates that this number will likely increase to 7.0 million participants by the end of fiscal 1969. Most of the increase probably will occur in the Food Stamp Program if present trends continue. At the beginning of this year, there were only about 480 counties and cities which did not operate under the programs.

The map on the following page shows the participation in both the Commodity Distribution Program and the Food Stamp Program. At the beginning of 1969, only six states had a family food-assistance program in all of their counties and cities. (Under present regulations, the programs cannot operate simultaneously in the same area.) Program participation is heaviest in the Mississippi River Basin and in Mountain and Far Western States.

In the southwestern states of Arizona, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas, some counties in each state participate in the Commodity Distribution Program. In fact, all counties in Arizona and all but three counties in Oklahoma participate in the commodity program. Counties in Arizona and Oklahoma have not participated in the Food Stamp Program, although a majority of the counties in Louisiana and New Mexico and a few counties in Texas are participants. The greatest concentration of participants in the stamp program in the Southwest are in Louisiana and New Mexico.

Less than 5 percent of the total population in the five southwestern states participated in the family food-assistance programs at the first of this year, with the proportions for the individual states ranging from slightly over 9 percent in Oklahoma to below 3 percent in Texas. In the Nation, less than 4 percent of the population participated in the programs.

PROGRAM PROCEDURES

Under current legislation, both the Food Stamp Program and the Commodity Distribution Program are operated as joint Federal-state-local efforts. Generally, counties, parishes, or townships desiring to participate in one of the two programs work through the

state's welfare office. Once a program is approved, the eligibility of participants is determined according to standards used by the state in its own welfare programs.

Under the Commodity Distribution Program, participants are usually given punch cards to show proof of their eligibility to receive food monthly at distribution centers. Under the Food Stamp Program, coupons are usually issued by local welfare departments or commercial banks. Recently, some states were given authority to deliver stamps to individual recipients by mail without being held liable for loss (Texas has been authorized to use mail delivery).

The dollar amount of food coupons received monthly by eligible individuals or families is based upon the amount of purchasing power necessary to provide an adequate diet as defined by local authorities, assisted by the USDA. Cost of the coupons to the participant is based upon the family's income and the number of dependents. The difference between the value of coupons received by a participant and the cost paid by the receiver is referred to as bonus power; mathematically, the cost of the stamps and their bonus value are inversely correlated. Food coupons are issued in books of 50-cent and \$2 denominations, and families use the coupons to buy domestically produced food at retail stores authorized to accept them by the USDA's Consumer and Marketing Service. Authorized retailers agree to abide by the rules governing the use of such food coupons.

PROGRAM GOALS

The relative effectiveness of the two family food-assistance programs probably could be evaluated in the light of three variables. First, and possibly most important, is the influence the programs have on increasing the dietary standards of low-income families. Second, the programs should be evaluated as to their influence on increasing the aggregate demand for farm products, thereby raising farm income. Finally, the relative cost of the two food distribution methods should be evaluated.

IMPROVING DIETARY STANDARDS

The potential for substantially improving the diets of low-income families under the Commodity Distribution Program was quite low up to 1961 because the foods distributed were basically limited to five commodities. Since 1961, a greater variety of commodities has been available; and by the beginning of 1969, a maximum of about 22 commodities, valued at \$12.75 per person monthly, could be distributed under the program. However, not all participating areas were distributing the maximum number of commodities.

Despite the fact that the number of commodities available under the Commodity Distribution Program has increased, the Food Stamp Program has the potential of providing a superior nutritional diet. Food stamp coupons can be used to purchase any basic foods at retail food stores at existing prices (no imported foods may be purchased). Since the choice of foods under the Commodity Distribution Program is dependent, in most cases, upon which commodities are in excess supply or have been acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Food Stamp Program—with no such restrictions—would seem to offer the housewife a better opportunity to prepare a wider range of nutritious meals.

The success of either type of program in increasing the dietary standards of participants is, however, limited by substitution. If any food acquired under either of the two programs is substituted for purchases that would have been made otherwise, the net increase in total food consumption would be smaller than anticipated. Both programs are intended to supplement food consumption.

tion; they are not intended to replace usual or previous levels of consumption.

The Food Stamp Program may be more effective than the Commodity Distribution Program in limiting the ability of participants to substitute the new purchasing power for previous purchasing ability. Participants are required to pay for food coupons, and the amount necessary to purchase stamps is based, in part, on the income of the recipient. Under the Commodity Distribution Program, recipients pick up their free commodities at central distributing points and may do as they wish with the income that would have been spent for food if the free commodities were not available.

INCREASING FARM INCOME

The influence of family food-assistance programs upon farm income naturally depends upon the extent to which the programs add to aggregate demand. Whether or not aggregate demand for farm products has been increased is difficult to determine because some assumption must be made as to what aggregate demand would have been without the family food programs. For simplicity, it is assumed that all food consumed by recipients under the two programs is an addition to aggregate demand; this assumption, in essence, implies that the substitution effects of the programs are zero.

The food distributed under the Commodity Distribution Program to institutions and needy persons in fiscal 1968 amounted to approximately 860 million pounds. At average market values, this quantity of food probably represented no more than one-half of 1 percent of total U.S. gross farm income. Federal subsidy to the Food Stamp Program in fiscal 1968 amounted to around \$173 million, which represented about one-third of 1 percent of farm income. The effect of both programs on gross farm income was, therefore, less than 1 percent. In addition, since the Food Stamp Program is not directly tied in with surplus commodities, as is the case for the Commodity Distribution Program, it is likely that the increased consumption induced by the food coupons had little effect on the demand for most surplus commodities, such as the basic food grains.

COST OF PROGRAMS

The direct costs of purchases and the amount of subsidies paid by the Federal Government for both programs reached a total of about \$321 million in fiscal 1968. However, the data available on this assistance are not adequate to permit a definitive analysis of all of the costs of each program on a common basis since the figures do not include state and local cost. Some analysts have taken the position that the Food Stamp Program may be the more efficient of the two programs. The reason given is that the Food Stamp Program utilizes the usual channels of distribution in the marketplace, while the Commodity Distribution Program requires a special distribution network. The USDA admits that the Commodity Distribution Program is a difficult program to administer.

Furthermore, the two programs may have different impacts on the local economy and may, therefore, involve some social cost. If the substitution rate under the Commodity Distribution Program is greater than zero, the program would have an adverse effect on retail food sales in the local community. By operating within the free market system, the Food Stamp Program stimulates retail food sales, and the amount of additional spending for food would equal the value of the bonus coupons minus any substitution.

Surveys by the USDA on the impact of the pilot food stamp plan on retail food store sales showed that the dollar volume of food sales in the pilot areas rose around 8 percent over the year immediately preceding the initiation of the Food Stamp Program. The largest percentage sales gain recorded by the survey stores was for fresh produce, a

food category for which an increase in consumption is generally indicative of higher nutrition levels. Because of their perishability, fresh fruits and vegetables are usually not available to participants in the Commodity Distribution Program. The value of food stamps redeemed by all stores in the survey also averaged 8 percent of total sales volume.

The concept of providing food assistance for low-income families has moved into a new dimension with the introduction of the Food Stamp Program. Emphasis has changed from a means of distributing surplus food to a method of increasing the food-purchasing power of low-income families so that these families can obtain a nutritious diet through the efficient food distribution system available to other U.S. families. There is also a growing interest in furnishing information and education on the proper selection and care of food in order to create a change in attitudes toward the kinds of foods to purchase for family health.

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. RYAN, today, for 10 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. LOWENSTEIN), for 10 minutes, today; 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. WRIGHT to follow special order by Mr. FINDLEY today.

Mr. FRASER to follow special order by Mr. FINDLEY and remarks of Mr. WRIGHT today.

Mr. EDMONDSON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. BURTON of Utah in 10 instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. CLEVELAND in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. SAYLOR in two instances.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. GROSS.

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

Mr. BIAGGI in two instances.

Mr. ST GERMAIN.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mrs. MINK in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. SATTERFIELD.

Mr. TIERNAN.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 537. An act for the relief of Noriko Susan Duke (Nakano); and

S.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate the period beginning June 8, 1969, and ending June 14, 1969, as "Professional Photography Week in America."

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 9, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

836. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the acting Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a formula for apportionment of State and community highway safety funds for fiscal year 1970 and thereafter, was taken from the Speaker's table, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

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. DADDARIO: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 4284. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Standard Reference Data Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 11235. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 4314. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to permit employer contributions to trust funds to provide employees, their families, and dependents with scholarships for study at educational institutions or the establishment of child care centers for preschool and school age dependents of employees (Rept. No. 91-286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 742. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the

Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DADDARIO: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 10878. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 6543. A bill to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-289). 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. ADDABBO:

H.R. 11900. A bill to provide for special programs for children with learning disabilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 11901. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high-timber-yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. PELLY, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RED of New York, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 11902. 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. CLARK:

H.R. 11903. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 11904. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the inclusion of certain cost estimates of certain measures reported by the standing committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. MORTON):

H.R. 11905. 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.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 11906. A bill to amend section 1682 of title 38 of the United States Code to increase the rates of educational assistance allowance paid to veterans under such section; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 11907. A bill to impose an excess profits tax on the income of corporations during the present emergency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 11908. A bill for the relief of certain civilian personnel employed by the Navy Department, for expenses incurred incident to temporary duty performed at the Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa., in 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 11909. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 11910. A bill to provide for orderly trade in antifriction ball and roller bearings and parts thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 11911. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to amend the definition of "employee" to include certain agricultural employees, and to permit certain provisions in agreements between agricultural employers and employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 11912. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (commonly known as the Fishermen's Protective Act), to strengthen the provisions therein relating to the protection of U.S. vessels on the high seas; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 11913. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide authorization for grants for communicable disease control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11914. A bill to amend section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964 to eliminate the provision which presently limits eligibility for residential rehabilitation loans thereunder to persons whose income is within the limits prescribed for below-market interest rate mortgages insured under section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 11915. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 11916. A bill to require annual disclosure to the Comptroller General of the United States of the source and amount of all outside income received by any person serving as a Federal judge, a Member of Congress, or a policymaking official in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUNT, Mr. NIX, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WYMAN):

H.R. 11917. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a pay differential of 10 percent for nightwork performed by employees subject to prevailing rate pay systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 11918. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to prohibit the granting of authority to broadcast pay television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 768. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide a method for nominating and electing Judges of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KEITH, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, and Mr. LUKENS):

H. Con. Res. 283. Concurrent resolution, Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. ESCH):

H. Con. Res. 284. Concurrent resolution, Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mrs. MAY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REES, Mr. RED of New York, Mr. REUSS, and Mr. ROBISON):

H. Con. Res. 285. Concurrent resolution, Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SISK, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. STANTON, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. WYDLER):

H. Con. Res. 286. Concurrent resolution, Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. PIKE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MANN, and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona):

H. Res. 433. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

204. By the Speaker: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to funds for the construction of Mount Carbon Dam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

205. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the definition of ammunition in the Federal Gun Control Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

206. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the establishment of the Continental Shelf as the exclusive fisheries zone for the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 11919. A bill for the relief of Fred J. King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11920. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Privitera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.