

to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Victor Cardosi, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Hampshire, for the term of 4 years, vice Paul G. April, resigning.

William L. Martin, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Georgia for the term of 4 years, vice Robert O. Doyle.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, May 8, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to announce the scheduling of a hearing on Tuesday, May 13, in room 4232, at 10 a.m., on the nominations of Mr. DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois, to be Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and Mr. John B. Martin, Jr., of Michigan, to be Commissioner on Aging.

REVISED HEARING NOTICE

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 29, as appears on page 10625 of the RECORD, I announced that hearings would be held on May 1 and May 14, before the Subcommittee on Economic Development of the Committee on Public Works at 10 a.m. in room 4200, on S. 1072 and S. 1090, on proposed legislation extending for 2 years the authority of the Appalachian Regional Commission and of the five regional commissions established under title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

In the text of the hearing notice, however, the date of the testimony of Hon. Robert A. Podesta, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and the several regional co-chairmen erroneously reads May 7. This should be changed to read May 14.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
MAY 5, 1969

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, May 5, 1969.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 5, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 30 (under authority of the order of the Senate of April 29, 1969), 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Oliver L. Troxel, Jr., of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Zambia.

John Davis Lodge, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

Matthew J. Loram, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Dahomey.

Francis E. Meloy, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

Spencer M. King, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guyana.

Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Daniel Z. Henkin, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Phil G. Goulding, resigned.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Richard K. Burke, of Arizona, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Arizona for the term of 4 years vice Edward E. Davis, resigning.

U.S. MARSHAL

Isaac George Hylton, of Virginia, to be U.S. Marshal for the eastern district of Vir-

ginia for the term of 4 years vice Forest F. Walker, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Arthur Fletcher, of Washington, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Laurence H. Silberman, of Hawaii, to be solicitor for the Department of Labor.

Robert D. Moran, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Edward E. Johnston, of Hawaii, to be High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

PEACE CORPS

Joseph H. Blatchford, of California, to be Director of the Peace Corps.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Marshall Green, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

William J. Handley, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America in Spain.

Kenneth B. Keating, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India.

William Leonhart, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Val Peterson, of Nebraska, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

Alfred Puhan, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Hungary.

Phillip K. Crowe, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 1, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Russel H. Dilday, Jr., Tallowood Baptist Church, Houston, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Fear thou not; for I am with thee; be not dismayed; for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of My righteousness.—Isaiah 41: 10.

Dear Father, knowing the immense and complex responsibilities these Representatives face, we are quick to acknowledge that so often the best we have is not enough. And taking courage from Thy clear and unmistakable promise which we have just read, we unashamedly be-

gin these proceedings with prayer for Thy help.

Sustain and strengthen our President, we pray, under the heavy demands of his office.

Sustain and strengthen the Speaker and each Member of this body. Sensitize their minds to that wisdom which comes only from Thee. Reinforce their native abilities with Thine own unlimited power and transplant within them a courageous enthusiasm to obey Thy will to the end that in all things Thy perfect plan for this Nation may be accomplished.

For it is in the name of Thy Son Jesus, who ever liveth to make intercession for us, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

APRIL 25, 1969.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of

1959, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on April 24, 1969, approved the following public building project:

Baltimore, Maryland: Courthouse and Federal Building (Construction) and conversion and renovation of existing Appraisers Stores Building.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to file before midnight Friday, May 2, reports on the following bills:

S. 1081, to provide for the striking of medals in honor of the dedication of the Winston Churchill Memorial and Library;

H.R. 6269, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of the State of South Carolina;

H.R. 7215, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the U.S. diplomatic courier service;

H.R. 8188, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Wichita, Kans; and

H.R. 8648, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American Fisheries Society.

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

SAFEGUARD MISSILE SYSTEM

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion and much controversy concerning the proposal for a Safeguard missile system. One of the Members of this House, whose advice and guidance I greatly admire, has said:

When the defense of our country is involved, always err on the side of the safety of our country.

The current Safeguard controversy reminds me of the southern gentleman who, during the arid days of prohibition, gave his butler a quart of moonshine. After a few days, he asked his butler how the moonshine was.

The butler responded, "It was just exactly right."

The gentleman asked, "Just what do you mean by 'just exactly right'?"

The butler answered, "If it had been any better, you wouldn't have given it to me. If it had been any worse, I couldn't have drunk it."

If the Safeguard system had been stronger, it might have strained our country's economy. If it had been weaker, it would not have provided the deterrent factor our country must maintain.

OREGON SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT NIXON'S ABM SYSTEM

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

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the controversy surrounding the proposal of President Richard Nixon for a limited anti-ballistic-missile system, very current reaction of the man on the street should be of considerable interest to my colleagues.

The President's recommendation was made immediately before my annual questionnaire was printed for circulation in Oregon's First Congressional District.

During the last 3 days massive returns of my questionnaire have been pouring in.

The question was:

Do you favor President Nixon's recommendation for a limited anti-ballistic-missile program? From 1,000 examined at random:

Answers:	
Yes	579
No	241
No opinion	180

Even more significant of support for the President's proposal are some of the comments made on the questionnaire:

"I feel that we need an ABM program which will keep up with anything the U.S.S.R. has."

"One sufficient to protect us from attack."

"It will be a base to build upon in case of trouble."

"Yes, and much more."

"A good, balanced program, which apparently does not offend the Russians, but shows them we mean business."

OIL IMPORT POLICIES

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, 1 month ago on April 1, I took the floor to discuss at some length our Government's restrictive oil import policies and to share with my colleagues the result of a careful study of the mandatory oil import control program.

My study convinced me that the program is costing American consumers more than \$4 billion a year in artificially high prices for petroleum products. It is conducive to shortages in some areas. It is inequitable. And most important, it is unnecessary.

Today, I rise to introduce a carefully designed bill to provide for a gradual elimination of the oil import control program.

Joining me in this effort are 53 of my colleagues from both political parties and from across the country. The response I received is, I think, a significant measure of growing concern over the lucrative and long-standing benefits enjoyed by the petroleum industry at the expense of the average American consumer and taxpayer.

Our bill is the first legislative effort to end the 10-year-old mandatory oil import control program. I urge its prompt and favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the following 53 Members have joined in sponsoring this legislation today: Representatives ADAMS, ADDABBO, BATES, BINGHAM, BOLAND, BURKE of Massachusetts, BUTTON, BYRNE of Pennsylvania, CLEVELAND, DADDARIO, DONOHUE, GIAIMO, GIBBONS, HALPERN, HANLEY, HATHAWAY, HECKLER of Massachusetts, HICKS, HORTON, KASTENMEIER, KEITH, KOCH, KYROS, LONG of Maryland, LOWENSTEIN, MCCARTHY, MATSUNAGA, MESSKILL, MIKVA, MINISH, MINK, MONAGAN, MOORHEAD, MORSE, O'NEILL of Massachusetts, OTTINGER, PEPPER, PHILBIN, PODELL, REID of New York, REUSS, ROBISON, RODINO, ROSENTHAL, ST GERMAIN, ST. ONGE, SMITH of New York, STAFFORD, STRATTON, TIERNAN, WOLFF, WYDLER, and WYMAN.

CENTRAL OHIO POLL

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, during the month of April, I conducted my annual public opinion poll in the 12th Ohio Congressional District. Approximately 35,000 ballots were mailed to central Ohio constituents, and approximately 7,500 expressed their views on eight issues.

Significantly, the greatest impact related to student disorders: 97.8 percent of those responding favored expulsion of students violently disrupting academic life in colleges and universities. And 96.8 percent would refuse Federal grants or loans to students actively engaging in unlawful campus disorders or violence. I have today introduced legislation to provide an incentive for college administrators to exercise some courage and enforce regulations and laws.

When an accused felon is out on bond, 87.7 percent would restrict bail for a subsequent or later offense, and if a firearm is used in a Federal crime, 93.3 percent would add a mandatory sentence.

On the subject of voting age, a constitutional amendment to standardize a minimum age was approved by 93.8 percent; however, in selecting the minimum age, 51.8 percent favored 21, 9 percent favored 20, 20 percent favored age 19, 19 percent age 18, and only 0.01 percent favored 17.

Post Office reorganization was approved with substantial margins with only 6.1 percent wishing to retain present system; 48.6 percent would base all promotions and appointments strictly on merit; 20 percent favor creating a non-profit public corporations and 24 percent suggest private industry handling.

The electoral college fared poorly as only 12.2 percent would retain present system; 75 percent favor a direct popular vote, and 11.2 percent suggest electoral college by congressional district rather than by State.

The "invasion of privacy" by the Census Bureau bothered 69.1 percent who favor limiting inquiries to seven basic questions; 22.1 percent would continue as in the past, while 8 percent favor ex-

panded inquiries to include additional information.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of making an announcement in connection with the program for today.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has advised that the various bills which have been unanimously reported from that committee and have been listed as probably coming up this week will not be called up today, but that he will seek to call up those bills sometime next week.

CREATING SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY CRIME IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 17 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 17

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all aspects of crime in the United States, including (1) its elements, causes, and extent; (2) the preparation, collection, and dissemination of statistics thereon, and the availability of reciprocity of information among law enforcement agencies, Federal, State, and local, including exchange of information with foreign nations; (2) the adequacy of law enforcement and the administration of justice, including constitutional issues pertaining thereto; (4) the effect of crime and disturbances in the metropolitan urban areas; (5) the effect, directly or indirectly, of crime on the commerce of the Nation; (6) the treatment and rehabilitation of persons convicted of crimes; (7) measures for the reduction, control, or prevention of crime; (8) measures for the improvement of (a) detection of crime, (b) law enforcement, including increased cooperation among the agencies thereof, (c) the administration of justice; and (9) measures and programs for increased respect for the law.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places

within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very fitting that on this May Day, dedicated to respect for and observance of law in our country, our House of Representatives should be considering a measure designed to promote respect for and observance of law in our land.

Most of us agree, Mr. Speaker, that the greatest challenge facing this country, probably, is the challenge of crime.

In 1967 there were in the United States over 12,000 murders. 63 percent of these were by firearms. I say this with interest, because sitting next to me is the distinguished gentleman from Texas, (Mr. CASEY), who has fought so hard to try to make mandatory prison sentences to be imposed upon those who commit crimes with firearms.

This represents a total economic loss to the victims' families or dependents of an amount in excess of \$800 million.

Aggravated assault increased by 9 percent from 1966 to 1967.

The most frequent crime committed in 1967 was robbery. There were over 202,000 robberies committed in 1967 as opposed to 157,000 in 1966, an increase of 27 percent in robberies between 1966 and 1967.

There were over 27,000 forcible rapes in the United States in 1967, an increase of 7 percent over 1966. In the year 1968, the last year for which complete figures are available, Mr. Speaker, serious crime increased in the United States 17 percent. Robbery was up 29 percent, murder 14 percent, and forcible rape 14 percent. Crimes against property also increased. Grand larceny in 1968 was up 21 percent. Burglary was up 13 percent. Crime in the large cities and in the suburban areas increased 18 percent in 1968 over 1967 and in rural areas crime was up 12 percent. Armed robbery rose 34 percent in 1968 over 1967 and made up 61 percent of all robberies. Serious assault with a gun rose 24 percent and made up 25 percent of the total.

The number of arrests, Mr. Speaker, in 1967 was shocking when you observe the number of those arrests where the subjects were under 15 and 18 years of age respectively. For example, in 1967

youngsters under 15 years of age committed 137 murders and under 18 years of age they committed 830 murders. There were 8,315 murders committed in that year by people over 18 years of age. Forcible rape, 475 by children under 15 years of age in 1967, and 2,515 under 18 years of age, and 10,144 over the age of 18. Robbery in 1967, 6,885 under 15 years of age, 18,889 by young people under 18 years of age, and 40,900 18 years of age and over. Aggravated assault in 1967, below 15 years of age, 6,559, under 18 years of age 18,359; and 18 years of age and over, 88,833. Burglary, under 15, 62,510; 15 to 18, 65, 659; 18 and over, 111,292. Larceny, under 15, 134,216; under 18, 246,057; 18 and over, 201,242.

Mr. Speaker, may I emphasize this figure. Auto theft, under 15—and these were arrests and not those who committed the offenses and were never detected—under 15 for auto thefts in 1967 there were 19,902; under 18 there were 73,080; 18 and over there were 45,153. In other words, over 63 percent of the auto thefts in the United States were committed by young people under 18 years of age. The percentage of increase in arrests of people from 1960 to 1967 under 18 years of age was up 68½ percent. Arrests 18 and over were up less than 1 percent.

Just one or two more figures, Mr. Speaker.

The narcotics and drug abuse today is one of those that is immeasurably hurting the young people of this country.

There are over 64,000 known drug addicts in the United States. The drug arrests for persons under 18 years of age rose during the period from 1960 to 1967 by 778 percent. Now, that means those under 18 years of age who were arrested for the use of drugs, rose in a period of 7 years by 778 percent.

For persons 18 years of age and over arrests for drug addiction rose 126 percent.

As of June 30, 1968, marijuana was involved in 62 percent of the drug arrests.

Mr. Speaker, the aim of this resolution is to set up a select committee of this House of Representatives to investigate all aspects of crime, to conduct careful hearings and inquiries and then make its recommendations to this House and permit the proper legislative committees to decide what weight they think they deserve. Further, this resolution is designed, certainly, to show to everyone that this House of Representatives wants to do what it can to prevent and curb crime and to make our people's lives, their persons, and their property, safe in their homes and on the streets and highways of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I remind my distinguished colleagues that on the 12th of July 1968 this House adopted by a record vote of 318 to 12, House Joint Resolution 1, which was similar to House Resolution 17 now before the House, except it was a joint resolution of the Senate and the House. The other body chose not to act upon the matter. So the sponsors of House Resolution 17 have proposed the enactment of this resolution setting up a select committee of the House and the

Rules Committee recommends it to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to present this resolution to the House today, and I hope it will receive the approval of the Members of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida for bringing this measure before us. I think he deserves a special commendation for having done so.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and pleased that the House today is considering House Resolution 17, the bill to create a select committee on crime.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) is due a special word of thanks from all of us for the job he has done in getting this proposal moving and for the leadership he has demonstrated. Originally, I joined with him last year—1967—in cosponsoring this bill, and I am glad to see that the House is now considering it. I hope and trust it will be approved overwhelmingly.

I have addressed the House before about the need for a committee of this type. I do not think it is necessary now to review the crime statistics—we all know that they continue to rise at an unprecedented rate.

The point to consider now is what should the House do about the problem. Certainly, in light of the substantial problem crime presents, we would be well advised to have a special group devoting its energies to revealing the causes of crime and making inquiry into the possible actions we might take to remedy the problems.

I am advised that this committee in no way will diminish the authority of other standing committees. It is not my intent to support a group which will displace substantive jurisdiction of other committees, but I do feel that it is important to have a group with the expertise necessary to look into the causes of crime and keep abreast of the latest works and studies being published in this field.

This is a job which can best be done by a staff of specialists, and I strongly feel that this problem is sufficiently serious to warrant this approach. The House of Representatives—and Congress—are in the best position to undertake this study.

Congress has worked around the problem of uncovering the causes of crime in many past programs. But at each such time, the criminal nexus was only an indirect one. I believe it is time we look as squarely and intensely as possible at what we can do to reverse our rising crime rate.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 17 comes directly from the Committee on Rules. For the information of the Members having the opportunity of serving here for the first time, we will not go into the Committee of the Whole House on

the State of the Union upon the adoption of this resolution. There will be 1 hour of debate on the resolution and at the conclusion of that debate, there will be a rollcall vote on the resolution. If, as a result of the rollcall vote, there is a decision and if the resolution passes, that will constitute the final action thereon. We will not then go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 17, if adopted, will set up a special select committee of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be designated by the Speaker. These seven Members are authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all aspects of crime in the United States, including quite a number of different specific recommendations and authorities set forth in the resolution.

On July 12, 1968, this House passed House Joint Resolution 1. That was a joint resolution and called for the other body to join in its adoption in order for it to be finally passed. However, the other body did not do so. Thus, the joint committee was not created at the last session.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply sets up a select committee in the House of Representatives. I made some remarks on House Joint Resolution 1 which are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 114, part 26, page 21027. I shall not repeat those remarks here, but there are some suggestions contained therein as to what this committee might possibly do.

I would like to call the suggestions to the attention of the committee, if this resolution passes, with the thought in mind that they might be of some help to the committee.

Very frankly, I do not know what the committee can accomplish. Crime has been investigated to death. I believe if we straighten out the Supreme Court on some of their decisions and take some actions so that the law-enforcement officer is not always tried instead of the criminal, we might do a lot more than we will by passing a resolution to investigate. By the same token, I do feel that the House of Representatives should determine whether or not there is anything that it can and should do, that it is not now doing in the field of crime, which will in any way help to solve this very serious situation which certainly is among the top three problems facing the Nation. In accordance therewith, I am content to support this resolution. I hope the resolution passes, and I will cooperate in any way I possibly can with the committee, based upon my previous experience in law enforcement, to assist the committee in carrying out the purposes of House Resolution 17.

Mr. Speaker, I do have some requests for time, but I will hold those in abeyance pending the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) proceeding with his time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN).

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for House

Resolution 17, a bill to create a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all aspects of crime in the United States. On April 4, 1968, in the 90th Congress, I introduced House Resolution 1128, a bill to establish a Select Committee on Coordinated Crime Control and I reintroduced that bill this year on February 5 as House Resolution 220.

House Resolution 17 is substantially the same as House Resolution 220. Like my bill, House Resolution 17 seeks to re-examine all of our existing crime control efforts to formulate how they can be best coordinated and where the weight of their effectiveness should be concentrated.

Presently we have a surplus of Federal, State, and local agencies, each replete with men, materials, and methods. Unfortunately, a lack of a common or coordinated method has led to unnecessary expenditures because of duplication, and a dilution of effectiveness because of a lack of knowledge of the objective.

To correct the present system we must develop an overview of our scattered efforts. We must take stock of our resources, discarding ineffectual programs and strengthening systems that have demonstrated their worth. When this is done, we should endeavor to weed out duplication as much as possible on the local, State, and Federal levels. Interlocking systems should replace overlapping systems. Cooperation should be the binding thread, and effectiveness in alleviating crime on all levels should be the common goal.

Hand in hand with a coordination of effort is a need to formulate a clear definition of objective. We must study all aspects of crime, its causes, effects and elements. Only an indepth study will suffice.

Once the elements are determined, we must endeavor to isolate and eradicate them.

I think the measure before us today is well suited to the enormity of the task, and I urge support in its passage. I do feel that this is only a partial step in the direction of comprehensive crime control. We must strengthen our national determination to support prosecution activities and law enforcement. We must regain our consensus to the effect that criminals should be charged and punished. We must abandon the idea that individuals or groups are above or beyond the reach of the law.

Nevertheless, this study is a start in the right direction and I am happy to support it and to express the hope that it will be activated and undertake this important work.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. KEE), one of the sponsors of the resolution.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highly commend the wisdom, the prudence, and the able leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER), who is the author of this measure. He has been in the forefront in this fight. Indeed, due to his effective action we have the privilege

and the opportunity to vote on this measure today.

Mr. Speaker, I favor and enthusiastically support Representative PEPPER in this measure. I would just like to point out one thing:

I have noticed in visiting with my constituents at home during trips that I have made that the very first thing the people ask me, and this is unanimous, they say, "The crime rate is going up. We elect the Members of the House of Representatives. What are they doing about this situation?"

Mr. Speaker, I have explained this measure presented by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) to my people at home, and they tell me that they are happy to see the House of Representatives taking concrete action in going out into these areas to determine the cause of the crime rate.

Therefore, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that when we have the vote today on this resolution, that the vote will be unanimous.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the able gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am appreciative, and I am confident that the membership of the House is appreciative, of the work done in this important field by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) the author and senior sponsor of this measure. I am very glad to have been a co-introducer.

This measure is designed to set up machinery for probing into crime—its causes, prevention, and cure. Undoubtedly the people of our Nation are gravely disturbed about crime; about all aspects of crime; and about the obvious lack of progress in curbing crime. They are impatient for action.

This is one of the matters which is uppermost in their minds. They consider crime to be one of the greatest threats to the security of America today—and they are right.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the action which is proposed here. This offers opportunity for a constructive step which can contribute to the great task of providing workable solutions to the problem of crime. We cannot afford to neglect this very serious and disturbing situation. We should take any reasonable action within our power which holds promise. We can make contributions beyond those which are now being made, and this is one means by which it can be done.

Therefore, I strongly support and urge unanimous approval of this resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the able gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD).

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Florida for leading the drive during the past several years to

have a committee such as this appointed and active in response to the urging of the people of America.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that we may not have a proper balance on the membership of this committee. I believe it would be a very serious mistake if, on our side of the aisle, we find that all of the Members selected are from the legal profession. I believe that there should be lawyers represented on the committee, for law is a very important aspect to be considered when we are discussing crime.

But, Mr. Speaker, crime is more than just law. Crime is people. Crime very often is the closed door of opportunity. Crime is deprivation in the cities. Crime is boredom in the suburbs.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that when this committee is formed, at least from our side of the aisle, that we will have its membership selected from a broad range of interests and backgrounds. Certainly, the legal profession should be represented. But I also hope that we have the representation of people who have a background of interest in people, in education and in other humanitarian aspects of American life.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able gentleman from New Jersey. He has been one of the strongest and one of the most loyal supporters of this measure from the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the able gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY).

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our colleague the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) for introducing this legislation.

Too long have we sat around here and taken recommendations from the executive that are dreamed up by theorists with no facts behind them.

This is a committee that can get the facts, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that you will join me in supporting the passage of this resolution so that we can get these facts.

We all know that everyone is concerned about crime. We can sit around and talk about it, but unless we develop the facts and know something about it and draw our own bill, we will not accomplish anything.

It is very apparent that something needs to be done—when in 1961 you had 2 million major crimes and yet in 1967 it jumped to almost 4 million major crimes. The comparison to that is: we had 220,000 prisoners in Federal and State prisons in 1961 and dropped to 194,000 in 1967.

I hope that your committee will find the facts on that.

Also, you know we have testimony from high officials in the Department of Justice telling about 5,000 members of the Cosa Nostra who were identified and yet so far as I know they are still walking the streets.

I hope your committee will find out about that.

We had some of the same Department of Justice officials state that there was an amalgamation between this crime syndicate and certain powerful labor unions. I hope your committee will find out about that.

We also had Chief Justice Warren state to the National Conference on Crime Control that corruption in business and government is perpetuating organized crime.

I hope that your committee will find out the facts about that.

Also, I have been concerned, and I know that many of you have been, about the appellate court decisions which seem to lean toward the criminal rather than the law-abiding citizen.

I hope your committee will find out the facts and bring them back to this House.

Mr. Speaker, I have compiled some figures which I will place in the RECORD giving these comparisons between major crimes and our prison population.

I wish the gentleman's committee well. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution and I think this is one time the House can act on its own instead of sitting back and waiting for somebody else trying to tell them what to do.

Far too long has America—and this Congress—listened to the social theorists. And far too long have we in this body neglected to press for a complete review, a thorough investigation, and development of facts—not opinions—into crime and the inability of our criminal laws to protect our people.

There has been a complete and absolute breakdown in law enforcement in America. And if there be any doubt I ask my colleagues to examine brief statistics on crime and punishment which I have collected from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Bureau of Prisons.

Decent people across our land are crying for this Congress to act—to make our streets and our homes safe—to bring needed protection to the small businessman who is prey to the career-criminal. Daily we read of hardened criminals free on probation or parole—or their own recognizance under the recently-enacted Bail Bond Act—robbing, raping or murdering our citizens. And still, we have failed to act.

Today, as we consider House Resolution 17, we will have an opportunity to rectify that.

Of tremendous importance is the corrosive effect of the breakdown in punishment for criminal acts, for it is eating away the vitals of our law-enforcement effort. I think it should be clearly evident from the tabular statistics I shall insert at the end of this statement that such has occurred, and it should be readily apparent to any rational person that the time to act is long overdue.

Never in our Nation's history has there been such a need for a thorough and complete investigation into crime and our inability to cope with it.

I, for one, give House Resolution 17 my fullest support and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

SOMEBODY'S GETTIN' AWAY WITH MURDER¹

Our growing crime rate is a national disgrace. Granted that the causes are many and complex, in my judgment the

¹(And the other six major crimes composing the FBI's national criminal index: robbery, rape, aggravated assault, burglary, auto theft, and larceny over \$50).

prime factors are lax prosecution, lenient sentencing, and liberal parole and probation policies. I think the following official statistics I obtained from the U.S. Bureau of Prisons and the FBI should convince any rational person where the breakdown has occurred in law enforcement:

	Prison population ¹	Major crime	Executions
1961.....	220, 149	2, 082, 400	42
1962.....	218, 830	2, 213, 600	47
1963.....	217, 283	2, 435, 900	21
1964.....	214, 336	2, 755, 000	15
1965.....	210, 895	2, 930, 200	7
1966.....	199, 654	3, 264, 200	1
1967.....	194, 920	3, 802, 300	2

¹ As of Dec. 31, each year.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, every Member should support House Resolution 17 because crime is one of our paramount domestic problems. I commend the gentleman from Florida for his work. I am proud to have introduced a similar bill, House Joint Resolution 167, at the beginning of this session. To fight crime we must find out as much as possible about its causes and put this information where it can be used by our enforcement agencies. I was much interested in the list of nine areas of inquiry recited in the resolution. I am especially interested in the third listed item for investigation and study, this being the adequacy of law enforcement and the administration of justice, including constitutional issues pertaining thereto. In this country we are very near to a constitutional convention if two or three more legislatures act. I hope that this convention will be called and that it will carefully consider a more just application of constitutional principles that will afford society with a degree of protection at least as great as that now being extended to the accused.

Then the ninth objective touches closely upon some things that are happening far too frequently around this country today; that is, the growing or increasing disrespect for the law. If the select committee can propose measures and programs for the increased respect for law it will be truly worthwhile. The crime being committed on our campuses we call disturbances or else campus unrest. But these are not peaceful demonstrations. Crimes are being committed. I hope that the committee would spend some of its time and take a careful survey of disorders and breaches of the peace on the campuses of our colleges this spring.

When this committee is named it will be able along with the House Committee on Internal Security, and perhaps with help from the Committee on Education and Labor, to try to find out the causes of the campus happenings and point to some solution. The people of my district are fed up with what is happening on our campuses. If this proposed committee can find out whether agitators have a common plan or pattern and leaders conspire to try to wreck our colleges according to a plan with collective intent—then

the committee will have made a great contribution to the solution of perhaps the most pressing internal problem facing our country today.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida deserves special praise for his effort because the creation of this select committee is a move by the legislative branch to take some steps to combat crime. For far too long we have sat back and waited for and listened for some direction from the executive branch both during the last administration and in this new administration. But if this select committee conducts the thorough kind of investigation and study into all the aspects of crime in the United States, which I am sure it will, then we will have all the facts and needed materials to prepare and pass a crime bill without having to await any longer for messages from downtown.

It is true that crime has been investigated by other committees. Until now, most, or all, of these have been appointed by the Executive. If there is any opposition to this resolution, it would be extremely difficult to understand the reasons. I suppose one ground might be the cost. I guess there is nothing worthwhile that does not cost some money. But the cost-benefit ratio here should be quite high and for the few dollars spent, the yield should be many, many times the cost. In other words, these expenditures should not be regarded as a cost, but an investment.

The only other possible reason I can conceive of for any opposition to this resolution would be from those who prefer to tiptoe around with such meticulous care as to avoid the overstepping of jurisdictional lines between committees. To bring it out in the open if the Judiciary Committee had any intention to conduct a survey and investigation into all the aspects of crime, surely they would have proceeded with some dispatch before now. This resolution may attract some opponents, but if so, it is my guess it will be largely confined to those same few who opposed continuation of the House Internal Security Committee solely and only because they thought this committee was infringing on the jurisdictional territory of the Judiciary Committee.

For my part, the problem of law enforcement in this country is so grave that this is no time to stand on points of order or split hairs between committees whether they be select or standing committees. The job that must be done is big enough to have several different committees working on the problem at the same time. Let's quit the useless fretting over jurisdiction.

It is a privilege to support House Resolution 17 and I know it will receive the enthusiastic support of the great majority of the Members of this House.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. OLSEN).

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Florida on this legislation. I very strongly support this legislation, and I wish to endorse all of the gentleman's remarks. I have this much to add: The able gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREEN) and the

gentleman from California (Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) conducted some hearings about a year ago on the question of a census of crime, the thought being that even the statistics that the able gentleman from Florida put in the RECORD are not the whole truth, that there are a great many victims of crime whose circumstances were not reported. The statistics the able gentleman has are reported by the police departments and by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I am sure they do the best they can. But there are many, many unreported crimes, because the victim does not complain to the police department. I think the situation is even more serious than has been said by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Again I say I very strongly support the resolution and urge that it be adopted unanimously.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman very much. I yield to the able gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is at a crucial moment of decision. Lawlessness threatens the foundation of the American society.

I need not cite the appalling statistical evidence. I need not describe the corrosive effects. These facts are all too well known.

I believe we must dig deeply into the very nature of American society for effective solutions.

Our national life bears a long heritage of frontier philosophy. Conflict is bred into our bloodstream. Our population mixture with all its magnificence and virility has produced inevitable clashes.

We see the breakup of families, the sometime curse of affluence on personal responsibility, the individual's loss of identity in group conformity, the great migration of people from one part of our country to another, and destruction of the restraints of their spirit of community, simply changing the form of their poverty and finding themselves in an area where the possibilities of crime are vastly intensified.

I think Congress must dig as deeply as it possibly can into the root causes, without forgetting the very practical problems of law enforcement in facing America's criminal population as it exists, not as we might have healed it, nor as we might, in the future, provide for its redemption. To the victim of an assault, at the moment of the onslaught the assailant's prenatal care and postteenage environment are of minimal interest.

Our concern for the rehabilitation of offenders must continue, and should be equaled by our concern for the welfare of our policemen, their education, their compensation and the facilities afforded them to accomplish their goals.

Our people—especially young people—reach out for better standards and goals. The social rebels are of all kinds, some constructive and some destructive. Essentially, all of them want something better.

Who does not hunger for a better society?

When the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder released its report last year it became evident that the Congress must indicate a genuine commit-

ment to better protect the American people and improve our law-enforcement program.

As a cosponsor of the resolution we are considering today, I firmly believe it will provide us with a congressional body to correlate the many studies that have been made, to look into all areas and aspects of crime in the United States, to hold hearings, to publish reports, and to recommend corrective measures to the Congress.

Crime and its causes have been studied by commissions, councils, court administrators, and executive committees. It seems not only fitting, but high time, the group which actually handles the legislation on this subject, should conduct its own study.

I applaud CLAUDE PEPPER for his lead in the drive toward establishment of such a committee and urge that all Members give this resolution their full support.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman very much. I yield to the able gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN).

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleague from Florida on this important resolution. I endorse what has been said by the other Members on the need for getting to the facts on the causes of crime throughout our country.

It will take the combined efforts of everyone of us in the Congress, as well as all of the citizens, the law-enforcement officers, and those charged with the responsibility of interpreting the laws, to contribute to the assembling and the interpretation of the information as to the possible causes and cures of this nationwide problem before we can hope for success.

There is no question but that this country can cope with any problem—no matter how great or small—if we simply “put our shoulder to the wheel”—and never has that effort been more sorely needed than in the situation in which we find this country today.

I pledge myself to do whatever I can to that end.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the able gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) on his leadership in bringing this matter to the House, and to associate myself with his efforts.

The problem of crime and lawlessness is not a new one. Many centuries ago a Greek named Heraclitus of Ephesus declared that the principal problem in every organized society is to combine that degree of liberty without which law is tyranny with that degree of law without which liberty would be license.

Obviously a society that cannot protect society verges on anarchy. Two broad elements in the crime problem seem apparent.

First. There is organized crime, by which sophisticated apparatus have been put together and vast systems built into them, with enormous illicit profits resulting. I was amazed and alarmed yesterday upon being told there is clear

indication that some elements of the Mafia had been rigging the stock market in respect to one particular stock on the American Exchange, deliberately bidding it up and down. If a criminal element can achieve this degree of organization, the implications to the unsuspecting public and to the economy itself are readily apparent.

Second. Another element, of course, is a general breaking down in respect for law. It is ever more difficult, with our cities growing and every organized activity becoming increasingly impersonal, to inculcate in this public at large a sense of community, a sense of personal responsibility. When a high-rise apartment complex houses perhaps 100,000 people in 1 square mile, and 80 percent of those people do not belong to any community organization and 90 percent are not qualified to vote in local elections, the business of maintaining respect for the community and the constituted authority in the community is ever more difficult.

For all of these reasons it seems quite logical that the House should conduct a thoroughgoing investigation of these and other related phenomena.

I am indebted, as I think all of us are, to the gentleman from Florida for his vision and leadership in this field.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, reserving the balance of my time, I yield now to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. DENNEY).

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have always held the philosophy that government cannot exist without order, and order cannot exist without government.

I have had the honor and privilege during the past 2 years, under a program called Opportunity Crusade to speak on 12 different campuses throughout the United States. Wherever I went, I was trying to find out what went through the minds of our young people.

I found they were losing respect for the legislative branch of our Government. I asked them why, and they said because the legislative branch is not taking the proper steps to get something done as far as maintaining law and order. We talked back and forth.

I finally came up with this arrangement. I would end every speech by saying, “I ask you young folks not to tear down the system until you know how to put something better back together again.” In every situation, I would get a standing ovation from those young people. They want somebody to speak straight from the shoulder to them.

Mr. Speaker, I think here we have a device, a committee from the legislative branch of our Government, that can find out from our young people what is making them tick and why things are going badly because a few militant dissidents are trying to disrupt our schools. This will not infringe on any of the prerogatives of any standing committee. It will act as a clearinghouse for all agencies of the executive branch that have had crime studies. We will be able to come up with meaningful legislation.

I ask my colleagues to get behind this legislation and make it meaningful. Let us tell the American people that Congress now is out to stop this crime problem.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN).

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in behalf of the law-abiding citizens of our great country; and, therefore, in support of House Resolution 17, which provides for the establishment of a select congressional committee of the House to investigate crime.

For years, the volcanoclike problems of crime have been steaming and boiling beneath the surface of American life. More recently eruptions of crime across the country have created tidal waves of despair and anxiety among our citizenry throughout the United States as well as in my own State of Kansas.

For example, the total crime index in America, according to the FBI's Uniform Crime Report of 1967, went up 88.7 percent during the years 1960 to 1967.

The despair and anxiety of our people has been demonstrated in the last couple of years through published poll results showing crime high on the list of citizen concern.

More recently, President Nixon laid down the gauntlet before the leaders of organized crime in this Nation. The President's “war on crime” dramatically demonstrates the great public concern.

With these facts foremost in my mind, I was proud to have joined my colleague from Florida, the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER, in cosponsoring this resolution.

Congress needs a select legislative committee with broad investigatory powers which can gather factual information that will form the basis for legislative action. I am confident that the select committee proposed in House Resolution 17 can satisfy this need.

Vigorous law enforcement is a step toward restoring an ordered system of government. But it is only a superficial resolution of the problem. Congress needs to get at the causes of violence and disrespect for the law and to continue to study the subject, not only for today but to meet tomorrow's problems.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the able gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT), one of the authors of the resolution.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, when I was a student at the University of Florida. I was very happy to be able to be active in the campaign of the sponsor of this resolution, then running for the U.S. Senate for the first time. I have admired tremendously all the important pages in his career since then, both of his career in the Senate and in the House. I feel what he is doing today is one of the most important pages in a rich book of life, and forwards the heritage and future strength of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the legislation before the House today, House Resolution 17, a bill

to create a Select Committee To Investigate Crime.

The gentleman from Florida, Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, is to be congratulated on bringing this legislation to the House of Representatives and to the attention of the American people.

There is no greater domestic problem facing our Nation today than the reestablishment of law and order. We have a significant challenge in this field throughout the Nation and locally. The select committee established by House Resolution 17 will be composed of seven Members of the House. It will have the power to make continuing investigations and studies of all aspects of crime in the United States.

While law enforcement is primarily a local responsibility, the Federal Government and the Congress have an important role to play in reversing the shocking crime and juvenile delinquency rate in the country. Crime costs us \$27 billion annually and the rate of crime jumped 17 percent from 1967 to 1968, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

A hundred years ago, Thoreau wrote:

There are a thousand hacking at the branches of evil to one who is striking at the root.

The Congress, with this committee, will be striking at the root of crime and juvenile delinquency in America through its in-depth studies and surveys.

I have been a strong supporter of legislation to assist local law enforcement agencies in updating their crime detection methods and in training policemen. I believe the words of President Woodrow Wilson, who said:

Our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually.

Several years ago I was successful in adding an amendment to the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act which allowed for the teaching of "high ethical and community responsibility standards." This amendment has been carried out in several different projects across the Nation.

J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the FBI, said recently:

There has been great apathy upon the part of the civilian population of the country. They are not sufficiently interested in combatting crime.

Because of this, and my own deep feelings about the need for all of us to lead a better life, I sponsored a seminar on law and order on Friday, August 9, 1968, at the George Washington Hotel in Jacksonville, Fla. This seminar brought together leading citizens of our community to discuss "Crime and Juvenile Delinquency—What Can We Do About It In Jacksonville?" Prominent national figures in law enforcement and corrections keynoted and addressed the half-day seminar. A panel of civic and social minded Jacksonville residents discussed these topics: "Law Enforcement"; "The Role of the Church in Fighting Crime and Juvenile Delinquency"; "School Challenge in Crime and Juvenile Delinquency"; and "Civic and Home Responsibility in Creating a Safe Society."

A further concrete example of my interest and concern over this problem is

my cosponsorship of the bill before us today.

I believe that a Committee on Crime can bring attention to the problem and solutions in this field and I am hopeful it can be established.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Congressman PEPPER on bringing this legislation to the Congress and to the people. This is typical of his outstanding leadership in the House. The creation of a House Committee on Crime will make an important contribution in this No. 1 problem at home.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able gentleman from Florida.

I yield 1 minute to the able gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this important resolution I am pleased to speak for its prompt passage. We have only to read our daily newspapers and listen to our broadcast news reports to realize the gravity of the problem of crime in all parts of our Nation.

This problem stretches from organized crime with its many outlets to urban violence to suburban teenagers experimenting with dangerous drugs. The magnitude of the problem is truly awesome and prompt constructive action is necessary.

In order to best define the sources of the problem and therefore offer constructive suggestions for possible solutions, a thoroughgoing congressional investigation is clearly desirable. This is, of course, the purpose of this resolution and the reason why I have joined in sponsoring the legislation drawn by my able and distinguished colleague from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

I trust our colleagues recognize the importance of initiating a complete study of the problem of crime at the earliest possible date and therefore anticipate immediate positive action. Not to act now would be a grave disservice to the tens of millions of law-abiding Americans. Finally I want to join in commending the gentleman from Florida for taking the lead on this vital subject.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately I could not be here for all the debate. Has anyone ascertained what this new committee would cost?

Mr. PEPPER. That matter would be determined by the Committee on House Administration and by this House.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman not have some idea of how many hundreds of thousands of dollars and employees it involves?

Mr. PEPPER. Not at this time. That will be a matter for the Committee on House Administration and the House to decide, after the select committee has introduced a funding resolution and been heard before the House Administration Committee.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this country's crime rate is spiraling upward at an alarming pace. In 1967—to cite statistics from just one recent year—a serious

crime was committed every minute. A murder occurred every 43 minutes, a rape every 19 minutes, an aggravated assault every 2 minutes. Since 1967 the crime rate has continued to grow, swelling by an astonishing 17 percent by the end of 1968.

America is becoming a nation of locked doors and shuttered windows. Faced with the growing menace of violent crime—murder, robbery, assault—most Americans are afraid to walk the streets after dark. People living in our biggest cities, in fact, do not feel completely safe behind their securely latched apartment doors.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that we need a searching examination of crime in the United States and the means to combat it. The bill we are now considering—House Resolution 17—would meet this pressing need. The bill, one that I am cosponsoring, calls for the creation of a seven-member House committee to carry out an investigation of crime: First, its elements, causes, and extent; second, the preparation, collection, and dissemination of crime statistics, and the availability of reciprocity of information among law enforcement agencies; third, the adequacy of law enforcement and the administration of justice, including relevant constitutional issues; fourth, the effect of crime and disturbances in the metropolitan urban areas; fifth, the effect, directly or indirectly, of crime on the commerce of the Nation; sixth, the treatment and rehabilitation of persons convicted of crimes; seventh, measures for the reduction, control, or prevention of crime; eighth, measures for the improvement of detection of crime, law enforcement, including increased cooperation among the enforcement agencies, the administration of justice; and, ninth, measures and programs for increased respect for the law.

The Nation's peace officers are doing the best job they can to accomplish these goals. Although commendable, these efforts are not good enough. Large numbers of crimes, including many very serious offenses, are not cleared by arrests. Police solutions of serious crimes declined 8 percent in 1967. The select committee proposed by House Resolution 17 would help to improve this situation. It would support increased cooperation among local, State, and Federal law-enforcement agencies. It would suggest measures to improve crime detection and law enforcement. With this aid the efficiency of our Nation's crimefighters would be significantly strengthened.

One of the most menacing problems confronting today's police is the growth of public disrespect for the law. Citizens often fail to come to the aid of officers who are attacked while attempting to perform their duties. According to the FBI Uniform Crime Reports, these attitudes have contributed to the 11-percent increase in the rate of assaults on law enforcement officers in 1967. In that year there were nationally 13.5 assaults for every 100 officers. There were 76 police officers killed in 1967. The Select Committee on Crime would suggest measures and programs to increase respect for the law and for our law enforcers.

An important aspect of the select committee's study of crime will be the treatment and rehabilitation of criminals. The failure of our present system for the care of offenders is reflected in FBI statistics for 1967. Sixty percent—yes, 60 percent—of offenders released to the street in 1963 were rearrested within 4 years. Our abysmal failure in rehabilitation is especially lamentable with respect to young offenders. Of the offenders under 20 years of age released in 1963, 70 percent committed new crimes.

The committee suggested by House Resolution 17 would be responsible for investigating methods employed for the rehabilitation of criminals. It would suggest measures to improve the present system.

Criminal activity has a staggering effect on our national economy: in 1967 property worth more than \$1.4 billion was stolen. This represents only a fraction of the dollar cost of crime, however. People who otherwise could be economically productive members of society are engaged in the destruction of our Nation through crime. The American correctional system admits 2.5 million people each year. This represents an immense economic cost measured in loss of labor power. The annual operating budget of our correctional system is over a billion dollars. Crime has the additional cost of adversely affecting the commerce of the Nation. If methods could be found to eliminate or reduce crime, this economic burden would be greatly alleviated. The Select Committee on Crime would work toward this end, searching for ways to eliminate the root causes of crime. It would greatly benefit our Nation economically, and, even more importantly, it would make America a safer place to live.

In 1967 almost two out of every 100 Americans were the victims of serious crimes. This situation is intolerable. I urge the passage of House Resolution 17.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, as a co-sponsor of the House resolution to create a select committee of the House to investigate all aspects of crime in the United States, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues in urging support for its passage today.

We must emphatically demonstrate to the Nation that the Congress is deeply concerned with the problem of crime, and is anxious to take constructive steps to curtail and turn back the spiraling crime rate.

Once the committee has been formed, we will have the proper machinery to launch a coordinated effort to control lawlessness in the United States. For the first time we will have an intelligence center and clearinghouse for activities and suggestions in the field of crime control. I am confident that the select committee will provide valuable assistance to the various committees in Congress that deal with the many phases of law enforcement and criminal activity.

It should be pointed out that the select committee would in no way interfere with the powers and prerogatives of existing committees, but would act as an agency for the collection, analysis, and

distribution of information to coordinate our entire effort. Such coordination is needed if we are to come up with meaningful solutions to the crime problems in the Nation.

I sincerely urge favorable consideration of this bill to create a select committee to investigate crime.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, as a co-sponsor of the legislation to create a select committee of the House to investigate crime in the United States, I am, of course, vitally interested in the passage of House Resolution 17.

Last week in his message to the Congress on organized crime, President Nixon said:

As a matter of national "public policy," I must warn our citizens that the threat of organized crime cannot be ignored or tolerated any longer. It will not be eliminated by loud voices and good intentions. It will be eliminated by carefully conceived, well-funded, and well-executed action plans.

The legislation before us will provide the machinery we in Congress need to conceive and establish the type of action plans to which the President referred.

However, this committee's jurisdiction should not be limited to the "traditional" crime problems plaguing our society. I hope it will include the very serious criminal offenses being committed daily by a small but militant group of persons who are dedicated to the destruction of this country. I refer to the ardent revolutionaries who have been crossing State lines to incite rioting and violence on college campuses, have attempted to devastate business establishments in our major cities and who make no pretext about their desire to "bring down this society." The time has come for Congress to take immediate action, not simply to insure protection of existing institutions, but to create a climate of freedom under law.

The acts of certain groups claiming to be expressions of dissent are, in fact, criminal in nature and aimed at destruction of the very foundations of this Republic. Let no one mistake their actual intentions, nor their dedication to this cause. We are today faced with criminals of the worst sort—engaged in activities of a subversive nature. Yet, there is no committee of Congress assuming jurisdiction of this problem. Existing committees are already overburdened and simply do not have the time to take on the tremendous undertaking envisioned for the Select Committee on Crime. Furthermore, although certain agencies of the executive branch are presently involved in active investigations of this type of crime, the Congress should have the benefit of its own, independent inquiry into this problem.

Yesterday, in a speech before the annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the President said:

There must be no compromise with lawlessness and no surrender to force if free education is to survive.

I concur wholeheartedly with this position and believe we in Congress have the obligation to begin at once an in-depth investigation of the campus disorders. The Select Committee on Crime is the appropriate body to conduct such

an inquiry. I urge approval of the legislation to create it.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I rise in opposition to House Resolution 17, which would establish a select House committee to conduct an investigation of all aspects of crime in the United States.

It is obvious that the resolution is going to pass by a wide margin. Since a vote against a study of crime may be viewed as a vote against "law and order" itself, the measure has great popular appeal. But, Mr. Speaker, this may be one of those cases when good politics makes for bad law.

In my judgment, the proposed committee, which would have investigative but not legislative powers, is unnecessary, is an encroachment on the jurisdiction of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and may be counterproductive with respect to actually achieving any results in the field of crime legislation.

In considering whether we need another committee to study crime, let us examine what has been done in the recent past. Most noteworthy is the mammoth study by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice—1965 to 1967—which submitted a general report, "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society," and nine task force reports entitled "The Police," "The Courts," "Corrections," "Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime," "Organized Crime," "Science and Technology," "Assessment of Crime," "Narcotics and Drugs," and "Drunkenness." These reports totaled thousands of pages of text and ranged over the entire spectrum of problems in the area of criminal justice.

The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders—1967-68—dealt in depth with the causes and preventions of riots in our inner cities and crime associated with them.

There are presently in existence a number of commissions studying various aspects of crime in America. The National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws was established in 1966 to formulate and recommend legislation to improve the Federal system of criminal justice and to revise the criminal laws of the United States. Other studies are being conducted by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training and the Subcommittee on Correctional Manpower and Training and the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Judiciary Committee of the other body. Two private organizations conducting ongoing studies of crime at a national level are the National Council on Crime and Delinquency in New York City, and the Lemberg Center of the Study of Violence, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass. In addition, there are many State, local, and regional public and private crime commissions operating throughout the country.

In view of these extensive investigations of crime, it may be appropriate to suggest that what is needed now is not more study, but more action. Not another committee and another voluminous

report, but new and bold legislation coupled with vigorous and imaginative enforcement of both existing laws and new laws.

I wish to caution those Members eager to proceed with a vigorous war against crime that the creation of an investigative committee such as proposed in House Resolution 17 can be used as an excuse to delay enactment of necessary legislation for many months until after the investigation is completed.

The President has indicated that he will propose important new legislation in the areas of organized crime, narcotics, obscenity, and the rights of the accused. An administration proposal, the Illegal Gambling Business Control Act of 1969, was introduced only this last week, and assuredly further important legislative proposals will be forthcoming. The proposed committee must not be used as a reason to put off action on this critically needed legislation.

This country faces a crisis in the form of a burgeoning crime rate, and the election returns last November indicated that the American public—no matter whether Republican or Democrat—is demanding that something be done. The people of this country gave the 91st Congress a mandate to move, and move forcefully and immediately, against crime. This is a mandate for action, not for unnecessary study and possible delay.

To the extent that further investigation proves necessary however, as a predicate to legislation, the existing staff and resources of the Judiciary Committee are best suited for that purpose. Not only is it possible that the proposed select committee will infringe on the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, which normally handles legislation dealing with crime, but it would apparently place the investigatory and legislative roles in the area of crime in separate hands, which would be inefficient and possibly cause delay and lack of coordination. There is no reason why the Judiciary Committee cannot itself undertake any investigations which may be necessary in connection with legislation in the field of criminal justice. The Judiciary Committee is fully equipped in terms of its professional staff, the background and training of its members, and past experience to handle all matters in the area of criminal law, be they investigative or legislative.

In order that the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, might more effectively take action in the fight against crime, I propose that a special subcommittee be created within the Judiciary Committee to deal with all aspects of the problem of crime. After holding whatever hearings were deemed necessary, this committee could then proceed directly to passage of legislation. The select committee proposed by House Resolution 17 could only propose legislation, which would still have to be referred to the Judiciary Committee for more hearings prior to passage of any legislation.

The reasons for opposing this legislation are substantial, but it will doubtless pass nevertheless. Recognizing this reality, it behooves those of us who serve

on the Judiciary Committee and have a special interest in legislation in the criminal field to work closely with the new committee to avoid, if possible, the pitfalls I foresee to prompt legislation.

I would prefer to proceed in a different fashion and, accordingly, will vote against the legislation; but the committee will have my best wishes as it approaches the critical task of restoring order to this troubled land.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today is May 1. It is a day that the Communists celebrate and commemorate revolution in the Communist nations. I suggest that today we make it a day to help launch a revolution in America—a revolution against crime and the elements of crime which create conditions that can deteriorate into a collapse of law and order that is the breeding ground for communism.

Today we have before the House, House Resolution 17, a resolution of which I am proud to be a cosponsor.

I feel this legislation is of paramount importance to the Congress. More and more America today is turning to the Congress of the United States for assistance in the Nation's grassroot-level fight against crime. Yet we, in our willingness to aid, are lacking a very vital tool needed to provide that aid—a committee of our own to make our own investigation into this problem and to recommend remedial legislation.

The rising crime rate in America, not only organized crime but crimes of violence against the persons and property of law-abiding citizens, is shocking and frightening. The people of America ask only that they be permitted to use our streets, parks, and playgrounds secure in the knowledge that they will be safe. And this is not a great deal to ask. It is a right in America but this right is being destroyed. Passage of this legislation today will help safeguard that right and that is our duty here.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more that we can and must do. But less we cannot afford. I respectfully urge favorable consideration of this legislation.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in support of House Resolution 17, of which I am a cosponsor, and I commend our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER), for his untiring and dedicated effort in bringing this measure before the House for action.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have naturally been directly and intimately concerned for years about the alarming problem of crime in our Nation and legislative efforts to combat it. In the last Congress I cosponsored and helped develop the landmark Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, which was described by the official journal of the International Association of Chiefs of Police as "one of the most important programs in the history of law enforcement."

In that historic Congress the Judiciary Committee also approved several other major measures in this area, such as the Gun Control Act which bans interstate mail-order sale of long guns to comple-

ment the prohibition on sales of handguns in the omnibus crime bill; two Justice and Court Procedure Improvements Acts to prevent discrimination in the selection of juries; and the bill establishing a Federal Judicial Center.

Under normal circumstances, therefore, I would consider that formation of a select committee to investigate a problem over which the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction, and on which it has acted so effectively over the years, would not be necessary.

However, the problem of crime today is not normal. In fact, it has reached such alarming proportions and ramifications that I strongly believe it warrants being the subject of special study by the proposed select committee, just as the horror of hunger in this affluent country moved the Senate to create its Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation reports that the crime index is continuing its climb, reaching new record-setting levels with each new tabulation. During 1967 a serious crime was committed every 8 seconds, and more than 10,000 crimes, felonies, and misdemeanors were committed every day. The 1968 totals are even more alarming.

Cold statistics have generated heated discussions, embroiling the Nation in controversy without shedding light on possible solutions. Effective, workable counteraction has eluded us, for not all crimes can be controlled by a single remedy. In the preparation of last session's crime control bill, it became clear that criminal activities could be identified as belonging to one of three broad categories.

Organized crime is the first category. It involves not only gambling, the numbers racket, loansharking, and narcotics, but numerous other illicit activities. Personal crimes of violence are a second type. In this classification are murder, rape, theft, burglary, mugging, assault, and so forth. A third category involves civil disobedience and violent civil disorders, ranging from campus uprisings to outright rioting.

Complicating the picture is the fact that the three classifications are not mutually exclusive. Elements and organizers of one may be involved in one or both of the other types of criminal activities. Thus the challenge confronting organized society today is to find effective solutions to contain and control all three categories of crime, any one of which by itself is capable of destroying society as we know it.

Organized society must demonstrate, by developing and implementing effective countermeasures, that it is stronger than organized crime. Organized society must prove, again through the development and implementation of effective countermeasures, that it can protect the law-abiding individual from the danger of bodily harm and personal loss at the hands of lawless thugs, whether they operate alone or in small groups.

The truth is that there is no single explanation of crime. It occurs in every part of the country and in every level of society. Its perpetrators and its victims

are people of all ages, incomes and backgrounds. Its trends are difficult to isolate, its causes are legion and its cures are at best speculative and controversial.

In my own State of New Jersey, a report issued last year by a Joint Legislative Committee To Study Crime and the System of Criminal Justice in New Jersey stated:

New Jersey has a serious and growing crime problem and a crisis in crime control. There are no meaningful developments or plans under way that bear any prospect of reversing these complex and deeply troubling conditions. Major action is needed immediately.

The report urged that New Jersey's citizens should inform themselves about "the actual operation of their entire system for administering criminal justice in New Jersey" and submitted 19 recommendations for action, ranging from establishment of a New Jersey Department of Criminal Justice to proposals to improve the salaries, training and recruitment methods for local police.

The committee concluded that in New Jersey it "finds the system of administering criminal justice to be complex, fragmented both in functions and jurisdiction, undernourished, without focus or command, largely invisible as to what is really happening, nowhere near as effective as we believe it should be—and neglected."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if this dangerous situation exists in one of the most advanced and wealthy of our States, the total problem in our 50-State Nation is in urgent need of investigation.

With approval of House Resolution 17 we can obtain a comprehensive and thorough evaluation of all aspects of crime. It is my deep conviction, however, that the greatest care must be taken to assure that the select committee is composed of members of the House with thorough knowledge and expertise in law enforcement, the administration of justice and, particularly, the delicate area of constitutional issues. For the mandate which House Resolution 17 gives the select committee is—and properly so to meet the problem—exceedingly broad and far reaching. It is imperative that the select committee will be one that can proceed expeditiously and responsibly to study this complex problem and make available recommendations on any appropriate legislative action which the House can take.

Mr. Speaker, a nation which has spent billions of dollars to reach the moon should be able to control crime within its borders. The select committee to be created by House Resolution 17 is a vital step toward achievement of this goal, and I urge its approval.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this legislation, I am pleased to rise in support of it. The need for an indepth and ongoing study of crime in this country is so painfully obvious, it is shocking that Congress has failed to act long ago. The House finally acted last session, but as you know, the other body failed to take action on our proposed Joint Committee on Crime.

Across America, tension and instability are rife as undisciplined elements in

our society increasingly run rampant. Leaving a deep imprint on the national character, they have carved out a new legacy of violence and left us with a heritage of destruction and devastation. Our educational system is now under siege as college campuses constantly are being threatened by student revolt and rebellion. Our electoral system, and indeed, our democratic process itself, are in jeopardy as national leaders are tragically, and all too frequently, falling prey to assassins' bullets. Our society has been uprooted in flames and pillaging and racial turmoil as scores of cities were put asunder last year by mass violence. Our system of private enterprise and free government is steadily being eroded as organized criminal activities, largely unnoticed in the wake of other more spectacular crimes, continue to flourish and expand. This wave of crime and violence exacts a heavy toll from all of us. Last year alone, nearly a billion dollars of property was subjected to theft. While some of this growing increase in crimes against persons and property can no doubt be explained by the moving to our urban centers, the higher proportion of crime-prone youth in our population, and more efficient crime-reporting techniques, the hard fact remains that, by any standard, the shadow of crime is rapidly becoming longer and more ominous. Nowhere is this more graphically evident than in the Nation's Capital itself. Across the land, citizens act not out of confidence, but out of fear. Crime has truly become our most pressing domestic problem. We cannot await the millennium when violence and criminality will hopefully wither away because their underlying root causes have been removed. While we in Congress should, of course, act to eliminate the seedbeds of crime, we must also take more effective measures to curb existing violence and disorder and we must act now. The time for hesitancy and inaction is past.

Though I do support this bill, because it is a step in the right direction, it does not go far enough to really meet the need which exists. Maybe we can only move one step at a time, but those steps should be strides and not shuffles.

My major objection to the approach taken in this legislation is in terms of its limited scope and its lack of real permanence. In our efforts to deal with the problem of crime in this country, we must cover all phases, including the courts and law enforcement as well as crime itself. These areas are interrelated and interdependent and the study of any one of these areas alone must of necessity be incomplete as to the total problem.

With respect to permanency of the committee, since a select committee must be renewed with each Congress, the committee and staff could really only plan for a maximum of 2 years. This would result in the one-shot type of study which has been altogether too prevalent in our attack on crime. What we really need is a long-range coordinated approach to the study, so that we begin to develop some expertise in the area. My bill, House Joint Resolution 408, would

create such a joint committee and would have the permanence to which I refer. With such a committee, the staff would be able to compile and coordinate all of the past studies in the area, and keep them up to date on a regular basis. At the same time, the staff would begin to develop some real intimate knowledge of the problems and be able to suggest some workable solutions.

With respect to the scope of the legislation presently before us, the jurisdiction of the proposed committee would seem to be a good deal narrower than is necessary for an adequate and thorough solution to the problem of crime. Although a number of areas are included in its investigatory authority, I feel it could be much broader. Here again, the provisions of my bill, House Joint Resolution 408, is much more comprehensive in the areas encompassed within its jurisdiction. It covers the courts and law enforcement, as well as just crime itself.

For these reasons I urge your support and passage of the pending bill. However, I hope that passage of this bill is merely to be used as leverage for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Crime, the Courts, and Law Enforcement, of a permanent and broad nature.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 17 which authorizes the creation of a select committee of this House to investigate crime.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this measure, I hope that every Member of this House will support this resolution which has wide support on both sides of the aisle.

I would like to say a few words about the splendid campaign put on in behalf of this resolution by the very able gentleman from Florida, my good friend, CLAUDE PEPPER, who has been the guiding hand behind this resolution. The speed with which this measure is going to be approved is in large measure due to the knowledge of the legislative process possessed by the gentleman from Florida who has demonstrated in this House and for 12 years in the other body an unusual—almost uncanny—ability to get the job done. I commend him for his outstanding leadership in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent a district which lies within the area called Metropolitan New York. In fact, the towers of Manhattan literally loom over almost all of the 14th District of New Jersey. It is not necessary for me to dwell upon the crime situation in the New York area. It is so well known that it needs no explanation.

In our area, the two great domestic issues have been street crime and rising rate of narcotic addiction. And as one who has studied this problem deeply, I can assure you that both of these problems share common roots. They are so interrelated that you cannot tell where one begins and the other leaves off.

I have advocated better pay for police officers and better training but these are only a part of our anticrime effort. Much crime has its roots in the ghettos and barrios of our older cities; it breeds on the poverty and misery which is part of

life in these areas. To fight crime we must in addition to providing more effective police work, we must raise the quality of life in these areas and make certain that the door of opportunity is open.

Mr. Speaker, we must instill a greater respect for law among all Americans, the poor in the streets of our great cities and the children of the affluent middle and upper classes whose lawlessness has made battlegrounds of great institutions of higher learning.

Mr. Speaker, if life is to be worth living we must wage a great war against crime. We must enlist government at every level in this war. We cannot permit present conditions to continue. We must wage war against crime and we must win it.

But it is not enough to send men into battle without leadership or a general design. Any war must be planned. There must be a general strategy, an outline for victory. It is my hope that this resolution will set up a committee charged with the task of setting all the resources of this Nation in motion so that we can win the war against crime.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my wholehearted support for the resolution now under consideration. As a cosponsor of a similar resolution in both the 90th Congress and the 91st Congress, I am keenly aware of the need for us to act favorably on it. Last July, we passed a similar bill, 318 to 12. I believe that we must repeat that overwhelming vote here today. Creation of the select committee is a necessary step in an all-out campaign to understand and control crime.

Late last year, we received the alarming report that the national crime rate was increasing eight times faster than the population. I believe, that to combat this, we must mobilize all levels of government to get the job done. Congress and the State legislatures can pass laws to get at the criminal but it is the local law-enforcement official who has to enforce them. Therefore we must give these officials the best tools we can provide so that they can enforce the laws quickly, decisively, and fairly. One way in which we in Congress can make an immediate contribution to this effort is by acting favorably on the resolution we are now considering.

The committee which House Resolution 17 would establish will in no way inhibit or interfere with the powers and prerogatives of the existing legislative committees regarding crime legislation. It will instead serve the invaluable function of coordinating intelligence and acting as a clearinghouse for the currently fragmented legislative and investigative activities relating to crime control. Up until the present, a fair job has been done. But a fair job is not what the American people want and what they have every right to expect. As their elected representatives, we are only too aware of our constituents' desire to see the lawlessness stopped. In the past, we have been hampered in our efforts to propose far-reaching anticrime legislation by a lack of information. The select

committee which House Resolution 17 establishes will increase our understanding of the problems involved and thus increase our effectiveness in initiating legislation to get on with the job of winning the war on crime.

Domestic order is the first responsibility of every level of government and every citizen. It is our duty to enact laws which will help our law enforcement officials carry out this responsibility. We have done this in the past and I know we will continue to do so because we all recognize that law and order must be the starting point to build a better society. Without law and order, the great strides which must be made in the years ahead in the social, economic, and political fields will never be made. We must take whatever steps are necessary to end riots and violence. We must take whatever steps are necessary to let those who riot and burn the flag on our college campuses know that their actions will not be tolerated. We must take whatever steps are necessary to protect the rights of law-abiding citizens generally. The liberty and freedom which we enjoy, and which is so essential to progress, must be built upon respect for the law.

We in Congress must make every effort to know as much as possible about the causes of crime and enact legislation which will strike these causes at their roots. I believe that creation of a Select Committee on Crime is a necessary step toward this end and I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting for passage of House Resolution 17.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today who also sponsored House Resolutions 17, 33, 34, and 35, calling for a select committee of Members of the House of Representatives to investigate and study all aspects of crime in the United States. I ask the Members of this great Chamber to wholeheartedly agree to endorse this resolution and put the stamp of approval on it. This measure means the continued livelihood and safety of our Nation in fighting crime to halt its encroachment into every facet of our society.

I would urge upon passage that the bipartisan committee of seven Members of the House duly consider the fact that President Nixon has seen fit to give the Justice Department plenty of ammunition to fight crime. By this thought, Mr. Speaker, I take note of the fact that President Nixon left intact and, in fact, expanded by \$16 million, the fiscal year 1970 budget allocation for the Justice Department to further augment its facilities to fight crime.

With the obvious great importance being attached to an increased crime fight in this country we must set the committee up to assist our lawmen in all phases of their work.

We are approaching the decade of the seventies and I would not like to see such a continued spiralling crime rate as we have experienced during the sixties.

This investigative study group of the committee would do much to demonstrate to the American people that Congress is taking the criminal element of the society

head on at all fronts and give the people the knowledge that their concern about the crime rate is not going unheeded.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 17, which would create a select House committee to investigate crime in the United States. I commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER), and his distinguished counterparts of both parties for introducing this legislation, which I believe is vital to the future of this Nation. I hope every Member of the House will do the same.

Mr. Speaker, some Members of this body sincerely feel that the greatest danger to America exists in Moscow, Peking, and Hanoi. They call for more and more money for defense. Others sincerely believe that the greatest danger exists in Watts, Harlem, and Appalachia. They call for more and more money to fight poverty, ignorance and hunger. Both these viewpoints are valid, Mr. Speaker, but I submit that the greatest danger of all is from organized crime.

I am glad the public is finally becoming aware of the incredible power wielded by organized crime in America. I am glad that President Nixon, in his message to Congress, has promised a large-scale effort to rid the country of this menace.

Organized crime is a menace, Mr. Speaker, a menace in every sense of the word. It saps our strength and subverts our lives. It takes from us our possessions, our health and our self-respect. It influences every facet of American life. It eats away at the foundation of the country itself, it is the epitome of evil.

Those who say that the money which must be used to fight crime could be better spent elsewhere I will answer now. They should remember when they discuss the ABM issue that organized crime could build such a system itself with only part of its income. They should remember when they discuss the war on poverty that just a portion of the money that goes to organized crime each year could be used to eliminate hunger and poverty in this Nation. They should remember when they discuss education that a small percentage of this illicit income could send every young man and woman in this country to college. What sense does it make to argue over "guns or butter" while organized crime is depriving us of both?

Most of all they should remember that this vile operation, through narcotics, gambling, corruption, and a myriad of other evils, is degrading and destroying untold thousands of citizens who could add so much to this country. This, alone, should be reason enough for us to act.

A select House committee is certainly not a cureall, but it is a positive step, an all-important step, in the effort we must make to smash organized crime in the United States.

We must make the people even more aware of what organized crime is doing to them and to their country. We must make them more aware of the nature of the enemy. If a select committee does this and nothing else, it will have served its purpose.

To say that the time has come to begin this battle is an understatement, Mr. Speaker. We must begin right now and pray that we are not already too late.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill to create a select committee of the House to conduct a full investigation and study of all aspects of crime in this country.

As a cosponsor of House Resolution 33, which is identical to the resolution we are considering today, I give House Resolution 17 my full and enthusiastic support. By passage of this legislation today, the House will be giving renewed recognition of our Government's commitment to combat the evils of crime.

This Nation was founded on the principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These principles cannot survive very well in an atmosphere of violence and fear. Until the grip of crime is broken, people will continue to be afraid to walk the streets at night, afraid to help others who need help out of fear that their involvement will endanger their own lives.

During my 6 years in Congress, I have twice been the victim of serious crimes. The first time I was attacked outside my Georgetown home while trying to help a lady apparently being accosted. The second incident took place right in my own office when I surprised a burglar late at night. I was lucky to escape with only a wound in the arm.

More tragic is an incident which occurred in Georgetown not too long ago. Donald C. Schreiber, a fine young man of great promise, went to the aid of a man who appeared to be in distress. The man asked him to help him home, which he did. When they got there, the man pulled a gun. A struggle resulted, and in the fight, the boy was killed. It was a tragic, pointless death, only adding to the distrust and fear which has grown up in our cities. It is this crime and this fear which must be broken if America's cities are to once again become decent places to live.

Mr. Speaker, I find the timing of this legislation most appropriate. It comes on the heels of President Nixon's plan to combat organized crime more effectively, a subject which the select committee we propose to create will naturally consider.

The select committee would also investigate and recommend ways of improving our police forces, crime detection methods, administration of justice, rehabilitation of criminals, and programs for increased respect for the law. This last point is important. Until our law enforcement agencies have the cooperation and support of the people, they will never be able to fully cope with the problem of crime.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for House Resolution 17, and urge its immediate passage by the House.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I fully support House Resolution 17, to create a select committee of the House to investigate crime. My colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER), is again to be commended for his untiring efforts to curtail and turn back the spiraling crime rate.

The basis of this legislation was overwhelmingly approved by the House in the last Congress, and I feel that this measure should be strongly supported again this year. Clearly, the need for a concerted probe into the crime problem in the United States is just as serious now as it was when we acted before.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs of the House Committee on Government Operations, I have long been concerned with the adequacy of the Government's effort against organized crime. The subcommittee has oversight jurisdiction over many of the Federal agencies involved in the fight against syndicated crime, and we have conducted a continuing study of their organizational effectiveness.

Our study has focused on the proliferation among some three dozen Federal investigative and administrative agencies of responsibility for the fight against organized crime.

In a report, "The Federal Effort Against Organized Crime: Report of Agency Operations," House Report No. 1574, 90th Congress, second session, we concluded that the Federal Government has not borne its obligations with the constancy and force that its role in the overall battle against organized crime demands. For one thing, the overall effort that was needed was lacking.

Last week, I was happy to say, the President of the United States, in his message to the Congress on organized crime, agreed that greater unity of effort is needed. The President centered the Government's program in the Department of Justice, and directed the Attorney General to mount the Federal antiorganized crime offensive and to coordinate the Federal effort with State and local efforts where possible. That has been attempted before, but I believe that all of the agencies that can contribute have now seen the light. I hope, and expect, that all will now be joined in the kind of massed effort that the subcommittee found was necessary if we are to prevail over that enemy.

As the executive branch responds to our recommendations to unify its organizational framework in this endeavor, Congress should also seek better coordination of its attack on crime. We have a problem in Congress in effectively dealing with the overall problem of crime, because we have so many different committees, each of which tends to consider only parts of the whole.

The legislation we are now considering would concentrate what we might call the House anticrime drive under a bipartisan seven-member committee which would hold hearings, publish reports, and make recommendations to the Congress.

By taking such an approach, Congress can probe deeply into crime problems, and work toward the kinds of solutions that the people of this Nation need, and demand. The Government's fragmented efforts to date undoubtedly have contributed to the fact that crime continues to plague our society. The kind of concerted action that House Resolution 17 contemplates raises expectations for winning the battle to again make our streets

and neighborhoods safe for law-abiding citizens.

For these reasons, I strongly support this measure and commend the sponsors for their inspiring leadership.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) for his perseverance in working to form a congressional committee to probe into the problem of crime in America.

The legislation we are considering today does more than demonstrate the growing national awareness of the crime problem. It offers a valuable opportunity for Congress to investigate all aspects of crime and law enforcement and to recommend appropriate legislation. It seems to me that with the President's recent announcement to commence an overall attack on the criminal elements of our society, this is a most fitting moment for the Congress to assume more initiative in the national fight against crime.

The committee established by this legislation would be empowered to delve deeply into all elements of crime in this country, including the preparation and dissemination of statistics, the availability of reciprocity of information among law-enforcement agencies; the effect of crime and disturbances in the metropolitan urban areas; the effect of crime on the commerce of the Nation; the treatment and rehabilitation of persons convicted of crimes; measures for the reduction, control, or prevention of crimes; and measures and programs promoting increased respect for the law. We must recognize the causes and seek the cures for crime.

I am sure that my colleagues have observed a mounting anxiety on the part of their constituencies because of the rapidly swelling crime rate. People are afraid; they are nervous and they are extremely tense. Mostly, I find, however, that they are confused. The rising incidents of campus disorder; the wide use of drugs by our young people; the lack of respect for our law-enforcement officers and the depressing disintegration of former accepted social mores are the factors troubling citizens all over the country. This is an era of intense questioning. The confused are asking, "What are we doing wrong?" People everywhere are groping for answers. Our concerned countrymen want to know how we can resolve the rift that is plaguing our society and sowing dissension among its inhabitants.

This attitude has been reflected in Congress in recent years with the enactment of legislation affecting all aspects of crime—its causes, its problems, and its prevention. Social welfare measures have complemented the congressional drive for law enforcement assistance and crime control but the time has come to launch an all encompassing campaign on the roots of our troubles. We must attain a full understanding of the problems involved and take decisive action to transform our findings into positive programs. Efforts that will assist all segments of our society are what is needed here. We cannot concentrate on preventing crime

without a genuine commitment to destroying the social maladies that often cause such disruption.

It is my sincere hope that this committee will be the catalyst for an ambitious and comprehensive program dealing with every component of the crime problem in this country and with this in mind, I urge my colleagues to join with me in calling for passage of House Resolution 17. As one of the cosponsors of this bill, I feel impelled to point to the broad support accorded this legislation in the House. Its bipartisan sponsorship represents over 25 percent of the membership, certainly indicative of the importance and concern attributed to this volatile issue.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the measure that we are considering today—a bill to establish a select committee to investigate all aspects of crime in the United States—is one of the most important pieces of domestic legislation this Congress will be called upon to enact.

I have long been an advocate of creating such a committee and I am proud to be associated with the able and distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) as a cosponsor of the joint resolution which would create it.

I would like to heartily commend the gentleman from Florida for his persistent leadership on behalf of this resolution.

I think everyone will agree that our basic problem is this: We do not know how to control crime. We do not know how to put a stop to the steady, dramatic rise in our crime rate. We do not know why we have been unsuccessful in reforming those who have committed crimes and in discouraging them from returning to a life of crime. We do not know why our police departments cannot attract and hold qualified young men to serve as law-enforcement officials. We do not know how to effectively revamp our court system to insure speedy trials.

In short, as a former attorney general declared:

Despite all the statistics we have gathered, we know so damn little.

The legislation which we are considering today is vital if we are to get to the roots of the crime problem and come up with meaningful solutions.

I concur fully with President Nixon's recent decision to launch a long-range Presidential-level attack on organized crime, but it is also essential for the representatives of the American people—the Congress—to take a direct initiative in the war on crime, and I believe the creation of this special committee is the necessary first step if we are to do so.

To the people of America, crime is a vital and emotional issue. But dwelling on these emotions will not solve our problems. Simple slogans such as "law and order" will not do. We need hard facts and the answers to some down-to-earth questions to find a truly adequate solution.

The familiar statistics on rising crimes have been seriously questioned by experts because entirely new improved methods of gathering the figures may seriously exaggerate the size of the increase in crime.

Therefore, we cannot even rely entirely on the information we now have. Congress must develop its own staff capability to verify the old data and get new facts.

Some of the problems this committee must explore are—

What are the causes of crime? What discourages people from wanting to live within the rules of society? Is one factor, for instance, that laymen find the laws make too little common sense because of technical jargon, out-moded theories and over-emphasis on irrelevant issues?

How can we rehabilitate people in prison so we won't have the all-too-frequent criminal repeater?

What new rules of evidence and investigative methods would enable police to lessen their tremendous dependence on confessions and guilty pleas to obtain convictions, and avoid Supreme Court reversals?

How can red tape be cut in the courts to insure speedy trials and remedy the whole problem of releasing accused persons on bail?

Only through examination of hard-headed queries such as these, can we understand and control this incredibly complex phenomenon of crime, and this committee is aimed at doing just that. I therefore urge my colleagues to give resounding approval of this legislation.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in July of last year, House Joint Resolution 1, creating a joint House and Senate committee to investigate crime, was passed by this body. Despite strong support in the other body, it did not take final action on that resolution before adjournment, and Congress today does not have available to it the services of such a committee. We of this body want the assistance and advice of a congressional committee to investigate crime. We voted almost unanimously last year in support of its establishment.

It is with firm conviction, therefore, that I rise today to speak in support of House Resolution 17, the measure now on the floor. House Resolution 17 would create a bipartisan select committee of the House to investigate crime. I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER), who is the principal architect of this resolution and the author of the legislation we passed last year, for his untiring efforts to establish this much needed select committee. I deem it a privilege indeed to be a cosponsor of House Resolution 17.

Preliminary FBI figures for 1968 show a total increase of 17 percent over 1967, with a 19-percent increase in the crimes of violence and a 17-percent increase in crimes against property. Crime increased in all parts of the country, led by the Northeastern States which registered a sharp upward climb of 21 percent. The Western States, and this includes my home State of Hawaii, were close behind, with an increase of 18 percent. Crime increased in all types of communities, with the suburbs tying the large core cities for first place with an increase of 18 percent.

If these statistics sound almost numbingly familiar, it is no accident. Crime has been rising steadily during this decade. According to the 1967 edition of the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports, during the 8-year period 1960 to 1967, the

volume of serious crime in this Nation rose 89 percent and the rate of serious crimes per 100,000 inhabitants rose 71 percent.

In the face of such facts on crime, it is our responsibility as Members of Congress to act quickly and effectively, and not simply in response to directives from the White House. It is my conviction that in order to do so we need the expert and informed assistance of a bipartisan investigative committee.

As the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) has so eloquently stated, the purpose of the committee which House Resolution 17 would create would be to make an intensive study of all aspects of crime in this country, to report its findings the House as soon as possible during the present Congress, and to make any recommendations which it deems advisable. The committee would not interfere with the rights and responsibilities of any of the committees and subcommittees which now have jurisdiction over legislation relating to different aspects of crime control. However, it could serve as a much-needed clearinghouse for information on such matters as legislation introduced in the area, hearings, and relevant studies underway in the executive branch.

As we are increasingly coming to realize, crime in the 1960's is as complex as it is pervasive. We need to understand it better, specifically in the context of what Congress could do and should do in the form of Federal legislation. This is indeed a new legislative area, and to date we have tended to let the executive branch take the initiative. I believe that the formation of a select House committee to investigate crime would be a first and important step in the direction of new legislative initiative in coping with the horrendous increase in the crime rate of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 17 deserves our unanimous support.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the resolution pending before this body. The rate of crime and its influence on our lives is increasing with each passing day.

Crime is on the rise in the streets, on the college campuses, in business and governmental activities, and in the military. In short, we are feeling the impact of criminal activity in virtually every sphere of human endeavor.

The select committee here proposed will certainly not discover all of the answers to the problem of crime which confronts us. But it can provide the invaluable service of bringing to bear on the problem the most capable minds in the Nation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge that this proposal be promptly passed, that the Members be designated at your earliest opportunity, and that the committee set about this most important task as soon as possible. We dare not wait too long to begin a coordinated and concerted assault on crime and its perpetrators.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this resolution to create a select committee of the House to investigate crime, I urge its speedy passage.

I also want to offer my warmest congratulations to the author of this resolution, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER), who has labored for many months to achieve passage of this resolution. His efforts deserve the recognition and applause of everyone concerned with the mounting problem of crime in our Nation.

I think it is clear that this resolution is not designed to establish a preemptive Federal responsibility for crime control, but rather to expand the capabilities of all public bodies to deal with what has become a crisis for the entire Nation. Primary responsibility for controlling crime must continue to rest with the States and local governments. But it has become increasingly clear that if crime in our society is to be brought under effective control, the Congress must act to assist the States and communities.

More than 3 million serious crimes are committed each year in our country. The crime rate is increasing at more than six times our population. Today alone, a murder is being committed somewhere in the United States every hour; an aggravated assault every 2½ minutes; and a burglary every 27 seconds. This is intolerable and it must be stopped.

The select committee established by the resolution before us today would enable this House to make a continuing investigation of all aspects of crime and the resources available to control it. I am convinced that enactment of this resolution will hasten the day when crime can be brought under effective control and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in support of House Resolution 17, a bill to create a Select Committee on Crime.

Such a committee is much needed and long overdue. The problem of crime in America today is the single most pressing issue facing us.

The roots of crime are not growing only in the shadows of our society. Organized crime has taken root in the legitimate business and industry of our Nation.

The alarming rise in crime statistics give every indication that crime is continuing to climb and will continue if the Congress, in conjunction with local and State law-enforcement agencies does not give the solution of the crime problem a very high priority.

I hope that through the creation of a special select committee, the Congress can spotlight, with a very bright beam, the entire crime picture in America, and can help recommend solutions.

I might add that I think it appropriate that we are considering this bill today, on Law Day. I feel that the passage of this bill will give the American public an indication that we intend to do something about crime in America.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I will vote against this resolution today. It is a temptation to vote to create another committee to combat crime, and obviously I agree with the objectives and good faith of the resolution. I do not agree, however, that the creation of another committee is essential to the securing of that ob-

jective. We already have standing committees with authority and the duty to perform these same general functions. We have administrative agencies and Cabinet departments already charged with the responsibility of making inquiry into the subject matter of the resolution.

I favor allowing existing agencies to discharge these responsibilities without competing with newly created committees in the performance of their jobs. If existing committees and agencies are not performing adequately, then let's do what is necessary to insure that they improve their performance.

Problems are not solved by the creation of new committees when there are existing committees and agencies already established to do the job.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a real sense of urgency that I rise today in support of House Resolution 17, to create a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of all aspects of crime in the United States. I am happy indeed to have the privilege of cosponsoring this bill with my distinguished and highly able friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER). The gentleman from Florida deserves much credit in leading the campaign to see this committee formed. I am indeed hopeful that he will be made chairman of the select committee when it is created.

Mr. Speaker, crime is rampant in many parts of our beloved country. In many instances we know what causes and breeds crime, poverty, and want. In many other areas we do not know its cause. I realize the first thing people want to do when presented with a problem is to study it. We all know that what is needed is action. However, since so many people are going in so many action directions, I think it is very wise for the Congress to take a look at all of these programs and above all study the various aspects of crime to see if the remedies we now have fit the symptoms and causes of crime.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the passage today of House Resolution 17 to create a House committee on crime is an important and significant step toward bringing the rampantly increasing crime rate in this country under control. If we are to prevail over these disturbing trends in crime we must coordinate our efforts and examine the problems from every possible angle, in order to reach the fullest possible understanding of the causes, effects, and ramifications of crime in our society.

The shocking fact that, according to the FBI, serious crime rose a full 90 percent between 1960 and 1967 is proof enough that critical attention is warranted in this area. While it is vital that our law enforcement efforts remain a center of attention, we must also work to better understand the psychological and motivational aspects of crime so that we may move effectively toward strangling the sources which breed criminal and lawless behavior.

As chairman of the Census and Statistics Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am most concerned about crime statistics

and what we can do to devise a more comprehensive method of statistical tabulation, in order to use the information as a weapon to combat the rising U.S. crime rate. Accordingly, our subcommittee will be investigating the possibility of creating a National Crime Statistics Center which would serve as a comprehensive information bank to all branches of Government, law enforcement agencies, students, and investigators of criminal behavior, as well as other groups concerned with the understanding and prevention of crime. We will pursue a thorough study of this proposal; the magnitude of the problem demands no less.

The greatest tragedy of crime in America is the fact that so much of it is committed by our young people—as much as 25 percent of all serious crimes. If the work of the House Committee on Crime can help us to reach these youngsters before the tragedy of criminal behavior becomes their way of life, then our efforts will not have been in vain and perhaps we may witness a reverse in the dangerous tide of increasing crime in this Nation. I am proud to have supported this legislation and I am hopeful that the results will be positive and encouraging.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the enactment of House Resolution 17, creating a Select Committee To Investigate Crime. As cosponsor of the resolution, I am pleased that this matter is now before the House. It deserves the full support the comparable resolution received last session which we approved by a 319 to 12 vote.

The creation of the select committee is not some congressional whim or fancy. It reflects our deep and genuine concern over the growing menace of crime, a national problem of great urgency. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice clearly recognized the need for such a committee, stating:

The creation of such a committee would place the prestige of the U.S. Congress behind the proposition that organized crime is a national problem of the highest priority.

These are not idle words. A cursory review of crime statistics, indicates that the crime rate in this country continues to rise at an alarming rate. We must focus on ways to curb the crime rate and to identify and eliminate the causes of crime. These are not easy tasks and require concerted effort. The select committee affords that opportunity and demands our strongest support.

It is clearly recognized that crime control and law enforcement is basically a local responsibility. The Federal Government is prepared to assist these local efforts in conformance with our constitutional dictates. Historically speaking, there has been until very recently little sustained concern or institutionalized basis in the investigation and prosecution of organized crime. It has been sporadic with occasional public forays. What is required is a rational, well-organized approach. The select committee can provide a framework in which to develop a solid understanding of the problem we face.

NOT VOTING—69

Abbott	Foreman	Morton
Abernethy	Frey	Murphy, N.Y.
Alexander	Friedel	Nelsen
Ashley	Fulton, Pa.	Nichols
Barrett	Garmatz	O'Neill, Mass.
Bates	Gialmo	Passman
Bell, Calif.	Grover	Pike
Berry	Hays	Powell
Brown, Calif.	Hébert	Reid, N.Y.
Broyhill, N.C.	Jacobs	Reifel
Cahill	Kirwan	Rhodes
Carey	Kluczynski	Rivers
Clay	Landgrebe	Ronan
Conable	Leggett	Rooney, N.Y.
Conyers	Lennon	Rostenkowski
Cowger	Long, La.	Rumsfeld
Cramer	MacGregor	Scheuer
Dawson	Maillard	Sisk
de la Garza	Mann	Smith, Iowa
Dickinson	Miller, Calif.	Tunney
Dowdy	Mize	Wilson, Bob
Edwards, La.	Mollohan	Wyder
Flowers	Montgomery	Young

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MAY 5

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have no further business for this week.

The business for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar Day, but there are no bills on the Consent Calendar.

There are five suspensions:

H.R. 6269, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of the State of South Carolina;

S. 1081, to provide for the striking of medals in honor of the dedication of the Winston Churchill Memorial and Library;

H.R. 7215, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the U.S. diplomatic courier service;

H.R. 8188, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Wichita, Kans; and

H.R. 8648, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American Fisheries Society.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week:

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day.

Also we will have H.R. 5554, to provide a special milk program for children, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reinsert in the RECORD a list of 11 bills previously listed which were unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and which the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) had originally planned to bring up this week. As previously announced, it is expected these bills will be brought up next week.

Mr. Speaker, the list is as follows:

BILLS REPORTED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

H.R. 9951, to provide for the collection of the Federal unemployment tax in quarterly installments, etc.

H.R. 2718, extending for additional temporary period suspension of duties on certain classifications of silk yarn.

H.R. 4229, continuing for temporary period suspension of duty on heptanoic acid.

H.R. 4239, amending Tariff Schedules of the United States so as to prevent payment of multiple customs duties by U.S. owners of

racehorses purchased outside the United States.

H.R. 5833, continuing to June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes.

H.R. 7311, amending Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that the rate of duty on parts of stethoscopes shall be the same as the rate on stethoscopes.

H.R. 8644, making permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots.

H.R. 10015, extending to July 15, 1971, the suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum.

H.R. 10016, continuing until the close of June 30, 1971, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap.

H.R. 10107, continuing for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle.

H.R. 8654, to provide combat pay income tax treatment for the crew of the U.S.S. Pueblo.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if I might ask the distinguished majority leader if there is any plan to bring up in the near future the bill that suddenly disappeared from the calendar yesterday, the retirement bill?

Mr. ALBERT. There is no plan to bring it up next week, I say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The week following?

Mr. ALBERT. We will make up the program for the following week after we see the entire schedule of eligible bills at the end of next week. That is as far as I can go at this time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 5, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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.

CONDEMNING STUDENT VIOLENCE AND INEQUITIES IN OUR SOCIETY THAT CAUSE IT

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, no issue facing the community since I have entered public life is as complex and

So the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Rhodes.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Landgrebe.

Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Maillard.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Abbott with Mr. Foreman.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Grover.

Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Wyder.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Cowger.

Mr. Pike with Mr. Mize.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Conable.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Bell of California.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Young with Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. Conyers with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Dowdy.

Mr. Flowers with Mr. Tunney.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Mann.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. de la Garza.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Hays.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF CRIME IN UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 17, 91st Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the select committee to conduct an investigation and study of all aspects of crime in the United States the following Members of the House: Mr. PEPPER, chairman; Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. NIX, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WATSON, Mr. WIGGINS, and Mr. DENNEY.

troublesome as the current student crisis. Despite the strident comments supporting and condemning SDS and the Afro-American students and their allies, there is no simple or short analysis that satisfies the situation. Instead, all mixed up, are political, educational, generational, sexual, and psychological elements.

I am proud of this generation of youth—the troublesome ones as well as the quiet ones. They have grown up under a nuclear cloud, and they have shown a healthy outrage at the mistakes of their elders. It is we, after all, who have failed to solve the problems of poverty and racism and war. Students sense the need to do something drastic about these issues and to renew our society, and they are not afraid. For this they have my admiration.

It is also true that the universities have often been insensitive and phlegmatic and undemocratic. Everyone who has followed the disturbances at Columbia, Harvard, and Cornell, to mention only the most notorious, must realize that college administrators have sometimes refused legitimate student demands, failed to give students and even faculties a voice in running their affairs, and opened the door to police violence.

Despite this, I want to condemn unequivocally the disease of violence that plagues our high schools and colleges. It is a disease that threatens to afflict all of us. Legitimate demands for change will not be satisfied by capitulating to white radicals and black militants on campus or anywhere else.

Whatever guilt we share, it should not prevent us from protecting our institutions from those who would destroy rather than redeem them. Whatever change we seek, it cannot be made at the expense of civil liberties and civil order. In short, I despair of those who condone violence so long as the goals of the mob seem worthy.

I think the forcible seizure of buildings, the assault of administrators, and the destruction and pirating of files are criminal acts and should be treated as such. If criminal charges are not warranted, academic officials should suspend or expel student offenders under procedures insuring due process.

But I oppose Federal legislation that would withhold Federal loans or scholarships to students involved in campus disorders. Those who have always feared the assertion of Federal power in education now seem bent on using it in a punitive manner. Such legislation would mean that the rich could demonstrate but the poor could not. Students must be held responsible for their conduct—but the Federal Government has no business using its funds to play schoolmaster.

But most important, we must do more than express our outrage at the use of violence; we must be equally outraged by the conditions that breed violence. Our authority to condemn violence rests on the assumption that we are willing to renew our society and its institutions without the prod of violence.

STUDENTS HELP IN FIREFIGHTING

(Mr. FUQUA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, in this day and time when we hear so much about disruption on our college campuses, it is refreshing to learn of the attitude of the student body at Florida State University in Tallahassee when the administration building suffered serious damage from fire last Sunday.

Hundreds of students formed a chain to save priceless records and equipment as fire raged in the fourth floor of Westcott Hall.

At considerable personal risk these students saw what needed to be done and did it. A few started into the burning building and others followed until the number helping was in the hundreds. Heavy filing cabinets, typewriters, sorting machines, adding machines, key-punch machines, computer consoles, desks, chairs, books, radios, drawers full of paper, and hundreds of cans of computer tape.

These students were concerned and they moved in swiftly to help.

As in most other areas of life, we spend a great deal of time being critical of disturbances by the minority without ever taking time to say something about the vast majority.

That majority or the average college student is the best prepared, most interested, and most dedicated student in the history of education. At Florida State last Sunday it was the majority that spoke.

Have no fear for the future. We have great leadership coming. It is not those bent on destruction that can build a better tomorrow. It will be young men and women like those who were in the line at Westcott Hall who will lead tomorrow.

I would like to insert at this point a news report from the Tallahassee Democrat of Monday, April 28, 1969, which points out the actions of these fine students:

STUDENTS HELP IN FIRE FIGHTING

Hundreds of students formed human chains Sunday afternoon to save priceless records and piles of equipment in FSU's administration building, before fire swept the top floors.

When the fire broke out, several students said, "We'd be better off if the records burned."

But minutes later, they were part of the chain, moving into the smoke-filled halls of Westcott, risking a possible cave-in from the fire above.

"A couple of people started going in," Brewster Banks, 19, of Tampa said, "and then everybody said we'd go in and help."

They hauled out heavy filing cabinets, typewriters, sorting machines, adding machines, keypunch machines, computer consoles, desks, chairs, books, radios, drawers full of paper and hundreds of cans of computer tape.

The sounds of "1, 2, 3" filled the air by male and female students alike as that heavy equipment was stashed into trucks and vans to get it away from the building.

"We can't keep them out," said an exasperated fireman.

"I was very impressed with the attitude of the entire student body . . . they were very concerned and helped us in every way," commented Fire Chief Earl Levy.

Levy commended the volunteers who trundled heavy cabinets and other furniture from the blazing building, and helped firemen

with the thick water hoses. "It's man killing work they did, and I'm proud of them."

There was even a coffee table, with the percolator coffee and sugar, but the cream got lost in the shuffle.

About 3,000 other students crowded around Westcott, some perched on top of the archway gate in front of the building and others just standing behind the streams of water flowing down Westcott Drive.

The human chain could be called one of the most diversified groups ever—composed of hippies, fraternity men, coeds in mini-skirts, dresses, slacks, bikinis and their hair in rollers, junior and senior high school students, undergraduates, graduate and law students alike.

Several students pointed out miniskirted Merlin Mowry, a student assistant in the Registrar's office who dashed into the smoke-filled building to open a vault containing vital student records.

The Miami sophomore said as far as she knew there was no one else available to open the vault. "You don't think about it," she said later. "Everyone was in there."

One student got a big cheer from the crowd when he marched out the front door with a four-foot potted plant.

One coed, who apparently worked in one of the administrative offices, saw a friend as she walked out of the building. "It looks like we've got a helluva remodeling job to do," she remarked.

A sweating fireman perched in a cubicle-like tower rising from the attic of the building drew praises from onlookers. "That's the guy that deserves credit," they said.

Students at FSU, like most universities, say from time to time they wish the "Administration Building" would burn down. But tears rather than jeers characterized the group yesterday.

"This is the saddest thing I've seen in a long time," said sophomore Jim Hooker from Ocala. This is the most important building on campus.

Acting FSU president J. Stanley Marshall, clad in Bermuda shorts and a polo shirt, said "the students were magnificent, simply great."

Gov. Claude Kirk made the scene, hand in hand with two little girls, but FSU security officers, stretching a rope along the outer boundaries of Westcott Drive, ushered him behind it just like anyone else.

"This is the real student body," Kirk said, as he watched the human chains at work.

FSU security and city police didn't seem to care who you were or what business you had there.

City Police armed with rifles were stationed at Park and Macomb Streets, W. College and South Macomb, and W. Park and Copeland and would let no one by.

But everyone wasn't so concerned about the 60-year-old building coming down.

Two elderly ladies didn't move from their front porch three blocks away.

Students in The Mecca, a cafe across the street from Westcott, went back to their pinball machines, hamburgers and quick order dinners after a quick observance of what was happening.

But hundreds stayed around after the fire was over to help carry equipment to other buildings for storage and simply to help anyway they could.

TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed and alarmed that the White House apparently has delayed Transportation Secretary John Volpe's recommendations on airports and airways. Mr. Volpe has been saying his top priority

would be measures to expand airport construction and upgrade traffic control and airways systems—this has given hope to some of us on the Aeronautics and Transportation Subcommittee. At last, we were witnessing leadership and direction.

However, it would appear that this is just another hope that was dashed on the rocks at the end of the runway before ever getting off the ground. We cannot stand another delay. If a suitable airports and airways measure was passed today, we would still face two or three years of planning before any actual construction could get underway.

Members of the committee are not interested in party politics—we are interested in unstacking the circling flocks over our airways. Earlier this session, Representative DEL CLAWSON and I introduced two bipartisan bills to finance needed expansion. I would redirect your attention to H.R. 9325 and H.R. 9326.

Several on our committee are asking for full and immediate public hearings on airports and their overhead stagnation. The time is now.

It is unfortunate that Secretary Volpe was boxed into listing priorities. A list of priorities indicates one program will move to the forefront at the expense of others. I do not believe this was the intention of the Department of Transportation; there are too many pressing transportation problems. I am convinced the Department of Transportation will give their full attention to mass transit, highway safety, the controversial SST, and all other facets of transportation, including the airports and airways measures. I am hopeful that they will give consideration to integrating the best of all our transportation systems into solving the congestion at our airports. I am hopeful, too, that the White House will reconsider the opposition to airport priorities.

The United States is a nation of high-fliers. Over 45 percent of this Nation's population has traveled by air, far above the world average. And most of our air passengers have spent a considerable part of their flying time circling some out-of-date airport waiting anxiously to get on the ground again.

Most of our flying public is faced with a footrace of considerable distance from the parking lot to the ticket window, and then another race for three-quarters of a mile to the airplane. They stand in line for tickets, seats, and baggage. Then in another line for ground transportation to the central city.

Of the 10,000 airports in the United States, nearly 70 percent of them are nothing more than grassy strips or packed dirt. Scheduled airlines serve only 535 airports; 189 of these have instrument-landing facilities. The 118 biggest and most congested fortunately have radar systems—the rest do not.

Aircraft are stacked in the air waiting to get down—and on the ground waiting to get up because of our overloaded system.

The volume of travelers and freight doubles with frightening regularity—every 6 years. The U.S. civilian air fleet con-

sists of 2,400 airliners and 112,000 private planes.

There is no single scapegoat although the buck is passed with inflationary ease. Private pilots say airports are at fault for overscheduling. On the other hand, airline pilots claim private pilots use too much premium runway space. Air-traffic controllers criticize FAA for not providing enough electronic equipment or skilled men to operate the systems. FAA shifted the blame to Congress for not appropriating enough money.

For one, I will let the buck stop here. I intend to work to expand our airports and open up our airways. I hope my colleagues will agree that we face an air transportation crisis. Eventually, I hope the White House will agree. The airport and airway bill deserves top priority, and I am disappointed, just as I am sure Secretary Volpe is disappointed, that his recommendations have been ignored, or set on the back burner by officials at the White House.

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE ACT OF FORMER MILITARY AIDES IN DEFENSE CONTRACTS

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would require contractors to include in their bids for defense contracts the names and military assignment of all former military personnel who had served on active duty 4 or more years and are employed by the bidder.

The bidder would have to list the name, the last held rank, the military occupational specialty, and the last assignment of each employee who served at least 4 years on active duty. It would include former officers as well as enlisted personnel.

The new regulations would apply to all bids submitted to the Defense Department, the Coast Guard, and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency.

It would also require that prime contractors must follow the same procedure for each of their subcontractors who would ultimately benefit from the bid.

At the close of each fiscal year, the three agencies would submit to Congress the names of all defense contractors who come under the Military Personnel Disclosure Act, and the total dollar volume of Government contracts awarded to each such company for the reporting period.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is in part the result of an excellent series of articles on waste on defense spending which appeared in the Chicago Daily News and which were written by Mr. Robert Gruenberg and Mr. William McGaffin. This series was one of the most exhaustive studies on defense spending. The Chicago Daily News performed a notable public service in preparing this series which clearly shows the pressing need for reforms in defense spending.

There are more than 2,000 retired high ranking military officers now employed

by 100 of the Nation's largest military contractors.

In fiscal 1968, these 100 companies held 67.4 percent of the \$38.8 billion of prime military contracts, or \$26.2 billion.

The 2,000 retired officers identified by the Defense Department include only those with the rank of colonel or Navy captain or higher in the three military services.

This legislation is being introduced to give contracting officers a better method of identifying relationships in the military-industrial complex.

There is nothing in my legislation which would prohibit a company from hiring retired military personnel but this bill would help contracting officers identify where the pressure is coming from for defense contracts.

It would also help discourage contracting officers themselves from feathering their beds in retirement.

There has been a sharp increase in the number of high-ranking retired officers who have joined the biggest defense contractors in the past 10 years.

Defense Department figures show that in 1959, the top 100 defense contractors employed 721 high-ranking officers, with 88 of the 100 firms reporting. In 1969, the 100 largest defense contractors—with the 100 reporting—employed 2,072 former high-ranking military officers for an average of 22 per company.

Another indicator of the growing tendency for high-ranking military officers to go into defense work is reflected in the fact that in 1959, 10 companies with the highest number of former officers reported they had 372 of them on the payroll, while in 1969, the top 10 had 1,065 former military officers or three times as much on their payroll.

There is a great deal of criticism of present military expenditures. I do not want to do anything to impede our Nation's defense but I do believe that this public disclosure of former military personnel on defense bids will help eliminate a substantial amount of the unnecessary expenditures.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 10835

A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that military procurement contracts shall not be negotiated with, or awarded to, contractor applicants until disclosure is made with respect to the military service of their employees

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2315. REQUIRED EMPLOYEE DATA

"(a) The head of an agency may not accept any bid, nor enter into negotiations, with respect to the purchase of, or contract for, property or services covered by this chapter, or by chapters 135, 139, and 141 of this title unless the bidder or offeror, as the case may be, first submits to the head of the agency a list containing the name, the last held rank, the military occupational specialty, and the last assignment of each employee of the bidder or offeror who served on active duty in the armed forces for a period of at least four years.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treas-

ury and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, prescribe regulations to carry out the purposes of subsection (a).

"(c) For purposes of this section, prime contractors shall apply the provisions of section (a) to all of their subcontractors.

"(d) The Secretary of Defense, the Coast Guard, and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall each submit to the Congress, as soon as possible after the close of each fiscal year, a copy of each list received pursuant to subsection (a) and (c) during the fiscal year by the agency or agencies with respect to which he has jurisdiction, and such list shall contain a description, including the total dollar volume, of each government contract awarded to such company during the reporting period."

Sec. 2. The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"§ 2315. Required employee data."

POLITICS OUT OF POST OFFICE? TALK, YES; ACTION, NO

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing bold statements and promises from President Nixon and Postmaster General Blount about their plan to take the Post Office Department out of politics.

Removal of politics from the Post Office Department has and has had my full support.

But it seems to me that the President and the Postmaster General are failing to deliver on their promises. Indeed, it even seems like a lot more than just "politics as usual."

Their plan for handling postmaster nominations falls considerably short of its claims. First, they forgot to consider giving full opportunity for promotion of career employees. The revised Nixon-Blount plan is still only a half-baked approach to the announced goal. I believe the restrictions on politics must be much tougher.

They are talking about the need for postal reform and are quite willing to discuss it in speeches and interviews, but they are reluctant to discuss their views with our House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The Postmaster General has been interviewed and his aides have appeared on panels to discuss postal problems, but they will not be ready for another month to discuss anything for the legislative record before our committee or our subcommittees. Our hearings are going forward nonetheless.

This week, for instance, the Deputy Postmaster General went before the annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to discuss postal problems. Also on the panel was Murray Comarow, Executive Director of the Presidential Commission which last year recommended that the Department be converted into a public corporation.

The chamber, of course, went on record last fall in favor of the corporation approach and it is interesting that the

chamber's program committee set up a "stacked deck" session, omitting any participation in the panel discussion by others, like myself, who have made intensive study of postal reform and have found shortcomings in the corporation plan.

It perhaps also is worthy of mention that last year's president of the U.S. chamber is now the U.S. Postmaster General.

In his remarks before the U.S. chamber, the Deputy Postmaster General is reported in the press to have said that the role of Congress in the operation of the Post Office Department does "more violence to good management practice" than anything else.

He cited the fact that the Department is responsible to two committees of Congress, referring to the legislative and the appropriation committees. Of course, he should know that actually there are four committees, not two—two committees in the House and two in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, now has come to my attention a clear example not only of politics, but also of political misrepresentation by the Post Office Department.

I refer to a canned press release which has been sent out by the Department to every postmaster for local distribution under the Postmaster General's name. The press release claims an "inherited" \$1.2 billion postal deficit has forced the administration to call for increased postal rates.

The suggested press release refers to "increasing letter mail from 6 to 7 cents as proposed by the Johnson administration."

What the Nixon-Blount administration neglects to mention is that when President Johnson proposed the first-class rate increase last winter, he provided for merging first class and airmail into a single priority service. In contrast, the Nixon-Blount plan keeps the 10-cent airmail rate, so the first-class increase carries no further service to postal patrons, just a 1-cent increase in the letter rate.

Whether or not there is need for changes in postal rates is a matter for our committee to consider in due course. As I have said before, the Department seems to have its priorities mixed. Postal reform must come first and then we can consider postal rates increases, if necessary.

As a matter of fact, the Nixon-Blount rate proposal has not been put into legislative form as yet, so far as we know—at least, no legislation has been introduced in the House.

Thus, it is interesting that the Postmaster General is asking his postmasters to lobby for a rate-increase proposal which has not even been put before the Congress yet.

Who is he trying to kid?

Mr. Speaker, the copy of the suggested press release which has come to my attention is really quite an amazing document. Reading of the text is most interesting. It follows:

NOTE TO POSTMASTERS

The attached "fill-in" release is designed for use in informing the public. Please fill-in the blanks, retype then produce on your own

news release letterhead formally used for press information. Do not use this form itself or give carbons to the press.

This from _____ For release _____
Time _____

An "inherited" postal deficit of \$1.2 billion is responsible for the proposal to raise the postage bill for residents of _____ (name of city) Postmaster _____ said today.

Mr. _____ said then advised by Postmaster General William Blount, Washington, D.C., that the record of \$1.2 billion 1970 deficit compelled President Nixon to seek postage rate increases. Without higher rates the Department will be left with a staggering deficit that would become an added public tax burden.

In addition to increasing letter mail from 6¢ to 7¢ as proposed by the Johnson Administration, President Nixon also adds that the Second and Third Class mailers help reduce the large postal deficit which would otherwise be paid by taxpayers, the Postmaster said.

For bulk third class mail and most magazine and newspapers the rates would be increased 16% to 20% above today's levels, he noted. These percentages include rate hikes already scheduled by previous action of Congress. The President recommended increases will reduce the 1970 postal deficit by more than \$600 million.

The Postmaster listed other details on the proposed increases:

First Class Mail: Letters and postcards would be increased 1¢ to 7¢ an hour and 6¢ a piece, respectively, on July 1, 1969.

Airmail postage would remain at 10¢.

This will yield \$557.2 million in new revenues.

Second Class Mail: Handling charge of three-tenths of a cent per piece for circulation outside home counties would become effective July 1, 1969. This would yield \$15.3 million and would represent a 12% increase in addition to the 8% rise scheduled to take effect January 1, 1970.

Third Class Mail: For single pieces rates would be increased 1% per piece. This would yield \$12.4 million. For regular bulk third class, the minimum would be increased to a uniform rate of 4.2¢ January 1, 1970, as contrasted to the present rate of 3.6¢. In 1970 increase would lift revenue \$46.8 million annually.

TAX BENEFITS FOR KOREAN VETERANS

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, 116 of our colleagues have thus far joined in sponsoring the legislation I introduced to provide American servicemen in Korea with the same tax benefits enjoyed by servicemen in Vietnam.

As I said when I introduced this bill, I believe this is an appropriate way to recognize that American soldiers are constantly facing dangerous assignments in and around Korea. American deaths and injuries in Korea have risen sharply in the past 2 years as North Korea has deliberately sought to increase tensions.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation would have 435 cosponsors in the House. There can be no questioning of the fact that Korean duty is dangerous; witness the *Pueblo* and EC-121 incidents. Nor can there be any questioning of the fact that our servicemen must be recognized for this service.

Exempting from taxation pay earned in an area of combat is historically appropriate and should be done promptly for our soldiers in Korea.

I include the following article from the New York Times of April 27:

UNITED STATES AND KOREA—THE PROBLEMS OF A "POROUS WAR"
(By Philip Shabecoff)

TOKYO.—The armistice signed at Panmunjom in 1953 ended open hostilities in Korea, but established no formal peace. Technically, the state of war continued. For a year now, it has become evident that the war is more than a technicality; it is a bloody fact.

The truce set a demarcation line between North and South Korea along the 38th Parallel and provided a demilitarized zone on both sides of the line. The armies of Communist North Korea on one side and South Korea and its United States ally on the other faced each other across the line, but for years the technical war was a kind of peace—albeit sullen and frequently broken.

For some time, the term "demilitarized zone" has been little more than an ironic euphemism for what is actually a deadly battlefield. Both sides bring proscribed heavy weapons into the zone; both sides shoot to kill, and soldiers from both sides have died there.

Open hostilities continue at varying tempos of violence. Gunfire rattles nightly through the DMZ. Sometimes it is the solitary bullet of a sniper, sometimes a hall of fire from automatic weapons as an ambush is sprung, or as patrols from the opposing armies make contact in the darkness.

In 1968, 15 American soldiers were killed by North Koreans along the DMZ and at least 149 South Koreans were killed either at the border or inside the country by infiltrators. According to United States authorities, 321 North Korean soldiers and agents were killed last year.

United States forces are stationed in Korea as a member of the United Nations Command that is committed to defend South Korea against aggression from the North. Representing the United Nations Military Armistice Commission, the United States has met with North Korean truce negotiators 290 times at Panmunjom since 1953. Almost all of these meetings have been devoted to little more than exchanges of insults and charges of violating the armistice.

Because of the increased use of electronic surveillance devices, the construction of a chain link fence across the southern boundary of the DMZ and beefed-up South Korean and American forces, North Korean agents have found it increasingly difficult to penetrate the border. Instead, Pyongyang has been sending more of its agents south on high-speed boats and landing them on the coasts of South Korea. These agents have attempted to set up bases for guerrilla activity, have extorted food and information at gunpoint from South Koreans, and often have shot farmers and policemen living in remote areas.

A HIGHER PLATEAU

The confrontation moved to a higher plateau of danger in January, 1968, when Pyongyang first sent a group of infiltrators on an abortive mission to assassinate President Chung Hee Park of South Korea, and then ordered the seizure of the United States intelligence ship Pueblo.

Between the capture of the Pueblo and the downing of a United States Navy reconnaissance plane in the Sea of Japan this month, North Korea sharply stepped up its efforts to send infiltrators into South Korea. Thus far, the highlight of this campaign was the landing of 120 agents on South

Korea's eastern coast last November. All of these infiltrators were killed or captured after trying down as many as 40,000 South Korean troops for months.

As far as the South Korean Government and the United States military authorities in Seoul are concerned, North Korea's Premier Kim Il Sung already is acting on his vow to use force in order to reunite Korea under Communism.

It is generally believed that Marshal Kim will avoid an overt invasion of the South, at least for the time being. Both South Korea and the United States are in a far better position to frustrate such an invasion than they were in 1950.

Instead, the North is said to be conducting what is described as a "porous war"—an attempt to create a revolution in South Korea through terrorist raids conducted by infiltrators. The North Koreans are believed to have 30,000 to 40,000 highly-trained men standing by for infiltration.

The "porous war" is differentiated from a "conventional peoples war" in which revolution is fomented through guerrilla operations by inhabitants of the country. There is no sign that many South Koreans are ready to form their version of the Vietcong, the guerrillas in South Vietnam.

Another explanation of Marshal's Kim's intentions holds that he is hoping to drive the Americans out of South Korea by adding fuel to the growing antiwar sentiment in the United States.

The South Koreans and Americans have tightened their defenses along the DMZ since the Pueblo incident, and Seoul has intensified its anti-infiltration activities. But as the mild American responses in both the Pueblo and "spy plane" cases indicated, there is little that can be done to prevent such hit-and-run provocations.

ADVOCATE RETALIATION

On both occasions, Seoul advocated massive retaliation. But a major assault against the North could very well turn Korea's "quiet" war into a major war involving China or the Soviet Union or both.

Indeed, there were observers in both Tokyo and Seoul who feared that President Nixon might have painted the United States into a corner last week by sending a Navy task force to the Sea of Japan to protect continuing reconnaissance flights. The 29-ship armada, these observers noted, was far larger than would be necessary merely to protect the planes.

How long the task force, or part of it, would remain on the scene, and what its full instructions were, were open questions. But there was the risk that the North Koreans might shoot down another plane or commit some similar aggressive act, perhaps forcing President Nixon into some kind of retaliation. A heavy blow at North Korea, it was widely felt, could trigger another Asian conflict.

PROTECTION NEEDED FOR AMERICAN CONSUMERS

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1969, there was inserted into the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered in Los Angeles early in March by Mr. Charles Y. Lazarus, the distinguished executive of the Federated Department Stores and the head of the American Retail Federation.

While I concur in the statements made by Mr. Lazarus when he dealt with the

consumer interests of this country, I must disagree with him when he talks about consumer interests in imports. He gives a list of articles that are imported, and attempts to show that these articles by being imported are giving the American people a better bargain than American-made goods. However, in searching through the custom reports, I find that taking every article that he had used in his demonstration before the Federated Business Associations of the country, that articles which are imported for as low as 20 cents are sold for \$3 each. Sweaters imported for \$6.29, including custom duties, are sold as a bargain to the American consumers for \$17. He then says this is a bargain because you have to pay \$18 for the American-made product which pays more in wages than the entire cost of the product coming from foreign countries.

The entire list and the entire program, as exemplified by the speech made by Mr. Lazarus, is just a repetition of the old story that they told the American people that the American people are better off with imports. They may be better off with cheap imports but, Mr. Speaker, the only ones who really benefit from imports are the importers and the profiteering groups that bring products into this country, or produce them overseas and then sell them to this country at cut-rate prices.

In his remarks to the members of the California Retailers Association, Mr. Lazarus paid fitting tribute to the emergence of the American consumer as an increasingly strong factor in the political and economic decisionmaking process. With that aspect of his speech, I am sure there is little difference of opinion. The increasingly articulate voice of the consumer is a welcome sound on the American scene and represents yet another aspect of the complex exchanging of ideas that is so fundamental to democratic progress in our nation.

There were, however, other aspects of the remarks made by Mr. Lazarus, and widely publicized in the general and trade press, concerning which there are most certainly wide differences of opinion. I have reference to the oversimplified views advanced by him regarding the important issues of national policy in the field of foreign trade. I would not wish it to appear that there is universal acceptance in the legislative or executive branches of government for the thrust of Mr. Lazarus's argument against the need to safeguard the domestic apparel industry, protect the jobs of its workers, and assure potential work for the many persons in the poverty groups for whom apparel employment is one of the major sources of jobs in many sections of our nation. The need to safeguard the textile and apparel industries, in view of their special character, was recognized by the previous administration. In negotiated international arrangements to regulate the flow of cotton garments and textiles; and the present administration has indicated the need to extend such safeguards to apparel and textiles made of other fibers.

Consumer interest must be of concern to all of us. But one cannot, as Mr. Laz-

arus does, oversimplify the issues. Imported apparel is much too frequently a product of substandard wages and exploitation of home workers, a practice banned as a matter of public policy in our country. In considering these problems, it behooves us to consider the many factors that affect our people, consumers and producers alike, for their welfare is indeed interrelated.

Mr. Lazarus seeks to make a case as a champion of the consumer. To this end he marshaled in his speech, and in the attached table, a number of illustrations, some of them—I must point out—very vague.

He neglects to tell us that retailers take much greater markups on imported goods than on goods of domestic manufacture. He offers situations of the presumed impacts of lower tariffs on apparel prices, but he fails to tell us that when tariffs were reduced in the wake of the Kennedy round and when some foreign prices were reduced as a result of currency devaluations, no corresponding benefit went to the American consumer in the form of price cuts by retailers.

This issue is important to so many Americans, to the many American communities, large and small where the apparel industry provides a major source of manufacturing jobs, and to firms in the industry, the bulk of which are operated by small businessmen.

SAFEGUARDING THE DOMESTIC APPAREL INDUSTRY AND ITS WORKERS' JOBS

The American consumer has a decided stake in the national policy designed to safeguard jobs in an industry, such as that producing clothing for men and women, in the face of a mounting tide of imports.

This is an industry of the small businessman. The average production unit in the industry in 1967, as shown by the data compiled by the Census Bureau from the social security records, employed only 57 workers. The plants of this industry were concentrated either in a few urban centers where they provided a major source of jobs for the type of workers the industry employed, or else they were found in smaller scattered communities where the garment manufacturing plant provided the only or the principal source of jobs. Nor is this an industry that profits at the expense of the consumer. Its average profit on the dollar of sales, as shown by the governmental studies, averaged but 2 cents on a dollar. Wholesale prices charged for apparel in 1968 were only 6.5 percent higher than those charged in 1948, a period during which prices of all manufactured goods produced in the United States rose by 23.7 percent.

The issues involved in our national trade policy, when it concerns an industry with special characteristics such as the apparel industry, is a complex undertaking. It requires consideration of a variety of factors that affect all segments of the American population. That is why it is important that caution be exercised when "simple" proposals are advanced which suggest easy remedies for complex economic matters.

These thoughts come to my mind as a result of the speech delivered in March before the California Retailers Association by Mr. Charles Y. Lazarus of Federal Department Stores and inserted on April 1, 1969, into the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In this speech, Mr. Lazarus offers a discussion of the consumer's stake in international trade. To this end, Mr. Lazarus offers some figures and arguments. Unfortunately, this speech is more an exercise in semantics than a serious review of the issues.

Mr. Lazarus' figures sound impressive but they raise some questions. His three-column table sounds as if only imports are good for the consumer in terms of price. But what is he talking about? "Men's cashmere sweater, English," is the name of the item. How much would it cost without any trade barriers? How can we know when we do not know what kind it is, how much markup the retailer would take, or anything else, except what Mr. Lazarus lists as an imaginary price? Why are there U.S.-made men's cashmere sweaters selling for less in New York stores? Has he chosen the exception rather than the rule? Are imports really helping the consumer or do some retail stores merely want cheap imports to sell to consumers at high prices? Why have prices not come way down when Britain devalued the pound and all British imports were cheaper?

Mr. Lazarus lists some products that he claims are not available because the U.S. does not produce them, or does not produce enough so that consumers can always find them. The boys' ski pants he lists are available—U.S. made, in catalogs—at lower prices than the \$18 Mr. Lazarus quotes for the import.

I am grateful to two leading organizations in the field of apparel which have prepared a memorandum concerning the facts and figures of this vitally important problem. It was written by Mr. Lazare Teper, research director of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and by Mr. Howard Samuel, vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. It is a document well worth reading by any student of our apparel trade policies, and I include it in the RECORD along with my extended remarks:

A JOINT MEMORANDUM ON APPAREL TRADES PROBLEMS CONCERNING ARGUMENTS BY MR. CHARLES Y. LAZARUS

The speech delivered by Mr. Charles Y. Lazarus of Federated Department Stores undertakes to provide an analysis of the consumer's stake in international trade. To this end, some figures are offered, coupled with arguments. Unfortunately, the speech is more an exercise in semantics and repetition than a serious review of the issues.

In an effort to show presumed differences between alleged current prices paid by consumers for goods of domestic and foreign manufacture and to indicate the retail prices consumers might pay if trade barriers were eliminated, Mr. Lazarus offers price quotations for a number of items of boys' wear, ladies' shoes, ladies' gloves, and men's sportswear.

It is impossible to check independently the figures offered by Mr. Lazarus. The reasons are obvious. The descriptions provided for the various items are ambiguous and incomplete. Each description covers a wide spec-

trum of goods sold at a wide range of prices, irrespective of whether particular items are of domestic origin or whether they are sold at wholesale or retail. This can be readily illustrated. One item cited by Mr. Lazarus is "Men's cashmere sweater (English)". No information is provided on whether the particular sweater is sleeveless, short-sleeved or long-sleeved, the fineness of yarn used in its manufacture, the closeness or looseness of the knitting stitches (which would affect the amount of yarn used in the production of a particular sweater), and whether the particular garments are full-fashioned or made by a cut-and-sew process. Yet, all of these elements affect the price of sweaters, irrespective of where they are made. Thus, today, one can find imported men's cashmere sweaters which retail for less than \$25 and those of domestic origin which retail for less than \$20. Similarly, some imported men's cashmere sweaters retail for \$37.50 and above.

The indefiniteness of merchandise descriptions provided in Mr. Lazarus' speech and its Appendix throws into question the validity of the comparisons made; for within the vague descriptions provided, wide variations of prices, at wholesale or retail, are found due to the nature of the raw materials, workmanship and design. Men's and boys' coats are made of fabrics of different weight, utilizing different grades of wool and constructions in their manufacture, and different grades of workmanship. Terry cloth robes are also made of fabrics of different weight and to differing specifications (the term "quality fabrics" to describe terry cloth is devoid of meaning to textile and apparel specialists). Ladies' cotton dress gloves are of different length, of varying workmanship, and are made of lace, net, woven fabrics, simplex double knit fabrics, Milanese knit materials, with plain and sueded or chamouis finish. All of these variables affect prices.

Parenthetically, it may be noted that some descriptions used by Mr. Lazarus provide even less information than others. When we look at his reference to "Boys' cardigan (individually hand-knit)", we are not even told of what fiber it is made. When reference is made on the same page to "Boys' wool ski sweater, bulky type weave," credibility is further strained, for there is no such thing as a "weave" in sweaters since they are produced by knitting, not by weaving.

The descriptions provided for the different articles are not even adequate for assigning the different products to the appropriate classifications of the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (1968), subsequently referred to as TSUSA classifications. In many cases, there are two or three TSUSA classifications, subject to different duty rates, into which the various articles listed could fall. Four items, for example, "Men's V-neck, lambs wool sweater (English)", "Men's fisherman's wool sweater, individually hand-knit (Italian)", "Boys' fisherman's sweater, individually hand-knit" (if it were, in fact, made of wool), and "Boys' wool ski sweater, bulky type weave" could be imported and subject to custom duties either under TSUSA 380.61.50 or under TSUSA 380.57.50. In the case of the first of these items, reported to retail at \$17.00, the average value of garment including customs duty imported from the United Kingdom in 1968, under TSUSA 380.61.50 was \$6.67 per garment and those under TSUSA 380.57.50 were \$6.49 per garment. Similarly, in the case of the second item, reported to retail at \$18.00, the average value of imports including custom duty from Italy was \$6.70 per garment if imported under TSUSA 380.61.50 and \$5.09 per garment if imported under TSUSA 380.57.50. Retail prices for the last two items are given at \$12.00 and \$14.00 respectively (no country of origin is given). The average value of imports from all countries including customs duty was \$7.00 per garment when

imported under TSUSA 380.61.50 and \$4.35 per garment when imported under TSUSA 380.57.50.

These figures, by the way, illustrate the wide disparity all too frequently found between the average value of imports including customs duty as derived from the statistics compiled by the U.S. Bureau of the Census and the retail prices cited by Mr. Lazarus. Examples can be multiplied. Imported "Ladies' cotton dress gloves" for which a retail price is given as \$3.00 per pair were imported in 1958 under TSUSA 704.05.20 at an average value including customs duties of 25 cents a pair. Similarly, imported "Ladies' kid leather gloves, fabric lined," for which the retail price was given as \$15.00 per pair were imported under TSUSA 705.74.00 at an average value including customs duties of \$5.13 a pair. "Boys' hooded terry-cloth robe, quality fabric," for which a retail price of \$15.00 is cited, were imported under TSUSA 380.18.40 at an average value including customs duties of \$6.18 per garment.

The wide gap between the average value (including customs duty) of the various ap-

parel and accessory products as shown by the official statistics of imports and the prices quoted by Mr. Lazarus reflect in part the omission of some charges involved in bringing the goods from the place of origin to the retailer. They also reflect the retailer practice of extracting from the consumer much higher markups on the wholesale prices of imported merchandise than on similar goods of domestic manufacture, a practice with which the business community is familiar and which was repeatedly testified to by importers and others during the course of the 1967 textile hearings before the Tariff Commission. As a result, the average markups on wholesale prices charged consumers by retailers have been steadily increasing, and at a higher rate, even in those retail sectors where imported goods have played an increasingly important role. This can be gleaned from the following figures which show department store markups in the departments singled out for discussion by Mr. Lazarus (calculated from the data published annually by the Comptrollers' Congress of the National Retail Merchants' Association):

[In percent]

Years	Little boys' wear	Boys' clothing	Women's and children's gloves	Women's shoes	Men's sportswear
1953.....	61.8	61.3	66.7	71.2	65.3
1961.....	64.7	63.7	72.4	78.3	71.5
1964.....	65.3	65.0	76.1	80.8	75.4
1965.....	66.9	66.1	76.7	81.2	75.4
1966.....	67.8	67.2	77.9	84.2	76.7
1967.....	70.9	68.1	80.8	86.6	79.2

Increases in retail markups continued into 1968—this is a matter of general knowledge among those who regularly follow retail developments. Interestingly enough, despite some reductions in customs duties effectuated in 1968 as a result of the Kennedy Round and despite the devaluation of the British pound, which cut back the cost of imports from the United Kingdom to the retailer, no evidence exists that the consumers were offered better buys on such imports in the retail stores—prices were not cut back by the retailers. In the light of this and other experience, one cannot take seriously the figures devised by Mr. Lazarus which presume to show lower retail prices to the consumer if there were no trade barriers. There is certainly reason to doubt Mr. Lazarus's easy claim that consumers would necessarily benefit from price reductions if there were to be a complete elimination of tariffs. Actually, the presumed retail price reductions alleged by Mr. Lazarus bear little relationship to the rate of duties charged by the United States in 1968, even after the tariff reductions under the Kennedy Round. Typically, the retail price reductions presumed by Mr. Lazarus are much smaller than the tariff duties and to an uneven degree. Retailers have a right, of course, to increase their profits at the expense of the American consumers. But such behavior hardly qualifies them as disinterested champions of a consumer interest rather than their own.

The credibility gap generated by Mr. Lazarus increases when one checks some of the items for which a claim is made: "Not available in U.S. or supply of comparable product inadequate to meet consumer demands." For example, "Men's hand loom wool coat" is produced by quite a number of American firms. Among them are the following:

- The Joseph & Feiss Co., New York, N.Y.
- Joseph H. Cohen & Sons, Inc., New York, N.Y.
- College Hall Fashions, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Arthur H. Freedberg Co., Boston, Mass.
- Stanley Blacker, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Cross Country Clothes, Inc., Northampton, Pa.

"Boys' wool ski sweaters, bulky knits" are produced by many domestic producers, among whom are the following:

- Jantzen, Inc., Portland, Ore.
- Robert Bruce, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Himalaya, Inc., New York, New York.
- New York Knitting Mills, New York, N.Y.
- Donmoor, Inc., New York, N.Y.
- Alps Sportswear Mfg. Co., Lawrence, Mass.
- Sooval Knitting Mills, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Majestic Sweater Mills, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Standard Knitting Co., Seattle, Wash.

Numerous firms in the United States produce "Boys' Helenca fabric stretch ski trousers." It may be of interest to quote from the April 15, 1968 catalog of Bancroft Manufacturing Co., Framingham, Massachusetts:

Professional Helenca stretch worsted authentic type ski pants:

Style 470, boys or girls: Authentic stretch pant, fly front, zipper pocket, elastic straps, adjustable side tabs at waist. Colors: black and navy; water repellent; machine washable. Sizes: 4 to 6x. Retail: \$11; price, \$6.50.

Style 670, boys: Authentic stretch pant, fly front, 2 zipper pockets, elastic straps at bottom, adjustable side tabs. Colors: Black, burgundy, and navy; water repellent; machine washable, size 6, waist 22½; size 8, waist 23½; size 10, waist 24½; size 12, waist 25½; size 14, waist 26½; size 16, waist 27½; size 18, waist 28½; size 20, waist 29½. Retail, \$14; price, \$8.

It should be noted that the recommended retail prices cited by Bancroft Sportswear Inc.—one at \$11.00 and the other at \$14.00—are lower than the \$18.00 retail price cited by Mr. Lazarus for "Boys' Helenca fabric stretch ski trousers" which are imported.

To bolster his argument, Mr. Lazarus makes a number of generalizations regarding the alleged benefits provided by such goods in terms of wider choice, fashions and craftsmanship, presumably not otherwise available in this country. As a matter of fact, foreign producers of apparel and accessories rely heavily on the designs and styling originated in the United States and adapted by them for the use of the American market. As a rule, the domestic needle trades industries, as well as the domestic textile industry, provide the

leadership copied and imitated abroad. The generalizations offered by Mr. Lazarus as arguments are spurious. Admittedly, a minute amount of foreign apparel production of high priced goods appealing to a small sector of the wealthiest group in our population may be properly considered as products of originators of fashion merchandise, as in the case with the products of a small number of domestic producers supplying the same class. These represent the exception and not the rule. Moreover, with regard to technological advance, the textile and apparel industries in the United States have no peer anywhere in the world. As a result, goods produced in the United States generally serve the American consumer better, both in terms of quality, design and selection, than do imports which retailers may find it advantageous to promote on the basis of hand sewing or hand knitting or other psychological appeals. Imported merchandise admittedly provides greater profit opportunities for retailers, but may not necessarily benefit ultimate purchasers. This is illustrated in the case of the hand-knit sweaters which are promoted by retailers as superior to sweaters of the same design and material that are machine knit, whether full fashioned or cut-and-sew. Most knitted constructions produced by hand can be produced by machine with appropriate standards of quality control and with greater efficiency.

Machine knit garments are superior products which offer consumers freedom from defects, greater durability and the same appearance as the hand-knits. Because of the absence of any inherent superiority, the domestic industry abandoned the production of hand knitted sweaters, while retailers continued to promote hand-knits to the consumers despite their inferior characteristics relying on the appeal of the "hand-knit" label and of the word "imported" to create an aura of superiority where none in fact exists. Hand-knit apparel survives solely because such work is performed in workers' homes at wage rates substantially below those found in factories. The major contribution of the continued promotion of hand-knit sweaters is the perpetration abroad of appalling labor conditions long banned in the United States as a matter of public policy in the national interest.

Mr. Lazarus' thesis concerning the presumed economic interests of consumers is presented in a simplistic framework. Consumers are indeed concerned with prices, quality and choice. But low prices are not in themselves a guarantee of quality, anymore than are the claims advanced by retailers to entice purchasers to buy those items which yield greatest returns to the stores. Moreover, low prices in themselves do not guarantee that consumers will necessarily be able to purchase the merchandise offered. One need only recall the early thirties when prices were indeed low and the consumer lacked the wherewithal to buy. This is why public policy requires consideration of the interrelationships of many complex factors having a bearing on the maintenance of a strong and viable national economy, including those that affect producers of goods and services and their employees, and wholesalers and retailers, among many others. Nor can one neglect the needs of the country during periods of national emergencies, when the nation must depend on its own plant and manpower to produce not only the material needed for defense but also goods and services to meet its consumption needs. Viewed in this light, Mr. Lazarus' condemnation of the "Buy American" policies, pursued by the Defense Department, on the narrow ground of presumed lower prices abroad, borders on the irresponsible. Equally irresponsible is his argument about the allegation regarding "increased capital costs for plant and equipment," were goods produced in the United States—as though our na-

tion's goal is to become a nation of shopkeepers. This was the goal of mercantilist economists, prevalent before the Industrial Revolution in England—long discredited and abandoned. It is noteworthy that, in his contentions concerning increased domestic capital costs, Mr. Lazarus neglects the fact that interest rates in most foreign countries—the cost of capital—are much higher than in the United States.

An effective national foreign trade policy cannot be based on a narrow abstraction, even if one seeks, as one should, to protect consumer welfare. It is not a question of free trade or protectionism. Nor can the issue be resolved by generating scare figures on some assumed decline in textile and apparel imports. Formulating a responsible national foreign trade policy for the United States is a complex undertaking. It requires consideration of the many national needs and goals; a comprehension of the different problems of different sectors of the economy faced with import competition; and an understanding of its economic, social and political impacts, including the effects on poverty and unemployment. Of great significance in this connection is the experience of the past few years with the difficulties encountered in trying to fit the unemployed into jobs, and a better understanding of the economy's need for a much broader spectrum of job opportunities for the less skilled. In the case of certain industries, such as apparel and textiles, there is relatively little interchangeability of capital and human resources, even in periods of high employment and relatively rapid economic growth. All of these factors and many others must be viewed together as an integral part of the whole, and weighed against each other in national policy formation. Only thus will consumer welfare be safeguarded.

HOWARD D. SAMUEL,
ACWA.
LAZARE TEPER,
ILGWU.

RESTRUCTURING OF JOB CORPS

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a number of people have taken it upon themselves to publicly criticize the administration for its decision to restructure the Job Corps by incorporating it into our comprehensive manpower programs within the Department of Labor and expanding the number of training opportunities available for disadvantaged youngsters.

I have no quarrel with those distinguished gentlemen who have seriously considered the proposal, reviewed the evidence, and arrived at a conclusion which does not coincide with the administration's. Such policy differences and disagreements are the lifeblood of the institution, and this is the proper forum for debate between two legitimate, strongly held points of view.

However, in the past 2 days a new thrust of criticism has come about which questions the basic motives of the administration, charges that the President has no authority to embark on his chosen policy, and accuses him of disregarding the legislative intent of Congress. Such criticism deserves, indeed demands, rebuttal.

The Economic Opportunity Act does not cast the Job Corps in a rigid mold, but rather provides for the operation of

a program designed to train disadvantaged young men and women; and that congressional directive is being carried out by this administration.

The Labor Department has made a careful and thoughtful study of the operation of the Job Corps program, using data collected by the Office of Economic Opportunity supplied by the Job Corps centers. The Department's recommendations, incidentally, coincide with those of the General Accounting Office based on its exhaustive analysis of programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act; an analysis commissioned by the last Congress.

The President accepted the recommendations and has instructed the Office of Economic Opportunity to implement them, and OEO, as an integral part of the executive branch, is subject to the directions of the President of the United States.

The new centers to be established in and near major population centers will qualify under the provisions of the act. They will provide residential services; they will provide the range of benefits required in the act. They will not be isolated from the rest of our manpower programs as has been the case with the Job Corps, and the services they provide, by drawing on existing community resources, will result in an improvement in program effectiveness. Every precaution is being taken to ensure that none of the present provisions in the statutes will be contravened in any way, and certainly if it should become apparent that changes are needed in the statutes, I am confident the administration will request the necessary legislative authorization.

It has been suggested that there is something illegal in the administration's decision to plan for the redirection of the Job Corps in light of the fact that the Appropriations Committee has not yet acted on next year's budget. I personally find such charges surprising, and a bit irrelevant. They imply that the administration should not plan ahead and communicate to Congress and the Nation its intentions in a major policy area until such time as Congress has formally appropriated funds to carry out that policy.

Finally, a number of individuals have complained that Congress was not given proper notice of the administration's intent to close some of the Job Corps centers. The facts indicate that the Secretary of Labor had scheduled a press conference—which was held—for Friday, April 11, and telegrams were sent to congressional offices the preceding afternoon. The fact that the story was reported by the press on Thursday, April 10, is not an indication of administrative doubledealing, but rather testimony to the abilities of certain reporters and the difficulties encountered by the administration in having to operate with key personnel appointed by the previous administration.

The Job Corps proposals are sound, based upon the best evidence available and intended to equip disadvantaged youngsters with the skills they need to compete effectively in today's highly technical job market. No one is proposing the abolition of those concepts in Job

Corps which have proven effective, nor is anyone recommending that we turn some 17,000 young men and women out on the streets on July 1. Approximately 50 percent of the centers will continue in operation and corpsmen at those centers to be closed have been given every assurance that they will be permitted to finish their course in a comparable program. Furthermore, the Secretary of Labor has set aside a special fund of \$1 million to enable enrollees to transfer to other programs.

The administration has made clear its commitment to training the largest possible number of individuals with the limited resources available. This policy choice may be questioned, but criticisms leveled at the authority or integrity of the administration are unjustified.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, it has been noted, and accurately, that the present Job Corps legislation contains legal constraints relating to the percentage of women in the Job Corps as well as the percentage of males in conservation camps in relation to all Job Corps males. Some concern has been expressed that these requirements may not be met in the restructuring of the Job Corps proposed by the administration. I have consulted with the administration and have been assured that both of these requirements will be observed. First, that the 25-percent women's requirements will not only be maintained but probably exceeded. And secondly, the requirement that conservation center enrollees constitute 40 percent of all Job Corpsmen will also be maintained, despite the closure of some Job Corps centers. The fact that the present percent of conservation corpsmen to total male corpsmen is as high as 54 percent will make it easier to achieve the legal objective.

I believe that the administration should be commended for the careful planning that it has done to insure the observance of these legal requirements despite the restructuring—and I might add very constructive restructuring—of the Job Corps.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, one of the intriguing proposals in the administration's redesign of the Job Corps involves the establishment of 30 new centers. However, there has been a great deal of misunderstanding about the nature of this new component. First, it should be pointed out that the basic premises that underline these new centers are two: First, they are limited to sites in or near labor market areas where the target population and economic opportunities exist and are closely tied to these labor markets. And, second, that rather than standing in splendid isolation they will now become an integral part of a whole stream of manpower programs and services that are available in the community.

These new centers will thus provide support to other ongoing manpower programs, such as the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Neighborhood Youth Corps and also be supported by these other programs. There has been a great deal of concern expressed about the timing of these new

centers. I understand that the administration intends to move as quickly as possible. However, I hope that it does not commit the mistakes made so many times in the past, of proceeding so rapidly as to be unable to build in sound program concepts and structures.

Some have erroneously described these new centers as "bunkhouses." Quite the contrary. These relatively small centers will provide intensive around-the-clock services.

The location, size, and concept of these new centers should considerably improve the services provided, reduce dropout rates, and increase job placements.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to compliment the administration for its very rational plan of redirecting the resources provided for the Job Corps.

The key element to me is a cutback in the size of the Job Corps from about 35,000 beds to about 22,000.

This cutback has been severely criticized by opponents of this administration. This, however, is a shortsighted view which reflects a complete lack of understanding of what is actually happening in the Job Corps.

It has been almost an impossible task for the Job Corps to keep these 35,000 beds filled—and they have to keep them filled in order to meet the statutory unit cost limitations we in the Congress have prescribed.

Job Corps now is spending about \$10 million a year in recruiting disadvantaged youngsters to enter the Job Corps compared with \$3 million for job placement. Of every seven individuals interviewed only one agrees to go to the Job Corps and, of those that agreed to the referral, about 30 percent never arrive at the Job Corps center. Then, at the center, almost 20 percent drop out within the first 30 days.

The evaluative studies that have been made of Job Corps and its problems all have indicated that recruitment is one of the major difficulties, that recruiters act more to fill quotas than they do to select those individuals for whom a residential training program is most appropriate.

Mr. Robert Lake, director of the Poland Spring Job Corps Center in Maine, testified before our House task force on poverty yesterday as follows:

Better recruiting and selection are needed. Every center director in the U.S. will testify to this.

All of this very clearly indicates to me that perhaps the Job Corps has been too ambitious, that perhaps 35,000 beds is too large a number and I am, therefore, very pleased that this administration has had the courage to reevaluate this program and take action to make it more realistic.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, several Members of Congress have expressed their concern over the future of persons now enrolled in the Job Corps camps that are scheduled to be closed soon.

Without debating the pros or cons of the Job Corps program itself, I would merely like to emphasize that a constructive alternative will be provided to those persons now in centers scheduled to be closed and that there will not be any

wholesale dumping of young persons on to city streets.

Two of the alternatives presently being made available are: First, giving corpsmen an opportunity to transfer to a camp remaining open—which is possible due to the high attrition rate of camps—and second, giving corpsmen an opportunity to enroll in other training programs under, perhaps, the Manpower Development and Training Act or the National Alliance of Businessmen's JOBS program. In addition, approximately \$1 million will be set aside for Job Corps enrollments in those cases where existing openings may not be immediately available.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has enacted many programs based upon the theory that they were at least entitled to a trial run. Based upon the record of the Job Corps in comparison with other manpower training programs, it may very well be that the alternative opportunities offered to persons now leaving the Job Corps may be more rewarding and constructive than the opportunities that would have been available through the regular Job Corps programs.

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the debate on the Job Corps, I am struck by the extent to which many people are focusing upon the individual tree rather than upon the forest. It seems to me that our concern must be not with an existing institution simply because it already exists—must not be with perpetuating an ongoing bureaucracy simply because it happens to be there—must not be wrapped up with a specific program component that is unrelated to the larger total manpower program. Quite the contrary, our concern must be with people and their needs. In this connection it is important to note that the manpower programs administered by the Department of Labor and directed to precisely the same kind of youth that the Job Corps attempts to serve, will be enlarged in 1970 over the 1969 levels. The projected program of the Department of Labor for 1970—including the Job Corps—will provide for about 368,000 opportunities for youth as compared to 362,000 during this fiscal year. In this context, it is apparent that the needs of the target population that we seek to serve will be more amply met in fiscal 1970 notwithstanding the slight reduction—when viewed in the whole—of the Job Corps program.

No program is sacrosanct. Every program must be able to stand the light of critical examination. If this examination suggests the need for a change in the program mix of our total manpower activities it should be accomplished. Only in this way can we be sure that we are getting the greatest benefit for the taxpayer's dollar.

I commend the Department of Labor for this kind of forthright examination even though the decisions flowing from the examination is a hard one. I believe that it is a wise one.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the subject on which I have spoken.

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

There was no objection.

DISCLOSURE OF HOLDINGS AND SOURCES OF INCOME

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once said that a man who assumes a public trust should consider himself public property. In keeping with this philosophy, I feel it is appropriate for a Congressman to make a full disclosure concerning his holdings and sources of income.

Yesterday, I filed a report with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct as required by the rule of the House of Representatives adopted April 3, 1968. I realize that there is no requirement for public disclosure, but it is my desire to make this information public, as well as additional pertinent information.

Since election day, I have sold all of my securities with the exception of 200 shares of Central National Bank stock and 16,570 shares of Larry Hogan Associates, Inc. I am in the process of trying to sell the latter. I no longer receive any salary from Larry Hogan Associates, Inc., and the only additional income I have at the present time, except for rents, is fees from writing and lectures. Before taking the oath of office as a Congressman, I resigned as a director of the Central Bank of Maryland.

A more detailed report follows:

Financial statement of Laurence J. Hogan and Nora E. Hogan, his wife, April 30, 1969

Assets:	
Cash (see schedule A)	\$3,547.00
Investments (see schedule B) ..	89,450.00
Real Estate (see schedule C) ..	126,800.00
Automobile: 1969 Oldsmobile ..	1,300.00
Household furnishings	7,000.00
Total assets	228,097.00
Liabilities:	
Accounts payable (miscellaneous) ..	350.00
Central National Bank loan (car loan)	4,950.00
Mortgages (see schedule D) ..	66,471.93
Total liabilities	71,771.93
Net worth	156,325.70

SCHEDULE A—CASH

Loyola Federal Savings & Loan (savings account)	1,747.00
Columbia Federal Savings & Loan (savings account)	300.00
Central National (checking bank)	500.00
Maryland National (checking bank)	500.00
Sergeant at Arms (checking account)	400.00
Cash on hand	100.00
Total	3,547.00

Financial statement of Lawrence J. Hogan and Nora E. Hogan, his wife, April 30, 1969—Continued

SCHEDULE B—INVESTMENTS	
Interest in Larry Hogan Associates, Inc.....	82,850.00
Central National Bank stock.....	6,600.00
Total	89,450.00

SCHEDULE C—REAL ESTATE	
Town House, Ocean City, Md.....	40,000.00
Cabin at Lake Jackson, Va., Prince William County.....	8,000.00
House, present residence, Landover, Md.....	50,000.00
Allegany County, Md. (94.6 acres)	28,800.00
Total	126,800.00

SCHEDULE D—MORTGAGES	
Town House, Ocean City, Md.....	23,710.93
House, Landover, Md.....	38,230.00
Allegany Co., Md. (94.6 acres)...	4,531.00
Total	66,471.93

ANNIVERSARY OF ADOPTION OF CONSTITUTION OF 1791 BY POLISH NATION

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, May 3, is a highly significant day for Polish people everywhere. It is a multiple anniversary day—a day for celebration and a day of mourning, paradoxical as that may seem.

On May 3 Polish Americans and Poles throughout the world will mark one of the brightest events in Polish history—adoption of the May 3 Constitution of 1791—followed just a year later by one of the three tragic partitions of Poland by warlike neighbors bent on territorial aggrandizement.

This Saturday is the 30th anniversary of the German-Soviet invasion of Poland during World War II, one of the blackest days in the history of mankind.

May 3 also marks the 25th anniversary of glorious Polish exploits in the Battle of Monte-Cassino and of the tragic deception attending the Warsaw uprising.

On still another note, Polish Americans on May 3 will observe the silver anniversary of the founding of the Polish-American Congress, an organization of about 10 million Americans of Polish descent.

Members of the Polish-American Congress are first and foremost good, hard-working citizens of the United States.

There are many fine citizens of Polish extraction in my own congressional district.

Polish Americans are justifiably proud to be of Polish origin. They are also ever mindful that Poland was the victim of incredible destruction and genocide at the hands of the Nazis and the Russians during World War II and was, in effect, sold into slavery after the war ended.

The world must never forget that the Nazis murdered 6 million Poles, half of them Jews, while the Russians executed 15,000 Polish Army officers and deported 1.7 million Poles.

The world must never forget that the Soviet Union used the Yalta Agreement to take over Poland in a fraudulent election in 1947 after a 2-year campaign of terrorism within Poland.

The Poles are a great people. Only a great people could have produced men like Copernicus, Casimir Pulaski, General Kosciuszko, Chopin, Joseph Pilsudski, Paderewski, Wanda Landowska, and Scholem Asch.

The Poles are a courageous people. Only a courageous people could have survived the invasions, partitions, political murder and terrorism to which the Poles have been subjected and still cling to a basic love of freedom and a hatred of tyranny.

The Polish-American Congress was established to perpetuate the traditions of a free, proud, and independent Poland.

The Polish-American Congress has constantly warned the leaders of the free world against the duplicity practiced by Communist leaders to achieve expansionist aims. The Polish-American Congress has worked tirelessly to promote the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live.

The principle of national self-determination is one embraced by all Americans.

It is most fitting, therefore, that all Americans, whatever their origin, join with the Polish-American Congress and with Poles everywhere in their May 3 observance.

It is an observance which calls for a rededication to the principles of freedom and justice for all peoples, self-determination for all nations, and unceasing devotion to any cause which furthers the natural and God-given rights of man.

LEGISLATION TO MAKE IT A FEDERAL OFFENSE TO WILLFULLY OBSTRUCT MILITARY RECRUITING

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

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would amend section 2388(a) of title 18 of the United States Code to make it a Federal offense to willfully obstruct the military recruiting or enlistment service during the time of war, military conflict, or national emergency.

The Constitution of the United States charges Congress—elected by the people through the democratic process—with the responsibility of raising and supporting armies. Until such time as we live in a world which recognizes that armed conflict of any nature must be eliminated, we have the solemn duty to provide adequate national defense. Through the constitutional power vested in Congress, it has authorized the ROTC and it must exercise this power without limitation placed upon it through coercion or willful obstruction of this program.

In my opinion, it is proper that we pursue a program which seeks to enlist, on a voluntary basis, reserve officers. Furthermore, any young man attending a college or university which provides the ROTC training has every right to

volunteer for this program and this right must be protected without infringement or abridgment, just as it is the right of those who seek not to volunteer to do so.

The bill I am introducing today is another effort to cope with the actions by certain groups which willfully seek to deprive any individual of his right under law. Disagreement, no matter how deep it may run, with any program authorized by law and within the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, does not warrant mob action or coercion. It is therefore my firm belief that those who resort to this type of conduct should be punished to the full extent of adequate laws. Certainly there is nothing in this bill which in any manner deprives any individual of his constitutional right of petition or right to peacefully express his dissent.

Mr. Speaker, I would like also to take this opportunity to commend my colleagues who have introduced legislation which seeks to prohibit the disruption of the administration or operations of federally assisted educational programs. I believe the rank and file citizens of this country and a substantial number of students on college campuses are fed up with the anarchical conduct of those who feel that they have the right to run rampant in expressing their demands and disagreements.

The shameful development of an armed revolt at Cornell University and, more recently, a similar episode at Voorhees College in South Carolina, is a culmination of the failure of many university authorities to take proper action before the situation reached its present intolerable stage. It becomes more and more obvious that there is nothing that can be gained by the wishy-washy manner in which some of our highly paid college and university administrators have dealt with campus revolts but the total disruption and perhaps destruction of our system of higher education in this country as we know it. For all its faults, it has provided the best education for the greatest number of its people of any country in the world today.

TEXTILE IMPORTS

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Maurice Stans, Secretary of Commerce, has our support and every wish for success in his efforts to work administratively, an international agreement on textile imports to cover manmade fibers and woolsens. The administration will have our support in its efforts to encourage enforcement among our allies and friends of the LTA cotton textile agreement.

We have been greatly encouraged by the Honorable Maurice Stans' special trip to Europe to discuss orderly trade. We look forward to Mr. Stans' visit to Japan, Hong Kong, and other areas of the Far East. We have been further encouraged by recent reports in the press that President Nixon may ask for import quotas on textiles.

Those of us in Congress associated with our textile group prefer that an international arrangement be negotiated with all of our friends and allies to limit textile imports. We are concerned over the ever-increasing volume of imports, violations of the cotton textile agreement, and failure to extend the principle to manmade fibers and woollens. We anxiously await the outcome of Mr. Stans' determined efforts. Should our friends abroad reject the international agreement approach, we are prepared and will make an all-out effort in Congress to pass quota legislation. I believe we have more support in the new Congress than last year when 197 Members of the House sponsored textile quota legislation and the Senate passed overwhelmingly a bill providing textile quotas.

Mr. Speaker, in my Committee on Public Works, we are daily conducting hearings and writing legislation authorizing vast public funds for Appalachia, economic development, pollution, and other measures for the economic relief of our people. We do not propose to see the hundreds of thousands of textile jobs in Appalachia and in the hard-pressed great cities of our country go down the drain.

Mr. Speaker, those of us fighting this battle were pleased to read the following story which appeared in the Fairchild publications:

NIXON MAY ASK CONGRESS FOR QUOTAS

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon Administration may be ready to ask Congress for textile import quotas if no progress toward voluntary curbs stems from the current European trip of Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans.

At this stage some Congressional sources apparently have been approached quietly about an Administration trade bill that would be submitted to Congress in two parts.

The speculation is that the Administration tariff experts want a two part bill so that other nations would be aware of a special textile quota plea.

This plan may end up in a pigeonhole.

But at this stage the Administration apparently is considering the drastic step of proposing mandatory textile import quotas if foreign countries offer no hope of voluntary curbs.

Under this plan the White House would send Congress a trade message asking for such things as liberalized trade adjustment assistance and would separately ask for the quotas.

The quota proposal would be part 2 of the message. It would be a club to induce countries to accept voluntary curbs on imports.

FIVE CENTS AN OUNCE WILL BALANCE THE POST OFFICE BUDGET

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

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have had a message from the President, and we are going to have testimony from the Postmaster General concerning a rate increase for postage in the United States.

I want to announce to the Members of the House that the Subcommittee on Postal Rates will, first of all, discuss and investigate the costs in the Post Office Department. However, pursuant to that investigation I want to tell the Members of the House my version of an old

slogan famous a long time before I came to the Congress: I say "What America needs is a good 5-cent stamp."

We still need a good 5-cent stamp, and we need a 5-cent stamp for all mail on the first ounce moving through the Post Office Department. Then we should have a 5-cent stamp on the second ounce moving through the Post Office Department.

If we do that, not only will we balance the budget of the Post Office Department, but also we could almost balance the budget of the Federal Government.

This is the study that I want the Members of Congress to look at, instead of looking at the creation of a corporation or the creation of any other kind of body.

We can do it, if we do our work. If we set the rates, we can do the job of balancing that budget.

But I want the Members of Congress to follow procedures in our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I note that our chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI), is here. He endorses this program that we will investigate.

What could we do if it were 5 cents for the first ounce and 5 cents for the second ounce? By way of review for just a moment, on 6 cents for 1 ounce today we lose money. It costs 6.2 cents. But most of the first-class mail is more than 1 ounce. That is why we make money on the first-class mail. And we make money on the airmail, which is 10 cents an ounce.

My proposal now is that second class, third class and fourth class, and every class pay 5 cents on the first ounce and five cents on the second ounce, and then we will argue after that as to what percentages various classes ought to pay toward general Post Office overhead expenses.

If we did that, we would balance the budget of the Post Office Department and have enough left over to establish a trust fund that would finance future capital expansion, modernization, and a fair wage and benefits to loyal postal employees.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the RECORD show I was unavoidably detained in my office on the last rollcall. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT PROBLEMS

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the thoughtful and timely remarks of the gentleman from Montana when he discussed the problems of the Post Office Department. I would like the RECORD to show, however, that there are two ways in which we can balance the Post Office Department budget. One, of course, is to play all sorts of games with postal rates. The other is to control the costs of the Department. If the gentle-

man from Montana will cooperate in maintaining the proposed budget of the Post Office Department in conformance with the budget submitted by President Johnson, he would be striking a blow for commonsense in the administration of that Post Office Department. I am sure that the gentleman realizes that President Johnson's budget called for a realistic control of the expenditures of that Department and I am sure that he would not be a part of any attempt to add abnormal costs to the budget which the Nixon administration inherited from its great predecessor.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. OLSEN. I join with the gentleman in that statement. I think the cost of the Post Office Department can be appreciably reduced with good management.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DERWINSKI. May I say that I think the gentleman from Montana has the potential to be a statesman.

SUCKER DAY

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is "Sucker Day." I want it understood that I do not intend to infer that any Member of this illustrious body could be fooled, deceived, or even "taken in," although I have been told that attempts have been made in the past.

The day of which I speak is the annual salute to "spring," held in the town of Nixa, Mo., a beautiful place in the Ozarks; with a population of about 1,000 peaceful citizens, which swells to as many as 15,000 on Sucker Day.

To the uninformed, the sucker is not a human, described so eloquently by P. T. Barnum, but a fish known to few as the golden redborse, but in Nixa referred to as the yellow sucker. Sucker fishing defies the technology of the space age. Nothing has yet been invented to improve the art of sucker grabbing, the object of which is to lower a treble hook in the water, sneak it up next to the unsuspecting pises, then with a quick jerk of the line, haul in your prize.

Nixa Sucker Day is topped off with the doggondest meal ever served, highlighted by steaming cupfulls of sucker soup which is said to be good for babies and people over 40, or to fertilize roses.

Yes, today is the 12th annual observance of Sucker Day in Nixa, Mo. A day set aside for the promotion and perpetuation of piscatorial pursuits, fun, fellowship, community service, and good citizenship.

LAW DAY, U.S.A., 1969

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POBELL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1958, Congress, by joint resolution, designated

that the 1st day of May of each year be commemorated as Law Day, U.S.A. The resolution states:

It is set aside as a special day of celebration by the American people in appreciation of their liberties and the reaffirmation of their loyalty to this country; of their re-dedication to the ideals of equality and justice under law in their relations with each other as well as with other nations; and for the cultivation of that respect for law that is so vital to the democratic way of life.

The purposes of Law Day, U.S.A., are fourfold: First, to foster respect for law and understanding of its essential place in American life; second, to encourage citizen support of law observance and law enforcement; third, to advance equality and justice under law; and, fourth, to point up the contrast between freedom under law in the United States and governmental tyranny under communism.

Nowhere is it more fitting to reaffirm these principles and purposes than in this House, and I am privileged to do so today.

The theme for the 1969 annual observance of Law Day, "Justice and Equality Depend Upon Law and You," was selected for its timeliness.

The Nation has been experiencing public disorders, a rising crime rate, strained race relations, student unrest. The theme of today's observance goes to the heart of the basic purposes of Law Day, U.S.A., and the principles upon which it was founded. It reaffirms that we are a nation of laws; that each of us is morally bound to uphold the law; that advances in social justice can come only by way of law; and that in order to achieve equality of opportunity for every American, each individual must accept these concepts and apply them in his daily living.

I would like to reflect for a moment on the obligation that each of us has to uphold the law. A just and democratic rule of law must prevail if we are to live together in a civilized society and enjoy the blessings of security, equal opportunity, and freedom. We ourselves create the rule of law, not only through the legislative process and the courts, but in a far deeper sense, by our daily conduct, by respect for laws and by respect for the rights of others. The rule of law is in essence the highest application of justice. The responsibility for maintaining law and order in our society rests upon the individual, and every citizen must take the responsibility to honor and obey the law if the foundation of our society is to be secure and lasting.

To be meaningful, the law must provide for the right of dissent—and this right is guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution. The right of dissent has been honored, protected, and cherished throughout the history of this Nation. There are limitations, however, on the use of this right.

Supreme Court Justice Fortas, in his penetrating discourse "Concerning Dissent and Civil Disobedience," stated his theory on the law of dissent—a theory which I believe goes to the basic principles of our democracy. I quote the Justice:

The theory—the structure—of our system allows full opportunity for both the state

and the individual to assert their respective claims and to have them adjudicated by impartial, independent tribunals, on the basis of a principle which is fundamental to our society: that freedom to criticize, to persuade, to protest, to dissent, to organize and to assemble peaceable are as essential to vital, effective government as they are to the spiritual and material welfare of the individual; and that the exercise of this freedom will be protected and encouraged and may not be diminished so long as the form of its exercise does not involve action which violates laws prescribed to protect others in their peaceful pursuits, or which incites a clear and present danger of violence or injury to others.

The moral obligation of each citizen to uphold the law applies, of course, to the matter of student protest and dissent—which, I believe, has reached critical proportions in this Nation.

Basic reasons for the phenomenon of student unrest doubtlessly can be found in the structure of our own society. The "whys" and "wherefores" require serious and intensive study. But, today, I am concerned with the right of students to dissent in the context of the law by which this Nation governs itself.

The law applies to the dissenting student as it does to every citizen. He is protected by the full scope of the first amendment. He is entitled to the full protection of the law in the exercise of his freedom of speech. But, he is not entitled to immunity from the law if he willfully incites violence or insists upon deliberately disrupting the movement of other persons.

There is no legal principle which protects a student who violates the law, whether his actions occur on campus or elsewhere.

In applying this principle, it is vital to distinguish student demonstrations that are violent in nature—those endangering personal safety and property rights—from the demonstrations that are non-violent. We cannot tolerate the former, for violence erodes the foundation of an orderly and democratic society. But, we must continue to protect the nonviolent demonstrator on campus even though we may disagree with the purposes of his demonstration.

Intolerance in any form cannot be substituted for law.

Our laws provide full opportunity for dissent. Freedom of speech, and press, right of assembly, the voting booth—these are the bulwarks of our form of government. These are the alternatives to violence.

The obligation to uphold the law is as essential to the freedom of the individual as it is to the continuation of the Nation.

The Law must prevail, but it must be just law, guaranteeing equality to all Americans.

And so, once again, we reaffirm the principles that we honor on Law Day, U.S.A.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SMITH), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, as I

want to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from California. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we in the United States are privileged to celebrate and honor Law Day on the 1st day of May in each year. The fact that today has been proclaimed Law Day should cause all Americans to pause and consider and be thankful for our wonderful heritage of equal justice under law, to consider that civilization advances as mankind submits himself to the rule of law for the settlement of disputes and the order of society rather than resort to the rule of force which powers the doctrine that might makes right.

Sometime, Mr. Speaker, even nations will submit their disputes to the rule of law and will abide by that rule, and when that wonderful day dawns, Mr. Speaker, mankind's fear of his brother will abate, and brother may go forward with brother around the world working toward the tremendous destiny which God has promised and revealed for mankind.

And so, Mr. Speaker, when we pause today to pay respect to the rule of law, we see some glimmer of mankind's brilliant future which shall be based on the universal rule of law and justice.

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

Mr. CORMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. WIGGINS).

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to commend my colleague from California for the appropriateness of his remarks on this May 1 Law Day.

Mr. Speaker, in preparation for my own remarks in California before a group of lawyers I was re-reading *Miranda* against Arizona, one of the controversial Supreme Court decisions that we often talk about. I was reading this decision just a few moments ago, and I want to quote from the language of that case:

Decency, security and liberty alike demand that government officials shall be subjected to the same rules of conduct that are commands to the citizen. In a government of laws, existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. Our government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy. To declare that in the administration of the criminal law the end justifies the means . . . would bring terrible retribution. Against that pernicious doctrine this court should resolutely set its face.

Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with that statement.

I believe there is a great lesson in the language quoted, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that all of the Members in this body will profit by them.

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

Mr. CORMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman for taking this time to pay tribute to this great national Law Day. I also wish to congratulate the American Bar Association

and the various State and city bar associations for promoting Law Day.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, for Americans to pause in their everyday schedule and reflect upon the fact that we are a Nation under law, and that as a free society we have to have standards of conduct which govern our behavior in relationship to one another.

So I think this is an important day. It would be my hope that on this great day when we pay tribute to the laws of this country, those laws that have made it possible for us to exist as free men, that perhaps those who administer and enforce these laws would give some thought to the full meaning of those laws.

It occurs to me that in many of our communities today, particularly on the college campuses, that these laws have lost their meaning. There are those who profess to be the greatest exponents of equal justice but who are too often the most impatient with the orderly processes of the law.

These are people who have no confidence, obviously, in the democratic processes that have made this Republic as great as it is.

It has also occurred to me that this is a good day for our judiciary to pause and to reflect that they have a great responsibility and if the law has lost its meaning in many instances and in many situations, it is only because the judiciary itself has in too many cases failed to face up to its responsibility.

It is the interminable delays in criminal prosecutions which make it possible for witnesses to be worn out and then for a criminal to walk out of court for lack of prosecution.

In my judgment, justice delayed is justice denied.

It occurs to me that this is an excellent day or the judiciary of this country to rededicate itself to the fact that there is strength and vigor in the law if they will administer that law with expediency.

I do not ask that any American be denied his full rights under the law. All I ask is for the judges of this country to start recognizing that this whole Republic and the success and future of this Republic to a great extent rests on their shoulders.

How they administer justice under the law affects the conduct of man and mankind in this Nation, and that is the key to our future survival.

I submit that in too many instances the judiciary has failed to carry out its responsibility and has looked the other way in prosecutions and have been a partner in these long and interminable delays that have merely delayed the execution of justice.

Citizens lose their patience with the law when they see that the judiciary itself is not executing and administering the law in the manner in which the citizens have a right to have it administered.

So it seems to me that this Law Day is a great day—a day of reflection for all of us. Thank God that we can have a Law Day so all of us as Americans can

reinvigorate our faith in the institutions that have made this country the greatest country in the world.

Mr. CORMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join in supporting Law Day.

Law Day is, I think, an appropriate time for us to pause and take a closer look at this system of laws and what it has done for us. It is also a time for us to consider what we as a Nation and as individuals are doing to strengthen and reinforce it, or whether we are, by our action or inaction, assisting those who would tear it down.

Whatever the injustice of society, real or imagined, no group or person has the right, under any circumstances, to exact self-determined retribution. Our imperfections do not justify tearing down the institutions which have given us our advances and our strength.

Law and order must be the starting point to build a better society, for without this the great strides that still must be made in the years ahead in the social, economic, and political fields will never get off the ground.

The liberty and freedom which we today enjoy and which is so essential to progress must be a liberty connected with good order.

The reestablishment of law and order in this Nation is the most crying need of our day and time—to delay means chaos and anarchy, riots, looting, burning, and murder. Americans are tired of living in fear of those who will not obey the laws of this land, and Americans are tired of those in positions of authority who are afraid to enforce the law, thinking of political consideration rather than safety of the public. May 1, Law Day, should be a day for those given the responsibility for enforcement of law to rededicate themselves to the fulfillment of their obligation.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, as a lawyer, a former chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Illinois House of Representatives, and a member of the Judiciary Committee of this body, I am happy to have this opportunity to express some thoughts on the occasion of Law Day.

The currently popular phrase among the younger generation to express their independence and individuality is that one must "do his own thing." I think it is appropriate on Law Day to observe that the law is really the touchstone of "doing one's own thing." It is the touchstone in the sense that the law—the basic framework of rules which we have established to govern conduct within our society—both gives us the freedom to "do our own thing," and sets the limits beyond which we cannot go. In other words, the law both protects and restricts our right to act as we choose. It protects that right in the sense that it prohibits the State or any official representative of the State from saying arbitrarily to any citizen, "that is prohibited behavior." On the other hand, the law circumscribes one's right to act to the extent that his actions impose or encroach impermissibly on the rights of other citizens exercising their rights of free and independent action.

I believe this theory of the law and its role in our society may be relevant to one of the most distressing problems facing America today—the problem of campus discord. What the strategy of confrontation and the technique of violent disruption have shown beyond doubt is how thin the veneer of civilization is.

These disruptions have demonstrated clearly how short is the distance between legal protest, on the one hand, and violence and armed force on the other. That thin line—the line between legitimate protest and dissent and impermissible violence and disruption—can only be maintained through law. Only the law can adequately balance the conflicting claims of dissent, often emotional and heated dissent, and the competing claims of those citizens who are unaffected or uninterested in dissent to carry on their daily activities without interference. Only the law can preserve the distinction between constitutionally protected free speech and constitutionally unprotected disruptive action.

Difficult as the line is to draw between protected and unprotected activities, if we grant that only the law can make the distinction meaningful, then it seems to me that two conclusions follow. First, our citizens' "awe of the law" must never lead them into forgoing dissent or suppressing unpopular ideas merely because these ideas are "different" or because a majority may disagree. In short, our "awe of the law" must not keep us from speaking our minds and raising our voices when the occasion demands it.

The second conclusion which follows from the importance of law in distinguishing permissible from impermissible activity is that "forceful" or "violent" enforcement of the law is never appropriate. The strength of our legal system—indeed the only thing which has made it viable—is the fact that the vast majority of our citizens respect and voluntarily observe the law. Other nations have marvelled, for example, at the fact that our income tax laws place almost their entire emphasis on voluntary compliance—and it has worked. Should this situation ever change, should our citizens' respect for the law ever degenerate to the extent that we could no longer count on the overwhelming majority of the population to support and comply with the laws, then we would have only anarchy.

But to preserve our citizens' respect for the law, we must insure two things. First we must insure that law enforcement is itself "legal." We must insure that in enforcing the laws, authorities do not themselves resort to methods which are so at variance with what our citizens expect and will accept that they debase and vitiate the laws they are trying to enforce. It seems to me that both "secret police" operations and unnecessarily violent law enforcement run the risk of undermining public confidence in law and law enforcement. These methods hurt far more than they help; they destroy confidence in our legal system far more than they contribute to it.

The second thing we must insure is that the laws themselves conform closely enough to social norms that they do not become anachronistic. When laws be-

come so archaic, so out-of-date, or so out-of-line with what the majority of citizens consider acceptable social behavior, then we run the risk that the laws will simply be ignored. Thus if the laws on divorce, or gambling, or abortion, or any number of other important social questions fail to reflect the feeling of a majority of the people—as some have argued they now do—then we run the risk that the laws will be both unenforced and unenforceable. We run the further risk that the law will become an object of contempt and disrespect.

All of these things give us, the law-makers, plenty of food for thought. The crucial role which the law plays in protecting our freedom and at the same time limiting it, the difficult distinctions between permissible and impermissible dissenting behavior, the need for "lawful law enforcement," and finally the importance of realistic and fair laws which truly reflect what society believes to be acceptable behavior—all of these are thoughts which come to mind on Law Day. They are certainly subjects which deserve attention throughout the year.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today is Law Day, U.S.A., created in 1958 by House Joint Resolution 32 in the 87th Congress and first proclaimed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. That resolution set aside May 1 of each year as a special day of celebration by the American people in appreciation of their liberties and the reaffirmation of their loyalty to the United States of America; of their rededication to the ideals of equality and justice under law in their relations with each other as well as with other nations; and for the cultivation of that respect for law that is so vital to the democratic way of life.

The theme this year is: "Justice and equality depend upon law—and you." It reminds Americans that equal justice and equal opportunity involve both law and the attitudes of individual citizens toward fellow citizens.

The objectives of Law Day, U.S.A. are—

First, to foster respect for law and understanding of its essential place in American life;

Second, to encourage citizen support of law observance and law enforcement;

Third, to advance equality and justice under law; and

Fourth, to point up the contrast between freedom under law in the United States and governmental tyranny under communism.

One of the Law Day posters eloquently states the limits of the right to dissent and is most relevant to our troubled and turbulent times. The poster is entitled: "No Man Is Above the Law" and I would like to quote from it as the essence of the message of Law Day, U.S.A.:

The right of dissent has been cherished and preserved since the beginning of our republic. The day must never come when it will be otherwise. Vigorous and effective expressions of dissent and of legitimate grievances are essential ingredients of the democratic process.

But there are valid and necessary limitations on dissent. Freedom of speech does not include incitement of riot. Seeking redress of grievances does not include the right to do violence to persons or the property of others.

A great American, Theodore Roosevelt, observed succinctly: "No man is above the law, and no man is below it."

Events of recent years have proved again that lawlessness and violence do not advance progress, but retard it. They destroy rather than extend civil rights, and they impede rather than promote real solutions to social ills.

They have confirmed that enduring advances toward full realization of the American ideals of equality and justice must come about through lawful channels. And they have reminded us that in a lawful society no one gains by attempts to enforce change by defying the law.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it has been said somewhere that the measure of man's progress through history is the increasing respect which has been accorded to the dignity and integrity of the individual human personality. This is a thought-provoking statement, and, I believe, a true one. Furthermore, I think it provides a standard by which we can judge any particular society.

What does it mean when we say that a society or culture protects and values the dignity of all its members as individuals? To describe a society in this way is to describe a society functioning under the rule of law. I think it is fair to say that the rule of law may be man's highest collective achievement.

Of course, I am speaking of the rule of law here in the ideal sense. No society in history has yet achieved perfect freedom and justice under law. The rule of law is too easily perverted to mean the law of an elite group—a party, a dictator, or simply, "the state." Totalitarian states and dictatorships pass "laws," but deprived of a foundation in principles of equal justice and protection, the term becomes meaningless.

With these thoughts in mind, I think the theme of Law Day, 1969, makes an inspiring message of welcome to the men and women whose new citizenship we celebrate today. "Justice and equality depend upon law—and you."

We are almost unbelievably fortunate to be citizens of a Nation which has made more progress toward the ideal of equal justice and protection under law than perhaps any other society in history. If you try to imagine the mathematical odds against being born to live in this particular era and in this particular country, you will have some idea of what I mean by "almost unbelievable."

You and I inhabit a piece of geography on which a noble and unique experiment in human history is in progress. There is no place in the world's history where we, as ordinary citizens, could have had the power, the dignity, the rights, the freedoms, the opportunities, the strengths, that we enjoy as citizens of the United States of America in 1969.

I think that all of us as citizens ought to ask ourselves from time to time just what it is that has made this American experience possible, what are its foundations. The key is found in the theme of this year's Law Day: "Justice and equality depend upon law—and you." This is the basic fact of American society and government. The responsibility for the expansion of justice and the maintenance of our free and democratic system lies with each individual citizen.

The success of "the American way" depends upon the fulfillment by each individual member of our society of both the rights and duties of his citizenship. Most of these rights and duties come down to us from the earliest days of American political tradition. Many of them were a part of our British and colonial heritage. But the record of American history, too, shows continual progress toward greater justice and equal protection of individuals under law.

As complex as our society has become, our rights and duties as American citizens can be easily stated. We have a right to equal protection of the laws and equal justice in the courts. We have a right to freedom from arbitrary search or arrest. We believe in the right to equal educational and economic opportunities. We have the right to choose public officers in free elections. We have the right to own property. We protect freedom of speech, press, and assembly, even when their irresponsible exercise seems to threaten traditional values. We have the right to worship freely in the religion of our choice. We believe in the right to legal counsel of our own choice and a prompt trial if accused of a crime.

The crucial fact of American citizenship, however, is that all these rights would be lost unless each of us acts responsibly to protect them. This responsibility is the basis of our duties as citizens.

We have a duty to obey the laws. This is true even though specific laws or the application of a law to a specific individual may seem unjust. Perhaps a more accurate way to put it is to say that we must respect our laws. This does not exclude the possibility or desirability of working to change unjust laws.

Inherent in this first duty to obey the laws is our duty to respect the rights of others. This is the foundation of our concern for the expansion of social justice and equality of opportunity. In our society, justice is the extent to which each individual can freely develop the maximum use of his physical and mental resources.

These first two prescriptions are the absolutely essential underpinnings of the American way of life. We are dedicated to the rule of law, not of men; and that rule applies to the greatest just as to the least of us.

A second group of duties relates more specifically to the maintenance of our system of government. We have a duty to inform ourselves on issues of government and community welfare. We have the duty to vote in elections. We have the duty to serve on juries if called. We have the duty to practice and teach the principles of good citizenship in our own homes.

Finally, as citizens, we are called upon at times to fulfill our duty to serve and defend our country and to assist agencies of law enforcement.

Talk of rights and duties always sounds rather dull and uninspiring. What makes this foundation of the American way precious and meaningful to us is the spirit of liberty which is nourished and protected by our citizenship. Perhaps no one has so eloquently stated what this

spirit of liberty means to us as Supreme Court Justice Learned Hand. In an address at an "I am an American Day" ceremony in 1944 he said:

What then is the spirit of liberty? I cannot define it; I can only tell you my own faith. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias; the spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded; the spirit of liberty is the spirit of Jesus Christ who, nearly two thousands years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on Law Day, 1969, it would be well to re-examine the true nature of American justice, for its meaning has been subverted.

The modern protest against injustice has too often become self-oriented. We hear the cry, "The establishment must make me happy; government must make me rich." These are self-serving demands for equality—not justice.

What, then, is justice?

The rendering of what is due or merited?

The impartial adherence to truth of fact?

The quality of being reasonable?

Justice is all of these things. It is also fairness, faithfulness, honor, integrity—but perhaps most of all it is tolerance—a willingness to listen, to consider, to evaluate a point of view, an opinion different from your own. Justice is both a passive and an active concept. It finds expression in contemplation and in commitment.

In our ever-changing world, the concept of justice is immutable. There is perhaps nothing nobler than a commitment to the advancement of human and social justice. Such a commitment on Law Day, 1969 is more necessary than ever before.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, Law Day prompts annual consideration of the system of justice which is the bedrock of our society. It is fitting that on this occasion we pay tribute not only to the law itself but also to its dedicated, responsible enforcers.

In the trying times in which we live, the average citizen owes an ever increasing debt to the policemen and other officers who guard and protect his life, his home and his property. These "men in blue" are often underpaid and overworked, but their devotion to duty and their fellow man forms the basis for our society's first line of defense against organized crime and anarchy.

Today I would like to pay special tribute to the 602 uniformed men in the Alabama Department of Public Safety and through them to all of the police, sheriff's deputies, and other officers engaged in law enforcement in Alabama.

The department of public safety was first organized as the highway patrol in 1935 with only 75 men. At that time, their sole responsibility was the enforcement of traffic laws and regulations. Since that

small beginning, the department of public safety has now grown to its present complement and in addition has assumed a much larger role in the prevention and detection of crime.

Of course, the highway patrol which is now just a division of the department, still maintains primary responsibility for safety on our State's highways, from the farm-to-market road to the eight-lane interstate. In this connection, this division issued more than 100,000 citations to traffic law violators during the last calendar year. An equally important function of the patrol division is a safety education program sponsored in cooperation with high schools and civic organizations throughout the State.

A separate unit, the drivers license division, is responsible for the licensing of prospective drivers and administers over 30,000 road tests per month.

The investigation and identification division provides backup support to supplement local police work, particularly in rural areas, and also assists in coordinating local police activities with those of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other related agencies.

Perhaps most significant from the standpoint of long-range benefits is the training and service division which is responsible for the Alabama Police Academy. This academy was first founded in 1955 in an old hangar at Gunter Air Force Base. Since then the academy has grown and expanded and now occupies a modern two-story building which contains the latest scientific equipment available.

The academy not only trains new recruits for the department of public safety but in addition provides basic training in proper police technique to members of local police forces, sheriffs' departments, and other related agencies throughout the State. Technical and refresher short courses are also available through the year.

We are proud of our department of public safety and the other agencies with which they work, and it is a real pleasure for me to express my deep appreciation and that of my fellow Alabamians to these dedicated public servants.

We often hear that this Nation is a "government of laws and not of men," and there is much truth to this saying. But in a larger sense, without the efforts of the hundreds of loyal public servants in the field of law enforcement, our "government of laws" would afford little protection throughout our land.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, Law Day is worthy of our most earnest consideration. It is a symbol of our national determination to insist upon the continued viability of democratic government which places no man above the law, thereby insuring justice for every citizen.

We have witnessed in the last several years an alarming rise in illegal protest demonstrations, crime, riots, and public disorder in general. I need not repeat the all too familiar statistics. But it is imperative that the citizens of this country, and especially its lawmakers, stress the necessity to stand foursquare behind the laws of the land and the Constitution

which delineates the function of those laws.

This is the oldest constitutional republic in the world. It is perhaps a curious irony that this phenomenon should be found, not in Europe, where democracy was born over 2,500 years ago, but, rather, in the New World, in a country not yet two centuries old. And yet such is the case. It is easy to forget, when one is fortunate, the reality of well-being. I think we have tended to forget, in this country, just how fortunate we have been in our history, in our heritage of free democratic government, free expression, and consideration for individual worth. Despite our problems, and the obvious injustices which have existed in our society, we have accomplished the feat of establishing, and continuing, the most stable government in the world for the better part of 200 years. In that time, we have witnessed a consistent extension of rights to all of our citizens, a process which though not always sustained without difficulty, has nonetheless endured. Despite current inequities, we can point with pride to the fact that minorities in this country today are not forgotten, and indeed, share in the political process, and in the economic benefits of our society, to an unprecedented degree.

We have not turned our backs upon the necessity for amelioration of inequity and injustice. But neither must we turn our backs upon that which makes amelioration possible—the framework of law. For it is a primary axiom of history that when law is weakened, or overthrown, when chaos and anarchy triumph, the logical conclusion to this process is tyranny and repression of the most savage kind.

We may not have Utopia in America; we have not yet reached the millenium. We probably never will. But we do have the most just and workable government in the world, and, up to now, the most stable. We cannot take the risk of throwing this establishment away—a risk we take whenever we fail to realize that it is only within the system of law that justice and equality can truly be attained for all of our citizens.

On this Law Day, therefore, let us renew our dedication to the principle of constitutional government, and determine that the forces of destruction will not prevail, as yet they have not throughout the notable history of this Republic.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this day has been set aside each year to remind us ours is a nation of laws, not simply men, and that our democratic processes depend to large extent on the dedication of our people to lawful processes.

Yet as we look around the Nation today, we see many danger signals which could indicate that a small minority is intent on subverting the lawful order and substituting one of threat, intimidation and violence.

Here in Washington, unrest continues at Howard and American Universities, where authorities are unwilling to require lawful behavior and democratic discussion and deliberation of proposed reforms.

In New York, Columbia University has again suffered the seizure of campus buildings, and City College remains closed because of the illegal activities of a small band of militant extremists. Cornell still smolders after an armed mob forced its views on the institution's leaders.

In South Carolina, strikers are not content with lawful protest, but insist on violating court orders. In Illinois fire bombings continue. And to greater or lesser extent, similar conditions exist elsewhere.

Law Day is a time to pause and consider the breakdown of order and due process. If activity this spring is any indication, we are indeed in for another long hot summer. What of the future of the Republic if this breakdown of law and order is permitted to continue?

The time has come for leadership. Leadership from university presidents to stand up against the angry few in support of the peaceful majority. Leadership from the White House, the Justice Department, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to enforce existing laws. And leadership from the Congress, to take whatever additional steps are necessary to cut off the flow of billions of tax dollars to those who would destroy the foundations of democracy, the respect for law and the orderly process of change.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, disorder rends our country—students seize university buildings, masses of people riot in our cities, desperate men do violence on our streets. Disorder makes law seem like a frail protection. Do any of us feel perfectly secure in our persons, our property, our liberties?

It is well for us to take this day—Law Day, 1969—to reflect on the truth that statutes alone cannot secure us against violence, and that only when justice forms the attitude between man and man will we live in peace.

Justice is the very purpose of law. Justice means to render to every man what belongs to him and it is therefore based on the worth of personal identity.

Justice is not permanently achieved even by the most vigorous and skillful law enforcement. Justice is permanently achieved only if it is based on mutual recognition of personal identity.

Justice cannot constitute the bond of community if men obey the law only out of fear of penalties.

Justice cannot constitute the bond of community even if men obey the law out of respect for law as law. Appeals for compliance with the law for the sole reason that it is the law probably indicate that men are sharply divided against each other with respect to the values to be preserved and the goals to be achieved by the community. Recourse to the letter of the law will not then suffice to restore civil consensus and unity.

Justice will constitute the bond of the community only when men respect the human personality which is the basis of rights and obligations. It is such respect alone which makes men just, and the letter of the law cannot save a community if men are not themselves just.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that at the origin of the disorders on university campuses and in the ghetto areas of our cities is a most serious kind of deprivation—a lack of recognition of human personality.

Many students feel that their universities have no interest in communicating to them any genuine understanding of themselves. Is it possible that universities are so bent on the elaboration of science and technology that they deny students the opportunity to seek the most important aim of education—self-knowledge? Is this why we see students seeking a sense of identity in underground groups of their own in which they find others like themselves and through which they can express their despair and anger in the nihilistic action of confrontation for its own sake? And how many of these students whose emotions are highly inflammable are liable to be welded into an aggressive mass by communist agitators from Students for a Democratic Society or from Progressive Labor who seek the destruction of our institutions?

And what is behind black power and black separatism and black anger but the conviction among black persons that they will never be regarded justly by white people, that they will never be seen as persons invested with personal dignity and worth, that they will never find anything else reflected in the eyes of white people than contempt and hatred? And in reaction to what they see as white attitudes toward themselves Negroes on the campus and in the ghetto seek a sense of identity through black awareness and through racial solidarity and through the collective expression of despair and anger.

The hostility which sets black against white and white against black jeopardizes the effectiveness of civil rights laws enacted to achieve integration through promoting equal opportunity. Fifteen years after the Supreme Court forbade segregated education in Brown against Board of Education and 6 years after James Meredith risked his life to enter the University of Mississippi and to pave the way for Negro students in southern white universities, black students repudiate nondiscrimination and resort to collective violence to make their demands for separate facilities and separate academic curricula. Nor will our whole collection of civil rights laws—Federal, State, and local—suffice to unify our national community so long as mutual disrespect and mutual hostility divide it.

And this must be our lesson for Law Day: law will secure us in our persons and property and liberties when law takes effect in the minds and hearts of men through the just attitude of man to man. Law is not the responsibility of legislators, judges, lawyers, and policemen alone. Law is the responsibility of every man who is a member of the political community. For law must take effect through his response to what other men are and through his recognition of what belongs to them as persons.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the theme of this year's Law

Day holds special importance to those of us here representing the people of this Nation. Only through collective dialog and action will there be further evolving of justice and equality, and, of course, it is incumbent upon us to translate voices of our constituents into effective law.

Yet, we must remember that justice and equality cannot be treated as abstract values. These terms are not rhetorical tools, not phrases of demagoguery. It is what men do that is interpreted as justice and equality, not what men write or what they say.

Thus, it becomes easy to ramble on about devotion to justice and equality, but quite another thing to practice these ideals. Law acts as the vehicle for attaining justice and equality, but law cannot create justice and equality. And it is because justice and equality are so changing—because men are so changing—that we still need to be reminded of the importance of the intertwining of justice and equality through law and through action.

Often, today, the terms "justice" and "equality" assume an aura of radicalism. Much of the dissent evident throughout America—dissent growing from a seemingly widening polarity caused by frustrations and alienation—arise because there is widespread belief that law hinders, rather than advances, justice and equality. The law is viewed as a major hurdle to achieving desired justice and desired equality, and the processes through which laws are determined are thrown aside as irrelevant or archaic. And whenever dissent erupts into conflict and turmoil, the protesters are reviled because they take the law into their own hands.

I do not condone violence and authoritarian tactics as the means of forwarding justice and equality. But neither do I feel that there is no place for dissent within our society. Both viewpoints must compromise, however, unless we aim to replace our participatory democracy with a tragic anarchy without justice, without equality, without law.

The founders of this Nation took the law into their own hands in order to create their view of a more perfect union because, according to the Declaration of Independence:

Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience has shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses of usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security.

Responsible dissent many times is the prelude to newer and broader definitions of the law. Justice and equality under law will continue only as long as citizens participate in the granting and implementing of these ideals. I hope always that we will remain a nation of justice,

of equality, of law, but we also should remain a nation of action.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we should dedicate Law Day 1969 to the youth of America. More particularly, perhaps, dedicate this celebrated day to the college youth of America. It seems to me that in all their posturing for progress and in all their stance for change they have given precious little credit to the great concept of government by law and not men.

When any of us are constrained to, in effect, "take the law into our own hands" we run grave and historically demonstrated dangerous risks. It matters not whether the person or group so involved be a vigilante, a lynch mob, or a righteously indignant group of French peasants, as in the great revolution of that country, results have shown time and time again the aftermath is despotism under those lifted up in violence or despotism under those called to bring new order.

It has always been attractive to romanticize the individual who, in the name of the people and their good cause violently contends with the law. Robin Hood filled this romantic yearning in his time. Jessie James in his. The raw truth is that each of these and all recorded counterparts arrogated to himself most of the benefits and visited indiscriminantly on those he reputedly served the bulk of the burdens of his conduct. Making romantic heroes out of those who articulate our troubles and by their oversimplified obstruction hold the promise of "short cuts" to nirvana has never proven to be productive in any society. We have such folk heroes proliferating in abundance on today's campus grounds and in our troubled cities. Put not your faith in such as these, history loudly and clearly proclaims.

Look to the law, as ultimately you must, to solve your problems. Yes, it is cumbersome; yes, it is slow; yes, it is frustrating, but also it is safe and abundantly more sure than is a summer night's hero. The slowly evolving, painfully acquired body of the common law and the heritage which is ours under the Constitution is what has assured us a place for dissent and a right for protest. Those who would destroy it are friend of neither young or old and are protectors of neither poor nor rich.

I believe in the system of law which we have inherited and to which we owe both thanks and service. Thanks for where it has brought us and service so that it may be so altered and so adjusted that it can take us to where we wish to go. I believe with Dean:

Lo great is the edifice of that structure builded from the framework of the common law that any of us may take just full pride who can point to even so much as one brick of it and say the work of my hand lies there.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity today of participating in the nationwide observance of Law Day, U.S.A., by inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter, with accompanying text of a most timely and thought-provoking Law Day address, from Adele I. Springer, chairman, law

day committee, Wilshire Bar Association of Los Angeles:

WILSHIRE BAR ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 14, 1969.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYBAL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROYBAL: You will be interested to know about a unique program innovated by your constituent, the Wilshire Bar Association, preparatory to the observance of Law Day U.S.A.

As you know, the 87th Congress, by Joint Resolution, designated May 1st of each year as Law Day U.S.A., for "rededication to the ideals of equality and justice under law" by the people and "for the cultivation with respect for law that is so vital to the democratic way of life".

This year's special program of the Wilshire Bar Association for such commemoration of Law Day, is a series of television and radio broadcasts on "Law for Children".

In view of the current violence on the high school and college campuses, members of the Wilshire Bar explain the meaning and importance of law to pre-teenagers, in a series of weekly telecasts for "In-Class Instructional Viewing" in the 4th, 5th and 6th grades of the Los Angeles City Schools, with the hope of instilling at an earlier age a better understanding and appreciation of the American system of law and justice.

In addition to the telecasts for children on the educational stations, more than 100 broadcasts on other Public Service and commercial stations have been arranged, to reach parents as well as the youth, in discussions of law by the lawyers and judges, to encourage better law and order in the community, including foreign language programs.

One of the Law Day speeches, by an officer of the Wilshire Bar Association, delivered in the Wilshire Center District, entitled, "The Spirit of Law Day U.S.A.", is enclosed, as illustrative of the general programming.

Thank you for your courtesy and valued cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

ADELE I. SPRINGER,
Committee Chairman.

THE SPIRIT OF LAW DAY
(Address by Adele I. Springer)

May 1st is Law Day.

It is the spirit of Law Day that I bring you a message.

We assemble here in the Spirit of this year's Law Day theme: "Justice and Equality Depend Upon Law—and You!".

The Spirit of Law Day demands of our people a greater sense of personal responsibility for the maintenance of our country. The very survival of our institutions depend upon your preservation of our Rule of Law.

What precisely is that Spirit of which I speak? It cannot be exactly defined but my own interpretation of it is one of faith in the Spirit of Liberty.

What then is the Spirit of Liberty? It cannot be said any better than was so eloquently expressed by that great American jurist, Judge Learned Hand, whose oft-quoted words bear repetition—as true today as when written a quarter of a century ago:

"Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it. And what is this liberty which must lie in the hearts of men and women? It is not the ruthless, the unbridled will; it is not freedom to do as one likes. That is the denial of liberty, and leads straight to its overthrow. A society in which men recognize no check upon their freedom soon becomes a society where freedom is the possession of only a savage few; as we have learned to our sorrow."

The Spirit of Law Day, then, is to give increased devotion to that Spirit of Liberty.

What was and what is the cornerstone of our Liberty? The pages of our history record the noble deeds and blood of countless Americans of many generations, native and adoptive, who made it possible for us to meet here today to enjoy that Liberty, under a Rule of Law.

What, precisely, do we mean by the Rule of Law? We mean that which is right—the rule of reason. It is significant that the word for "law" in French is "droit" and that the French word for "right" is also the same word "droit". So is it similarly in Spanish with the word "Derecho" meaning both "law" and "right".

When we speak of the "Rule of Law" we mean the system under which the rights of people are governed by established rules, where the freedom and the dignity of the individual are assured, and where disputes are decided by impartial tribunals.

The Rule of Law is not a new phenomena, nor is it anything experimental. It has come down to us from the experience of man since the dawn of civilization. Its application may change, but never its basic principles. The same principles are contained in the Ten Commandments recorded by Moses. The same principles are set forth in the Magna Carta forced by the Barons from King John at Runnymede in 1215 A.D. And these are the same principles which our forefathers borrowed from the wisdom of the ages and wrote into our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

You who are French-Americans know well "La Declaration des Droits de l'Homme" of 1793. Like the American Declaration of Independence, the "Declaration of the Rights of Man" is France's symbol of the rights of individual citizens, with its embodiment of the principal democratic thoughts of the 18th century: "Men are born and remain free and equal in rights"—"The essence of sovereignty resides in the nation"—"Law is the expression of the general will".

That great drafter of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, who was then Minister Plenipotentiary at the head of the American Diplomatic Mission in Paris, penned in some suggested changes when presented with the drafts of the French Declaration of Rights. We are told that General Lafayette, who contributed in the writing of that historic Declaration, had had the first ten amendments to the U.S. Constitution put in a double frame, leaving the other half vacant for the day when he could put their French equivalent into the frame.

Such milestone documents as these—basic documents in the evolution of the rights of man—and others borrowed from ancient times, in the development of the Rule of Law, teach the lessons of history, the warning of which cannot go unheeded.

It is not my purpose here to recount the struggles of mankind. But let us face squarely the fact—the world today is in a ferment, the like of which it has never known before—and in our own country we have been witnessing a period of domestic turmoil—we are today confronted with violence running rampant, and by unparalleled conditions.

The great issue, therefore, is the danger of expedience as against the historic experience which lies behind the fundamentals of American constitutional law which has served as the bulwark of our liberties.

Those among us who would take the law into their own hands, who attempt to pursue Justice and Equality not by law but by force, tugging at the very foundations of our great governmental system, who would destroy constitutional government in America and its system of checks and balances, and who advocate a government by men instead of government by law, would do well to heed the warnings of history.

Some illuminating historical examples may help to provide perspective.

At least a century and a half before the Christian era, Polybius, a Greek historian, charted and recorded the cycle of governments. The descent from democracy to mob rule as described by Polybius should have especial interest to present-day Americans. Let us ponder his prophecy:

"As any survive who have had experience of oligarchia supremacy and domination, they regard their present constitution as a blessing, and hold equality and freedom as of the utmost value. But as soon as a new generation has arisen, and the democracy has descended to their children's children, long association weakens their value for equality and freedom. For the mob, habituated to feed at the expense of others, and to have its hope of a livelihood in the property of its neighbors, as soon as it has got a leader sufficiently ambitious and daring, being excluded by poverty from the sweets of civil honors, produces a reign of mere violence. Then come tumultuous assemblies, massacres, banishments, redivisions of land; until, after losing all trace of civilization, it has once more found a master and a despot."

One wonders whether he was writing the history of governments ended over two thousand years ago, or was gifted with prevision into our own times.

One of the greatest lawyers of antiquity, Cicero, similarly seems to have been clairvoyant when he emphasized that "Freedom itself punishes with slavery a people whose freedom has no bounds."

It should be remembered that both Polybius and Cicero warned that the decay of democratic institutions commences with the third or fourth generation—and we now are not far removed.

We are reminded that the 19th Century French philosopher, Frederic Bastiat, prophesied that, what he described as "legalized plunder," would become the greatest threat to our Republic.

Let us also not overlook our own martyred Lincoln's admonition, that we have "more to fear within our own borders than from without."

Benjamin Franklin had in mind those struggles of the spirit when, as he left Independence Hall after the Constitution had been signed, he cautioned:

"We have given you a Republic, if you can keep it."

We have kept our Republic for almost two centuries. We have kept the Spirit of the Rule of Law. Democracy is of the Spirit. It is based on the worth and dignity of the individual. Our government is based upon equal justice to everyone regardless of race, color, creed, or station in life. It is not based upon the principle that its powers may be used by any segment of our people to gain advantage over the others. The democratic ways of life are based upon the conviction that the common interests can be better served by relying upon the rule of law rather than upon force.

History's lessons are just as plain today as they were to that great champion of rights of yesteryear, Edmund Burke, who aptly declared, that governments are a covenant with the dead, the living, and the unborn. You, individually, represent that compact.

We are the heirs-at-law and beneficiaries of those valiant architects of freedom. They did not view government as something to support them—they supported the government. We are the successors of those great and heroic trailblazers of history who fought the good fight. Ours is the task of developing and protecting the heritage of a free government under Law which the sacrifices of the past have made it possible for us to enjoy.

To this task of preserving the Rule of Law, the members of the Bench and Bar are

dedicated. To this ideal, all of our citizens, citizens by birth and citizens by choice—must be re-dedicated.

This is the Spirit of our Government under Law envisioned by those who assured our Liberty and from whose lifeless hands the burning torches of freedom and responsibility have been passed on to us! If you are worthy of our heritage, you will keep the flame aloft!

This year's Law Day theme of the American Bar Association, initiator of Law Day in the cause of liberty under law, portrays a torch held aloft with joined hands—holding aloft the ideal of equality and justice—a torch of order and justice.

Shall we permit the flame to die? What are the alternatives? Shall we preserve the Rule of Law which has given us the most advanced form of government known to man—a form of government in which the spirits of men are free—or shall we permit ourselves to slip back into a primitive form of government, such as that which prevailed before our government "of the people, by the people, for the people", was "conceived in liberty"? I have no doubt that every one of you would answer in reply to the abstract question that we must by all means preserve democracy, but an answer to the abstract question is not enough.

The important question is: What are you going to do against the attempt of a very small minority of our people to fasten upon us that same system which existed in the governments of antiquity and of the Middle Ages, with complete loss to the average individual of economic opportunity and freedom under law? When we reflect on this, the wonder of it is that we have tolerated until now such disorders and such disservice to everything for which America stands! Economic opportunity exists for men and women only so long as they continue to recognize their social responsibilities and protect them from invasion by other individuals or by political forces.

"The greatest menace to freedom is an inert people"—as was so well stated by that great jurist and statesman, Justice Brandeis.

These words by Goethe also are fitting to our times:

"Yes, This thought I hold with firm persistence; The last result of wisdom stamps it true; He only earns his freedom and existence Who daily conquers them anew!"

That your Association is conscious of its responsibilities, is made evident by this Assembly of thinking men and women, and by your dedication of this meeting to the theme of Law Day.

"Men grow in stature only as they rededicate themselves to a noble faith", said our recently departed former President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

It is noteworthy that it was the late President Eisenhower who proclaimed the first Law Day, in 1958. In tribute to his memory, let us take to heart the words of his first LAW DAY Proclamation: "The world no longer has a choice between force and law; if civilization is to survive, it must choose the rule of law."

President Eisenhower, again, in a Message to the Convention of the American Bar Association, in 1959, emphasized: "Peace cannot prevail until men and nations recognize that their conduct must be governed by respect for and observance of the law."

In fact, his warning is more timely at his passing than it was even at its utterance.

He kept faith in America's traditions and institutions. We would honor his memory best by keeping alive such dedication and bequeathing them to oncoming generations. With the magnificent example of this great American before us, let us all rededicate ourselves to such faith in America—to faith in the Rule of Law.

We assemble here this Law Day through gratitude for the Rule of Law we still enjoy in this nation.

We recognize, however, that the acme of perfection was not reached when our Constitution was placed in operation and that conditions change with the years, but the basic principles and purposes of government have not changed.

We recognize, too, that, in the spirit of Law Day, we must "remodel" the machinery of government to meet changing conditions. Such changes, however, must be made by lawful means and within the proven framework of the Constitution's basic principles. It is trite to say that we live in a world that is ever changing amidst things which never change. Among those things which never change is the longing for liberty. But freedom and liberty cannot exist without Justice. Among those things which must not change are the basic principles of our government.

There have necessarily been changes in the application of basic principles to the needs of an ever changing social and economic order, but no change in the basic principles themselves.

In the span of years, the enormous technological changes which have been transforming the society that the law serves, necessitate many new rules. But that does not mean that we should not meet these problems within the framework of our basic law and upon the basis of tried and true principles.

We have come from the isolation of the pioneer to an interdependence undreamed of when this nation was founded. In California alone the population has grown to many times greater than the total population of all the original thirteen States. It is recalled that when our Constitution was formulated, the aggregate population was then less than 4,000,000. Only 3.3 percent of the entire population of that period resided in cities of 8,000 or more, and there were but six cities of that size in all America. The tremendous shift from the rural to the urban areas and the modern technical and other advances have resulted in economic and social problems unknown when the sound principles within the framework of history were structured into our Constitution and Government. But we must consider the law against the whole panorama of man's continuing experience.

Upon this foundation we have grown to be the greatest nation of our day and our people have been blessed with liberty and economic opportunities never enjoyed by any other people of any other government in the recorded history of mankind.

That great legal scholar, Dean Roscoe Pound, put it this way: "Law must be stable and yet it cannot stand still!"

The Courts have demonstrated that our Constitution is a flexible document with remarkable powers of adaptation under which our nation has been able to meet its problems for almost two centuries.

The words of George Washington, in the Constitutional Convention—are as true today as in 1787—"Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hands of God".

It therefore follows that, Liberty for the individual under law is enshrined not only in those great Charters of human freedom but in our hearts; and that, indeed, "Eternal Vigilance is the Price of Liberty".

This, then, is the "Spirit of Law Day 1969"—in the "Spirit of 1776".

And so it is that the Spirit of Law Day is this year's Law Day theme: "Justice and equality depend upon law—and you!"

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

THE EMERGENCY SMALL LOAN PROGRAM: ITS BENEFITS IN JASPER, ALA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced the Emergency Small Loan Act of 1969. The act would extend a program which was initiated by my amendment in 1966 to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The loans are limited to \$300, an amount sufficient to meet most personal financial crises, and an interest rate of 2 percent per annum is charged. The nominal rate of interest compares well to the 3 percent which is charged students and graduate students with national defense loans; and surely, the alleviation of suffering is as worthy a cause as providing the opportunity for a prosperous career.

I have surveyed the results of the 15 "demonstration programs" designed to test out the principle that even the poorest of the poor deserve some form of credit relief during times of personal emergency, and the assumptions upon which this program is further predicated, namely that the poor would make every effort to repay these loans and that conventional credit services which exclude these people from the benefits of their services do an injustice to them. I would like to take this occasion to report on one response to my survey, in Jasper, Ala.

Jasper is located in the northern part of Alabama in Walker County, which is in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. This district has received able representation in Congress since 1967 from the Honorable TOM BEVILL. The Walker-Winston County Community Action Committee, Inc., which supervises the program in his area, is but one example of the many services accruing to his district because of Congressman BEVILL's service in the House of Representatives.

The Community Action Committee, Inc., received an original grant of \$174,201 of which \$110,698 was budgeted for the loan fund and \$63,503 for operational expenses. As of December 31, 1968, 761 loans had been made, totalling \$111,759. This amount completely exhausted the loan fund. Collections amounted to \$45,998, and 119 loans have been paid in full. There are 642 loans outstanding, constituting \$63,186. A recent audit charged off 30 loans, or \$4,178, but most of these cases were deceased or had left the area.

The statistics are encouraging but they tend to gloss over the real "gut" problems with the emergency loans were meant to solve. Therefore, I think it would be appropriate to look at four case histories which have been reported to me by the director of the Community Action Committee in Jasper:

CASE NO. 1: MRS. LUCILLE GUYTON, JASPER, ALA.

Mrs. Guyton is a widow with eight children, four of which are in school. She was existing on \$80 per month, which she earned working

as a maid when work was available. She was paying \$20 rent on a very run down shack—no water, etc. She did not get any assistances from welfare or the Food Stamp Program. We insisted that before she got her loan of \$125.00 that she apply for assistances through the welfare and the food stamp program. In fact, we set up her appointments and were told by both agencies that they could and would help. She was advanced \$25 on that weekend as the household was out of food and money. We have also helped her move to a much better house, in a better neighborhood. No payments have been missed by Mrs. Guyton as of this date.

CASE NO. 2: MR. ALEC E. FREEMAN, QUINTON, ALA.

Mr. Alec E. Freeman is a victim of emphysema; he also has a daughter with leukemia. Mr. Freeman has to have oxygen available at all times and his daughter has to have transfusions on a regular basis. This had been taking all of their income which is from social security and welfare in the total amount of \$151 per month. They have four children, three of which are in school. Due to the high cost of treatment and medicine they had gotten behind in their appliance payments and were about to lose them. We made them a loan of \$225 on which no payments have been missed.

The Walker County Health Department was contacted on their behalf and they promised to provide some medical assistance to them.

CASE NO. 3: MR. CHARLES F. GARDNER, JASPER, ALA.

Mr. Gardner, had a two and a half year old son dying with cancer. Treatment and hospital expenses had erased their savings and the child had to be brought home. He had to have twenty-four hour attention so his wife attended the boy in the day time and the husband at night. It was mandatory that he quit work. We made them an emergency loan of \$300 for food stamps, medicine and emergency subsistence. They have six other children from one year old to sixteen with three in school.

CASE NO. 4: MR. MELVIN BRUNER, OAKMAN, ALA.

Mr. Bruner had an accident being run over by a truck leaving him with a back condition which disabled him from work. They were about to lose their stove, refrigerator and other household goods.

Having six of eight children in school was quite a burden on an income from welfare of \$140 per month. With the assistance of emergency loan staff one of their daughters was able to get on the NYC In-School Work Training Program which is sponsored by the Community Action Agency. This increased their earnings by fifty dollars per month.

We made them a loan in the amount of \$300 enabling them to save their appliances and furniture from repossession. They have not missed a payment on their loan.

These case histories illustrate the outstanding successes of the program far better than any preamble of legislative purposes or administrative statistics could possibly do. That we could have had such an impact upon so many lives by such a small effort on our part should inspire us to rededicate ourselves to the principle of emergency loans to the poor and to extend the program through H.R. 9643, the Emergency Consumer Small Loan Act of 1969.

SCHWENGEL TAX REFORM PROGRAM—1969

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the balance of my tax reform program. The purpose of my tax reform program is simple—to prevent a revolt. Yes, the purpose of my tax reform program is to remove the inequities from our present system of taxation before there is "open revolt" by our low- and middle-income taxpayers. These are the so-called forgotten people who have been "paying the bill" without fuss for so many years. Taxes are high and there has been some grumbling, but I think most taxpayers on reflection, feel that they have been getting their money's worth for their tax dollar. However, the grumbling has increased considerably, and justifiably so, with increased examples of the many loopholes by which the wealthy escape taxation of their income and assets. If our system of self-assessed taxation is to continue, we must have meaningful tax reform, and now.

The tax reform program which I have assembled is not perfect by any means, but it is a bona fide attempt to correct some of the more flagrant loopholes and inequities in our tax system. I have already introduced eleven bills relating to my reform program, and am introducing seven more today. The net effect of my proposed legislation would be to increase revenues by almost \$2.5 billion. Most of the revenue gained by plugging loopholes would be used to offset the revenue loss resulting from increasing the personal exemption.

The areas included in my tax reform program are as follows:

1. INCREASE PERSONAL EXEMPTION TO \$1,200

One of the biggest inequities in our present tax system is the \$600 personal exemption for purposes of Federal income tax. The personal exemption was set at the \$600 level in 1947, and no changes have been made since that date. In the meantime, inflation has increased the cost of living by more than 50 percent. This inequity hits hardest in large families with low incomes, those least able to bear the additional burden. To correct this inequity, I am proposing that the personal exemption be raised from \$600 to \$1,200. This increase in the amount of the exemptions will be expensive in terms of revenue loss. Some estimate it will result in the loss of \$17 billion of revenue. To offset part of this loss, I plan to add a provision which would limit the exemption of middle and lower income brackets. This would be accomplished by the use of the so-called vanishing or reducing exemption. It would work like this: Persons with income of \$20,000 or less would enjoy the full \$1,200 exemption; those with incomes from \$20,000 to \$26,000 would have an exemption ranging from \$1,200 to \$600; and finally, those with incomes over \$26,000 would be limited to the present \$600 exemption. This effectively limits the increase in the exemption to those families who need it the most, and would reduce the revenue loss by approximately \$6 billion.

There is an indirect effect which will be achieved by increasing the personal exemption, and it is very important too.

The increase will place an additional amount of funds in the hands of a group of consumers who will most likely plow them right back into the economy. The additional revenue to be gained by this increase in activity in the economy is hard to judge, but could result in several billion dollars worth of additional tax revenue.

2. CORRECT INEQUITIES IN DEDUCTIONS ALLOWED FOR INCOME TAX PURPOSES

As a result of court actions, administrative rulings, and just plain laxness on the part of some officials, the deductions allowed on our income tax returns have become major loopholes. For the most part these loopholes have benefited one group, the wealthy. We have overlooked this area for far too long. But the time has come when the average taxpayer who is carrying his full share of the tax load, and a heavy one it is, has said to the Congress: Put a stop to this.

First, curb abuse of charitable deductions: One deduction which some wealthy taxpayers have abused is that of the charitable deduction. Let me make it quite clear that I do favor charitable contributions, and do not want to see them curtailed on a wholesale basis. However, the time has come to end the serious abuses in this area. Some wealthy people are able to invest their assets in investments such as State and local bonds, which result in tax-free income. They then qualify for unlimited charitable deductions by donating 90 percent of their taxable income to charity. Thus, they can donate enough to offset their taxable income, and still live a very comfortable life on the income from their tax-exempt investments. And, they pay no Federal income tax whatsoever.

The Treasury Department has proposed a limitation of 50 percent on charitable contributions to curb this abuse. My legislation implements this proposal. The Treasury has estimated this reform will produce \$1.1 billion in additional revenue.

Second, liberalize moving expenses: today we live in a highly mobile society. In many industries it is not uncommon for employees to be forced to move their families every two years. Present regulations allow some deductions for the expenses incurred with such a move, but are far too restrictive for today's inflated moving costs.

Among the costs which I feel should be deductible are the following: Cost of house hunting trips; temporary living costs at new location while awaiting permanent quarters; and certain costs incurred in selling the home. The Treasury has recommended a \$1,500 maximum on the deduction, and I concur in this recommendation. It is estimated that these changes will result in a revenue loss of approximately \$85 million.

Third, eliminate gas tax deduction: The Department of the Treasury has also recommended that the deduction presently allowed for taxes paid to States on gasoline be eliminated. These taxes, are in effect, charges for the use of the States' highways, and it is difficult to justify the deduction. I feel, and I am sure you feel the same way, that each motorist should pay his own way insofar

as the use of the highways. I don't want or expect nonusers to subsidize me, and that is the effect of this deduction. For this reason I concur in the Treasury recommendation to eliminate this deduction with respect to personal use of automobiles. My program implements this proposal.

Fourth, tax-loss farming: A major loophole in this area is the one allowed for losses resulting from farm operations. This problem has two aspects, with the aspect of revenue loss probably being the least important. The most serious problem results from the unfair competition when wealthy individuals almost deliberately operate their farms so as to achieve a tax loss. They can then deduct their loss against other nonfarm income. These people really have no intention of operating their farms for a profit. The result is obvious. Bona fide farmers are forced to compete with these so-called "gentleman" farmers.

Another aspect of this problem is the unfair image it gives to the person who is trying to make his livelihood from farming. The "honest" farmer should not be penalized and given a bad name by those who seek to take advantage of tax loopholes for their own selfish gains. The bill which I have introduced, with certain exceptions, limits the deduction for farm losses to the amount of income realized from bona fide farming operations. It will effectively limit the use of this deduction to those for whom it was originally intended. The bill which I have introduced in this area is the same bill which was introduced by Senator MILLER in the Senate and by Congressmen KYL, GROSS, and MAYNE, S. 1560 and H.R. 8952, respectively.

3. ESTABLISHMENT OF A MINIMUM TAX

I was shocked to learn recently that 21 taxpayers in this country with incomes in excess of \$1 million did not pay any income tax for the tax year 1967. There were an additional 134 taxpayers whose adjusted incomes exceeded \$200,000 and who likewise paid no income tax. Any self-assessing tax system such as we use in the United States must remain reasonable and equitable or the taxpayers will lose faith in it, and it will fall of its own weight. When inequities such as the examples I have just cited can exist under our system, I would say that it is in danger of falling of its own weight. Even though closing of this particular loophole will not result in vastly increased revenues to the Treasury, enactment of a minimum tax is vital to preservation of our system of taxation. The psychological impact of this legislation is probably far more important than the estimated \$420 million in revenue which would be generated by it. My legislation adopts the proposals advanced by the Treasury Department. The bill would place a ceiling of 50 percent on income which could be excluded from taxation. At the present time, through various manipulations, some individuals are able to exclude nearly all of their income.

4. QUALIFYING SINGLE PERSONS AS HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

For a number of years, our tax laws have contained a very basic inequity with

respect to persons who qualify as head of household, and thus a lower tax bracket. In most cases, single people living away from their parents home are required to equip and maintain a household in nearly as extensive a manner as would a married person. It seems to me to be grossly unfair to continue to discriminate against single people in this respect. If they are forced to maintain a household, they should be given the corresponding tax break enjoyed by married persons. The effects of my bill in this respect are difficult to estimate. Presumably there will be some loss of income but I have been unable to obtain any reliable estimates.

5. TAX APPRECIATION AT DEATH

Another area which has too long enjoyed the luxury of the absence of close scrutiny is that of estate and gift tax. Once again, we have the situation where loopholes have developed over the years. And, again, the principal beneficiaries of these loopholes are the wealthy.

The general rule with respect to capital gains on stocks and other property results in a tax being imposed at the time property is sold and the increase in value is realized. If the owner retains his stock or property until his death he can pass it on to his heirs without the increase in value being taxed. The heirs pay a tax based only on any increase in value between the time they inherit the property and the time they sell it. By this device a good deal of tax can be avoided. Naturally, this loophole is most beneficial to those who are wealthy enough to retain the bulk of their estate until their death. My bill has the effect of taxing the increase in value at the death of the owner. It is estimated that this bill would have the effect of producing \$2½ billion in additional revenue.

6. INCREASE GIFT TAX

Another loophole in this area has the opposite effect of the problem just discussed. I refer to the fact that gifts during a person's lifetime are taxed at a rate equal to three-fourths of the rate for property transferred at death. In addition, it is possible to give away up to \$3,000 per year per person—donee—without paying any gift tax. The effect of this loophole is to encourage gifts during the lifetime of the owner. Again, the only people who can take full advantage of this loophole are the wealthy.

I would propose to close this loophole by raising the gift tax by 25 percent so that it will be the same as the estate tax. My bill would produce an estimated \$150 million in revenue.

The effect of my bill is basically the same effect as the Uniform Transfer Act proposed by the Treasury Department. There are some advantages to the Treasury proposal and I may at a later date, substitute the Uniform Transfer Act for this bill.

7. LIBERALIZE PAYMENT RULES TO PREVENT FORCED SALES

The Treasury Department has proposed a liberalization of the rules relative to payment of the estate tax, particularly with respect to closely held corporations and family farms. The purpose of the legislation which they recommend is to prevent the forced sale of

a closely held corporation or a family farm to pay the estate tax. This is an improvement to ease the problem of the average man. The proposal would allow the tax to be paid off over a longer period of time and thus allow the corporation or the farm to continue to produce profits with which to pay the taxes. In the past, many small closely held corporations and family farms had to be sold in order to pay the tax. My legislation puts this proposal into effect.

8. ELIMINATE PAYMENT OF ESTATE AND GIFT TAX WITH BONDS AT PAR VALUE

The sale of Government bonds would seem to be a worthy goal. However, by use of a special provision in the estate tax law, the purchase of Government bonds turns out to be another tax loophole. The provision to which I refer allows an estate to pay the estate tax due the Federal Government with Government bonds, at par value, even though they have not matured. Thus, if a person is fairly certain that he will have a high estate tax bill to pay he can purchase \$50,000 worth of Government bonds with a face value of \$60,000 at maturity. At the time of his death, the bonds can be offset against the tax which is due, at the face value, that is to say, \$60,000, even though the market value would be closer to the original purchase price of \$50,000. My bill closes this loophole.

CORPORATIONS

9. ELIMINATE MULTIPLE SURTAX EXEMPTION FOR CORPORATIONS

A problem area with respect to corporate taxes is that of the corporate surtax. I refer here not to the income tax surtax of 10 percent which was recently enacted, but rather the provision which allows corporations to pay a tax of 22 percent on the first \$25,000 of income and 48 percent on any income over \$25,000. The existence of this provision has enticed a number of corporations to split their operations into multiple small corporations so that they will be able to take advantage of this provision many times over. If all their operations were carried on in the name of one corporation, they would be entitled to one corporate surtax exemption, whereas if they split up into a series of multiple corporations all controlled by the parent corporation they will be able to take advantage of the corporate surtax exemption with respect to each of those subsidiary corporations. The intent of this legislation was to assist the small corporation, but by virtue of the abuse of this provision the opposite effect has resulted. The legislation which I have proposed will tighten up the requirements for the use of this provision, and will result in additional income of \$200 million to the Treasury each year.

10. ELIMINATE \$100 DIVIDEND EXCLUSION

In 1954, a section was added to the Internal Revenue Code which excluded the first \$100 of dividend income received by the taxpayer. The theory behind this provision was that corporate stockholders would otherwise be taxed twice on the same income. It can be argued that elimination of the \$100 exclusion would result in double taxation. However, the corporation and the shareholder are two separate entities and it certainly would

not seem terribly inequitable to tax each of them independently. There are numerous situations in our tax laws where a person ends up paying a tax on a tax. My bill to eliminate this loophole would bring additional revenues of \$225 million per year into our Treasury.

11. ELIMINATE ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION ALLOWANCE ON SPECULATIVE REAL ESTATE

Eliminate the accelerated depreciation allowance on speculative real estate. Real estate speculators have been able to utilize the provisions of section 1250 of the Internal Revenue Code to realize vast profits. They work their operation like this: First, they buy property and utilizing the accelerated depreciation provision, charge off—or recover—a large portion of their investment in the first few years, then they sell the property and avoid the lower depreciation rates for subsequent years.

By repeating this process often, he can generate a nice profit. And, of course, any gain realized is taxed at the preferential capital gains rates. In the meantime he offsets the large amounts of depreciation against ordinary income.

12. TAX ALL STOCK OPTIONS

For some time now, the device of the stock option has been used to reward corporate executives. Under this plan, the corporate executive is given the option of buying stock at the price set at the time the option is given to him. He may have a lengthy period in which to exercise this option and normally the price of the stock will increase during the period in which he is holding the option. At such time as he does exercise the option, he will pay a tax on the increase in value, but at the preferential capital gains tax rates. An example of this would be the case of an option given to an executive for the purchase of stock in the corporation at \$5 per share, where he held the option until the stock had risen in value to \$10 per share, and then upon exercise of the option, he would pay tax on the \$5 increase in value at capital gains rates. The net effect of this provision is to allow the executive to pay roughly half as much tax as he would have paid if the equivalent of the option had been given to him in cash or in salary.

13. REDUCTION OF MINERAL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

The concept of allowing a businessman to charge off depreciation on his plant and equipment is fair and is readily accepted. Many years ago, a provision was written into the law to give as nearly as possible, this same treatment to the producers of various minerals. The difference, however, is the fact that there are some fairly restrictive limitations on the period for which a businessman may take depreciation on various items of equipment and machinery, whereas the mineral producer is allowed to continue his depreciation on the oil well indefinitely. Specifically, it provides that the producer can exclude 27½ percent of his gross income so long as it does not exceed a maximum of 50 percent of net income.

This gimmick allows the mineral producers, in particular, the oil producers, to recover the average cost of their oil

well 19 times, according to a Treasury estimate. The result of this provision has been to force the country as a whole to subsidize the users of petroleum products. It may be that elimination or reduction of this allowance will force an increase in the price of petroleum products. I strongly feel, however, that the consumers who are using the petroleum products should be paying the full cost, and that they should not be subsidized by the taxpayers as a whole. And, of course, any increase in petroleum prices would have to be justified on its own merits, and not just on the basis of a reduction in the depletion allowance. I am proposing that the allowance be reduced from 27½ percent to 10 percent. My bill to achieve this would produce an estimated \$2½ billion in additional revenue for the Treasury.

14. ELIMINATE FOREIGN DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

I feel even more strongly about the use of the depletion allowance for foreign oil investments. With respect to foreign investments, I feel that the oil depletion should be completely eliminated. My legislation in this respect would generate an additional \$2 billion in revenue.

15. TAX THE INTEREST ON STATE AND LOCAL BONDS

The problems presented by taxation of State and local bonds is very great. For many years we have subsidized these bonds by exempting the interest paid on them from Federal income taxation. This subsidy was granted because it was very difficult for the local governments to compete in the money market with other bonds. Recent studies indicate that the Federal Government could in effect, save a vast amount of money by taxing the interest on those bonds, and providing direct interest subsidies to the States and municipalities. Once again, the prime beneficiary of this provision in the tax law has been the wealthy. The average tax bracket of people purchasing tax-exempt bonds are those taxpayers in the 48-percent tax bracket. My proposal therefore, would be to make interest on all State and local bonds taxable, and to establish a corporation to handle the subsidization of State and local bond issues. I would estimate that the increase in revenue to be realized by taxation of these bonds would be approximately \$1 billion.

16. INCREASE AMOUNT OF CAPITAL GAINS SUBJECT TO TAXATION

The provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and subsequent amendments to it, provide for special treatment for capital gains realized on investments held for a period in excess of 6 months. Only 50 percent of the gain for qualified property is taxed, subject to a maximum tax percentage of 25 percent. It is difficult for me to justify this preferential treatment, and particularly the short 6-month period required to qualify for this preferential treatment. It is my present plan to introduce legislation which would reduce the amount of income which would be subject to capital gains. At the present time, only 50 percent of the capital gains are taxed subject to the maximum of 25-percent tax rate. The legislation which I propose would subject 75 percent of the gain to taxation at

regular rates. This legislation should produce an additional \$2 billion in revenue for the Treasury.

As I indicated initially, my program for tax reform is not perfect, and I would certainly welcome any comments or criticisms of any phase of the program. The items contained in the program appear to me to be the ones most in need of immediate attention, and the solutions I have offered appear to be the best available at this time.

PARIS NEGOTIATION ON VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, certainly all Americans are hopeful that the Paris negotiations will yield an acceptable settlement. I applaud the new administration for intensifying the search for a negotiated settlement.

However, we must note that negotiations began on May 13, 1968. In the last 11 months, while negotiations have been underway, some 11,500 American troops have been killed in action. Thus, while we properly continue to seek a negotiated settlement, it is clear that we must develop and implement an alternative and parallel approach for scaling down the U.S. commitment—should these negotiations either fail or take longer than it is wise to wait.

After 2½ years of intensive analysis of the Vietnam war—and after visiting Vietnam in February—I am convinced the United States is overcommitted in Vietnam. There is insufficient strategic justification to warrant the continued expenditure of \$30 billion a year and some 200 to 300 American lives each week. We are spending too much American blood and money in Vietnam. It is time to begin to carefully scale down our commitment—with or without a negotiated agreement. It is time to de-Americanize the war by shifting the combat responsibility back to the South Vietnamese—slowly but steadily.

From my recent conversations with President Thieu and others, I am convinced that we are at the point where we should begin a staged withdrawal of American troops. I believe it is practical to talk in terms of withdrawing some 50,000 troops at this time—as the initial step of a plan to withdraw all American combat forces—on a carefully staged basis, over approximately the next 2 years. Such a plan would guarantee only that the South Vietnamese have a fair, fighting chance to make it on their own.

It is important to note that this would be a unilateral allied plan which would not require enemy concurrence. This approach should be thought of as a fail-safe parallel plan to be coupled with intensive negotiations—which would provide a certain scaling down of the U.S. commitment should negotiations either fail or take longer than it is prudent to wait.

It is essential that such a plan be carried out in a manner specifically designed to minimize the chance for miscalculation by our allies or adversaries

with respect to American will, our strategic international commitments, or our probable future actions.

I believe such a policy is in the best interests of the United States and the South Vietnamese.

Careful analysis of recent observable actions with respect to U.S. involvement in Vietnam leads me to conclude that a significant new program of “de-Americanization” is being developed and implemented by the Nixon administration. I am encouraged by these developments.

While feeling an urgent need to scale down the U.S. commitment, I have concluded, on the basis of this emerging administration emphasis on de-Americanization, that it would serve the interests of the country to give the President another 40 to 60 days to complete his reformulation and redirection of American policy in Vietnam.

I therefore urge my colleagues and our citizens to bear with the President in the weeks immediately ahead—and support his initiatives with respect to Vietnam.

AMERICANS OF ITALIAN ORIGIN SHOULD NOT BE STIGMATIZED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the new administration's fight against organized crime would not be steeped in the disgraceful tradition of the past. But now I know better. I know that the era of untruths, distortion, and fantasy for the benefit of the public image is still with us.

Once again, it has been clearly implied that organized crime is the exclusive preserve of Americans of Italian origin. In that context, President Nixon's crime message last week was disappointing, sad, misleading, unfair—and I regret to say—insulting to our Nation's 22 million law-abiding Americans of Italian ancestry.

One has only to read the text of the President's message to get his clear but absurd signal equating organized crime with Italian-Americans. Passage after passage is replete with such implications.

As an illustration, I quote this passage:

The arrest, conviction and imprisonment of a Mafia lieutenant can curtail operations, but does not put the syndicate out of business.

Here is another illustration:

Not a single one of the 24 Cosa Nostra families has been destroyed.

The President also said:

They are more firmly entrenched and more secure than ever before. It is vitally important that Americans see this alien organization for what it really is . . .

Regrettably but understandably, much of the Nation's news media followed the President's lead and reported accordingly and extensively about the “alien organization” described in his message. The President's very words virtually dictated that “this alien organization” be characterized as the Mafia or the Cosa

Nostra—and in either case, the reputations of so many respectable Italian-Americans were again impugned.

The President asked for \$61 million to fight what he called “La Cosa Nostra” whose membership, he claimed, totals 5,000. Simply translated, the President asked Congress to spend more than \$12,000 for each one of the 5,000 in a single year. It is astounding when you consider that our boys are fighting for their lives in the jungles of Vietnam with \$75 rifles.

Nonetheless, if I thought the administration had the problem in focus—and that is essential if we are to get meaningful results—I would have no hesitancy whatsoever about spending \$61 million to get the job done.

But there are obviously top Government officials charged with the responsibility of law enforcement who do not even know the makeup of the crime syndicate. So they choose to deal in the fantasy that has become organized crime's best ally because you cannot apprehend a suspect when you do not know who he is. If we are to make any progress, we must shake loose from that trap. If we are to be effective we must be thoroughly realistic. That is the only way the job can be done right.

As a police officer on the streets of New York City for 23 years, I came up against every kind of criminal and spilled my share of blood in the performance of my duty. If I have learned anything from it all, it is that organized crime—or any kind of criminal activity—is not now and never was a matter of nationality.

I commend to the President's attention the tens of thousands of Italian-Americans in the field of law enforcement who are risking life and limb daily to carry out increasingly difficult and dangerous duties for the preservation of law and order.

Yes, there are Italian-Americans who are immersed in organized crime. But there are others, too; many others of varied nationalities and backgrounds who are engaged in every facet and at every level of organized crime.

In the past, I have spoken out about this subject as President of the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service Inc., an organization of 80,000 Americans of Italian origin. I have carried this crusade to the newspapers and to the television networks and, frankly, not without a measure of intimidation from certain quarters.

Now, for the first time, I speak about this subject as a Member of Congress. Some well-meaning associates have cautioned me about the sensitivity of my present position. They have said that my words could be readily twisted so that they would be misunderstood.

The alternative would be to remain silent. I cannot do that—I will not do that while millions of Italian-Americans continue to be stigmatized. Their children are scarred psychologically; they are subordinated to the role of second-class citizens. During this period of concentration on civil rights, let us have civil rights for all.

I hope, therefore, that my words will be heard more clearly simply because I am a Member of this 91st Congress. I hope that the meaning and purpose of my words will help impart the sense of direction we need so badly if we are ever going to stamp out organized crime.

"La Cosa Nostra," as the President called it, became part of the American vocabulary when discredited Government witness Joseph Valachi starred in the useless, televised Senate hearings of 1963.

At the time, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover made it plain that he was not impressed by the hearings and Valachi's allegations. Mr. Hoover obviously had good reason to feel that way because not a single conviction was obtained nor a single law enacted as a result of those hearings that proved to be nothing more than a grim circus. If anything was accomplished, it was the perpetration of a fraud on the American public and the temporary enhancement of the public image of certain officials at the expense of Americans of Italian origin.

To continue to relate organized crime to any one particular group is a disservice to all of the people of our Nation because we will not cure the ailment until we diagnose it correctly. I am convinced that this is largely the reason why organized crime becomes a greater threat each year to the welfare of our Nation.

There are many among us who have not taken the time to look at the facts. Or, if they have looked at the facts, they have been blinded by them. They have been engaged in a form of self-deception that is tearing at the fabric of our Nation and giving the crime syndicate unprecedented power and strength.

We have been embarked on an aimless course navigated by pilots who have been telling us in one way or another that there would be no organized crime if there were no Italian-Americans living in our Nation. In spite of the fact that FBI statistics prove otherwise, we have not moved off that course.

If we are ever going to combat organized crime, we must see it for what it really is. It is least of all an "alien organization" whose franchise belongs solely to Americans of Italian, Irish, German, Polish, or any other ancestry.

It is purely and simply a conglomeration of diverse nationalities united by the common bond of crime for profit. Ethnic background does not in any way govern the rise or fall of its membership and hierarchy. They live by and respect but one law—the law of the jungle. In their arena, the weak perish and the strong survive.

If responsible officials do not begin examining the facts, we will never overcome the forces who are corrupting government and deriving billions from gambling, narcotics, labor shakedowns, and other criminal pursuits.

Surely I do not quarrel with any decision to step up the fight against organized crime. I support it wholeheartedly. But I say if we are going to win the fight, we must first turn the page so we can see the enemy we are fighting.

It troubles me that the President of our Nation should seek out Italian

Americans for undeserved notoriety while there are organizations in existence who openly exhort violence and whose acts border on treason.

I have not heard the President, for example, lift his voice and ask for millions to check the lawlessness of the Black Panthers, or the Revolutionary Action Movement or the Students for a Democratic Society. Yet, there is overwhelming evidence showing that those organizations have been largely responsible for provoking violent upheavals on high school and college campuses and in city after city.

Crime on the streets is rampant. There are Americans who will not go for a walk after dark because they are afraid of what they will encounter. There are Americans, who thought not too long ago that they would never touch a gun, and now keep weapons in their homes for self-protection. There are Americans—very worried Americans—who ask: "What is happening to our Nation?"

When the President was a candidate for his office, I remember hearing him promise that he would deal with the critical problem of crime on the streets. Let us hope he has not forgotten. Let us hope his promise has not been lost in the maze of absurdity that has once again stigmatized Americans of Italian origin.

In this era of strife, turmoil, and lawlessness, fine and decent Americans are entitled to better treatment. No matter what their heritage, there are too few of them left.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, few Members of this House have as thorough a knowledge, from a personal basis, of crime, as has the gentleman now in the well. Prior to coming to this House he established a unique record in this Nation as the most decorated police officer in the United States. He showed personal bravery and was wounded in line of duty 11 times while a member of the New York City Police Department from 1942 to 1965. He has established a record which deserves support for anything he has to say on the subject which he is discussing. He retired as a detective lieutenant and holds the New York City Police Department's Medal of Honor along with 27 other decorations. He is also an attorney, earning his law degree at the New York Law School at the age of 46.

I should like to commend the gentleman from New York for the statement which he has just made and to say that it deserves the attention of all thoughtful Americans.

Mr. BIAGGI. I thank the gentleman very much.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POBELL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we in this Congress, free men operating under

a timeless Constitution which guarantees our freedom, pause in our deliberations each year to pay our respects to another constitution, the great Constitution of the Polish Nation that was signed on May 3, 1791.

This Saturday marks the 138th anniversary of the adoption of that Polish Constitution.

Like our own American document, the Polish Constitution pledged liberty and representation and a greater share in the Nation's destiny to the people of beleaguered Poland. It was a benchmark in the struggle of men to provide government by the consent of the governed. Hereafter the law was to serve the people and not to oppress them. With this farsighted decision Poland threw off the background of medievalism and stepped into the present with a respect for human dignity. Poland helped to shape the ultimate quest of other nations for greater individual freedoms, for elimination of the paralyzing class distinctions, for a removal of the economic barriers, and for liberty to worship God as individual wishes dictated.

The American Congress, so representative of a free system of government, annually salutes the fine and strong constitution of Poland out of our mutual respect for dignity and liberty for all men. As any student of history knows, shortly after the enactment of its Constitution, Poland was crushed in a ruthless invasion. Somehow, through all of the decades that intervened and the wars and the misery that followed, the flame of hope kindled by that Constitution flickered as brightly as on that day in 1791. For 168 years the memory of this Constitution has withstood the test of generations. Each year the flame of hope burns higher and more fiercely in the hearts of those who must endure the tyrannical rule of dictatorship.

Poland today is ruled by Communists but the people of Poland will never accept totalitarian Communists. The people of Poland have proclaimed clearly in their eloquent Constitution the spirit which prevails in that country. Their memories are long and they are capable of enduring much.

It is ironic that this sad day also marks the 30th anniversary of the Nazi-Soviet invasion that shattered Poland even further and which plunged her into the orbit of the Communist world.

Poland one day will stand again with the free nations of the world. In a fervent belief in that goal, we free men in the Congress of the United States—men of all races, creeds, and backgrounds—commemorate the anniversary of the signing of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791. This Constitution symbolizes the unending drive of the Polish people toward freedom. Our commemoration of the Polish Constitution today reinvigorates our own belief and our dedication to the institutions of freedom as Americans, for the Polish people are themselves an inspiring symbol of man's struggle for human dignity under the rule of law and justice.

From their very beginnings the Polish people have been dedicated to the principles of human dignity and righteousness.

Poland's charter of 1374, which established on the European Continent the writ of habeas corpus—the first such action taken on the European continent—provided for the people of Poland, a concept of freedom for the individual and protection under the law. The right of a writ of habeas corpus is one of the great hallmarks of man's struggle for human dignity.

Poland was one of the first countries to experiment with religious freedom. Her great belief in religious freedom and practice dates back to the 14th century, thus making Poland a haven for minority groups oppressed throughout Europe for their religious beliefs. Poland became the sanctuary for the oppressed; the hope for Europe's Jewish people.

By 1940, Warsaw had 450,000 Jewish citizens. It demonstrated that the Jews could find in Poland a sanctuary which they could not find in other parts of Europe.

I listen with a heavy heart when I hear some of my colleagues in Congress who are unable to draw a distinction between Nazi and Communist persecution of the Jews, and the attitude of the Polish people themselves toward the Jewish people. History is replete with examples of friendship between the people of Poland and their Jewish compatriots.

We cannot blame the brave and gallant freedom-loving people of Poland for the actions of the present administration in Poland, the Communist regime, which is ruthless in trying to destroy the Jewish population in Poland just as the Nazis tried to destroy it during World War II.

It should not be forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that the heroic uprising of the Jews in the Warsaw ghetto could not have been started if it were not for the bravery of the Polish people themselves, who at great personal danger, supplied guns, ammunition, and food to the beleaguered Jews of Warsaw.

Mr. Speaker, the Polish people have too much respect for human dignity and human freedom to tolerate the indignities that are being practiced today, not only against the Jews, but against all the people of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at the great past of this country we will find that in 1610, Capt. John Smith brought to America the first group of Polish immigrants. They were called Polonians in those days. He brought them here to Jamestown to work in the first factory in this country, the glassworks factory in the Jamestown Colony. These Polish workers worked for 9 years, from 1610 to 1619. Although they were permitted to work, they were granted no rights to citizenship, no rights to own land, no rights for the individual.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is to the everlasting credit of America that this brave group of Polish immigrants, brought here to this country in 1610, staged the first sitdown strike in this country. These brave Polish immigrants did not strike for any monetary remuneration as we know sitdown strikes today. It was a sitdown strike for human dignity and human freedom. As a result of this action they were given full rights of citizenship,

full rights to own land, and full rights to participate in the elections.

Capt. John Smith, worried about the possible collapse of this first industry, hurriedly summoned the House of Burgesses which as the legislature of those days and urge the legislature to bestow upon these gallant Polish people their full rights. And, today in the Library of Congress reposes that great document, a constant reminder that this Nation, the great United States of America, might very well have gone the route of a class system, recognizing people by classes, religions, and ethnic backgrounds, except for these brave Polish people who said that they would not tolerate this type of treatment; rose and took brave action in 1619, and set the pattern for human dignity and human rights on these shores.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution which we honor here today was a revolutionary document and contained therein a concept of freedom which was foreign to the oppressors of Europe at that time. It was inconceivable to the despots of that continent that there could be a Constitution which bestowed upon the people of that country religious freedom, the right of habeas corpus, the right of petition, and the right to participate in elections.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of freedom is infectious. Just as the Soviet Union last week crushed further vestiges of freedom in Czechoslovakia and drove Dubcek from power, so it was in 1791. No country could be permitted to survive that would bring upon the European Continent a concept of human dignity and human values as was contained in the Polish Constitution of 1791. And, even more fierce were the despots, because the Polish Constitution was adopted just 5 years after the American Constitution and it brought to the European Continent a concept of human dignity that was adopted by the Americans in this country, 5 years earlier.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say the Constitution that we honor today is but another indication of the unending struggle on the part of the Polish people for freedom and human dignity.

Mr. Speaker, we well remember the heroic contributions of General Kosciuszko and General Pulaski, two great heroic Poles who came to this country to help our own forefathers carve out an island of freedom in the American Revolution. And to those who today would suggest that somehow or other the Poles do not understand the plight of minority groups, let me remind my colleagues that it was General Kosciuszko who asked Thomas Jefferson to take the money that was due Kosciuszko for his services in the Revolutionary War—money that was paid out by the Congress to all generals of that day—to take that money and use it for the establishment of the first institution of higher learning for the American Negroes.

Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko was so moved and so depressed with the oppression of the American Negro that he was among the first to suggest that the American Negro ought to be given full equality in this country.

It is folly to suggest that the Poles do not understand the plight of minority

groups. They have been a minority group themselves for over 1,000 years, and they well know and understand the great pains of persecution and bigotry.

Further, Mr. Speaker, we need only remember the heroic resistance of the Poles during the Nazi invasion. For 3 weeks the Polish people withstood the Nazi Wehrmacht which destroyed all of Europe.

And then perhaps the most inspiring chapter in the history of the Polish people is their heroic resistance this very day against Communist oppression in their country.

Mr. Speaker, it would be my great and profound hope that at this late date, 30 years after the invasion of Poland, our good friends, the illuminati of the press and TV, would finally start distinguishing the difference between a Poland dominated by an illegal, brutal, barbaric, Communist regime, and the Polish people themselves.

Nothing lends a heavier heart among Americans of Polish descent than to hear Poland referred to as Communist Poland. Poland never was and never will be Communist. Poland today is dominated by an illegal regime, but the great day will come when that country will join the family of free nations throughout the world.

So today, Mr. Speaker, as we pay tribute to this constitution I suggest that we rededicate our own belief in the great institutions of freedom. Polish Constitution Day will be observed all over America this weekend. In Chicago the Polish National Alliance will stage a huge parade, and more than 100,000 people will assemble Sunday afternoon in Humboldt Park to hear Secretary of Transportation Volpe participate in a rededication of faith in the principles of freedom and human dignity. And all over this great country of ours there will be similar celebrations and observances of Polish Constitution Day.

So, Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to this great document, and to the brave and glorious Polish people who made it possible.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, 178 years ago, the people of Poland adopted a constitution which was one of the most liberal and progressive documents to come out of 18th century Europe. The tone of this document was, however, no more than a reflection of the creative spirit of the Polish people.

On the observance of Polish Constitution Day, I am happy to be able to add my voice to the salute to the Americans of Polish ancestry, who annually celebrate the anniversary of this constitution which transformed Poland into a modern state.

The absolute rulers of Russia, Prussia, and Austria had taken away large sections of Polish territory. Facing possible annihilation, all forces in Poland united behind the new Constitution, which was greatly influenced by the liberal movements in America, England, and France.

The Constitution of 1791 gave Poland a government of limited monarchy, with a responsible Cabinet-type of Ministry. Many old features of the governmental machinery were discarded, and nearly all class distinctions were abolished. Per-

sonal privileges formerly enjoyed by the few were made available to all townsmen, and the peasantry were placed under the protection of the law.

This enlightened document came to Poland without a bloody revolution or even a single disorder and succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy unfortunately came to the Poles too late to forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795.

Nonetheless, the Constitution adopted by the Polish people in 1791 will stand for centuries to come as a monument to the progressive character of the Polish people.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 3, marks the 178th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day.

Americans of Polish descent all over the United States, thousands of whom live in my own Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, will pause to observe this significant anniversary.

It gives me great pleasure to join them, and my distinguished colleagues of Polish extraction in the Congress, Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois; Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan; Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI, of New York; Hon. HENRY HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey; Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, of Illinois; Hon. LUCIEN N. NEDZI, of Michigan; Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin; Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, of Illinois; Hon. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, of Illinois; Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin; and Hon. CHARLES A. VANIK, of Ohio, in celebrating Polish Constitution Day.

My colleagues have afforded able and patriotic leadership, not only to Polish Americans, but to all the American people. I commend them for their dedicated public service and for their continuing efforts to sustain the hope for a Poland free from Communist bondage.

The Polish Constitution is a vital symbol of assurance that one day Poland will again achieve complete freedom and independence. Its adoption in 1791 was a milestone in the struggle of mankind to establish representative and democratic governments with full protection of the law and equal justice extended to all the people.

The Polish Constitution still stands today as one of the guiding lights of European democracy, and many of the principles of a free society that we in the West still hold true can be found embodied in this great proclamation.

Mr. Speaker, this year the May 3 observance of Constitution Day coincides with the following important dates in Polish history: 30th anniversary of the German-Soviet invasion of Poland; 25th anniversary of the battle of Monte-Cassino; 25th anniversary of the Warsaw uprising; and 25th anniversary of the founding of the Polish American Congress.

The Polish American Congress is an outstanding civic organization which is being guided this year under the able and inspired leadership of Aloysius A. Mazewski, who is serving as president. I want to take this opportunity to commend him, and also the members of the

executive committee, Valentine Janicki, secretary; Joseph T. Pranica, treasurer; Adele Lagodzinski, vice president; Kazimierz Lukomski, vice president; all of whom are from Chicago, Ill.; and Stanley Maziarz, Trenton, N.J., vice president; Thaddeus Maliszewski, Windsor, Conn., vice president; Richard Jablonski, Cleveland, Ohio, vice president; and M. Wasilewski, Pittsburgh, Pa., vice president.

Another outstanding Polish American to whom I want to pay tribute on this special occasion is Mr. Sig Sakowicz, 159 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., which is within my congressional district. Sig Sakowicz is an outstanding radio personality, associated with radio station WGN and radio station WTAQ in Chicago, and has contributed a great deal to the Polish American community in the Chicago metropolitan area. In fact, Sig has become well known throughout our Nation, because the Italo-American comedian, Jackie Vernon, never fails to mention Sig Sakowicz whenever he does a show of his own on television, radio, or the night club circuit.

Mr. Speaker, the Polish American Congress has issued statements about Polish Constitution Day, the Battle of Monte-Cassino, the Warsaw uprising, and the founding of the Polish American Congress. It gives me great pleasure, under leave to extend my remarks, to place into the Record these statements, as follows:

MAY 3D: THE POLISH NATIONAL HOLIDAY

On May 3d Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday—the Polish Third of May Constitution Day.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3rd in 1791, barely two years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia and Austria.

POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May Third Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national, sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then, as it has been throughout the years that followed and even unto today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in

Russia and Germany. In 1795 Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939 Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish Third of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

AMERICAN AND POLISH CONSTITUTIONS SIMILARLY INSPIRED

The philosophy of government discernable throughout the Third of May Polish constitution leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Meditation on the anniversary of May the Third deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty and her territory by one of our former allies, Soviet Russia, with the consent of other United Nations.

THE WARSAW UPRISING

The story of heroic Warsaw Uprising and inhuman Soviet treachery goes back to July, 1944.

The invasion of the European continent by the Western powers was progressing rapidly. In the East, Soviet army already occupied large Polish territories won from retreating Germans.

Moscow radio, through its "Kosciuszko" station began to broadcast appeals to the Poles:

"Warsaw . . . the hour of action has struck. Your houses, parks, bridges, railroad stations, factories, buildings, stores, have to be transformed into centers of resistance. The Germans will attempt to make a stand in Warsaw—to destroy whole city. In Bialystok they were busy for six weeks destroying everything and murdering thousands of people. . . . Let us do everything in our power to prevent them from committing same crimes in your city. People of Warsaw, to arms" . . .

These calls were repeated day in and day out, and finally, on July 29th, when the Russian offensive ground to a halt on the right bank of the Vistula, in the Warsaw's suburb of Praga, Moscow radio sent out a more "urgent appeal to Warsaw", urging the Poles to "fight against the Germans", for "the hour of action has arrived." Warsaw never surrendered, never ceased to struggle. And now everything will be lost in Hitlerite deluge unless you save it through action . . . Poles, the time for freedom approaches. Poles, take to arms . . . There is no second to be lost . . .

The Polish underground authorities adhered to the instructions given by Polish Government in London, where the Western Powers insisted that the Poles must actively co-operate with Russia. Accordingly, the Polish Government in Exile issued such orders.

Then, on July 31, 1944, Delegate of the Polish Government in London, and Vice-Premier of the Polish underground branch of this government, Jankowski, after having heard opinions of the Commander-in-Chief of the Home Army, General Bor-Komorowski and his Chief of Staff, General Monter, issued orders to the Home Army, to start revolt against the Germans the next day, August 1, 1944, at 5 P.M.

Three days later, on August 4th, all activities on German-Russian front ceased, although the Soviet forces already consolidated their positions in Praga. Even their heavy guns were silenced.

Instead of promised and anticipated roar of Soviet artillery, which would herald new phase of Russian offensive, all was quiet on the eastern front of Warsaw.

There was only one explanation: Warsaw had been betrayed by the Russians.

On August 17th, Premier Churchill and President Roosevelt appealed directly to Stalin to help Warsaw. Stalin did not reply.

Anglo-American Staff drew up a plan in London for bombing German positions in Warsaw by means of shuttle operations. British and American aircrafts were to bomb German strongholds in Warsaw, then fly for re-fueling to nearby Luck, already occupied and secured by the Soviet army.

Stalin not only rejected this plan, but at the same time accused the Poles, fighting and dying in Warsaw, of "betrayal" and "collaboration" with the Germans.

The Poles fought on against all odds, against all hope.

They forced the Germans to send three armored divisions, badly needed on the Western front, to Warsaw. These, with incessant bombing by German planes, finally crushed the uprising.

After sixty-three days of fighting, Warsaw capitulated.

Over 250,000 Polish men, women and children died in this struggle, in which even juvenile Scout troops rose to the height of heroism and sacrifice.

The Germans, with a teutonic fury destroyed, burned, pillaged the remnants of the city.

Warsaw did not die, however.

The indomitable Polish spirit rebuilt the city from desolation and ruins.

Warsaw, rising like Phoenix from the ashes, remembers Nazi brutality and Soviet treachery.

And it longs for the day on which a truly free and independent Poland returns to the Western family of Nations.

VICTORY AT MONTE CASSINO

From the dawn of history, Cassino stood as the southern gateway to Rome. On the adjacent mountain known as Monte Cassino, many temples and altars were built to unknown deities by unknown worshippers in the dim past.

St. Benedict arrived there in the years of 525-529 and found a complete pagan Acropolis, which he rebuilt, in a Christian pattern, into the Abbey of Monte Cassino.

Here, the Poles have tried to grasp the always elusive to them freedom—when the Polish Legions under General Henryk Dąbrowski was guarding this territory for the Armies of Napoleon; then again in 1918, when Polish Army of the West was being organized from Polish-Austrian prisoners of war; and in May, 1944, when the Second Corps of the Polish Army-in-Exile wrestled the mountain from the Germans.

There were four battles of Monte Cassino in 1944 and they belong to epic struggles of World War II. The chain of hills towering above the city of Cassino blocked the northward offensive of the Allied Armies, and was transformed by the Germans into a seemingly impregnable fortress.

In the three previous battles, soldiers from seven nations, including the United States Second Corps, tried unsuccessfully to blast the Germans from their mountain stronghold. These battles raged from January until the end of April, 1944.

Then, on May 11th, 1944 at 11 p.m., the Apennine peninsula began to tremble from a renewed violence; two thousand heavy artillery guns opened fire on Monte Cassino.

At 1 a.m., on May 12th, main elements of the Polish Second Army Corps—the Third and the Fifth Divisions under the command

of Lt. Gen. Władysław Anders, began to attack German positions, capturing under withering enemy fire and in hand to hand combat Points 593 and 569, and finally—the Phantom Ridge.

The battle lasted whole week. The Poles advanced yard by yard, bled, died and fought, sustained by the indomitable will to win.

During the night of 17th an 18th of May, the Germans recurred to flight. With the dawn of May 18th Polish white and red flag was unfurled above the smoke filled and blood stained battlefield.

Peace returned to ruins of Monte Cassino. The Poles paid a heavy price for this victory; 860 officers and men killed in action, 2,822 wounded.

One year later, in March, 1945, a committee was formed for the purpose of rebuilding the Monte Cassino Abbey. It made very little progress, however.

Then on October 10, 1945, the Polish Embassy at the Vatican notified the Papal Secretary of State, that the soldiers of the Polish Second Corps are willing and ready to rebuild the Abbey. The Pope accepted this offer with deep gratitude. British Command assigned 200 German prisoners of war, who worked whole year on the project under Polish officers and men.

Thus the Poles not only conquered the enemy on Monte Cassino, but were the first to start working on the restoration of its former glory.

The gallantry and heroism of the Poles were beyond praise.

On the memorial of their war cemetery at the slopes of Point 593, these poignant words are written:

"We Polish Soldiers,
For your freedom and ours,
Have given our souls to God,
Our bodies to the soil of Italy,
And our hearts to Poland."

As Fred Majdalany points out in his book, "The Battle of Cassino,—

"By their selfless immolation the Poles turned that grim mountainside into a memorial to soldiers everywhere."

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS

"We, the representatives of the united Americans of Polish descent, assembled in convention at Buffalo, New York, mindful of our civic duties, solemnly pledge our unqualified service, love and affection to our country, the United States, and our active participation in its life. Deserving to give true expression to our sentiments and aims, we call into existence the Polish American Congress . . ."

With this declaration a representative body of about ten million Americans of Polish origin had been founded at organizing convention, held on 28, 29 and 30 May, 1944, with the participation of over 2,000 delegates from Polish American church organizations, fraternal orders, professional, educational, civic and business groups.

Under wise and skillful leadership of its officers, the Polish American Congress was the first American organization to speak out against Russian aggrandizement and warn of the folly of any attempt to appease Russia on the grounds of wartime expediency. Since 1944, its leaders have carried this warning to the public, to this Country's leaders and to the governments represented at the United Nations. Events of history, which now reveal the true menace of Communism to civilization, have proved the validity of these warnings.

The Polish American Congress has made strong protests against the Yalta Agreement, which sacrificed Poland to Soviet domination, and against the rigged elections which were staged in Poland to form the present government. It has emphasized the importance of restoring a free, independent and integral

Poland as the cornerstone of European stability and as the true foundation of world peace and American security.

Numerous and comprehensive memoranda, statements, resolutions, letters, wires and booklets have been directed to Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon; Secretaries of State Hull, Stettinius, Byrnes, Marshall, Acheson, Dulles, Herter and Rusk; members of the United States Congress; delegates to the United Nations; the press; the clergy, educators, and the public. In all, the Polish American Congress has called for adherence to the Atlantic Charter and respect for "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

Delegations of the Polish American Congress have met Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon, to plead the case of a free and democratic Poland and oppose the terms of the Yalta Agreement; presented the cause for an independent and integral Poland to the United Nations Conference in San Francisco; attended the Paris Conference, and made a tour of Polish displaced persons camps in Western Europe.

A delegation of the Polish American Congress presented the viewpoint of Americans of Polish origin to numerous leaders and diplomats of democratic countries in personal conferences in Europe.

Officers of the Polish American Congress, have testified before Congressional committees considering legislation to admit displaced persons into this country. The Polish American Congress has established a committee on displaced persons.

It has established commissions of American affairs, culture and education, civic affairs, economics and management, and information and publications to improve the welfare of Americans of Polish descent through support of their schools, parishes, press and vocational activities.

The Congress has through several of its state districts offered scholarships to young Americans of Polish origin to encourage study in fields such as social work, arts and journalism.

It has supported the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America; the Polish Immigration and Relief Committee in New York and The Polish American Historical Association.

It has published a Polish-English newspaper, the Delegates News-Letter, and a digest-size magazine—the Bulletin, containing informative articles on American foreign policy, the Polish situation and related subjects.

Cooperating with the national headquarters at 1520 West Division Street, Chicago, Illinois, are 33 state divisions in 26 states. Membership in the Congress includes more than 20 fraternal organizations and their local lodges, parishes, several Polish language newspapers, outstanding members of the arts, sciences and professions, and business, industrial and civic leaders—also thousands of local church, civic, charitable, cultural, business, ideological, political, professional and other associations, clubs and societies, in cities and towns from coast to coast.

Mr. Speaker, Poland has made great contributions to the cultural development of both Europe and America. I join my colleagues in saluting these contributions and in looking forward to the day when the Polish people can once again live under the principles of freedom and democracy embodied in the original Polish Constitution.

On this occasion, I am pleased to send my sincere greetings to the people of Poland, to Polish Americans all over the United States, and especially to those re-

siding within the Seventh Illinois Congressional District, as they join together to celebrate this important anniversary in the history of Poland.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, is a very important document. Its adoption and promulgation marked a turning point in Poland's Central Government, and the date has become a Polish holiday.

The Polish people had the misfortune of losing a good part of their country late in the 1770's to their greedy neighbors. Certain Polish leaders felt that if they had a strong central government, capable of uniting all elements in the country and strengthening its fighting capacity, future calamities could be avoided. They were thoroughly dissatisfied with their absolutist, monarchical form of government. The King had too much power, and was incapable of using it effectively because of certain crippling defects in the old Diet—legislative assembly. The discontent was widespread among liberal leaders and also among the mass of the people. These liberal, democratic and patriotic leaders took upon themselves the task of drawing up a constitution which would improve, if not revolutionize, the Government of Poland. The result was the Constitution of May 3, 1791.

This Constitution drastically reduced the arbitrary powers of the King, and made Poland a constitutional monarchy. Heretofore the King could exercise his authority only through a council. The powers of the upper chamber were curtailed and those of the popularly elected lower chamber were strengthened. The peasantry was freed from its bondage and placed under the protection of the law.

Religious toleration was assured to all citizens, and freedom of speech was guaranteed. These features made the Constitution a democratic instrument, and represented a great forward advance in popularizing the Government. It was hailed as such throughout the country, and even many liberal leaders abroad praised the Polish leaders.

On the 178th anniversary celebration of the Polish Constitution Day one can hardly overlook the 29th anniversary of the Katyn Forest massacre of many thousand Polish officers by their heartless captors early in the last war. Lastly, I would also like to stress the fact that over 1,000 years ago, in the year 966, Poles adopted Christianity as their faith and founded the most powerful Christian power in Eastern Europe. In taking note of all these occasions, I gladly join all friends of Poland and of freedom.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, we celebrate on May 3 the 178th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. For those mindful of the long years of fidelity and friendship which link Poland and America, the celebration is a mixed one.

We are, on the one hand, justifiably pleased in observing the Constitution of 1791 itself; for it was, and is, one of the most brilliant political documents of all time. Its brilliance, moreover, lies unmistakably in the unequivocal support it lends to human rights and political liberalism. The humanitarian and liberal

spirit which pervades the document is concisely stated in the Constitution thusly: "All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people."

When King Stanislaw II led the members of the Polish Diet in swearing allegiance to the Constitution of 1791, he simultaneously lifted the hopes of freedom-loving men and women everywhere. It is important to stress, I believe, the extent to which political leaders and scholars have lauded the 1791 Constitution in the 178 years since its adoption. In its attempt to modernize the governmental institutions of Poland, to give the smallest towns representation in the lawmaking bodies, in limiting the power of the monarch and creating a system of ministerial responsibility, and in establishing unqualified religious freedom—in these and many other respects the 1791 Constitution achieved a level of legal and political excellence which stands even today as a landmark of liberalism in Europe. For all these reasons and more we are justly joyous in today's celebration.

We are also saddened, of course, that we are not actively joined in this celebration by the citizens of contemporary Poland. For them the celebration is a silent one. The long years since 1791 have not been kind to Poland. Decades of dominance from outside have prevented the noble ideals of the 1791 Constitution and the most deeply-held aspirations of the Polish people from being realized.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 10 million citizens of Polish descent in America today. I am honored to join them in commemorating the 178th anniversary of the Constitution of 1791. This celebration is truly one for free men everywhere as well as those who would be free. That document and our own Constitution were the product of the same inspiration and hope. For ourselves, the struggle for freedom has been difficult and largely successful. For the Poles, the fleeting dream of democracy mirrored so perfectly in the 1791 Constitution has yet to be fulfilled. We appropriately remember in this regard the prophetic words of the late President John F. Kennedy:

No one can doubt that the wave of the future is not the conquest of the world by a single dogmatic creed but the liberation of the diverse energies of free nations and free men.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, Saturday is a time of celebration for all free people of Polish origin. For May 3 marks the 178th anniversary of the creation of the Polish Constitution of 1791, a document so noble in purpose and so liberal in thought that its meaning will never be forgotten.

A scant 2 years after America drafted her Constitution, the small, proud nation of Poland, surrounded by absolutism and militarism, drafted a proposition which to this day is considered a landmark for democracy in Europe.

The words in this document, Mr. Speaker, are as beautiful as any ever written. They espouse a concept all but unheard of in the 18th century and still alien to many of the nations of the world:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and ob-

jective being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

This Constitution is a tribute to the meaning of freedom, Mr. Speaker. It cannot go unheeded any more than the desire of all people to be free can be ignored.

The flame of freedom and independence still burns in Poland. It could not be extinguished by partition, it could not be extinguished by hobnail boots, and it will not be extinguished by an Iron Curtain.

As we celebrate with free Poles everywhere the creation of their Constitution, let us pray that someday the people in Poland itself will be able to live in the freedom which they promised themselves nearly 200 years ago.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to count among the people of my district many citizens of Polish origin who contribute to our area the strength, vitality, and sheer joy of living so characteristic of their race.

This Saturday marks the 178th anniversary of the birth of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, a great historic document whose high purpose is expressed in these immortal words:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation. . . .

This glowing promise small and gallant Poland has never had a chance to realize. I salute a people who have endured crushing tyranny down through the centuries, but whose love of liberty has never been extinguished. Let us share with them the fervent prayer they know so well: "Niech zwycięży Orzeł Biały"—"May the White Eagle Triumph"—and may the happy day arrive when, God willing, Poland will once again be free.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, as we approach May 3, I wish to join with my colleagues in saluting a day which is of special significance to all Americans of Polish descent and to all of us who appreciate the contributions the freedom-loving Polish people have made to our Nation.

The Polish people cry out for freedom. On May 3, the anniversary of the Polish Third of May Constitution of 1791, we should all pay tribute to these gallant friends and dedicate ourselves to assuring that some day the Poles will again live in peace and freedom in their homeland.

We have much to learn from the Poles. They were the pioneers of liberalism in Europe and those thousands who have come to our country have contributed immeasurably to our way of life and culture.

It is my pleasure to join today with all Polish Americans in honoring this Polish national holiday.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 we will celebrate the 178th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, the framework within which the liberty and freedom of the Polish people supposedly is guaranteed. We all know, however, Mr. Speaker, that freedom and

liberty for the Polish homeland are rights only to be dreamed of but not shared in, for brave Poland, as she has been so many times in her tormented history, is once again under the boot of tyranny.

The Polish American Congress has done and is doing a magnificent job, Mr. Speaker, in keeping the cause of Polish liberty before the conscience of the free world. It serves as a constant reminder to those of us on this side of the Iron Curtain, that freedom must be nurtured constantly if it is to survive, and that once lost to the bloody hands of an oppressor, it is difficult to regain.

Mr. Speaker, we all pray that Constitution Day will soon be celebrated in a free Poland.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, May 3 will mark the 178th anniversary of the Polish May 3 Constitution of 1791, which this year coincides with the following significant dates in Polish history: the 30th anniversary of the German-Soviet attack on Poland; and the 25th anniversaries of the Battle of Monte Cassino, the Warsaw uprising, and the founding of the Polish American Congress. The Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, and the American Constitution of March 4, 1789, both recognize the sovereignty of the people as the cornerstone of their respective governments and both resulted from the same spirit of freedom which swept the world when our own Nation was born. The philosophy of government discernible in the May 3 Polish Constitution leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Unfortunately, history has been cruel to our Polish brothers. The adoption of the Polish Constitution did not insure the freedom which it promised. Just 4 years after adopting the Constitution, Poland was partitioned by Russia, Prussia, and Austria for the third time. In this century Poland has been devastated twice by war and has been dominated by Communist regimes for 24 years. However, generations of Poles both at home and abroad have continued to dream and struggle for liberty. We in America owe them a special debt for the dedication of the Polish patriots who joined us in our own struggle for independence. Indeed, Polish Americans have continually distinguished themselves as defenders of the American Constitution, defenders of liberty, and the highest American traditions.

As we in the U.S. Congress commemorate Polish Constitution Day, I am proud to add my personal tribute to the people of Poland, and to the millions of men and women of Polish ancestry who live in the United States and around the world. The principles of the Constitution of May 3, 1791, have continued to live in the hearts of the Polish people throughout their long history of oppression and foreign domination and they are alive today.

Mr. Speaker, our participation in this observance dramatizes once again our continued support and interest in the Polish nation and all peoples around the globe who are captives of communism.

We must continue to support the hopes and rightful aspirations of the Polish people for the restoration of their freedom so that one day their dream will become a reality.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1791, 2 short years after our own country had adopted its Constitution, the people of Poland likewise declared their intention to establish a free and democratic form of government. Their purpose was stated in the 3d of May Constitution, as follows:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Our Polish comrades in democracy, however, were caught in the middle of the European struggle for expanding power. Since 1791 they have suffered under a history of being torn apart by their neighbors. Presently they are ruled with an iron hand from Moscow, which closed around them at the conclusion of World War II.

Throughout this history of occupation, the Poles have kept alive their desire for freedom and their love of independence and democracy. During this last occupation, they have been encouraged and aided by their brothers abroad. The Polish American Congress, established 25 years ago this month, has been fierce in its dedication to the final liberation of their homeland, Poland. The organization has taken its case to our Presidents and people, as well as to the people of the world through the United Nations.

Our fellow countrymen of Polish descent are fine, unstanding citizens and truly loyal Americans. I share their concern for the future of their brothers in Poland. And I am on the side of all men who would be free.

May I commend the Polish American Congress for its efforts on behalf of the people of Poland, and today urge my colleagues that we, too, may work to see this beacon of freedom once more burn bright.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in commemorating the 178th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day, to be celebrated on Saturday, May 3.

It was on May 3, 1791, that the Polish people, who had been so anxious to put into effect the ideological concepts which had taken root in their minds, illuminated all Warsaw to celebrate the bloodless revolution and usher in the birth of their Constitution. That day should have marked their first step toward constitutional democracy, but history was not to be so kind. This Constitution, born without murder or violence, this ideal for the future, would not forestall the tragic partition by the Russians, Prussians, and Austrians.

These invaders robbed Poland of her hope to raise herself to an independent and secure condition but they could not diminish the historical importance of that great Constitution. May 3 still continues to be acclaimed as a day of celebration, joy, and remembrance for Poles around the world.

The quest for liberty which sparked the Constitution has endured down through the ages and we in America will not forget their fortitude. For their gallantry and stubborn belief in the dignity of man, we pause here today to pay tribute to these courageous people of Poland. Though dominated by Communist rule, the Polish people have never lost that spirit which founded their Constitution of 1791.

Let us then serve as a reminder that the American people have not forgotten the plight of the people behind the Iron Curtain. All Americans join in the hope that the people of Poland will yet realize the attainment of the ideals and spirit of their May 3 Constitution.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the House will not be in session on Saturday, it is most appropriate that we observe May 3, the traditional Independence Day of Poland, which specifically commemorates the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. This year, the 178th observance of the adoption of the first democratic constitution in Europe, has special significance for the Polish people since they persist in their efforts to ease the oppression of the Russian-orientated Warsaw government.

I am pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary of Transportation, the Honorable John A. Volpe, will deliver a major address at the Chicago Polish Constitution Day program to be held in Humble Park this Sunday afternoon.

Unfortunately, under the tyrannical domination of their Communist rulers, the brave people of Poland cannot speak out on this day as proudly and vigorously as they wish. The Gomulka dictatorship, which obviously is not representative of the freedom-loving Polish people, forbids proper observance of the religious and historical events of which the Polish people are so rightly proud. However, Americans of Polish extraction and people of Polish origin scattered throughout the world, as well as other freedom-loving people, join in this commemoration of the historic Constitution Day of Poland.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include as part of my remarks the message of the President of Poland in exile to the Polish nation. President August Zaleski has just issued this message from London on the occasion of Poland Constitution Day, May 3, 1969:

Thirty years have passed since the Polish Nation was able to celebrate in a free Poland the great anniversary of the Constitution of May 3, 1791.

Today only those of us in foreign lands can do so openly, as such celebrations are forbidden in our Country by the Communist regime. Despite similar restrictions imposed by the partitioning powers in the past, the Nation venerated the day of May 3rd throughout the long years of oppression and proclaimed it as National Day on gaining independence in 1918.

Adam Mickiewicz, Poland's great national poet and patriot, had this to say about that day:

"We have but one deed of the past, one written law, which should be delved into and the spirit of which taken to heart. This law . . . drawn from the heart of the great masses . . . still lives in the memory, in the desires of the generations, and so it is a living law, rooted in the past, and develop-

ing in the future. We have the May 3rd Constitution. Strange but worthy of consideration is the fact that Europe has witnessed many Constitutions since 1791, disputed, wondered at, wise and forgotten. Yet only the May 3rd Constitution is esteemed by the Polish Nation. During the long years of foreign oppression the day of its proclamation was secretly honoured in all the provinces of former Poland, from the Carpathian Mountains in the south to the River Dvina in the north, in homes, churches and at youth gatherings . . . Hence it has been well and justly said that the May Constitution is the political testament of former Poland."

Therefore, the whole Nation rejoiced, when Pope Pius XI chose the anniversary of this Constitution as the Day of the Holy Mother of God—Queen of the Polish Crown, thus giving yet another proof of the indissoluble ties that join the Polish Republic with the Faith of Christ.

Mr. Speaker, this message from the legitimate President of Poland, August Zaleski, voices the true feelings of the Polish people.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the 3d of May is a date which is dear to the people of Poland and to persons of Polish descent throughout the world.

It was on May 3, 1791, only 2 years after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, that Poland peacefully adopted her Constitution. This Constitution was based on the light of liberalism which is so much a part of the makeup of the Polish people.

In the Polish Third of May Constitution, this liberalism was formulated in the following words:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

The people of Poland enthusiastically acclaimed the Constitution of 1791. For weeks after the May 3 proclamation, expressions of approval and gratitude were heard from citizens in all sections of Poland. Celebrations were held throughout the cities and towns.

The Constitution of 1791 was an attempt to do away with the medieval and outmoded system of government in Poland and replace it with a modern constitutional monarchy and parliamentary system of government somewhat akin to that existing in England. By instituting a wide range of reforms, this Constitution afforded the possibility of a new, sound, and progressive national life.

It was this opportunity which was universally hailed by the people of Poland.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was seen by the rulers of Russia and Prussia as a threat to their tyranny. Thus Catherine the Great, the ruler of imperial Russia, ordered her Russian armies to invade Poland on April 8, 1792. The Prussians promptly reneged on their promises to aid the Poles and Poland was left to fend for itself against the invading Russian armies. The Polish Army under Prince Joseph Poniatowski and Thaddeus Kosciuszko, fought valiantly, but failed to halt the Russian columns. After 3 months of fighting, the war came to an end in a Polish defeat.

The defeat forced the abandonment of the Constitution and subsequently led

to the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

In 1939 Russian and Prussian soldiers met once more on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarian systems of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the United States, Americans of Polish descent honor the 1791 Constitution with appropriate observances during the entire month of May. They do this to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind their fellow Americans that Poland was one of the pioneers of liberalism in Europe and to give encouragement to the citizens of Poland in their continuing struggle for democratic rights.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the proudest days of the year for citizens of democratic nations is the anniversary of their country's constitution. In the United States we observe July 4 as Independence Day, commemorating the declaration which gave us our freedom. Similarly, one of the brightest events in Polish history was the adoption of the May 3 Constitution of 1791.

While their historic homeland is now under ruthless suppression by Communist tyranny, free Poles throughout the world still recognize May 3 as a time for remembering and honoring this proud event. To some 10 million Americans of Polish ancestry, the day is a reminder of the cultural links between this Nation and the free Poland that existed prior to the outbreak of World War II. Since then, Poland's valiant struggle against Nazi-Communist totalitarianism has become an inspiration for mankind, and May 3 is observed in both Houses of our Congress in commemoration of the struggles of these people for their liberty.

This year's observance coincides with other significant dates of Polish history—the 30th anniversary of the German-Soviet attack on Poland; and the 25th anniversaries of the Battle of Monte Cassino; of the Warsaw uprising; and of the founding of the Polish American Congress. I take pride in saluting all Americans of Polish ancestry, and their countrymen who still believe in the cause of freedom.

The world must never forget the horror of barbarism which caused a free Poland to be eliminated from existence, except in the memories and ideals of those loyal citizens who have steadfastly refused to accept totalitarianism. On this occasion I pay homage to the Polish Americans whose country has suffered so much through history, and express the hope that ultimately the cause of justice will be restored to their homeland.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join with my colleague from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) and with the other gentlemen who have spoken here today to pay tribute to the proud heritage of the Polish people on this occasion. As Mr. Aloysius A. Mazewski, president of the Polish American Congress, has pointed out, both Houses of Congress have traditionally taken the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791, to commemorate other notable events in Polish and Polish-American history. I am happy to

have the opportunity to join in this observance today and to review briefly those historic events of such significance for citizens of both Poland and America.

On May 3, 1791, barely 2 years after our own Nation had adopted its present Constitution, Poland without revolution or bloodshed adopted a Constitution which the Polish American Congress notes "eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system." The principle, so dear to Americans, that government shall be established and shall exercise its powers only "with the consent of the governed," was included in the Polish Third of May Constitution in this form:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

The great misfortune of the Poles was that instead of being protected as was America by two vast seas, it was bordered by three aggressive and powerful nation-states—Russia, Prussia, and Austria. In 1795, barely 4 years after adoption of the Third of May Constitution, Poland was partitioned for the third time among her three neighbors.

Three other events which are often commemorated on this date all occurred in 1944: the Battle of Monte Cassino, the uprising of Warsaw against her Nazi occupiers, and the founding in America of the Polish American Congress.

Of special significance to me, Mr. Speaker, is the uprising of Warsaw in July 1944, against the occupying German forces. This uprising followed by only 15 months the fateful Warsaw ghetto uprising which occurred in the spring of 1943. The brutal and inhuman methods employed by German forces to suppress and finally obliterate the ghetto foreshadowed the tactics which would be employed against all the residents of Warsaw just a year later.

Poland's early commitment to self-government and free institutions stands as a monument in the never-ending struggle to try to find the best way to live together in society.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in commemorating the anniversary of the adoption of the May 3, 1791, Polish Constitution. This Constitution, similar in philosophy and intent to our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution, was a memorable first in the evolution of democracy in central Europe.

The significance of this document in man's history cannot be measured. However, the advancement in freedom, liberty, and justice for the individual which it represented is deserving of our lasting tribute.

It is therefore entirely fitting that we pause in our deliberations in the Congress of the United States to pay homage to the May 3 Constitution of 1791, and to honor the nation that created it.

The Constitution guaranteed the people of Poland the rights to which men always and everywhere have aspired. It

is based upon the principle that government belongs to the people.

Popular sovereignty has been handed down to us as a birthright by our Founding Fathers. However, in Poland there was such basis, since her neighboring nations of central Europe were founded on the principle of state, and not national sovereignty.

Many observers attribute the subsequent rape and partition of Poland by the soldiers of Russia and Prussia to the fact that these two absolutist powers felt threatened by the forces of liberalism within Poland.

The similarity, then, between the 1795 partitioning of Poland and the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia is obvious. In both cases, the forces of a totalitarian state invaded and suppressed another nation because they feared the philosophy of individual freedom which was blossoming in Poland in 1795, and in Czechoslovakia in 1968.

There is sad irony in the fact that the attempted justification for the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine, was proclaimed on Polish soil by Leonid Brezhnev at the Congress of the Polish Communist Party in Warsaw last November. This doctrine is but a reworking of the basic Communist philosophy of totalitarianism. Because of its dire implications regarding the future of Soviet foreign policy it should be considered carefully by the Congress and the entire free world.

It is truly tragic to reflect that a people as soundly schooled in the philosophy of individual liberty, as the Poles, who conceived such a brilliant and enlightened document as the May 3 Constitution, should now be under the yoke of Soviet Communist rule.

This crassly materialistic philosophy, so completely devoid of personal freedoms, is alien to the very spirit of the Polish people. It is also completely alien to the Judeo-Christian tradition in which the Poles have played so important and integral a part.

Today, the people of Poland are denied the rights that were the historic cornerstones of their May 3 Constitution. They are denied any meaningful participation in the political life of their nation, and enjoy little, if any, personal liberty.

It is particularly tragic to compare the Poland of today, a puppet of the Soviet Union, to the kind of Poland that might exist had the May 3 Constitution prevailed. There can be little doubt but that Poland would be the most dynamic and successful nation in central Europe.

It is true that the Poland of today is a better place to live than Poland under Stalin. Yet, the present regime refuses to grant any meaningful freedom in the press, in the universities, or in political activities.

Yet we must not falter in our hope for a better day for the great people of Poland. In their hearts still burns the fire of freedom. The setbacks of the past year are but minor obstacles in their onward movement to ultimate freedom and liberty.

We can not forget that essentially embodied in the May 3 Constitution of 1791 was the concept of the value and dignity

of the individual man. This philosophy has been passed from generation to generation of the Polish people. It is an idea which cannot be erased by tyranny, repression, or death. The Polish people have suffered for many years, but they have not given up hope, and will not give up hope.

Outside of Poland, in practically every nation of the free world, there are groups of Poles who continue to aid the people and the cause of freedom in the homeland. These groups, by their commemoration of such memorable historic Polish events as the anniversary of the May 3 Constitution, contribute unmeasured encouragement to the people of Poland.

One such group, the Polish American Congress, is celebrating the 25th anniversary of their founding this year. I congratulate the Congress for their effective work in instilling the value of Polish culture in Americans of Polish descent. This group has also helped to make the United States more aware of the contributions of the Polish people to this great country, as well as contributed to the development of an appreciation of Polish culture among the people of this country.

Most of all, however, the Polish American Congress should be commended for its untiring efforts in calling attention to the plight of the Polish people.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Poles were having serious troubles during the late 18th century. Externally the country was under threat by its implacable foes, and in 1776 it had lost a good part of its territory to the neighboring countries in the first partition of Poland. Internally, the central government was weak, unwieldy and ineffective. And one of the most serious drawbacks was the constitutional right given to any member of the Diet—the assembly—who could, by casting a negative vote, block the passage of any legislation. For a long time this indiscriminate use of liberum veto—or, free vote—had stopped the enactment of any legislation, even when badly needed and supported by the preponderant majority of the Diet.

After the first partition of Poland many enlightened leaders of Poland thought seriously of changing the fundamental law of the land, and adopting a new one which would enable them to overhaul the antiquated and ineffective form of government in Warsaw. They also hoped that a new government set up under a new constitution would be in stronger position to ward off foreign threats. With this purpose in mind the Diet empowered a select committee of highly intelligent and patriotic members to draw up such a document. This committee worked hard, carefully and conscientiously studying other constitutions, and came up with one that seemed best suited to the needs of Poland. It was submitted to the Diet; it was approved, and on May 3, 1791, it became the law of the land when both the Diet and the king took their oath in the Warsaw cathedral in support of this Constitution of May 3, 1791.

This was a liberal Constitution with many progressive provisions. The mon-

arch's powers were curtailed and were to be exercised under the restraints of a council. Although he retained his prerogatives, he could not exercise them except upon the approval of the council. The Constitution protected the peasants against their landlords, and the nobles were to share their privileges with the ennobled townsmen. Religious toleration was guaranteed to all sects. By this Constitution, Poland took a forward leap towards modernism and governmental progress. It was hailed by all friends of Poland abroad, and forward-looking leaders everywhere were jubilant over the adoption of such a liberal Constitution in this outpost of Western civilization in Eastern Europe. Poland's neighbors and foes, however, were disturbed and shocked by it. Fearing that the ideas embodied in the new Constitution would infect their subjects, the autocrats of Austria, Prussia, and Russia at once attacked Poland, overran it, and partitioned most of it among themselves. This they did before the Constitution was effectively tested in Poland. A few years later Poland was overrun once more, and this time the rest of the country was parceled out in the third partition of Poland in 1796.

These ruthless acts on the part of Austria, Prussia, and Russia put an end to Poland's independence and tore up its new Constitution. But the spirit of that democratic Constitution lived on. It still lives in the hearts and minds of freedom-loving Poles in Communist-dominated Poland. The Poles abroad and their friends observe the anniversary of the enactment of that document, the Polish Constitution of 1791, and I am glad to join them.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 3, marks the 178th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, an event marked with great pride each year by Polish people and Polish descendants everywhere.

Everywhere, that is, except in Poland itself, where the Soviet-imposed dictatorship prohibits the Polish people from marking this important historical event.

The year 1969 also marks three other significant dates in Polish history:

First, the 30th anniversary of the German-Soviet attack on Poland.

Second, the 25th anniversary of the Battle of Monte Cassino.

Third, the 25th anniversary of the Warsaw uprising.

It also is of special significance to Polish Americans in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., that this year marks the silver jubilee of the founding of the Polish American Congress.

It was in May 1944 in Buffalo that over 2,000 delegates of various Polish American groups gathered and formed the Polish American Congress which has contributed so much to the better understanding by all peoples of Poland and its proud history.

Mr. Speaker, it is always a great pleasure and honor for me to join with my colleagues at this time of year to collectively call attention to the plight of the Polish people today under continued Soviet domination, coercion, and oppression.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, once again Members of Congress participate in observance of the adoption, on May 3, 1791, of the Polish Constitution, and on this 178th anniversary of that triumphant event in the history of democracy, I would like to raise my voice in tribute to Poles throughout the world, and to Americans of Polish descent, who are the proud inheritors of the courage and greatness by which their forebears survived tragic and endless oppression.

The constitutional government established by Poland in 1791 lived but briefly, and in Poland today, its people still yearning for freedom and the right of self-determination, greet the anniversary with silence. Yet that first brave struggle for democracy, and each ensuing cruel episode of Polish history, has endured as man's highest inspiration in fulfilling the dream of independence and human dignity for all people everywhere.

This year marks the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Polish American Congress which binds together millions of Americans who have brought to our Nation so much of the cultural and idealistic wealth of their native Poland. To these fine citizens I want to express my praise for their vital efforts to encourage and sustain modern Poland and its psychological resistance against the forces of tyranny.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today in public recognition of an important Polish national holiday—the Polish Third of May Constitution Day.

Millions of Americans of Polish descent join today with their brethren in Poland, and with Poles throughout the world, in an observance which reminds us that Poland was one of the pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

On May 3, 1791, only 2 years after adoption of our own Constitution, Poland adopted a Constitution which revised the nation's parliamentary and social system, and established the sovereignty of the people. This great event was achieved without a revolution and without internal disorder.

Unfortunately, this great assertion of democracy was short lived, and was cut short by the partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

Today's observance of May 3 coincides with other significant dates in Polish history—the 30th anniversary of the German-Soviet invasion of 1939, and the 25th anniversary of the Battle of Monte Cassino, of the Warsaw uprising, and the founding of the Polish American Congress.

The 1939 invasion is familiar to most Americans alive today. But the other events may not be so well known.

The Battle of Monte Cassino which Poles observe as a national holiday took place on May 11, 1944, when the Polish Second Army Corps, commanded by Lt. Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, attacked this mountain fortress and wrested it from German hands. This ancient fort, located in the mountains south of Rome, has a long and famous history. St. Benedict erected an abbey there about 530 A.D. Virtually destroyed in a series of World War II battles, it was rebuilt in 1946 by

German prisoners of war under the direction of Polish Second Corps veterans.

The Warsaw uprising marked one of the most heroic episodes in Polish history. More than 250,000 Polish men, women, and children died during 63 days of fighting against the Germans during the summer of 1944. The city finally capitulated, and was burned and pillaged by the invaders. After the war, the indomitable Polish spirit rebuilt the city from the ashes and ruins.

The Polish American Congress was founded in May 1944, by Americans of Polish descent, proud of their ancestry and anxious to preserve the traditions and legends of their homeland. Today there are 33 State divisions, and the membership includes more than 20 fraternal organizations. The congress publishes a Polish-English newspaper, and a digest-size magazine, the Bulletin, which stresses foreign policy, Polish information, and related subjects.

On behalf of the many thousands of Polish Americans in my district, I pay tribute today to the courage and love of freedom which Poles have displayed since the beginning of recorded history.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is a day of tremendous significance to our millions of American citizens of Polish birth or extraction as they join with their loved ones in Poland and elsewhere around the world in celebrating the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution in 1791. The Polish Constitution, like the American Constitution which was adopted a 2 scant years earlier, was an amazing document for the times. It established, among other things, the ideals that a nation's power lies in her people, not in the state, and that the function of this power is to preserve freedom and liberty for all men in an orderly society. The Constitution of Poland was another example of the spirit that has pervaded Poland throughout her millennium. It is the spirit that granted religious freedom as early as the 14th century, that established the first continental Parliament and that provided America with such heroes as Kosciuszko and Pulaski. Thirty years ago this same spirit was once again shown to the world as valiant but hopelessly outgunned Polish soldiers fought to preserve their homeland against the invading Nazis. A sad but equally helpless free world could do little but watch the agony. And again only 5 years later a numbed world watched as the people of Warsaw, betrayed by a Russian army that would not come to their aid, battled Nazi troops for 63 days. More than a quarter million Poles died in that fight—a milestone in treachery even for the Russians.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen with my own eyes the rebirth of Poland after the war as I visited that country but I have also seen the tragedy that haunts a people not at all free. Is it not ironic that Americans of Polish birth or ancestry can celebrate this day but Poles in Poland cannot do so by decree of their Communist oppressors? Poland today, as she has so many times in her tragic history, knows the weight of the despot. But we also know that Poland will again be free. One thousand years of history have clearly

shown the world that to be alive in Poland is to be fighting for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Poles everywhere, and particularly those Polish American organizations in this country who do so much to keep alive the spirit that is Poland and remind us that we must never cease our efforts to bring freedom to those who so earnestly yearn for it.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today Polish Constitution Day.

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

There was no objection.

TAX RELIEF FOR APARTMENT DWELLERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to provide tax relief to apartment dwellers. I believe that this legislation will bring equity to a group that has long been at an unfair tax disadvantage.

In these days of apartment shortages and soaring rents, it is vital that we turn our efforts to finding means to help the rent payer. I know of no more justified and simple way of giving at least some assistance than this tax relief measure.

My bill would permit the tenant a deduction on his income tax for the percentage of his rent which the landlord uses to pay taxes and mortgage interest charges on the building.

The owners of apartment dwellings are permitted to deduct property taxes on the building as well as mortgage interest payments while the tenant must pay the full amount of his rent including the portion the landlord deducts. This arbitrary discrimination clearly puts the apartment dweller at a disadvantage.

Since the apartment dweller contributes toward the owner's property taxes and mortgage interests as a hidden cost included in the rent charge, he should, in all fairness, be allowed a reasonable deduction for that payment.

I, therefore, urge, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation be given prompt consideration by this House.

LET'S GET OUT OF VIETNAM TOMORROW MORNING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon has just announced that there were only 163 Americans killed in Vietnam last week. This announcement was coupled with the seemingly cheerful news that the figure of 163 battle deaths was the lowest for any week in the past 4 months. I see no

cause for rejoicing in these figures; 163 lives lost are just 163 too many.

We ought to start getting out of Vietnam unilaterally at 0600 tomorrow morning. We ought not to wait for the conclusion of the seemingly fruitless Paris peace talks. The war in Vietnam has generally been considered an instrument of our foreign policy. It was a mistake of American foreign policy to get heavily involved, and it is even more of a mistake to remain. But the war in Vietnam in reality has become a major domestic issue affecting the lives of all Americans. It has disrupted the economy of this, a rich nation, with the expenditure of \$30 billion a year and over \$3 million every hour of the day. More important, it is a great divisive force, gnawing at the vitals of our country. But most important of all, our young men—America's hope for the future—are being so needlessly sacrificed at a time we can insensitively refer to the fact that only 163 were killed last week.

Without any if's, and's, or but's, in the name of humanity all over the world, let us get out of Vietnam tomorrow morning.

PACIFISTS WITH BLOODY HANDS

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans who dislike war, including the present war in Vietnam, realize that we are there for reasons which remain valid to this day. Their greatest objection to this war is that their fellow Americans who are fighting it are not being permitted to win. These Americans, many with their own firsthand experience in war, simply do not understand sending young men into battle and refusing to back them all the way.

Repeated incidents such as the piratical seizure of the *Pueblo* or the unconscionable murder of 31 men aboard the unarmed EC-121 reconnaissance aircraft over international waters, without any effective retaliation by our Government, further bewilder the American people and undermine popular support for our war effort.

Dissent and criticism should not be confused with the giving of aid and comfort to the enemy. Yet there are those in this country who consistently utilize their freedom of speech and their freedom of assembly to exploit the confusion of our people and poison the minds and emotions of our young men. Such people are exerting tremendous and well-coordinated efforts to disrupt the operations of our Military Establishment. So is the enemy, and these people are aiding that enemy.

They attack the source of military manpower—by urging the impressionable young men to shirk their unpleasant duties to their country. What in another generation were scorned as “slackers” or “draft-dodgers” are given the press agent treatment in an effort to label them heroes and patriots. Deserters become “protesters” under the influence of the same elixir which makes filth and obscenity “free speech.”

Attacks are made on the college ROTC programs, the major source of officers for our Army. Supplies are collected for and shipped to the enemy. Professional agitators visit, correspond with, and in a variety of ways actively aid the enemy. Subversive material and seditious propaganda, frequently financed by foreign and hostile governments is circulated. Physical attacks are made on draft board offices, files are mutilated or destroyed, efforts are made to interfere with the manufacture and shipment of the munitions of war. The widows and sorrowing parents of the men who have given their lives in battle are fiendishly harassed.

This is not aiding the American fighting man by any stretch of the imagination, nor is it aiding the cause of peace. It is aiding the enemy. Despite all of the pious protestations—they are not pacifists—they are agents of the enemy—they are performing the enemy's mission in the United States—they are collaborating in killing Americans in Vietnam. Their acts—overt sedition—are directly responsible for the murder of young Americans whose boots they are not fit to shine. Their hands are bloody—with the blood of their brothers. They are increasingly recognized for what they are.

Where treason prospers, none dare call it treason. Traitors become neopatriots. Local news reports follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1969]

THE DEFIANT “NEW PATRIOTS”

(By Mary McGrory)

Roger Black, age 20, editor of the University of Chicago Daily Maroon, was asked what he would say to the President if he and his fellow draft-resisters were granted an audience with the President.

“I would tell him that I love my country,” Black replied.

He and nine other student body presidents and the college editors went to the microphone one by one in the House Agriculture Committee hearing room yesterday to announce in stark terms their intention to refuse induction into the armed services.

These are the new patriots.

They feel they can serve their country best by defying its laws and going to jail, if necessary.

RISK THOUGHT ODD

Some of the reporters watching this strange, courteous parade of defiance thought it odd that these articulate young comers were risking a record that could blight the careers obviously otherwise in store for them.

“That shows the depth of our commitment,” Black explained politely.

Wayne Hurder, the editor of the University of North Carolina Daily Tar Heel, was the straightest-looking of the group, and he said in a Southern accent, “I choose this alternative over fleeing to Canada because of my love for this country.”

They do not expect to be universally understood by their elders, who were brought up in an era where the acceptable expression of patriotism was to answer a call to the colors, put on a uniform, shoulder a rifle and go forth to defend the homeland. Their elders have told them that the “vital interests” of their country are at stake in Vietnam.

They do not believe it.

TROUBLE FEARED

They think their country is in terrible trouble, not because Ho Chi Minh is on the march, but because America, they have re-

gretfully concluded, has become violent, vicious, racist and imperialist.

As far as they are concerned, the country is like a mental patient who is in hysterics and has to be slapped back into reason.

World War II veterans call them cowards. They think a willingness to face prison disproves that. They know they are being put in “the same moralistic bag,” as one of them said, as the violent students who are disrupting universities. They are feeling the backlash of Cornell, where the uprising was armed.

But they feel that the war is the root of the evil, the source of economic dislocation and the alienation of the black, the poor and themselves. They feel quite simply that America in 1969 is its own worst enemy.

They think they tried the system. They worked in the McCarthy campaign. They got knocked on the head in Chicago for their pains.

Now they think they are trying the system again. They brought with them a polite letter to the President, signed by 350 student leaders, urging him to make his own policies before he becomes identified with those he inherited. It was similar in tone to a letter their predecessors had addressed to Lyndon Johnson in December 1966.

Dennis Riordan, the new president of the student body at Colgate, said he did not know one student in his year at Colgate “who intends in any way to serve in that war . . . everyone is thinking of avoiding service in Vietnam.”

MUNICH ANALOGY

For five years, American leaders told them that Vietnam was Munich all over again, a symbol of the folly of appeasing rampant totalitarian powers. The young draft-resisters think it is Munich, too. But they feel their obligation is to resist an outrageous government policy, not Ho Chi Minh. They do not wish to repeat the mistake of the “good Germans” who remained silent while Hitler embarked on his plan to conquer the world.

Obviously an interpreter is needed between the White House and the cream of the country's youth. The President cannot win them over to the premises and purposes of the war, which they totally reject.

But unless withdrawal begins soon, it appears that many young Americans will go to jail under the impression that they are not only doing the right thing but communicating with their government in the only way left open to them.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 17, 1969]

PROTESTERS IN ARMY ARE INCREASING

(By Leroy Aarons)

NEW YORK, April 13.—The military reservation is fast becoming the newest battleground for youthful rebellion.

Sub rosa activity has been growing for more than a year now. But the Presidio mutiny courts-martial and the public reaction; the civil liberties court challenge brought by a group of servicemen at Ft. Jackson, S.C.; and the participation of hundreds of GIs in several cities in the recent peace march has propelled the movement into the open.

Many of the servicemen who marched in the peace parade in New York on April 5 went back to their bases emboldened to spread the word to their colleagues with greater aggressiveness than before.

“The fact that 100,000 people turned out in the bloody rain to back us up—now we're ready to do anything,” said one of them.

“Anything” ranges from passing out one of the dozen or so underground newspapers now circulating at military bases to outright refusal to be shipped to Vietnam. As in the peace movement everywhere, there are sharp divisions in approach.

The basic schism in the GI movement is between the militant wing and what that wing scornfully calls the “Trots”—short for Trotskyites.

The militant wing is typified by the American Servicemen's Union, a group of ex-GIs that is attempting to build a world-wide organization of American servicemen dedicated to radical action within the military.

ASU is run out of a small office on lower Fifth Avenue. Its chairman is Andy Stapp, an ex-private who was ejected from the Army after a series of clashes over his efforts to organize soldiers. Stapp, a product of the radical Youth Against War and Fascism, claims several thousand members of ASU in the United States and overseas.

The main voice of ASU is a newspaper, the Bond, which is filled with accounts of rebellion within various military stockades, reports of GIs who have refused to fight, and stories of a wide variety of abuses committed against soldiers by their superiors.

EIGHT DEMANDS

ASU lists eight demands, including an end to saluting, election of officers by enlisted men, Federal minimum wages, the right of collective bargaining and the right to disobey orders to fight in Vietnam. Its principal aim is radical action, focused on the demands and designed to force a series of confrontations with the basic military system.

It can be compared with the approach of the radical wing of Students for a Democratic Society on college campuses.

Stapp is scornful of the "Trots" who he says reduce everything to the issue of free speech.

"This is evading the issue," he says. "We're for freedom of speech, but that's merely a tool to get at the question of racism and the right to refuse to go to Vietnam. It's the difference between saying the war is wrong and acting against it. ASU guys in the service have physically refused to go to Vietnam. Unless you take a gun to the generals' heads you can't get more militant than that."

The so-called "Trots" include groups like the Student Mobilization Committee, the Young Socialists Alliance, and Veterans and Reservists Against the War, all of whom have begun to step up their military-directed activities.

PRIMARILY ANTIWAR

The approach of these groups is primarily against the war, rather than challenging the entire military system.

They encourage organization of coffee shops near military bases, establishment of underground newspapers, distribution of anti-war leaflets in terminals and airports and instigation of court cases testing the right of servicemen to protest the war.

The Ft. Jackson case is the vanguard and most celebrated example of this kind of approach. Jackson has been a major focus of the antiwar mood, especially as a result of the trial of Capt. Howard Levy held there in 1967. Recently a group formed GIs United Against the War in Vietnam and sought to hold discussion meetings on base.

Nine members of the group were arrested at one such meeting and charged with breach of peace, disrespect and disobeying an order. Shortly afterward, a suit was filed by a group of civil liberties lawyers to give Ft. Jackson soldiers the right to hold open meetings on post to discuss the war and civil rights.

"The Ft. Jackson GIs have the right approach," said Howard Patrick, military organizer for the Student Mobilization Committee. "It's based on opposition to the war, not bitching about KP or having to do guard duty every night. The fight isn't against the army, it's against the war. The anti-army approach confuses the political issues to the point where it's easy to be attacked."

DRUMMED OUT OF ARMY

Patrick, 23, from Edinboro, Pa., boasts that he was the first man drummed out of the Army for opposing the war. He was given an undesirable discharge after passing out antiwar literature at Ft. Hood, Texas.

Patrick was hired by SMC in September of last year. He travels to bases around the country, establishing contacts with antiwar servicemen, building a mailing list for literature and informing soldiers about what is happening at other bases.

In addition to existing groups now turning their attention to antiwar movement inside the military, the increased activity has spawned a number of new civilian support organizations. Notable among these are the GI Civil Liberties Defense Committee, which concentrates on galvanizing public support for serviceman protest, and the New York Draft and Military Law Panel, organized eight months ago to defend GIs and draft eligibles involved in resistance.

The draft panel, created by the National Lawyers Guild and the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, claims membership of 100 lawyers and more than 250 cooperating attorneys throughout the country. It has a docket of about 35 military cases, including the Ft. Hood 43—a group of mostly black GIs who refused to be flown to Chicago during the disturbances surrounding the Democratic National Convention.

EXPANSION IS AIM

Henry Disuvero, executive director of the ECLC, said the panel plans to expand its activities. "We are going to start a military law project with a full-time lawyer travelling from base to base organizing local civilian counsel to defend GIs involved in political charges."

ECLC has taken a militant public position about the Vietnam war, declaring it in violation of the United Nations charter, and the principles established at Nuremberg.

In addition, "the black revolution is sort of hitting the Army. A lot of guys entered the service without a clear idea of what it means to be in the war or in the service of 'the man.' Now, black militancy seems to be seeping into the service."

The military, he added, "is a great organizing thing, because you can capitalize on discontent you find in any authoritarian setting. The radical left has been talking about a coalition between poor white and poor black. Well, the military is also ideal for that, because they are forced to live so close together."

The reaction of the military to all this so far has been inconsistent. It appears to be confounded by the series of assaults on what for so many years had been a hallowed institution.

The mutiny charges and original sentences at the Presidio are examples of the more extreme and most publicized reactions. But servicemen report hundreds of incidents of unpunished harassment against GIs involved in protest.

At Ft. Dix, N.J., Spec. Allen Myers, an antiwar leader and publisher of one of the two underground papers aimed at that base, was court-martialed (and acquitted) last year for handing out literature in violation of a post regulation.

This year, just days before the antiwar march, Myers was picked up with copies of his newspaper, the Ultimate Weapon, and again charged with breaking the regulation. He was held on base over the weekend, and formal action has not yet been taken against him, although he is soon scheduled for discharge.

The ASU has been a thorn in the side of the military for more than a year, but until recently the Army acted as if it didn't exist. On March 24 the First Army Command at Ft. Meade issued a private memorandum about ASU to all bases in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic states saying that "commanders will not recognize any organization that purports to be a collective bargaining unit representing members of the Army."

The best way to discourage such activity, it continues, is to "convince the soldier that

those in positions of authority have a direct interest in his welfare and morale."

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 21, 1969]

CAMBODIA BORDER IS HOME FREE: REDS HIT, RUN, AND THEN HIDE

(By Don Tate)

TAY NINH, SOUTH VIETNAM, April 21.—Altho the Communists continue their shellings, their ground offensive has gone nowhere and they have reverted to the war game they play best—border hide and seek.

They hit this city 10 miles from Cambodia with rockets, killing the usual quota of civilians. And all week they have been popping across to raid little American outposts. Each time they get licked. But they limp back to Cambodia with the sure knowledge the Americans won't follow and finish them off.

Many here say that's the story of the war in microcosm. "The war is hand-tailored to fit the enemy's capacity to drag it out as long as he's got a man left alive to run across a border," says an intelligence officer. "It sounds stupid, doesn't it?"

MADE TO ORDER

He adds that if Ho Chi Minh had filled out an order blank on how to endure against the United States, "this is how he would have ordered it."

The restrictions under which U.S. soldiers have fought in Vietnam have enabled a minipower to endure against the mightiest power in the world, say seasoned military men. They say it often with rancor, but with resignation. They don't think things are going to change much.

"In Washington," a veteran officer notes, "the great virtue is restraint—mustn't expand the war. Out here it seems inhuman to perpetuate something that could have been ended with quick, merciful strokes. As long as we're in a war, it's more merciful to get it over with."

This officer contends the communists have not won a big battle in more than two years, have not gained an inch of territory, and have lost 480,000 men to 34,000 Americans (a more than 13-to-1 ratio)—yet the unimaginative American strategy of attrition is apt to backfire because American patience may become exhausted more quickly than Ho's army.

ATTACK AT SOURCE

"If we could go after them and attack them at their sources," he says, "or have attacked them massively at the beginning, the war would be a memory by now. Instead we go on year after year with no plan except to kill them in dribs and drabs. Then, each time they get licked we give them all those sanctuaries to go back to, and all the time in the world to launch another offensive."

"Obviously, the war can go on as long as they keep having babies up there."

North Vietnamese troops still flood into South Vietnam through Laos. Along the Demilitarized Zone the Reds have rebuilt their roads, fortifications, supply and troop staging areas since the bombing halt and have deployed another 100 heavy artillery pieces barely 10 miles away.

The departing commander of Third Marine Division, Gen. Raymond Davis, said recently, "It doesn't make sense . . ."

TRUCK LIGHTS

Along the Cambodian border soldiers at American outposts can sometimes see enemy truck lights approaching the border. The trucks are loaded with enemy troops who will cross over during the night and attack them. The Americans can't go over and knock them off. They have to wait for the enemy to make up his mind to attack.

Official Washington says it has thus avoided expanding the war.

Predictably, however, the creator of the North Vietnamese Army, Gen. Vo Nguyen

Giap, who has no qualms about expanding wars, already is sending forth words about his next offensive in which he will "level" Saigon.

The Americans, as usual, will be waiting.

MARINES DRIVE OFF NORTH VIETS, KILL 35

SAIGON, April 21.—North Vietnamese troops firing machine guns and antitank rockets stormed a U.S. Marine outpost overlooking the demilitarized zone today and captured part of it, killing eight leathernecks and wounding 25.

The embattled unit of the 9th Marines called in "Spooky" gunships and artillery barrages that drove the North Vietnamese from the battlefield. Thirty-five communist bodies were found.

It took the Leathernecks two hours to break the attack on the camp they had set up for the night 200 yards below the six-mile-wide DMZ that serves as a border between North and South Vietnam.

It was the second time in four days that the guerrillas had seized part of a U.S. outpost below the DMZ as the focus of war action turned to the northern front.

The increase in combat to the north was accompanied by reports from U.S. military sources that the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese were pulling away from cities farther south to regroup and rest for another offensive thrust.

ARTISTIC ANARCHY

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the organization calling itself the "New Thing Art and Architectural Center" is dedicated to one purpose and that is to obtain taxpayers' money under false pretenses, as grants in the arts, and use it to further revolution. These grants have been used to recruit and organize the discontented Negroes of Washington to enforce the impossible demands of the Black Student Union.

This "New Thing Art" headed by Colin "Topper" Carew was given a lame-duck grant of \$25,000 by the Roger Stevens National Council on the Arts on January 10 of this year. Despite Carew's emotional pretense of advancing minority art, at a recent student rally he bragged that as head of the art group he had organized the mob to enforce with destruction demands of the Black Student Union.

Carew is already seeking more taxpayers funds to continue his revolutionary buildup. In his latest appeal he was accompanied by Charles Cassell, an architect on the Federal payroll, who also happens to head up the Black United Front. This is the outfit which, last July, presented the citizens of Washington with an infamous resolution approving the murder of a District of Columbia police officer, killed in the line of duty and stating in part, "the slaying of a honky cop is justifiable homicide."

In my remarks of March 26, 1969—page 7806—I had called for all grants to the arts and humanities to be curtailed until such time as the responsible leaders of the fine arts community has demonstrated its ability to use the taxpayers' money for the purpose for which the grants are made—to promote art, not anarchy.

Mr. Speaker, several news clippings follow:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 10, 1969]

TOPPER CAREW'S NEW THING

Colin (Topper) Carew is waging a quiet battle to make Washington more aware of black culture.

He says "there is a cultural void in the city because Washington is 65 per cent black and most of the cultural organizations, which are white, are programmed to control culture in the black community."

He started the New Thing Art and Architecture Center in June 1967 to point the way toward new cultural symbols in the black community ("someday we may become a focal point for black culture").

Before the New Thing, the 25-year-old Boston native, studied architecture for 5½ years at Howard University, worked in the civil rights movement in Maryland and Mississippi and was an associate fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies.

In addition to his heavy schedule at the New Thing, Carew commutes once a week to Yale where he lectures on urban design. He also stays busy on the philanthropic circuit in search of funds for the New Thing.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 10, 1969]

NEW GRANTS FOR THE ARTS

(By Hollie I. West)

Four Washington groups are among those receiving \$1.8 million grants from Rogers Stevens' National Council on the Arts today.

The grants, the final ones for fiscal 1969, include awards to 43 organizations and 19 individuals from New York to San Diego.

A \$25,000 grant to the New Thing Art and Architecture Center, a school of black arts in the Adams-Morgan area, will be used for staff salaries for a new black-oriented high school.

New Thing Director Colin Carew said 100 dropouts will be trained in the school, which he prefers to call a "learning center."

"It will not be like a traditional high school," he explained.

The dropouts will take courses in the arts—photography, film-making, music, dance and fashion—mathematics, African and Afro-American history and practical life experiences. Then the students will be tested for the equivalent of a high school diploma.

Carew said that many of the 100 students, between 16 and 21 years old, have been recruited for the year-round classes.

Among the teachers and artists-in-residence will be 15 work-study students, including 10 from Williams College.

Kenneth Kitch, associate executive director of Arena Stage, said Arena's \$20,000 grant will be used to set up an improvisational touring company—the Living Stage 1969.

The company is scheduled to go into production in March.

A small, interracial company of five actors and a music director, the troupe will put on audience participation productions for inner-city youngsters in their own neighborhoods.

Kitch said the "main thrust of the company will be to bring a theater of relevance to young people."

The Washington Theater Club will use its \$20,000 grant, said Director Davey Marlin-Jones, to continue producing new works by unknown playwrights.

Plans also call for establishing a resident company. Engagement of guest directors would free Jones from his normal duties to work with the young playwrights.

"The plan is to bring in young people in theater who are socially geared to our times," he said.

Mark Estrin, Director of the American Playground Theater, said his \$5000 grant will be used for operating expenses.

The one-year-old group, he said, would continue its work in audience participation

theater and try to finish remodeling its building at 1507 Corcoran st. nw.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 30 1969]

GROUP ANNOUNCES CULTURAL PACKAGE FOR CITY: BLACK ARTISTS WANT PROJECT CASH

(By Sarah Booth Conroy)

A black committee of artists is putting together a package of black cultural projects for the city and says it will demand that the D.C. Commission on the Arts give it the money it needs.

The committee met yesterday at the New Thing Art and Architectural Center.

Heading the group is Topper Carew, director of the New Thing, and himself a member of the D.C. arts commission; Charles Cassell, an architect and chairman of the D.C. School Action Council; and Melvin Deal, director of the African Heritage Dancers and Drummers.

MANIFESTO

The group's manifesto says "We, who are representative of the cultural movement in the Black Community of Washington challenge the legitimacy of the D.C. Commission on the Arts as it relates to our community."

"The D.C. Commission on the Arts is made up mostly of people who adhere to that standard which runs counter to a 'black thing.' Most of the money is being granted to establish cultural organizations and their appendages and not to community based cultural organizations in Washington."

The black artists group also thinks that the 35 member commission should have a black executive director and a black chairman and a 71 per cent black membership "in a city 71 per cent black."

It charges that most black cultural organizations are unaware of the commission or the way it functions.

Eric Jones, director of the New Thing Learning Center will be, according to Mr. Carew "co-ordinating the energy." Mr. Carew said an effort will be made "to choose projects not only representative of the various forms of art: theater, music, dancing, painting, etc.," but also "to cover the city geographically."

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 30, 1969]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARTS PANEL CALLED WHITE-ORIENTED ON AID

(By William Holland)

Several Negroes active in the arts charged yesterday that the D.C. Arts Commission is white-oriented in its standards for deciding financial aid.

A commission official replied that the aid will benefit many blacks. But he said he welcomed suggestions from the critics.

The commission, set up last year, has received \$30,909 from the National Endowment for the Arts. It is scheduled to announce its first grants tomorrow.

At a meeting yesterday at The New Thing, an art center at 2335 18th St. NW., director Colin (Topper) Carew, a commission member, said a list of suggested grants prepared by the body's executive committee contains no "black-oriented" recipients.

Architect Charles Cassell read a statement calling the commission "illegitimate and irrelevant to a city 71 percent black."

The commission chairman is George Stevens Jr. The director is Gerard Boesgaard. Vice chairman is Lloyd McNeill, a black artist. He attended the meeting with Carew and Cassell but did not comment.

Carew said he was "seriously considering" resigning from the commission, appointed by Mayor Walter E. Washington. But in the meantime, he and the others formed a Black Cultural Committee, which will propose projects for funding by the commission within two weeks.

PROJECTS CITED

Boesgaard later issued a statement pointing out that the recommended grants include aid to the Corcoran Dupont Center for a program of jazz and new Afro-American music to be directed by Gaston Neal, director of a black arts center.

Other recommendations would provide funds for the Capital Ballet Guild, a predominantly Negro group; to George Washington University for an arts-careers workshop run by Peggy Cooper, a Negro, and to other institutions whose projects would mainly benefit young Negroes—Arena State, the Shakespeare Summer Festival, Southeast Neighborhood House and several public-school programs.

But Boesgaard said the plan of the new black arts committee to submit its own proposal is a "constructive idea" and "in line with the goals and purposes this commission has set for itself from the beginning."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 30, 1969]

BLACKER BY PROPORTION

(By Hollie I. West)

Topper Carew, director of the New Thing Art and Architecture Center, announced yesterday the formation of a group of all-black artists, called the Black Cultural Committee, who would propose more Negro-oriented programs to the D.C. Commission on the Arts.

In announcing the group, Carew charged that the Commission had ignored black artistic organizations that had applied for recommendations for grants for fiscal 1970 from the National Endowment for the Arts.

He also questioned whether it was proper for the Commission to have a white executive director and white chairman in a city that is 71 per cent black.

"I think the Arts Commission goals are valid," Carew said. "It's just a question of implementation."

He recommended a reorganization of the Commission, with it being made 71 per cent black and having a black executive director and chairman.

Carew also suggested that a review be made of proposals approved by the Commission, with the thought in mind of funding more organizations operated for and by blacks.

He said the all-black artist group would canvass the city during the next two weeks to find black artist groups interested in receiving National Endowment grants.

Artist-musician Lloyd McNeill, vice chairman of the Commission, was a spectator at the news conference when Carew issued his statement. He had no comment of Carew's remarks.

Gerard Bosgard, executive director of the Commission, said several black artist groups were recommended for grants, including the Capitol Ballet Guild, Inc., and the Instrumental Music Laboratory Program for Anacostia.

Bosgard said several groups were "deeply involved with the black community." He pointed to the Afro-American Music program of the Corcoran Art Gallery and the Arena Stage's work with inner city youngsters.

The ad hoc black artist committee includes John Kinard, director of the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum; James Speight, director of Southeast House, and Paul Carter Harrison, drama instructor at Howard University.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN M. MURPHY UNDERSTANDS ISRAEL'S POSITION

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, Mr. JOHN M. MURPHY,

of New York, has most accurately placed his finger upon the central points in the Middle East situation. Mincing no words, he has outlined the situation and our choices quite clearly. I commend his remarks to the attention of this body, particularly in light of the understanding he shows for Israel's position.

The text of his remarks follows:

Birthdays should be gala occasions; times of rejoicing for progress and development, not times of terror and havoc, sabotage and skirmish, and death and destruction—the ruthless and useless consequences of a deliberate, continual war.

But those are the unalterable facts that faced that small, magnificent State of Israel—haven for more than 1,250,000 refugees and immigrants—as it recently celebrated its 21st year of existence. I say existence, rather than birthday, because in those 21 years gallant Israel has been forced into three wars despite its continuous efforts to seek and to offer peace. Israel has been the constant victim of a stream of vicious acts of terrorism from the hostile Arab lands surrounding it from birth until present. Ruthless acts of murder have been committed over and over again exacting the lives of children on summer tour, shoppers in Jerusalem markets, passengers at Tel Aviv bus depots, travelers in an Athens airport, lynch-victims of frenzied mobs in Iraq.

We do not need United Nations Secretary-General U Thant to tell us that "a virtual state of war now exists" in the Middle East. The people of Israel—America's only reliable friend in that vital area of the world—have known it, dreaded it and fought it successfully—so far—from birth.

Since the end of the abortive six day war of June, 1967, the defeated Arab states have yet to recoup the necessary military strength to try and wrest back the lands they lost. Yet, in the 22 months since that conflict, inflamed Arabs have managed through stark terroristic tactics to kill nearly 800 Israelis—most of them innocent civilians.

While destruction dominates, diplomatic efforts have been hopelessly unstable.

The one-sided decision of the United Nations Security Council late last year to censure Israel and to ignore Arab terrorism was disgustingly prejudicial and harmful to the attainment of a genuine peace. Resolutions which condemn those who want peace and which shield those who wage war are a travesty to the U.N. charter.

I said then, as I joined a number of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in a forceful statement condemning the U.N. action, that the resolution forbode a continuation of insane atrocities and slaughter. The United Nations' action, as has now been proven merely inflamed the Arabs to further barbarious acts.

The Arabs repeatedly have sneered at the unenforced U.N. cease-fire arrangements of 1967, hoping to goad the divisive Big Four into agreeing on an imposed anti-Israel solution to the Mideast crisis. The Big Four—Britain, France, Russia and the United States—have been stalled in diplomatic dialogue, each selfishly reflecting vested interests in the Mideast while bombs kill the innocent. Further, the Russian and French governments have been viewed as encouraging the Arabs in their openly declared aim of annihilating the State of Israel.

The U.S. has repeatedly condemned this state of war in the Mideast and persists in the search for a negotiated and contractual peace as a major goal of American policy. Yet, aside from staunch congressional declarations, we have only weakly deplored one-sided U.N. resolutions which ignore Arab violations of the cease-fire and which censure Israel's reply and counter action.

We hope that our government will not participate in a dangerous collaboration with Israel's enemies for a one-sided peace.

For in effect United States support for the Big Four talkathon is to the Arab's advantage. It provides them the perfect escape from the direct negotiations with Israel. And even if the Big Four could perform the miracle of agreeing on a settlement, it should and must recognize the sovereign rights of Israel, or be rightfully ignored by Israel.

More importantly, it must ensure direct negotiations and to secure a contractual peace settlement, freely and sincerely signed by the leaders of the Arab states with their Israeli counterparts.

Imposed settlements, whether by the entire United Nations body, the Big Four, or other outsider powers, would be futile and foolhardy. Halfway measures are not conducive to a permanent peace. Face-to-face negotiations—in the spirit and service of peace—are the only effective measures to resolve years of self-destructing horror and hate. But despite three futile and costly wars, Israel's Arab neighbors regrettably refuse to negotiate a final peace settlement with Israel.

Earlier this week, 206 Members of Congress signed a declaration for peace in the Mideast and on the occasion of Israel's 21st Birthday. I joined in that declaration though, through an administrative oversight, my name was omitted from the role. Now as the 207th Member to again enthusiastically support their action, I would like to cite pertinent excerpts from that declaration:

"To ensure direct negotiations and to secure a contractual peace settlement, freely and sincerely signed by the parties themselves, the United States should oppose all pressures upon Israel to withdraw prematurely and unconditionally from any of the territories which Israel now administers.

"Achieving peace, Israel and the Arab states will be in a position to settle the problems which confront them. Peace will outlaw belligerence, define final boundaries, end boycotts and blockades, curb terrorism, promote disarmament, facilitate refugee resettlement, ensure freedom of navigation through international waterways, and promote economic co-operation in the interests of all people.

"The U.N. cease fire should be obeyed and respected by all nations. The Arab states have an obligation to curb terrorism and to end their attacks on Israel civilians and settlements."

I hope and pray that every diplomatic, humanitarian and moral means will be utilized to prevail upon the Arab world to end its barbarious course so alien to the highest concepts of humanity and justice.

PODELL CALLS FOR FEDERALIZATION OF WELFARE

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the entire scope of urban life is increasingly overshadowed by the burgeoning question of our welfare system and how to cope with it. As a result of uneven national development, some areas, particularly cities, have offered wider welfare benefits. By so doing, they have become attractive migration points for many who seek such services.

Drawn by the promise of jobs and a climate of formal equality, many have sought out urban areas on a geographical basis. Few have been prepared for the urban challenge, lacking understanding of city life and marketable skills.

As time went on, welfare expanded to prevent these people from complete collapse physically as urban demands and

pressures mounted upon them in an increasingly computerized and skilled milieu. Yet this expansion of more services at greater cost has placed an escalating strain upon budgets and wallets of urban taxpayers and tax structures. We have reached a point of saturation, financially, physically, and emotionally.

Today, the taxpayers of urban areas bear a double burden. Further, these are major industrial and wealth-producing areas which in turn are making harsher demands upon their citizens in order to provide these basic services. New York State, as an example, provides close to \$23 billion annually in revenue to the Federal Treasury, receiving in total return less than \$2 billion in Federal money. Add skyrocketing demands of welfare, and the people of New York have a right to ask for redress of such imbalance. America's welfare system is a crazy quilt patchwork which is falling apart. Working hardships upon taxpayers and welfare recipients alike, it stands badly in need of standardizing, reform, and federalization.

New York City presents the situation in classic microcosm. In fiscal year 1967-68—the most recent year for which there are complete figures—New York City began the year with 688,812 persons on the welfare rolls, and ended the year with 1,093,964 persons on the rolls, an increase of 405,152. At the year's end, 13.6 percent of the city's population was on welfare, receiving a total of \$1,069.5 million. Of this, the city paid \$310 million, the State paid \$337.9 million, and the Federal Government paid \$421.6 million.

In the present 1968-69 fiscal year, the New York City welfare recipients will have received a total of \$1,535.8 million in welfare. Of this, the city will have paid \$436.7 million, the State \$487.5 million and the Federal Government \$611.6 million.

The city projected a need of \$1,733.9 million in welfare payments for the coming 1969-70 fiscal year. But the State's recent cuts in both requirements and funding of welfare for the city resulted in a cutback from this projected need of \$215 million. The revised fiscal year 1969-70 budget for welfare after the State cuts result in a lower welfare payment figure than the total given in the present year. Next year's budget for welfare is \$16.9 million below this year's actual payments, and \$215 million below the projected need for next year.

People in New York City on welfare receive city, State, and Federal funds in a complex series of interlocking, interdependent matching grants. Recent action by the New York State Legislature has, in effect, stated it will cut a certain amount from its present contribution.

In such a complex system, the State is the keystone of our existing welfare system structure. It initiates the entire pattern, setting up its framework. Then our Federal Government complies with the State's plan and initiative. Here is where the entire concept of State initiative in this area crumbles at expense of both taxpayers and welfare recipients. New York City cannot take up the slack. Its taxpayers are already shamefully overburdened. Mayor Lindsay has already jacked up the city's indebtedness

to unheard of levels. An already intolerable situation verges upon the chaotic.

Quite recently, the New York State Legislature proceeded to give legislative birth to amendments and cuts in our State welfare budget which will result in drastic curtailment of services.

Estimates of exact losses because of cuts vary. Still, the basic situation emerges clearly. After the legislature's action, new relief payments to New York City welfare recipients will be 8.5 percent less than fiscal year 1969 payments were. Figures given by Mitchell Ginsberg, New York's human resources administrator, show that with loss of matching Federal and city funds, cuts would cost the city of New York \$250 million in aid.

What is our solution? We see taxpayers and welfare recipients caught in an impossible bind. There is no solution on a State or city level. Our increasingly desperate search for one where none can be found is merely causing increased frustration and recrimination. Only the Federal Government holds a key.

I feel there must be total federalization of welfare in all States and absorption into a Federal structure of the existing framework of State welfare agencies. Simultaneously, there must be standardization of welfare codes and requirements on a national basis. This would insure an end to disparities now existing between different States, bringing an end to rural to urban migration for the purpose of obtaining welfare benefits.

Certainly, this is the only inevitable answer. We cannot tolerate a situation which brings chaos to the welfare system and taxpayer pocketbooks. Both pose intolerable menace to all of us. One result of this has been slashing of essential public services, such as the unthinkable threat to our libraries and museums.

A time for national initiative is at hand, obviating such actions as were recently taken by the New York State Legislature. Such an initiative must begin here. I am today introducing a measure that will—

First, provide for nationally uniform minimum standards and eligibility requirements for public assistance;

Second, provide for a supplemental family allowance program; and

Third, provide that cost of public assistance under the Social Security Act be borne by the Federal Government.

Aims of my bill are to curb migration of low-income people to urban centers where welfare benefits are greater than in urban areas as well as to create new work incentives by permitting an individual to retain more outside earnings. The supplemental allowance would be reduced only 50 cents for every dollar earned by the recipient. My measure would also free State and local governments from financial burdens of welfare costs.

I feel this is a well-balanced bill; one that would institutionalize recognized and necessary solutions to a national problem of outlandish proportions. By easing weight while shifting burdens we would insure a fairer, more equitable meeting of this problem. We shall have to act eventually, and there would be no better time than now, particularly

in light of the unparalleled growth of this dilemma.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S PROGRAM TO ELIMINATE ORGANIZED CRIME

(Mr. BIESTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the April 24 Washington Post regarding President Nixon's program to eliminate organized crime.

Organized crime is a separate society that seeks to operate outside of the control of the American Government. It involves many criminals, working within structures as complex as you might find in any large corporation, subject to laws more rigidly enforced than those of legitimate government.

While it is true that organized crime is in the business of supplying illegal goods and services such as gambling, loan sharking, narcotics, and other forms of vice, we must take notice of the fact that organized crime is extensively in legitimate business.

Organized crime affects the lives of millions of Americans, but because it desperately preserves its invisibility, most Americans are not aware how they are affected, or that they are affected at all. For example, the price of a loaf of bread may increase 1 cent as the result of an organized crime conspiracy but the average housewife has no way of knowing why she is paying more.

We should keep in mind that it is organized crime's accumulation of money, not the individual transactions by which money is accumulated, that really presents the great threat to America. You see, organized crime exists by virtue of the power it purchases with its money. The money it can invest in narcotics or use in other areas give it power over the lives of many, many people. The money it can put into the legitimate economic system gives it power to manipulate the price of retail merchandise, and to make it easy or difficult for businessmen to continue in business.

Organized crime participates in any illegal activity that offers it maximum profit at minimum risk. To be blunt—it offers goods and services that millions of Americans desire even though declared illegal by their State and local governments.

Law-enforcement officials generally agree that gambling is the greatest source of revenue for organized crime. In fact, in very large cities where organized criminal groups exist, very few of the gambling operators are independent of a larger organization. Should a small-time gambler become successful in operating an independent gambling operation, it is very likely that he will receive a visit from an organization representative who will convince the independent operator, usually through fear or promise of greater profit, to share his revenue with the organization. The President's Crime Commission noted that there really is not any accurate way of ascertaining what organized crime's gross revenue is from gambling

in the United States. Estimates of the annual intake from gambling have varied from a low of \$7 billion up to as high as \$50 billion. However, even the most conservative estimate would provide substantial capital in the hands of these organized crime leaders.

Loan sharking, which is the lending of money at higher rates than legally prescribed, is another large source of revenue for organized crime. For example, gamblers borrow to pay gambling losses, narcotics users borrow to purchase heroin, and some small businessmen have to borrow from loan sharks when legitimate credit channels are closed to them. When an organized crime group lends money, interest rates will vary anywhere from 1 to 150 percent per week, depending upon the relationship between the lender and the borrower, the use for which the money is intended, the size of the loan, and what the repayment potential is. The lender is more interested in perpetuating interest payments more than he is in collecting the principal. Force of the most brutal kind, including murder, is used to collect.

The sale of narcotics is another area in which organized crime is very active. The President's Crime Commission pointed out that large amounts of cash and the international connections necessary for large, long term heroin supplies can be provided only by organized crime. The Commission's report states:

Conservative estimates of the number of addicts in the nation and the average daily expenditure for heroin indicate that a gross heroin trade is \$350 million annually, of which \$21 million are probably profits to the importer and distributor. Most of this profit goes to organized crime groups in those few cities in which almost all the heroin consumption occurs.

One of the greatest dangers occurs when organized crime infiltrates legitimate business. This enables the racket executive to acquire respectability in his community and to establish a source of money that appears legal and upon which just enough taxes can be paid to avoid income tax prosecution. The Crime Commission found that organized crime invests the profit it makes from illegal activities in many forms of businesses. And in doing so, it uses accountants, attorneys, and many other experts.

Many times, because of the reciprocal benefits involved in organized crime's dealings with the business world, or because of fear, the legitimate sector of society helps the illegitimate sector. After investigating one industry, the Illinois Crime Commission reported:

There is a disturbing lack of interest on the part of some legitimate business concerns regarding the identity of the persons with whom they deal. This lackadaisical attitude is conducive to the subversion of legitimate businesses by the organized criminal element.

The fact that organized crime has gained a foothold in our society can partly be explained by the belated recognition on the part of the people and their governments of the need for specialized efforts in law enforcement to counter the enterprises and tactics of organized crime. The public usually de-

mands action only after sensational disclosures reveal intolerable violence and corruption caused by organized crime, and without consistent public demand, political office seekers and holders have little incentive to take affirmative action to combat it.

I think we need a national policy in the area of organized crime and the Nixon administration has given us one.

Organized crime is a sinister disease gnawing at the country. The people involved in it have become rich and powerful by encouraging the needy to take up gambling, by encouraging the troubled and mentally weak to wreck themselves by using drugs, by exerting money from businessmen, by maiming or murdering those who oppose them and by bribing those who are sworn to destroy them. It is dedicated to destroying our American institutions and the decency and integrity that are so very important in our free society. As these racketeers continue to operate in open defiance of the law, they preach a message that many Americans are heeding, and that is, "the Government is for sale; lawlessness is the road to wealth, honesty is a pitfall and morality a trap for suckers."

I personally feel that the extraordinary thing about organized crime is that America has tolerated it for so long.

The editorial referred to follows:

A WAR AGAINST ORGANIZED CRIME?

"The extraordinary thing about organized crime," the President's Crime Commission said two years ago, "is that America has tolerated it for so long." Thanks mainly to the efforts of Senator Kefauver and later of Attorney General Kennedy, the veil that hid the development and the extent of organized crime was lifted. There is no doubt about its power today. It makes its money largely on gambling, multiples that income through the narcotics trade and loan-sharking, dabbles with great success at illegal stock market operations, buys into legitimate businesses, uses whatever physical force is necessary to achieve its goals, and protects its interests by bribing or intimidating public officials. Its leaders are wealthy and powerful; its victims lie scattered over the landscape, some ruined economically, some destroyed morally, and some simply dead.

Thus, the need for an all-out drive, by both Federal and state officials, on organized crime is clear and the emphasis President Nixon is giving to this program is welcome. If he and Attorney General Mitchell can pull together the investigatory agencies of the Federal Government, give them the resources they need to strangle organized crime, and win whole-hearted cooperation from the states, they will have redeemed part of his campaign pledge to do something about crime.

Whether the program that Mr. Nixon has announced will achieve this remains to be seen since the Federal attack on organized crime in the past has been largely noted for bursts of enthusiasm followed by waves of apathy. That formal program began 15 years ago but picked up only a little momentum until Robert F. Kennedy became Attorney General. It bogged down about the time he left the Justice Department, partly because of criticism of its tactics and partly because some key agencies drifted back into their pre-1961 attitude of disinterest. President Johnson tried to stir the drive up again in 1966 and his Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, created the strike forces on which Mr. Nixon's program is modeled. But Mr. Johnson discovered, as Mr. Nixon has said, that it takes

more than "loud voices and good intentions" to do the job.

It takes more largely because the public has been and still seems to be apathetic. A few dollars on a horse here, ten cents on a number there, a slot machine next door seem like nothing. But Mr. Nixon was not exaggerating when he said the profit organized crime makes on illegal gambling runs into the billions (not millions) of dollars a year. With that kind of capital and with no moral scruples about the use of violence, organized crime has gobbled up a large section of the economy. If that flow of money can be cut off, as Mr. Nixon hopes it can be, the backbone of organized crime can be broken. Without that kind of money, organized crime would find it far more difficult to run the narcotics trade that is the root cause of many of the burglaries and robberies that plague the cities and to corrupt the officials who watch over its interests all the way from local police stations to the national legislature.

The details of Mr. Nixon's legislative program are not what can be called clear. It is impossible to make a judgment on proposed statutes that seem not to have progressed beyond the idea stage. But the ideas appear to be good and the request for an additional \$25 million to bolster the investigative and prosecutive effort is valid. Congress should have no hesitancy in providing the funds and spurring the program along.

STILL OPPOSES RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for years there have been isolated demands by some of our citizenry for recognition of Red China. Such appeals are particularly unfortunate today, for an indication of an accommodation of this nature will only encourage Mao Tse-tung to continue Vietcong support.

There are innumerable other reasons why our position on Peking must remain unchanged, but realization that Americans advocating recognition are committing a grave disservice to U.S. military forces in Vietnam should in itself be sufficient to still the voices of modification toward a regime that is steeped in deception, tyranny, and genocide.

It is unnecessary to recount the many published facts of savagery chargeable to the People's Republic since it came into power 20 years ago.

The persecution of missionaries has been repeated many times. The torture of Buddhist priests and the sacking of their monasteries, along with barbaric treatment of people of all ages, during the invasion of Tibet a decade ago, is common knowledge throughout the world. It was less than three years ago that American newspapers published the unforgettable photograph of a Catholic nun dumped onto a baggage cart and shoved toward the British Crown colony of Hong Kong by the jeering, hooting Red guard. She died less than 24 hours later.

Although the U.S. State Department has been notoriously slow in assuming a posture that would reflect unfriendliness toward any country regardless of how despotic, deplorable, and despicable its leaders may choose to be, the disgraceful episode in Tibet prompted the Department to issue a statement on March 28,

1959, objecting to the treatment of that little nation. I quote the concluding paragraph:

The United States is profoundly sympathetic with the people of Tibet in the face of the barbarous intervention of the Chinese Communist imperialists to deprive a proud and brave people of their cherished religious and political autonomy and to pervert their institutions to Communist ends.

If the attitude and actions of the Red leaders have changed since that time, Mr. Speaker, the transformation has not been in the direction of morality or mercy. The toll of lives lost continues to spiral upward and includes many American citizens. More than 400 prisoners of war taken into China during the Korean conflict have never been accounted for and the number has unquestionably increased since the beginning of hostilities in Vietnam.

Recognize Red China? No, Mr. Speaker, and it is regrettable that the idea is again being advanced. Rather than open arms of welcome to international criminals, it is time to demonstrate that this country will not compromise with beasts and butchers. Only when we strike such a pose will Red China and her allies come to understand that America stands on the side of God and human respect, that we will not lend dignity—through recognition—to a mortal enemy of civilized mankind.

CITIES AND RURAL COMMUNITIES

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the administration's guided migration plan announced last week will fall short of solving urban problems unless it includes incentives to make rural areas attractive to families on the move.

Helping to train and adjust those who come to the city will not substitute for discouraging the influx into metropolitan areas. Instead of inviting greater numbers into already crowded neighborhoods, the Federal Government should concentrate on taking advantage of the unlimited space available in the countryside. It is obvious that too many families who migrate into large cities find economic and social adjustment extremely difficult.

Rather than pack these people into the uncomfortable containment of teeming tenements and overcrowded schools, the Government ought to do everything possible to bring them into the refreshing atmosphere of the small community and provide inducement for adjacent industrial development.

On August 23, 1966, Mayor Jerome Cavanagh, of Detroit, who also spoke as president of both the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, told a Senate subcommittee that a minimum of \$250 billion in Federal funds would be needed in the next decade to spark "the rebirth of the American city." He was talking about enough money to build 25 million \$10,000 homes in rural communities.

Last year big-city mayors advanced on Washington in a group with a request for \$2 billion for public works programs to

train and hire half a million youths and hard-core unemployed. I submit that it is time to think about putting such funds into communities with a future instead of directing them into the bottomless slums of cities.

Because there is more space and opportunity to have playgrounds and appreciate nature, families in rural areas are less likely to become involved in the criminal activities that plague large cities. What is most important, however, is that most people who have been reared in small towns would be happier in this environment. The following paragraph appeared in the Pittsburgh Press of May 5, 1968, under the byline of George Gallup:

A company survey shows that many persons now living in the largest cities would like to move to the smaller cities and rural areas of the nation. This is true of many Negroes as well as whites.

Mr. Speaker, unless the guided migration program is guided in the right direction, the Government could be headed up a blind alley—in a large city.

SCOGGINS CREEK DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the problem of water pollution in the United States is becoming increasingly more grave each year. It is important that the Federal Government take whatever steps necessary and within its jurisdiction to prevent and alleviate stream and water pollution. In regard to the congressionally authorized development in the Tualatin Valley in western Oregon, the Oregon State Legislature has memorialized the Congress urging the Federal Government to provide in the Scoggins Creek dam and reservoir project a provision for water quality control.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the following memorial of the Oregon State Legislature:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Fifty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas control of stream pollution has become a matter of vital interest to the Congress and the people in all 50 states; and

Whereas the Congress and most of the various branches of government concerned with river and stream control and improvement have indicated almost unanimously their vital interest in the maintenance of clean water in our rivers and streams; and

Whereas the matter of releasing water from storage and flood control reservoirs during low stream flow periods is a proven method of maintaining the necessary biological oxygen content of rivers and streams, satisfactorily diluting polluting nutrients from treated effluent and eroded agricultural fertilizers, and otherwise providing a livable habitat for fish and wildlife, reducing health hazards for residents and visitors, and enhancing the esthetic values of our nation; and

Whereas water quality control provisions for the operation upon completion of the

Scoggins Creek dam and reservoir, a Bureau of Reclamation project in the Tualatin River basin of Oregon, were not included in the project authorization; and

Whereas the Tualatin River traverses an important agricultural area as well as flowing through one of Oregon's most heavily populated suburban residential regions and several important cities and towns, and empties into the Willamette River just prior to that stream's passage through the center of the heavily populated Portland, Oregon, metropolitan area; and

Whereas water quality control, if provided in the Scoggins Creek dam and reservoir project authorization, will not require change in the proposed physical structure of the project, nor will it require additional appropriations beyond those envisioned in the authorization for construction; and

Whereas this will set a precedent for future Bureau of Reclamation projects of this type to conform with similar dam and reservoir projects operated by other federal agencies; and

Whereas the adoption of such a program will be to the benefit of all the states, directly or indirectly, including residents of affected areas, visitors, and the impetus it will give to local governmental and private pollution control efforts; and

Whereas it is vital that the Congress and the Federal administrative bodies continue to show leadership in water quality control; and

Whereas such water quality control, to be workable, must be a nonreimbursable portion of the project because of its value to visitors from every state and the demonstrated impossibility of allocating such minor operating costs fairly to any state, or portion thereof, city, district, or particular property owners when most of an entire river basin and scenic area is involved; now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) The Congress of the United States is memorialized to reassert its continuing leadership in improvement of our rivers and streams by amending the Scoggins Creek dam authorization to include water quality control as one of the nonreimbursable operating provisions of the project, it being understood that this is establishment of a policy for reclamation projects in line with prior policy expressed by the Congress and found to be to the best public interest by other federal administrative bodies.

(2) The Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives shall cause copies of this memorial to be sent to the presiding officers of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

GENERAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce a bill which bears the short title, "General Education Assistance Act of 1969." The bill would carry out recommendations of the National Education Association with respect to broad support of education in our Nation's school systems. It would authorize grants on the basis of \$100 per school-age child, ages 5 through 17, starting in fiscal 1971. Allocations would be computed on the basis of school-age population in a given State vis-a-vis the school-age population of all the States. This allocation would total \$5.2 billion in the current fiscal year. In addition, the bill would authorize equalizing grants

totaling \$2.5 billion to assist those States having the lowest per capita income. The total cost would be about \$7.7 billion per year.

Mr. Speaker, the essential feature of this bill is that it offers our Nation's hard-pressed schools Federal money which is desperately needed to meet their most urgent needs. At least 50 percent of the basic grants would be earmarked for increasing teachers' salaries. The remainder would be used, at the discretion of the State education agency, for providing such essential services as pre-school and summer programs, shared-time programs, and for hiring additional staff.

This legislation, more than half again as large as any education bill yet passed by the Congress, would supplement existing Federal categorical or earmarked programs, including the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The Federal Government now provides somewhat less than 8 percent of the Nation's school revenues, whereas many leaders in education believe the Federal share must rise to at least 25 percent within a few years. Nevertheless, this bill would require continued maintenance of State and local fiscal effort. The State would also set forth such fiscal control and accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State agency.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that this bill would broaden the scope of educational opportunity within the States while protecting the essential educational authority of the States. I believe that Congress has an obligation to restructure spending priorities in such a way as to relieve the strain on State and local taxation resulting from ever-increasing demands on our school systems.

The nationwide education crises to which this bill is directed is more serious

than many of us realize. Recent studies indicate that our national economy and the very quality of American life is impaired by lack of well-educated and skilled workers. This problem stems in large measure from the inability of our schools to attract and hold good teachers. Able college students are lured away from teaching by shamefully low salaries. Starting pay for an elementary teacher in some areas is as low as \$2,400 per annum.

In my State of Kentucky alone, where taxpayers are exerting strenuous efforts to maintain good schools, we face these startling statistics:

Per capita personal income in 1967 was \$2,426; the national average was \$3,159.

Percent of households with incomes under \$3,000 at the same time was 29.8 percent, versus 20.2 percent for the Nation as a whole.

Total public school revenue receipts per pupil in ADA, 1968-69 were \$699, as compared with the national average of \$895. The figure for New York is \$1,500.

Per capita State expenditures for all education in 1967 amounted to \$110.28; the national average was \$107.72. New Mexico spent \$221.02.

These figures are not an indictment of the people of Kentucky nor of their State and local governments. They simply reflect that Kentucky, along with many other States, simply lacks an adequate tax base to meet the urgent needs of an ever-increasing school population. The whole Nation faces severe shortages of qualified teachers, resulting in overcrowded classes and a shockingly low standard of instruction.

The quality of teaching suffers when salaries are too low. Young children from impoverished homes fail in school because they cannot bring to the classroom the skills and knowledge of children from more affluent families. Schools cannot

educate in a sophisticated technological age without up-to-date materials and equipment. Workers for a technological society cannot find jobs without proper vocational training.

It is no wonder that so many of our bright and talented youngsters drop out of school before high school graduation because of programs that are outmoded and dull. It is no wonder that the less able youngsters drop out of school environments that prove hostile to them.

Therefore, the Nation must gear up to the enormous task of putting its educational house in order. States and local communities cannot do the job without substantial infusion of Federal funds.

The States themselves know what must be done. They should be free to decide what must be done. And, given the aid that this legislation would provide, I am confident that great advances could be made rapidly.

Unfortunately, we are a nation at war, with billions of dollars spent annually in Vietnam. I introduce this bill in the hope that Congress can enact it promptly but I realize that may not be within the realm of practicality for me to expect that we will begin immediately to supply the school aid the children of this Nation urgently require. But we must begin the task of rebuilding our school system. We cannot in good conscience deny the Nation's children the opportunity for a useful, productive, and enlightened course of life. This bill comes to us from the teachers of America. We must study it, and think through the possibilities it offers. And then, at the earliest possible moment, we should move toward the kind of broad, general, support provided for in this bill.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have placed a table showing State-by-State distribution of funds under the bill:

GENERAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

	Number of poor 5-17, 1968-69 (1)	Percent of poor in each State (2)	Equalization (3)	Basic amount (4)	Total amount (5)	Total amount per child (6)
Alabama	351,430	3.9	96,825,000	96,200,000	193,025,000	200.60
Alaska	9,270	.1	2,550,000	9,000,000	11,550,000	128.36
Arizona	66,536	.7	18,325,000	48,200,000	66,525,000	138.03
Arkansas	217,890	2.4	60,025,000	51,000,000	111,025,000	217.72
California	549,753	6.1	151,475,000	493,000,000	644,475,000	130.73
Colorado	67,222	.7	18,500,000	55,400,000	73,900,000	133.39
Connecticut	58,311	.6	16,050,000	74,800,000	90,850,000	121.46
Delaware	13,706	.2	3,775,000	14,900,000	18,675,000	125.34
District of Columbia	32,782	.4	9,025,000	18,700,000	27,725,000	148.26
Florida	257,846	2.8	71,050,000	155,000,000	226,050,000	145.84
Georgia	382,068	4.2	105,275,000	124,200,000	229,475,000	184.76
Hawaii	20,302	.2	5,575,000	21,100,000	26,675,000	126.42
Idaho	26,176	.3	7,200,000	20,200,000	27,400,000	135.64
Illinois	333,125	3.7	91,800,000	280,000,000	371,800,000	132.79
Indiana	143,502	1.6	39,525,000	136,700,000	176,225,000	128.91
Iowa	133,861	1.5	36,875,000	73,900,000	110,775,000	149.90
Kansas	82,590	.9	22,750,000	60,400,000	83,150,000	137.67
Kentucky	285,909	3.2	78,775,000	85,600,000	164,375,000	192.03
Louisiana	313,896	3.5	86,500,000	108,500,000	195,000,000	179.72
Maine	39,236	.4	10,800,000	26,100,000	36,900,000	141.38
Maryland	117,588	1.3	32,400,000	102,000,000	134,400,000	131.76
Massachusetts	128,132	1.4	35,300,000	137,600,000	172,900,000	125.65
Michigan	265,053	2.9	73,025,000	245,400,000	318,425,000	129.76
Minnesota	155,441	1.7	42,825,000	103,000,000	145,825,000	141.58
Mississippi	338,596	2.7	93,300,000	67,400,000	160,700,000	238.43
Missouri	211,779	2.3	58,350,000	120,000,000	178,350,000	148.62
Montana	26,886	.3	7,400,000	20,300,000	27,700,000	136.45
Nebraska	67,258	.7	18,525,000	37,700,000	56,225,000	149.14
Nevada	6,620	.1	1,800,000	12,000,000	13,800,000	115.00
New Hampshire	14,531	.2	4,000,000	18,000,000	22,000,000	122.22
New Jersey	157,058	1.7	43,275,000	177,400,000	220,675,000	124.39
New Mexico	64,178	.7	17,675,000	31,400,000	49,075,000	156.29
New York	653,622	7.2	180,100,000	436,800,000	616,900,000	141.23
North Carolina	492,087	5.4	135,600,000	134,600,000	270,200,000	200.74
North Dakota	43,037	.5	11,850,000	18,500,000	30,350,000	164.05

GENERAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969—Continued

	Number of poor 5-17, 1968-69	Percent of poor in each State	Equalization	Basic amount	Total amount	Total amount per child
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Ohio.....	295,569	3.3	81,450,000	283,400,000	364,850,000	128.74
Oklahoma.....	148,811	1.6	41,000,000	61,100,000	102,100,000	167.10
Oregon.....	51,336	.6	14,125,000	52,100,000	66,225,000	127.11
Pennsylvania.....	384,566	4.2	105,975,000	293,500,000	399,475,000	136.11
Rhode Island.....	27,540	.3	7,575,000	22,600,000	30,175,000	133.52
South Carolina.....	298,168	3.3	82,150,000	74,500,000	156,650,000	210.27
South Dakota.....	52,139	.6	14,350,000	18,800,000	33,150,000	176.33
Tennessee.....	337,556	3.7	93,000,000	100,000,000	193,000,000	193.00
Texas.....	653,171	7.2	179,975,000	289,000,000	468,975,000	162.28
Utah.....	24,457	.3	6,725,000	31,700,000	38,425,000	121.21
Vermont.....	17,770	.2	4,875,000	11,900,000	16,775,000	140.97
Virginia.....	276,216	3.1	76,100,000	119,500,000	195,600,000	163.68
Washington.....	80,828	.9	22,250,000	84,500,000	106,750,000	126.38
West Virginia.....	155,659	1.7	42,875,000	45,900,000	88,775,000	193.41
Wisconsin.....	130,937	1.4	36,075,000	117,500,000	153,575,000	130.70
Wyoming.....	9,907	.1	2,725,000	9,000,000	11,725,000	130.23
United States.....	9,071,907	100.0	2,500,000,000	5,230,000,000	7,730,000,000	147.80
Added total.....			2,499,325,000		7,729,325,000	174.79

SCANDAL AT SBA—III

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have previously advised the House of the scandalous conduct of Albert Fuentes, the special assistant to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. I have called upon the Administrator to suspend this man forthwith, and to fully investigate the charges that have been raised. Yet there is a strange silence from the Administrator. Mr. Speaker, there is not only evidence that this man abused the trust and responsibilities placed in him, but that he intended to use his office and powers for personal gain before he ever entered into it.

Mr. Speaker, the San Antonio Light reported on Monday, April 28 that Albert Fuentes registered two corporate names with the Bexar County clerk on February 28, 1969—just 3 days before he took up his duties as special assistant to the Administrator of SBA. Those organizations were called Governmental Affairs and Management Consultants and Area Research and Planning Services; both were located at 303 International Building, San Antonio, Tex. Mr. Speaker, that is the same room where Albert Fuentes and his cohorts attempted on March 30, 1969, to shake down a loan applicant for 49 percent of his business. One of the participants admits that there was such a meeting and that the applicant was asked to turn over 49 percent of his company; he called it a "finder's fee." That meeting took place only 10 days after Fuentes had received an extraordinarily unusual report about the prospects of the company.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that the Administrator would want to keep this man in an active status in the face of all the evidence, the overwhelming evidence, of his misconduct. I again call upon the Administrator to suspend this man immediately; he clearly is a questionable character to have in such a delicate position as he now occupies.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD the newspaper story—uncontradicted—mentioned earlier:

ASSUMED NAMES: TWO FUENTES FIRMS
(By Jim Price)

A San Antonio Republican, accused of using his position for financial gain, regis-

tered names of two consulting firms with the exar County clerk three days prior to his appointment to a post in the Nixon Administration. The Light learned Monday.

Albert Fuentes Jr. was charged Friday by U.S. Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez with using his position in the U.S. Small Business Administration to head a "shakedown racket."

SBA Administrator Hillary Sandoval, El Paso, appointed Fuentes his special assistant March 3.

Fuentes registered "Governmental Affairs and Management Consultants" and "Area Research Planning and Counseling Services" as assumed names with the county clerk on Feb. 28. He listed the address of both firms as 303 International Building.

The former Democrat was accused in an affidavit by a San Antonio businessman of attempting to gain control of 49 per cent of his business in return for help in obtaining an SBA loan.

The affidavit claimed the meeting occurred April 18 in the International Building.

Gonzalez claimed Fuentes and at least three others said they could get a loan for as much as \$100,000 if Manuel Salaiz, 235 Avant, organized his business into a corporation that gave them 49 per cent.

Fuentes denied the charge and Eddie Montez, former Edgewood School Board president and former Gonzales liaison defended Fuentes. Montez said he, not Fuentes, encouraged Salaiz to incorporate his ornamental hardware manufacturing firm, presently in a garage at Yorkshire and East Whittier streets.

Salaiz said he had been attempting to obtain a \$10,000 loan for his E&S Sales Co. since 1967 and finally got approval in February.

His affidavit claims that a special report by SBA Assistant Administrator W. J. Garvin claimed \$200,000, including working capital, was needed to develop the firm to its fullest capabilities.

Gonzales said compilation of such a report was highly unusual.

The Democratic congressman called for a House investigation and the suspension of Fuentes, pending the completion of an investigation.

Sandoval, appointed by Nixon Feb. 21, has not suspended Fuentes but said he will investigate Gonzalez' charges. Presently the House Banking and Currency Committee is investigating SBA loans allegedly made to Mafia members in the New York area.

FORD FOUNDATION PLUS SAN ANTONIO EQUALS MURDER

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, one Ford Foundation grantee in San An-

tonio is the so-called Universidad de los Barrios. This place has become a hang-out for tough characters who are supposedly undergoing rehabilitation. However, the place is supervised only loosely, when it is supervised at all. One result is that the place has become a headquarters for late and boisterous parties. Last January 10 a young man was stabbed there, and a second young man was murdered there that same night. Since then not much seems to have changed; the neighbors are still terrified, the "Universidad" is run by the same people, and probably in the same way. It is a shame that a great Foundation's money has gone into this project, when it could have been used to alleviate vast and pressing problems for the people of San Antonio.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just completed the preparation and filing of the financial disclosure forms required by rule XLIV of the House. As one who has consistently pressed for clear rules of ethical conduct and financial disclosure which will eliminate doubt by both Members and the public, and which will provide full information on a Member's financial involvements, I was somewhat disappointed by the paucity of information required by the present rule.

For the past several years I have been making a voluntary disclosure of my financial situation which went far beyond the information required by the forms I filed yesterday. Until the requirements of the rule are upgraded, I will, therefore, continue to voluntarily provide the information I have offered in the past.

My personal income for 1968 included my congressional salary of \$30,000, miscellaneous income from speaking engagements of less than \$1,000, and a long-term capital gain of \$365 on the sale of about \$5,000 in stock.

I own 1,000 shares of stock in Monarch Savings & Loan Association and 150 shares of stock in Pan American National Bank, both of which businesses are in my congressional district. I own no other stock of any significance.

I own a home in the District of Co-

lumbia in which I have an equity of about \$15,000. I own an unimproved parcel of real estate in my own congressional district which I purchased during the year for future development. My equity in this is about \$3,000. I have no other real estate holdings.

DISPOSITION OF JOB CORPS FACILITIES

(Mr. BUSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed out, and I think with some justification, that there is a sizable investment in Job Corps facilities and property that would be affected by the restructuring of the Job Corps. This is a legitimate concern. However, it is not accurate to say, as some have said, that we are about to "chuck an investment of over \$70 million out the window."

Two points need to be made in this regard. First, the fact that an institution already exists does not, by itself, constitute a sufficient reason for its continuation and further capitalization, any more than it makes sense for a poker player to continue to put money "in the pot" simply because he already has an investment on the table. I have been assured by the administration that every effort will be made to utilize both the fixed assets and property invested in the Job Corps. Already numerous State agencies had expressed an interest in using many of the campsites for other constructive purposes, such as drug addict rehabilitation centers, vocational education centers, recreation centers, and so forth. All States will be invited to propose uses for these facilities. The existing property, if it cannot be used on site, will be constructively used in other centers or in other manpower training programs for young people. I would like to commend the administration for anticipating the problems involved in the disposition of the camps and for going ahead with a very realistic planning for their future utilization.

VIETNAM FRUSTRATION

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it has become fashionable within the last few weeks to make a great outcry against what is called the military-industrial complex. There is no question but that an objective independent study of the entire U.S. defense community would be useful. For that reason we should all welcome the proposal of Secretary Laird to create a separate commission within the executive branch to look into the escalating military expenditures and cost overruns, as well as methods of contract negotiation.

However, the large sums which have to be spent today in the defense budget when all is said and done are the result of today's continuous technological changes. Today our weapons systems may become obsolete before they are fully completed.

Those who would believe that the late and beloved General Eisenhower in his use of the expression, "military-industrial complex," really believed there was some evil conspiracy between our generals and industrialists will find they are wrong, if they will only read the entire content of his farewell address of January 1961. In recent weeks he has been quoted out of context and quite inaccurately quoted. Notwithstanding if one reads the full content of his statement he can easily see that the general said the vital element in keeping the peace is our Military Establishment which must be kept so strong and ready for instant action that no aggressor would ever be tempted to risk his own destruction.

Kenneth L. Fox, associate editor of the Kansas City Star, has made a valuable contribution to his readers when he recently pointed out that to make the career military and the defense industry the scapegoat for the frustration that exists because of Vietnam, as far too many critics of the ABM and other defense expenditures have recently been trying to do, is both irrational and unjust.

It is a privilege to share with my colleagues and others who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the very excellent editorial, which follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, Apr. 27, 1969]

OUTCRIES AGAINST MILITARY INFLUENCE REFLECT VIETNAM FRUSTRATION

"Complaints about militarism are, of course, old. In the 9th century A.D., before the knights took over the arms-bearing monopoly in Europe, the freeholder groaned about the burdens laid upon him by the numerous Carolingian war enterprises, much as liberals in the 19th century, deplored strains put upon national economy by armaments." (Alfred Vagts in his book, "A History of Militarism.")

The liberals, and some persons of no particular political leaning, are still at it. Nowadays in this country they have a catchphrase—the military-industrial complex—as a clothesline on which to hang their criticisms.

The source generally identified with the origin of this term is none other than the foremost American warrior-statesman of his time. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. Ike used the phrase in his farewell address as President, on January 17, 1961, to warn against "unwarranted influence" and endangerment of "our liberties or democratic processes" by "the huge military and industrial machinery of defense."

Unlike many of today's critics, General Eisenhower had a thoughtful and balanced view of the forces now being described by some as a conspiratorial menace to a well-ordered and progressive America. Ike observed:

"A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be kept mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction."

Ike's valedictory message to the Nation was delivered more than 4 years before the decision was made—by Lyndon B. Johnson—to commit a large U.S. expeditionary force to the Vietnam war. When General Eisenhower spoke of potential aggressors, he presumably had Communist China and Russia in mind, not North Vietnam and the Vietcong. The Red drive to conquer South Vietnam belongs in a special category—"the wars of liberation" as China's No. 2 leader, Lin Piao, and other Communist chieftains have called them.

The United States more or less stumbled into the mire of the Vietnamese version of

revolutionary guerrilla warfare. A step at a time—through limited pledges of aid by the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations and finally the decisive troop deployment ordered by President Johnson—this country became involved on a scale that has subsequently made Vietnam the fourth costliest American war in combat casualties.

The facts of human and material losses, with no end in view at the stalemated Paris peace talks, have stimulated the growth of antiwar sentiment. Patience is wearing. It has been a long war—the longest in American history.

U.S. forces are not losing on the battlefield. They have not once been defeated in an engagement involving as much as a battalion of American troops. But our side is not headed for conclusive victory, either, in a bogged-down struggle that is seemingly unwinnable by military standards. Critics are not soothed by the recital of self-imposed restrictions that have barred the allies from using their superior firepower to crush the enemy in his sanctuaries in North Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

Frustrated in Vietnam, with its full capabilities held back to avoid a general Asian or global war, the American Military Establishment finds itself under increasing verbal attack on its home front. The basic reason, perhaps, is that for the United States, Vietnam is not a war of national survival. Most critics do not even see it as a war of national interest in which the Communist doctrine of "wars of liberation" is undergoing its most crucial single test. Nor are they put off by the argument that three successive U.S. administrations have committed this country's resources to the defense of South Vietnam's independence; that to renege on this obligation would cause some 42 other American allies to write us off as faithless.

Until a few months ago the main thrust of antiwar feeling was directed at high civilian leaders. President Johnson and his first Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, were the principal targets. Mr. Johnson sampled the boiling political waters and decided that it would be imprudent for him to run for reelection. In his campaign effort Richard Nixon profited from the demand for a change tied to hopes for ending the bloodshed. Now, as President in time of an unpopular war, he too, is feeling the heat. But the fallout has also begun to strike the professional military even though its leaders have done no more than to carry out policy decisions that were made by civilian officials.

So there is much talk of skulduggery by an all-powerful military-industrial complex that is somehow supposed to be responsible for the casualties of Vietnam, the inequities of the draft, and the \$78 billion defense budget that diverts much of the Nation's resources from the war on poverty and social human needs in general. It also is identified as keeping Federal income taxes higher than they would be without the extra bite of the surtax.

Lately the protesters, especially on campuses, have been crying out not only against the war and the draft but against the broad influence of the military and its suppliers on American life as a whole. In the universities and colleges the demands, spearheaded usually by local chapters of the Students for a Democratic Society, are for severance of all academic connections with military research and the abolition of ROTC units.

So it goes. Another illustration of the trend is the current debate over the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile program. This donnybrook involves not only considerations of the Soviet missile capability and the Red Chinese potential, but an opposing view that ABM defenses would be wicked per se even if it were not for the large prospective expenditures at stake.

Under the jolt of these various developments, the Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird, has decided to appoint what he de-

scribes as a "blue-ribbon panel to conduct a thorough, independent, and objective study of the defense community." It seems an excellent idea. The Commission could appropriately consider such large, related questions as:

Is the present system of congressional-executive control over military spending adequate?

Does defense industry have excessive and unwarranted influence in the determination of contracts with the Government?

Is the hiring of a great many retired military officers by these contractors sufficiently safeguarded against possible abuses, such as ties that might be established by procurement officers with a view to future employment?

What effect does the mounting criticism of "the military-industrial complex" have on the attitude of younger officers and enlisted men about staying in the Armed Forces as a career? This question can have considerable bearing on the widely hailed plan of the Nixon administration to move toward all-volunteer forces and reduce or eliminate reliance on the draft.

We have no doubt that the present system of awarding many defense contracts by negotiation instead of open bidding can be tightened and improved. Congress has not fully used its prerogative in this connection. In fact it is Congress that authorizes the funds and programs which critics of the military now find so objectionable. Nearly all Members of Congress are possessive about defense installations and payrolls in their home districts and States and are prepared to fight for any and all such plums.

The huge defense undertaking that soaks up more than half of the national budget no doubt can be made less wasteful. Improving the Military Establishment at less cost would be constructive. Lashing out at the generals and admirals and defense contractors and trying to make them the scapegoats for this country's troubles in Vietnam and its preparedness needs created by the mallet fists of Moscow and Peking can solve nothing.

If this were the best of worlds, without the nuclear might of the Soviets and the building atomic arsenal of the Red Chinese, the American Military establishment could safely be reduced to a fraction of its present size. Until an inspected and enforced system of general disarmament exists, however, the United States in wisdom can only remain well armed. The inescapable requirement for maximum national safety is to deal with the world as it is and not as we would like for it to be.

NOW A C-5A SCANDAL?

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, interesting indeed is the news story in the Washington Post of April 30, 1969, concerning the costs of construction by the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. of the new aircraft known as the C-5A.

It recalls the notorious manipulations that occurred a few years ago when Robert S. McNamara, former Secretary of Defense, against the advice of most of the experts in the Defense Department, awarded a contract to General Dynamics for the production of the F-111—a contract that has resulted in a costly fiasco for the taxpayers and the armed services of this country.

Have we here another inordinately costly contract? Let us have a full disclosure of the facts as promptly as possible.

The present Secretary of Defense, Melvin R. Laird, is to be commended for promptly ordering a "thorough" investigation of the multibillion-dollar C-5A contract and the procedures used in production of the plane.

The newspaper article follows:

AIR FORCE DATA DOCTORED, HILL TOLD—
COLONEL SAYS SUPERIORS HID C-5A COST
RISE

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

A nervous Air Force colonel yesterday testified that his civilian superiors approved the doctoring of internal Air Force documents to hide the huge cost overruns incurred by Lockheed Aircraft Corp. on the C-5A.

The officer, Col. Kenneth N. Beckman, said the data were suppressed because disclosure "might put Lockheed's position in the common (stock) market in jeopardy."

His civilian chiefs who he said agreed to this tactic were Robert H. Charles, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations and Logistics and Robert N. Anthony, the former Defense Department Comptroller who now teaches at the Harvard Business School.

In addition, it was disclosed that Charles had prepared a press release to gloss over a warning that Lockheed might lose the multibillion dollar C-5A contract because the big transport was not measuring up to specifications. Charles wrote in an accompanying document that the warning had to be explained away to protect Lockheed's new \$125 million issue of debentures.

Anthony said last night, "I know of no doctoring of any documents and would not have authorized any doctoring." Charles could not be reached for comment.

The contract allegations emerged piecemeal at a hearing of a House Government Operations Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee chairman, Rep. Chet Holifield (D-Cal.) was obviously unhappy over the production of testimony he had played no part in assembling. At one point, he ordered Col. Beckman, currently in charge of the C-5A contract, not to answer a question that might have illuminated Lockheed's potential loss. Holifield dared the reporters present to make something of that.

Moreover, Col. Beckman, 46, was testifying from a seat in the audience and was not a formal witness before Holifield. Several of his superiors were, including Maj. Gen. Harry E. Goldsworthy, commander of the Air Force Aeronautical Systems Division and Brig. Gen. James Lindberg, director of procurement policy.

The generals, however, sat in silence at the witness table while the chain-smoking colonel answered the uncomfortable questions from the rear.

These were largely the product of Rep. William Moorhead (D-Pa.). He had by himself pursued the Air Force until it disgorged a series of documents stamped "confidential" that gave away the hide-and-seek story.

Lockheed had originally told the Air Force it could build 120 of the big transports for \$2.9 billion. The Air Force didn't believe that, and estimated the cost at \$3.1 billion. But its latest reading puts the cost at \$5.2 billion, an overrun of \$2.1 billion.

Under the normal buying practices, the bigger the bill a company runs up, the bigger the loss it suffers. But Charles, former executive vice president of McDonnell Aircraft Corp., had designed a special agreement for Lockheed. It provided that losses Lockheed suffered on its first batch of planes could be turned into profits if the Air Force ordered a second round.

However, until the Air Force ordered that second round—and it did last January—disclosures of overruns would tell investors that Lockheed was facing losses of several hundred million dollars.

Under questioning by Moorhead, Col. Beckman acknowledged that Air Force officials

knew Lockheed's costs were ballooning as early as Feb. 2, 1966.

By Dec. 19, 1966, Gen. Goldsworthy had received a memorandum from a Col. Larry Killpack that said:

"Lockheed really busted Budget No. 1 in the engineering area. Numerous overruns, several in excess of 100 percent, were observed. . . ."

Nevertheless, Air Force officials were testifying 15 months later to the House Appropriations Committee that the program was doing well and coming in near its target cost.

Aaron J. Racusin, Charles' deputy, yesterday insisted that this testimony was not misleading. He said the Air Force didn't positively know in March, 1968 of the big C-5A overruns but it did satisfy itself on this point just 2 months later.

However, starting at least in June, the Air Force monthly contract summary, a document used by financial managers, weapons analysts and others, failed to show any overrun at all.

Asked why, Beckman, a stocky, gray haired man, replied uneasily:

"Because of the volume of the overrun, sir. We felt and Dr. Anthony and Mr. Charles agreed at the time, that the projections we were making were actually estimates subject to actual approvals later on and that the nature of the estimates were such that if publicly disclosed might put Lockheed's position in the common market in jeopardy."

Apart from Beckman's testimony that Charles and Anthony had approved these omissions, Moorhead came up with a document to support Beckman's testimony. It is a memo dated last Oct. 9 and signed by Trenton Boyd, the Air Force deputy auditor general.

It says that Air Force aides managing the C-5A "readily confirmed the inaccuracy" of the monthly report "as it relates to projected program overruns. They stated that verbal direction was received on or about June 6, 1968, that the anticipated overrun on the C-5A program should not be reflected in routine management type reports. It was indicated that this direction was by Mr. Charles and Mr. Anthony. . . ."

Charles' man, Racusin, told the inquiry he saw no wrong in this. He said that the figures on overruns were only "estimates" and that those who needed to know, like the Air Force Secretary and his Chief of Staff, were getting an accurate count.

Racusin said that if the report had been accurately filled out, Lockheed's plight might have leaked to the public with "an adverse effect on the company."

Chairman Holifield and Racusin then agreed, laughing, that only Congressmen and Government auditors have "20-20 foresight."

Secretary Charles' concern for Lockheed stock was evidenced by another document that the struggling Moorhead succeeded in getting into the record in part.

This was a letter of March 15, 1967 from Charles to Harold Brown, then the Air Force Secretary.

Charles noted that Lockheed had ignored an Air Force "cure notice," warning the company it would lose the C-5A contract unless it overcame some grave performance defects.

Lockheed, Charles continued, was trying to sell \$125 million of convertible debentures and had mentioned the "cure notice" in its registration statement with the Securities & Exchange Commission.

Since this was the first time the Air Force had resorted to so drastic a step, Charles wrote, "it may cause concern, particularly in the financial community, that the C-5A is in serious trouble."

To allay investor's fears, Charles continued, he had prepared a press release to say that Lockheed is "hard at work" on its problems and that "the Air Force fully expects that a firm with the ability, experience and re-

sourcefulness of Lockheed . . . will meet the performance requirements specified in the contract."

Last night, it was learned, the SEC began looking into this entire history to see whether investors were wrongly denied knowledge that Lockheed officials had.

Today, Moorhead hopes to complete the record that he was trying to make yesterday.

As for chairman Hollfield, his view was that the C-5A's overruns "are not substantially greater and in some cases less than on other large management systems."

Racusin, the Charles deputy, responded: "Yes, sir."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GROVER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today through May 12, 1969, on account of official business.

Mr. KEE, for May 5, 1969, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. BIAGGI, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL, for 1 hour, on May 8; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. RUTH), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, for 2 minutes, today.

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

Mr. SIKES, for 30 minutes, on May 5.
Mr. FARBSTAIN, for 20 minutes, on May 5.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. DORN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter in two instances.

Mr. GROSS to revise and extend his remarks on House Resolution 17.

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

Mr. CONTE in two instances.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. BERRY in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.

Mr. MESKILL.

Mr. KLEPPE.

Mr. DEVINE.

Mr. KING in three instances.

Mr. HORTON in two instances.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in 10 instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. COLLIER in three instances.

Mr. ASHROOK in two instances.

Mr. BELL of California.

Mr. WOLD in two instances.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

Mr. BROCK in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. BOW in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. GUDE in two instances.

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. MANN in three instances.

Mr. BIAGGI in three instances.

Mr. ABBITT.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in six instances.

Mr. SLACK in two instances.

Mr. SHIPLEY.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. PIKE.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina in two instances.

Mr. YATRON in two instances.

Mr. GRIFFIN in two instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. CORMAN in five instances.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia.

Mr. ADAMS.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. GIBBONS.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. VIGORITO.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in four instances.

Mr. BLATNIK in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. OLSEN in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 5, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 10781. 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. ADDABBO:

H.R. 10782. A bill making supplemental appropriations for grants-in-aid as authorized by the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 10783. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to eliminate the provisions of section 9 thereof concerning two or more members of a family in competitive civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10784. A bill to modify the regulatory requirement that the son or daughter of an employee of the postal field service may be appointed to summer employment in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 10785. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 10786. A bill to amend section 427(b) of title 37, United States Code, to provide that a family separation allowance shall be paid to a member of a uniformed service even though the member does not maintain a residence or household for his dependents, subject to his management and control; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARING (for himself and Mr. BURTON of Utah):

H.R. 10787. A bill to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to classify public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 10788. A bill relating to the control of organized crime in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10789. A bill to permit the Federal Government to further assist the States in the control of illegal gambling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10790. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to modify the provisions relating to taxes on wagering to insure the constitutional rights of taxpayers, to facilitate the collection of such taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. CULVER, Mr. HICKS, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WEICKER, and Mr. FASCELL):

H.R. 10791. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to direct the Comptroller General to establish information and data processing systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 10792. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to improve its benefits; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10793. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10794. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to provide additional dental care for dependents of active duty members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. HICKS, and Mr. SAYLOR):

H.R. 10795. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 10796. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the disruption of the administration or operations of federally assisted educational institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10797. A bill to make it a Federal offense to willfully obstruct the military recruiting or enlistment service during time of war, military conflict, or national emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10798. A bill to provide for the deportation of nonimmigrant participants in exchange programs who engage in certain activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BATES, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KEITH, Mr. KOCH, and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 10799. A bill to provide for the elimination, over 10-year period, of the mandatory oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. PHILBIN):

H.R. 10800. A bill to provide for the elimination, over a 10-year period, of the mandatory oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. ST ONGE, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WYDLER, and Mr. WYMAN):

H.R. 10801. A bill to provide for the elimination, over a 10-year period, of the mandatory oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 10802. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if certain relatives of such member died while serving in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10803. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of facilities to control water and air pollution by allowing a tax credit for expenditures incurred in constructing such facilities and by permitting the deduction, or amortization over a period of 1 to 5 years, of such expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 10805. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make certain secondary boycotts, regardless of motive, an unfair labor practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEVINE (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. WATKINS):

H.R. 10806. A bill to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to colleges

and universities which are experiencing campus disorders and fail to take appropriate corrective measures forthwith, and to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to teachers participating in such disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 10807. A bill relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 10808. A bill to amend section 204(a) of the Coinage Act of 1965 in order to authorize minting of all new quarter dollar pieces with a likeness of the late President Dwight David Eisenhower on one side; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 10809. A bill to provide increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 10810. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 10811. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act to improve the existing program for assistance for construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities and to provide for the making of loans for such modernization; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BETTS, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. DORN, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 10812. A bill to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 10813. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 10814. A bill to increase the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations by two members who shall be elected town or township officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 10815. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to tenants of houses or apartments for their proportionate share of the taxes and interest paid by their landlords; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 10816. A bill to provide that certain members of the Retired Reserve shall be entitled to retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10817. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10818. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10819. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a special pension to certain survivors of persons awarded a Medal of Honor posthumously; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 10820. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to designate the home of a State legislator for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 10821. A bill to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to colleges and universities which are experiencing campus disorders and fail to take appropriate corrective measures forthwith, and to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to teachers participating in such disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10822. A bill to make specific provisions for mounted ball and roller bearings in the Tariff Schedules of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 10823. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1960 to permit certain participants in the Foreign Service retirement and disability system to exclude amounts received as disability annuities from gross income for certain past taxable years; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 10824. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 10825. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 10826. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs requiring a doctor's prescription, and colostomy irrigation equipment, among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10827. 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.

H.R. 10828. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 10829. A bill to repeal percentage depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 10830. 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 Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 10831. A bill to establish an urban mass transportation trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10832. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the present limit on the number of days for which benefits may be paid thereunder to an individual on account of posthospital extended-care services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mrs. GREEN of Oregon):

H.R. 10833. A bill to provide Federal assistance to States for improving elementary

and secondary teachers' salaries, for meeting the urgent needs of elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 10834. A bill to provide for nationally uniform minimum standards and eligibility requirements for public assistance, to provide for a supplemental family allowance program, and to provide that the cost of public assistance under the Social Security Act shall be fully borne by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 10835. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that military procurement contracts shall not be negotiated with, or awarded to, contractor applicants until disclosure is made with respect to the military service of their employees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 10836. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an insured individual's divorced wife or surviving divorced wife may become entitled on the basis of his wage record to wife's, widow's, or mother's insurance benefits, if she is otherwise qualified therefor, without regard to whether or not he is contributing (or has been ordered to contribute) to her support; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. FOREMAN, and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 10837. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Pima and Maricopa Counties, Ariz., and to the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., of certain lands for recreational purposes under the provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES (for himself, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona):

H.R. 10838. A bill for the relief of the Arizona Power Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 10839. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 10840. A bill to exempt the State of Iowa from certain provisions of the General Bridge Act of 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 10841. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the personal exemption for low- and middle-income taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10842. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a minimum income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10843. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the alternative tax on capital gains, and provide for a 25-percent capital gains deduction to individuals and corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10844. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to service the charitable contribution deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10845. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to liberalize the estate tax payment rules and bonding rules; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10846. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the gasoline tax deduction for individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10847. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to liberalize the moving expenses deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 10848. A bill to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to colleges and universities which are experiencing campus disorders and fall to take appropriate corrective measures forthwith, and to require the suspension of Federal financial assistance to teachers participating in such disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10849. A bill to deny Federal grants and contracts to institutions of higher education which refuse to undertake research important to the national security; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 10850. A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 to increase the limitation on annual appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10851. A bill to amend section 17 of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for judicial review of orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10852. A bill to amend section 212(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to suspension and revocation of motor carrier operating authority for noncompliance with certain rules, regulations, and orders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10853. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission, after investigation and hearing, to require the establishment of through routes and joint rates between motor common carriers of property, and between such carriers and common carriers by rail, express, and water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona (for himself, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 10854. A bill to authorize grants for the Navajo Community College, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 10855. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 10856. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the disruption of the administration or operations of federally assisted educational institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10857. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DIGGS, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LENNON, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, and Mr. McFALL):

H.R. 10858. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BARING, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONTE, Mr.

DADDARIO, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENT, and Mr. DORN):

H.R. 10859. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. CAREY, Mr. KEITH, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. NIX, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. PELLY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RONAN, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 10860. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FALLON, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, and Mr. HATHAWAY):

H.R. 10861. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. ROUBEUSH, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. SISK, Mr. STANTON, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WHITE, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WINN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. ZABLOCKI, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 10862. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 10863. A bill to prohibit travel at Government expense outside the United States by Members of Congress who have been defeated, or who have resigned, or retired; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 10864. A bill to establish the Federal Medical Evaluations Board to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the regulation of biological products, medical devices, and drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:
H.J. Res. 695. Joint resolution to provide for the creation of a captive nations freedom series of postage stamps in honor of national heroes of freedom, commencing with a Taras Shevchenko freedom stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:
H.J. Res. 696. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.J. Res. 697. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 237. Concurrent resolution encouraging and supporting programs of scientific research and training at gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Con. Res. 238. Concurrent resolution in support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 387. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Res. 388. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the organization of standing committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCCLORY:

H. Res. 389. Resolution authorizing Members of the House of Representatives to em-

ploy during each summer two student congressional interns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. POWELL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. WALDIE):

H. Res. 390. Resolution to express the sense of the House regarding the shutdown of Job Corps installations before congressional authorization and appropriation actions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

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

142. Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to revising the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

143. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the Armbuckle Job Corps Center at Sulphur, Okla., to the Committee on Education and Labor.

144. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; relative to including a cost-of-living index formula in social security benefits payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 10865. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Kelly Air Force Base, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 10866. A bill for the relief of Michele Trovato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H. Res. 391. Resolution to refer the bill, H.R. 10449, entitled "A bill for the relief of the estate of William E. Jones," to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims, in accordance with sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INLAND WATERWAYS OF THE UNITED STATES CONTINUE TO PROVIDE FOR LOW-COST MOVEMENT OF QUANTITIES OF BULK COMMODITIES SO IMPORTANT TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT—EXCESS OF \$131 BILLION INVESTED IN INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION FACILITIES AT WATER-ORIENTED SITES SINCE 1952

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is charged with compilation and publication of statistics on waterborne commerce in addition to their responsibilities for development and maintenance of the Nation's navigable waterways and harbor channels.

Preliminary estimates by the Army Engineers show an increase of 3.5 percent over 1967 in waterborne commerce in the United States. This represents the sixth consecutive year that the Nation has set new all-time high record for tonnage carried on our waterways. The corps also estimates that the ton-miles of freight moving on our waterways during 1968 will be 287 billion ton-miles, also an all-time high. This increase is reflected in larger tonnage on the Ohio and Monongahela Rivers in West Virginia.

Since 1952, statistics compiled by the American waterway operators reveal that over \$131 billion has been invested in industrial production facilities at water-oriented sites, to aid in the handling and moving of cargo in waterborne commerce. Our waterways continue to provide for low-cost transportation of quantities of bulk commodities necessary for the economic development of our country.

An example of how a waterway project

stimulates economic growth can be seen in the Arkansas River development, which will extend the inland waterway system approximately 450 miles up the Arkansas River to a point near Tulsa, Okla. This project, now open for navigation to Little Rock, Ark., is scheduled for completion by the end of 1970. It has aided in a new round of economic activity in this region. Thirty-five permits have already been issued for docks and related facilities to service waterway traffic. Thus far, announced industrial expansion exceeds \$394 million.

Mr. President, H. Sutton Sharp, the very capable editor of the Parkersburg (W. Va.) Sentinel, has written an editorial, "Traffic on Waterways," in the April 23 issue. I request unanimous consent that the comment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TRAFFIC ON WATERWAYS

Data on commodities transported over the inland waterways of the United States in 1967 has been compiled and published in pamphlet form as a public information service by the American Waterways Operators, Inc. The data was compiled from reports issued by the Waterborne Commerce Statistics Center of the Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans, Louisiana.

The AWO report, titled 1967 Inland Waterborne Commerce Statistics, shows that 500,912,733 tons of freight were transported on the inland waterways in 1967 as compared to 489,066,120 in 1966, an increase of 2.42 per cent. Ton-miles of service in 1967 totaled 173,300,000,000 as compared to 164,528,798,000 in 1966, an increase of 5.33 per cent.

Thirty-five principal commodities made up 94.14 per cent of the total commerce in 1967. Ten of the 35 principal commodities accounted for 81.77 per cent of the total. They were bituminous coal and lignite, 23.09 per cent; other petroleum and coal products, 14.33 per cent; sand and gravel, 11.70 per cent; crude petroleum, 10.12 per cent; gasoline, 7.94 per cent; unmanufactured marine shells, 4.66 per cent; rafted logs, 3.65 per

cent; grain and grain products, 3.47 per cent; basic chemicals and products, 1.48 per cent; and jet fuel, 1.33 per cent.

Included in the AWO pamphlet are tables showing total net tons and ton-miles of service on the inland waterways (exclusive of the Great Lakes) for the calendar years 1931, 1940, 1947, 1950 and for the entire period 1954 through 1967. Another table gives the total net tons and ton-miles of coastal and coastwise traffic for the years 1957 through 1966, the latest year for which these figures are available.

Tables in the pamphlet also show the comparative data on net tons and ton-miles of freight traffic in the United States by inland waterways, Great Lakes, railways, motor trucks and pipelines for the years 1961 through 1966.

As of January 1, 1968, a total of 4,395 towboats and tugs with total horsepower of 3,545,821 and 18,611 dry cargo and tank barges having total cargo capacity of 21,186,331 net tons were engaged in the performance of transportation services in the United States.

Included in the 1967 pamphlet is a table showing a comparison of the vessels on the inland waterways of the United States for the years 1962 through 1967.

Reports on 27 major waterways show the navigable length, controlling depths, a comparison of total annual traffic for the period 1962 through 1967, and the net tons of major commodities transported in 1967.

A two-color map of the inland waterways of the United States is incorporated.

Single copies of 1967 Inland Waterborne Commerce Statistics are available to others upon request to the American Waterways Operators, Inc., Washington, D.C.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR THE RECOMPUTATION OF MILITARY RETIRED PAY

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation to pro-