

rent-subsidy program, the rat-control bill, and (the) many other measures before Congress."

This is a line I have also heard some of my colleagues adopt here, in their remarks, this week—but it does not constitute a very valid argument if what we are searching for beyond, first, the restoration of law and order in our riot-torn cities, is a long-range solution that gets at the causes—the root causes—of the riots themselves. The reason it does not is that what the Times is talking about is a "crisis gimmick-programs approach designed—primarily—to quiet and contain the ghettos."

Now those last 11 words are not mine—and that is why I have put quotation marks around them. I found them, in of all places, on the same editorial page of the Times in a published letter to its editor from Prof. Kenneth B. Clark, of New York City, whose remarks make more sense to me right now than anything I have heard here or read elsewhere the past few days. That letter was entitled "For Total Mobilization To Solve Urban Crisis," which I have adopted as the title of these remarks and, under leave again to do so, Professor Clark's letter is now set forth:

FOR TOTAL MOBILIZATION TO SOLVE URBAN CRISIS

To the EDITOR:

The reputation of The New York Times for incisive and distinguished editorials was enhanced by the series of editorials (July 16, 17 and 18) concerned with the difficult and complex problems inherent in the tragedy of Newark. These editorials are significant contributions to public education and should be required repeated reading for public officials responsible for the future of American cities.

If it is possible to salvage any positives from the tragic consequences of past neglect, discrimination and pervasive insensitivities which made Newark inevitable, old postures and explanatory clichés must give way to a serious and dispassionate search for solutions to critical urban problems.

In seeking the solutions to the problems of our cities and ghettos, the choices before us are limited. First, we can increase the number of state police, National Guard or Federal troops, which are easily available to put down "insurrections" within the ghettos and thereby turn them into compounds of frustration and discontent. Second, we can continue a crisis gimmick-programs approach designed to quiet and contain the ghettos. Or third, we can seek serious long-term solutions to longstanding problems of crime and delinquency, criminally inferior education, subhuman housing and dangerous unemployment.

SAME BENEFITS FOR ALL

Solutions consistent with a tough-minded self-interest of the privileged and with humanity must assure that the people of our ghettos have the same access to democracy, justice and mobility and the same choices which American democracy has provided for all other ethnic groups.

When our society was confronted with the

threat of national survival implicit in an archaic approach to military defense and when our Government sought to meet the new challenges of space exploration, we demonstrated the seriousness of our concern by mobilizing the best brains available and providing them with the necessary financial resources and independence to do the necessary planning, research and development, and to seek and recommend appropriate solutions.

The problems of the stability of our cities and the problem of the ghettos are in a real and concrete sense equal in their threat to the survival of our nation. Our scientific and industrial genius needs to be organized now just as the nation organized its nuclear scientists for Los Alamos and its defense strategists at RAND.

The decision which America makes must now be made affirmatively and not by default. What we decide to do will determine whether the American experiment in democracy can work or must remain a mockery.

KENNETH B. CLARK,
President, Metropolitan Applied Research Center and Professor of Psychology, the City College.
NEW YORK, July 21, 1967.

As you will note, Mr. Speaker, Professor Clark states we have three general choices concerning what is to be done about our developing crisis. The first of these, as some here are already suggesting, is to pour Federal moneys into "beefing up" State and local police forces. Even granting the urgency of bringing order out of chaos, this is, at best, clearly no "solution."

Professor Clark's suggestion for a second choice is—as I have already mentioned—the continuation of that "crisis gimmick-programs approach designed to quiet and contain the ghettos." I know I will get into an argument if I should attempt to relate the programs and pending bills the Times was talking about all into this category—so I will not even try that being content, instead, to point out that the same, again at best, offer only very distant and very partial "solutions." Certainly, this is true about the model city program which may prove to be the best of the several new approaches Congress has indicated a willingness to try. However, even if that program were now fully funded it would be well for the critics of those of us who supported its partial funding to remember that Secretary Weaver has even yet, not made up his mind as to which American cities are going to be favored with model cities funds.

The rent-subsidy program has already been amply debated here, so suffice it to point out that there are existing alternatives to it that are funded and that are working and that—in the mind of some of us, at least—there are also pending proposed alternatives, such as the Percy homeownership plan of which I am a cosponsor, and which, if we had it now, might be of substantial value in rebuilding some of the devastated ghetto areas

that we are undoubtedly going to be asked to help rebuild.

And, finally, as to that pesky "rat-control" bill, perhaps it was a mistake from the standpoint of images for the House to have turned it down. But what the liberal press has failed to realize, in its criticism of this action, is that the House Members who so voted were voting not "for rats" or "for economy-in-government," as has been suggested, but against the burgeoning categorical-grant programs Congress has been indulging in lately to the serious detriment of local flexibility in trying to meet local problems. And I do not know if it really matters now but, with Detroit so very much on all our minds, would the critics of this House action—including the Times—mind too much taking public note of the fact that Detroit, well prior to its recent trouble and all on its own, had practically cleaned up its own rat problem, reducing the incidence of rat-infested building by a whopping 96 percent?

In my view, Mr. Speaker, what the Detroit situation now demands of us is not passage of a rat-control bill but a thorough reexamination of the whole governmental and social structures on which we may too long have relied. For, as Charles Orlebeke, executive assistant to Michigan's Gov. George Romney, said about that city's tragedy:

We've got to try to see what went wrong. This is more than the wreckage of a city. It is a wreckage of our clichés, and that means a lot of things that the sociologists talk about.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think Professor Clark had a real point in suggesting to us, as our remaining third choice now, that we stop thinking in terms of "gimmick programs" that we evidently cannot resist overselling in our desire for votes or in our hope that they will somehow help "keep the lid on," and that instead we get down to work—mobilizing our undeniable scientific and industrial genius just as we did before in matching the Russian space challenge and in unlocking the secret to nuclear power—to find serious, long-term solutions to the longstanding and vastly complex human problems that, unsolved, will continue to tear at the very fabric of our society.

I confess I do not know how to get such an effort going. It would not be easy—enamored of those old clichés and so trapped in our own verbiage as we are; but perhaps if one or another kind of congressional investigations into the riots as now proposed gets started it might point us in that ultimate direction.

But I deeply believe that such an all-out effort must be made—and that on the success of it may well depend the future of what Professor Clark calls the American experiment in democracy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 31, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. Alfred B. Clarke, Fairfax Methodist Church, Fairfax, Va., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 24: 1: *The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; the world, and they who dwell therein.*

Eternal God, before whom the empires of the past have risen and passed away, we pray that Thou wilt establish this Nation in righteousness, and in personal

character and public integrity make her foundations secure.

From prejudice of race and color that divides us, from inequity that begets ill will and spoils fraternity, from the loss of priceless liberties bequeathed us by our forefathers, O Lord, deliver us.

We pray that these elected Representa-

tives of a free people may so order their personal lives, and so fulfill their public trust, that all may regard them as leaders who sustain the moral fiber of our citizenship, keep alive among us an enlightened social conscience, and save us from the collapse of national character.

Hear us in the name of Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 27, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 8718. An act to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1009. An act to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to increase the protection afforded consumers against injurious flammable fabrics.

IS FIDEL CASTRO TRAINING GUERRILLAS AND AGENTS TO FOMENT AND EXPLOIT RIOT SITUATIONS IN U.S. CITIES?

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the presence of Stokely Carmichael in Havana clearly establishes the ideological link between the organized violence taking place in our major American cities and Fidel Castro's plan to subvert and overthrow existing Latin American governments.

However, in light of Carmichael's "guerrilla warfare" threats made at the Latin American Solidarity Conference, an even more serious question arises, and that is the extent of actual Castro aid and assistance to the criminal rioters who have terrorized American cities in recent weeks.

As was pointed out in the recent report of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, Castro cadres have trained and are training guerrilla personnel now operating in several Latin American countries.

It has also been pointed out that Castro operatives are at work in Africa, training antigovernment subversive terrorists.

Inasmuch as what the Castroites and Carmichael call the Negro revolution in the United States is high on the agenda at the Havana conference, Carmichael's presence there raises the possibil-

ity that the degree of guerrilla proficiency attributed to many of the rioters of the last weeks can be traced to Castro-Cuban operated training cadres.

It is my belief, therefore, that any investigation conducted either by the special commission appointed by the President or a congressional committee should include consideration of evidence regarding the possibility that American nationals who are Castro-trained guerrillas and agents have been, and are even now, operating to foment and exploit riot situations in the cities of the United States.

PEOPLE ARE CONCERNED ABOUT RADICALS WHO ARE TRAVELING TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, first, I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] and to concur in the remarks of my illustrious colleague.

Mr. Speaker, people all over this country are concerned about the radicals who are traveling to Communist countries, consorting with the enemy, and then coming back home to create more strife and turmoil. Stokely Carmichael, the black power advocate who, at last word, was still in Communist Cuba plotting with Castro, is the latest of these, and has really brought the problem to the attention of the American people. But we have also had people to travel illegally to North Vietnam and other countries declared off limits by our State Department.

There is presently no provision to punish those who violate their passports, other than to revoke their passports.

I have introduced, in the Congress, a bill which would make violations of travel restrictions punishable by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or 5 years' imprisonment. Americans want to see something done about these people who are plotting with Communists, and this bill would be a deterrent to illegal travel.

TRAGIC FIRES ABOARD OUR AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the third tragic fire aboard an American aircraft carrier in the past 9 months shocked the Nation this past weekend. The loss in lives is staggering and threatens to equal a week's toll of

combat deaths among all U.S. forces in Vietnam.

The loss in terms of damaged and destroyed aircraft and a badly disabled carrier, the U.S.S. *Forrestal*, is a severe blow to our air mission in Southeast Asia.

There is, I believe, cause for deep concern in this day of sophisticated weaponry and land, sea, and air craft when primitive enemies such as accidents and malfunctions can cause such tragedy and loss.

I have been in contact today with the terrified parents of eight young men from my congressional district who are serving aboard the *Forrestal*. I am aware of their deep anxiety and I personally share their concern for the safety of their sons.

Hundreds of lives have been lost, and hundreds of our men severely injured as the result of what we sometimes lightly term "incidents" of the war in Vietnam. At this moment we are awaiting a report of the functioning of a new rifle—the M-16—which has superior fire power as well as a seemingly unusual frequency of malfunctions.

I believe the M-16 investigation was necessary, Mr. Speaker. But I believe another and far broader congressional study is warranted to examine the causes of these terrible "incidents" and to get a clear picture of our ability to combat their causes. Have we developed precautionary measures to guard against incidents at a pace equal to the refinement and sophistication of our weaponry and equipment? And have we developed the means to effectively control our losses when precautions fail and incidents occur?

These matters warrant investigation and I am introducing today a resolution to authorize the House Armed Services Committee to make such an investigation.

RIOTS ARE SYMPTOMS OF A NATIONAL SICKNESS

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, not since 1933 has this country confronted a domestic crisis as grave as the one in which we are now engulfed.

In some ways even 1933 was not as bad, for then there was a greater sense of unity as we faced our national problems. There was not the hatred that today is spreading on both sides of the racial divide.

Certainly the riots of the past weeks, and most of all the disaster in Detroit, are symptoms of a national sickness which threatens our future as a free and democratic country just as truly as our survival was threatened in World War II. Surely the danger to us today represented by Communist violence in Vietnam is far less serious than the danger

represented by the spreading violence in our cities.

Yet, up to now, there is no evidence that we as a nation are prepared to devote the kind of massive effort to our problems here at home that we are devoting to the conflict in Vietnam. This is not only true in the Congress, it is also, I am afraid, true in the executive branch of our Government. In his speech last Thursday night, the President spoke with commendable restraint, but he gave no indication that he was prepared to make any change in his scale of priorities for national action.

Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to know exactly what actions should be taken in our efforts to prevent riots in the future or to reduce their scope and ferocity when they do occur.

It is easier to speak in negatives than in positives. For example, the following negative propositions seem clear:

First. There is no easy or simple answer to the riots. There is no panacea.

Second. The solution does not lie in the direction of more criminal laws or tougher application of the criminal laws already on our books. The malady exposed by the riots is far too serious to be dealt with purely by repressive means. The end of such a road is a totalitarian society such as exists today in South Africa and Rhodesia.

Third. On the other hand, the answer to the riots is not to pour money into our cities to be hastily spent on crash programs. Particularly, it would be a grave mistake to concentrate crash programs in those cities where riots have occurred. This would only justify the rioters and encourage riots elsewhere.

Fourth. It would be a mistake to be lenient with those who have committed crimes, such as arson, looting, and sniping. The fact that one can find historical and sociological explanations for these actions does not alter the fact that the foundation of our civilization is the rule of law, and that crimes, especially crimes of violence, cannot go unpunished. At the same time, it would be a mistake to deal vindictively with those who have been convicted of such actions. Those who engaged in the most extreme forms of violence were obviously prepared to risk their lives; such fanaticism will not be deterred by the fear of punishment.

Fifth. The worst course of all would be to turn our backs on the ghettos, to abandon our efforts to provide equal opportunities and a better life for all our citizens. I have been shocked to hear the comments of some of my colleagues that what happened in Detroit proves the fallacy of Government efforts to encourage integration, better education and better jobs for Negroes, and our other programs to cope with the infection in our cities. What Detroit proves is, not that we have been moving too fast in some cities, but that in no great city have we been moving fast enough.

If these are wrong courses, what then is the right course?

First of all, it is helpful, I think, to keep in mind what the President and others have pointed out, that we are confronted by two quite separate tasks: one is to improve our methods of riot prevention and control; the other is to try to

cure the underlying causes of the riots, the bitterness and the frustrations which explode into widespread violence when ignited by a stray spark.

The Congress must move much faster than it has till now on the President's proposals for action to combat crime. The need for measures to strengthen local law enforcement agencies and for stricter weapons control—measures which I cosponsored back in March—is clearer than ever. One bill, the so-called Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Act of 1967, is coming before the House this week, but it does not in my opinion go nearly far enough. Especially glaring is the omission of any provision for regulation of the sale of firearms.

We simply must make more vigorous efforts to prevent firearms from getting into the hands of dangerous people. The fact that today any one can buy a rifle from a mail-order house without any restrictions is monstrous. In the national interest, our sportsmen should be willing to accept regulations with regard to the purchase of firearms, and the attendant inconvenience, just as they do with the case of automobiles. Is a rifle less of a dangerous weapon than a car, is it any less subject to improper use in the wrong hands?

Also in the area of riot prevention, I believe it is urgent that we develop educational programs, particularly films, for use in communities where riots threaten. Especially useful would be documentaries of riots that have occurred, which would clearly show the death and suffering that results from riots, and who it is that suffers most. They ought to be shown regularly on TV and in city schools. I plan this week to introduce legislation authorizing and directing the Office of Education, in cooperation with the FBI and other Federal departments, to embark on such a program.

As for the longer range programs designed to eliminate the causes of riots in our ghettos, recent events have not altered my view that we can and must do much more to meet the needs for decent housing, for better education, and for more and better jobs, and that the Federal Government, with its vast resources, must carry an increasing share of the financial load. What the riots have done, I believe, is to make clear that our sights have been set much too low. We must start thinking in terms of an annual Federal Government effort, not just in billions, but in tens of billions of dollars.

If it is said that we cannot afford to do this while the conflict in Vietnam rages, then I say we must stop and think about our priorities. Which is more important, victory over the Communists in Vietnam, or victory in the struggle for a peaceful and decent society.

To me there is no doubt that Vietnam not only consumes a disproportionate share of our national resources, but that the conflict there actually adds fuel to the flames here at home. Just let us try to imagine how it looks to people living in the hopelessness and isolation of the ghetto for this country to be spending billions of dollars in a remote and controversial war at a time when insufficient funds are available to help the poor in our cities. When the history of the riots

of 1967 is written, I believe this dreadful contrast will be seen to have played a significant part.

I know that to end the war in Vietnam is easier said than done, and that, as a practical matter, it may not be possible to do it soon. This is not a matter entirely within our control. But we could unilaterally and without any need for negotiations, greatly reduce the scale of our efforts in Vietnam by going over to a more defensive posture.

Up to now, the President has been saying, with the support of the majority of the Congress, "Whatever General Westmoreland needs, he will get." The same kind of imperative, the same kind of commitment has not been applied to our needs here at home. This is what has to change.

Mr. Speaker, there was an excellent editorial on this subject in the New York Times last Friday. For the benefit of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD, I insert it at this point:

SICKNESS OF THE CITIES

The shrill racism that has been the battle cry of some of the rebellious residents of the Negro ghettos tends to disguise deeper causes of urban upheaval that have nothing to do with race.

They may not realize it themselves, but slum dwellers are in revolt at least in part because the cities in which they are condemned to live have become unlivable—concrete, brick and neon monstrosities unfit for human habitation.

The urban poor are condemned to the slums because they themselves are unfit, or rather have not been fitted, to compete for the more sophisticated jobs of an industrial-urban era that enable others to purchase at least temporary respite from the maddening din, dirt, ugliness and congestion of modern city life.

The fact that an increasing proportion of the urban poor is Negro, because inferior education and other consequences of a long history of segregation have left Negroes behind in the race for better-paying technical jobs, gives the urban revolt undeniable racial overtones. But instant racial justice, even if it could be achieved, would not end the agony of the American city and of the dispossessed of all races who are confined there.

Any man condemned to spend his days and nights without end on East 103d Street would be likely to "blow his cool" sooner or later, or give up. Men without education or skills haven't much choice.

Racism, white and black, must be eradicated. Peace and order must be restored by police, or when necessary by military action. But if peace and order are to be permanently restored to America's cities, the broader problems of urban and human rehabilitation must be tackled with far more vigor and imagination than have yet been displayed.

It will not be enough to patch up old dwellings or build new ones in the more deteriorated city areas. It will be necessary to reshape the total urban environment to make the cities livable for all who work and dwell there. This means restoring the purity of air and water, reducing noise, relieving congestion, creating more parks and recreation areas, improving transportation, enriching the artistic and cultural milieu.

It will not be enough to patch up old schools with instant programs. Total overhaul and enrichment of the educational system will be necessary—and this must be nationwide because many of the cities' dispossessed are immigrants from other areas who have brought their handicaps with them. In the world of America today, education means jobs, and lack of it means joblessness.

These are not black problems, or white problems. They are national problems. They are problems that are bound to confront any nation in the forefront of the modern industrial-urban revolution. They need to be attacked with at least the same free-spending determination that the Administration and Congress so far have reserved for the war in Vietnam.

COMMENTS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO THE NATION ON THURSDAY, JULY 27

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in his televised address to the Nation last Thursday night, the President at long last issued a stern warning that lawlessness will not be tolerated. He also called for a national day of prayer and for this, too, he is to be commended, especially since the call came so quickly that the Supreme Court did not have time to declare it unconstitutional, as it has done in so many decisions involving prayer. Perhaps now the Department of Justice will act and back the constabulary.

But even in his call for law and order the President demonstrated the same political timidity that has marked his administration. Not once did he mention "black power," the battle cry of the insurrectionists. Not once did he mention by name Stokely Carmichael or "Rap" Brown, whose inflammatory words, carried so often and so willingly by the communications' media, have served as the catalyst for riot and admitted rebellion. Being against lawlessness is like being against sin, who but the Carmichaels and Browns are for lawlessness?

Some have said that the President's message was moderate in tone and non-political, but I submit that it was political in the sense that the President put forth the same old promises of spending more money and adding more personnel for Great Society programs. It does not take too much memory to recall that these are the same cures that were advocated a few years back. Virtually all the prescriptions were adopted, but instead of curing the disease they spread the infection.

I do not know what the eventual cost will be to the taxpayers for this latest Presidential study group, but it will be largely wasted since we can already anticipate its findings. They will say spend more money and hire more Federal employees, the pat Great Society answer for everything that ails the Nation.

It is interesting and revealing to note that the President is asking for a substantial tax increase, even before there was any indication that he was going to ask for a new escalation of the Great Society. Since he has now acknowledged the danger of a large and planned deficit, though refusing to prescribe cut-backs in Federal spending; it is not illogical to assume that to finance another and more expensive round of the Great

Society's social experiments, he will also ask for another substantial increase in Federal taxes. How much more in taxes no one yet knows, 10 percent or perhaps even 20 percent?

But one must ask, what good will another round of massive Federal programs accomplish, as long as the Federal judiciary refuses to back up the law enforcement agencies whose task it is to repress lawlessness? The record clearly shows that every Supreme Court Justice appointed by the President has voted with the narrow but majority decisions that further detract from the ability of the police, at all levels, to protect society. There is little, in fact no reason, to believe that the latest appointee, Thurgood Marshall will deviate from this trend. It is almost cynical for the President to come out foursquare against lawlessness, while he himself has appointed Supreme Court Justices who consistently encourage it by their decisions; to wit—Goldberg, Fortas, and now Marshall.

Since a Presidential Commission has been appointed, may I make a responsible and progressive suggestion that it turn its attention to the questions I raised in a speech on the House floor, Thursday, July 27, 1967; in which I suggested that the national news media has contributed to riot and insurrection by giving racial extremists like Stokely Carmichael and "Rap" Brown, a national vehicle to dispense their messages of hate and violence to millions of people, no small percentage of whom are more than willing to take their advice. The commission should secure from each of the television networks a listing of all network news and "public affairs" programs which have featured appearances by Carmichael, Brown, Bayard Rustin, and others who fit their category. I believe such information, and the amount and percentages of so-called public service time, when made available will demonstrate that poor judgment, on the part of many network producers, has made a direct contribution to the rebellion on the streets of the Nation. I insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the July 29 issue of the New York Daily News, and also an article from the current issue of Reader's Digest:

(From the New York Daily News, July 29, 1967)

RIGHT YOU ARE, REPRESENTATIVE HALL

A Stokely Carmichael calling for insurrection on a street corner soapbox is a curiosity—a hippie talking to a few other hippies. But a Stokely Carmichael talking face to face to millions of people [via television] is immediately transformed from an oddball to a national figure.

That striking and eminently sound observation comes from a speech prepared Thursday for insertion in the Congressional Record by Rep. Durward G. Hall (R-Mo.).

Stokely Carmichael, of course, is the Negro firebrand now in Cuba professing admiration for Red F. Castro and hate for the U.S.A.

Rep. Hall in this speech urged strongly that news media—especially television and radio—use a lot more discretion than they have been using about letting these merchants of race hate sound off via TV and radio.

Such exposure to millions of viewers and/or listeners gives these birds an importance

in many people's minds which they do not rate. They speak at most for a few misguided Negroes and a few malevolent U.S. Communists. Why not give them publicity in proportion to their unimportance, and no more?

The same goes for some newspapers. And no question of censorship is involved here. It is, to repeat, a matter of editorial sense and discretion in all media.

[From the Reader's Digest, August 1967]
THE UNREAL WORLD OF TELEVISION NEWS

(By Henry Fairlie)

None of us has ever seen Alexander the Great emerging from his tent. If there had been television in his day, and if we could today look at the tape, would we know him any better, as we think we now know a Lyndon B. Johnson when we see him on television news emerging, say, from a helicopter?

The answer is far from clear. Of all historical evidence, the public presence of voice or of physical appearance is the most revealing, but it can also be the most misleading. Yet every night, watching television news, millions of people have to decide whether they can believe what they see flickering in front of them. Is it genuine? Can television, by its nature, tell the truth?

"The evidence of one's own eyes?" But that is precisely what is not available. What is available is the evidence of the camera, making its own selection, dictating its own terms.

Television does not merely create news—as newspapers have done for generations. Television creates its own events. Unlike the newspaperman's words, television happens as we watch.

There is a vital margin of difference between saying, "Did you see the report in the New York Times of the massacre in the Congo?" and saying, "Did you see the massacres in the Congo on television last night?" The first remark implies only that one has seen a report, which may conflict with another report. The second implies that one has seen the event itself. However carefully television is used, it cannot avoid this deception.

Television can report incidents; it is the nature of incidents that they can, and do, happen in isolation. But rarely can television report an event. The true meaning of an event depends on all of its known and unknown causes, on all of the known and unknown incidents that contribute to it, on all its repercussions. The whole of an incident can easily be described; the whole of an event may escape even the historian.

If this is the difficulty that confronts the newspaper reporter from day to day, it is one that the television reporter can rarely overcome. For the newspaper reporter has flexibility. He can reach where the camera cannot reach. He can go "off the record." He can qualify, provide perspective. The television reporter on the other hand, however carefully he chooses his words, can never properly qualify a spectacular picture.

Not only is the core of television the public and the spectacular, but there is an important sense in which television has a vested interest in disaster. From the point of view of a good story, both newspapers and television prefer covering a major strike to covering negotiations which prevent a strike. Yet it is possible for the newspaper reporter to make negotiations almost as exciting as a strike. But what can television do with negotiations? It can only show pictures of people arriving at a building and people leaving it.

Violence—movement—is the stuff of television, something it cannot help emphasizing. Three distinct characteristics of television intensify the special temptations to which it is exposed. There is, first, the limitation of time. A lead news story in a paper

may take ten minutes to read. This sort of time is simply not available in handling television news. This means concentration to the point of distortion; and, in the reporting of violence, it means concentration on the violent incident to the exclusion of the whole event.

An example of such distortion was the police attack on civil-rights marchers at the Selma, Ala., bridge on March 1965. Every reliable reporter I know who was present points out that there was first a period during which and police and demonstrators faced each other without violence, in an atmosphere of unbearable tension.

Television news broadcasts did not, and could not, show this preliminary encounter; three minutes of film is an extended sequence in a news program. But without knowledge of the buildup to put the violence in perspective, one begins to think that police brutality is automatic, that the police will always behave in such a manner.

There is, second, television's tendency to produce self-generating news. The problem has arisen, again and again, wherever there have been riots and disturbances, as in Watts. However spontaneous the original outbreak of violence, as television cameramen and reporters move into the streets looking—literally looking—for trouble, they add an external provocation. The crowds begin to play up to them. Television, merely by its presence, helps to create incidents.

Finally, there is the size of the television screen—the limitations it imposes, the temptations it offers. Last summer, television news showed some alarming pictures of white men and women in the Chicago suburb of Cicero screaming abuse at some Negro marchers. Their hating faces filled the screen. They looked as if they were a representative example of a much larger crowd. But anyone who was there knows that these particular whites were only a small part of the crowds in the streets, and that the crowds themselves were only a small part of the total white population of Cicero. To this vital extent, television that night distorted badly.

So, people sitting in their homes begin to think that all police are brutal, that all demonstrators are violent, that all disturbances are riots, that all crowds are aggressive. The fact that we ourselves usually go through each day without either meeting or displaying violence becomes less real to us than what we see on the small screen. Much of our feeling of living in a condition of perpetual crisis, and the agitation arising from it, stems from this.

Television can create not only events but whole movements out of incidents. The television news coverage of the Meredith march across Mississippi, during the time when I accompanied it, constantly appalled me. The straggling column was made on the small screen to look like an army. When the cameras were rolling, the marchers—few in numbers and anything but impressive in mien—pulled themselves together and played the role expected of them. The leaders strode in line abreast, at the head of their enthusiastic followers.

The real story of the Meredith march was not this unified demonstration at all, but the fact that it brought to light the deeply significant clash between different factions of the civil-rights movement over "black power."

Newspapers felt their way to this story, which for the most part was taking place in private meetings, and by the end they were reporting it fully. But when television at last caught on to the fact of "black power," it inevitably exaggerated and distorted it. Since film is expensive, in reporting any speech the television reporter and cameraman make an automatic, almost involuntary, preselection. They wait for the mention of a phrase like "black power"—then on go the lights, and the film rolls. By

constant reiteration on the small screen, the slogan of "black power" was elevated into a movement. It was suddenly there. It had suddenly happened.

The only immediate answer to most of the problems of television news lies not in pictures but in words. Most television reporting just describes the pictures, and by doing so reinforces them. But the object should be to correct the pictures, to supply qualification, to say, "It was not quite so. This was not the whole story." In essence: to remind the viewer that he is seeing not an event, only an impression of one.

That television news can do some things remarkably well, especially in full-length features and documentaries, that those involved in making television programs are conscientious and skillful, does not touch the main problem. Life is not made up of dramatic incidents—not even the life of a nation. Many of our unnecessary anxieties about the way we live, about the fearful things that may happen to us, might be allayed if television news began, now and then, to say: "It has been a dull day. But we have collected some rather interesting pictures for you, of no particular significance." Television news has a deep responsibility to try to be dull, from time to time, and let the world sleep better.

STRICT ENFORCEMENT OF EXISTING LAWS AT ALL LEVELS NEEDED TO STOP RIOTING

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to convey my appreciation to the Chaplain of the House for permitting the minister of my church, Dr. A. B. Clarke, to give the invocation today.

Mr. Speaker, a number of Members have expressed the grave concern we all have of the violence in our streets. Any attempt to justify this criminal activity because of lack of adequate housing, employment opportunity or educational facilities is untenable. Regardless of social or political philosophy we must stop this looting, arson, and murder by strict enforcement of existing laws at all levels and by the enactment of such additional statutes as is necessary.

A good friend and constituent, Hardee Chambliss, who is a lifelong Democrat, has written me of his shock and dismay at the administration's handling of these riots and the events leading up to them. I insert his letter at this point in the RECORD and commend it to you.

CENTREVILLE, VA.
July 28, 1967.

Congressman WILLIAM L. SCOTT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I rarely write any letter involving political questions but I am dismayed and shocked at the racial riots that have occurred in our nation within the past two weeks. I feel that the administration has woefully mishandled this problem from its inception; and, indeed, it seems to me that the President and the Vice President have both contributed to aggravating what has always been an explosive situation.

A noteworthy article appears in the current issue (July 31) of U.S. News & World

Report. It is entitled, "Is U.S. Able to Govern Itself?" On page 26 of that issue the article quotes from a speech made by President Johnson on August 3, 1965:

"... Free speech, free press, free religion, the right of free assembly, yes, the right of petition, the right to buy ads and to have teach-ins and sit-ins and parades and marches and demonstrations—well, they're still radical ideas. And so are secret ballots and so are free elections, and so is the principle of equal dignity . . ."

"I hope that you . . . will go out into the hinterland and rouse the masses and blow the bugles and tell them that the hour has arrived and their day is here; that we are on the march against the ancient enemies and we are going to be successful."

Similar utterances by Vice President Humphrey have been so frequent that they are now a part of the fabric of the current administration. It is impossible for me to see how either the President or the Vice President can avoid the responsibility that these utterances have put upon them.

The leaders of the militant Negro revolutionary parties blame the riots on the treatment the Negroes have received from the whites. They overlook the fact that Detroit and Newark had both been regarded as having made exceptional progress in race relations in setting up employment and welfare programs to aid the Negro.

In the Washington Post of July 28, Mr. Whitney Young, Jr., Executive Director of the National Urban League, is quoted as saying that "it comes right down to liberate or exterminate the Negro." The newspaper did not quote any definition that Mr. Young may have given for the terms "liberate" or "exterminate." If he meant by "liberate" to permit the Negro to burn, loot, steal and murder, then I am compelled to suggest that we are not required to give the Negro that type of freedom. It seems to me that when looting, arson and murder are linked with rioting, it is the responsibility of the Government to suppress any such insurrections promptly and effectively. It is no time to delay, to parley, and to attempt to conciliate those engaged in such acts. If, in order to protect its peaceful citizens, it is necessary to "exterminate" people engaged in looting, in arson and in murder, then there is, I would assume, a duty and responsibility on the Government to do exactly that.

A further commentary on the "liberation" of the Negro occurred in the riot in Detroit. According to Drew Pearson, Damon Keith, Negro head of the Civil Rights Commission (who is expected to become a Federal judge), telephoned the news media asking them not to publicize the Detroit riot when it first commenced. He requested that Negro leaders be given time to get things under control. Your colleague, Representative John Conyers of Michigan, also a Negro, went into the 12th Street area of Detroit urging fellow Negroes to keep the peace. Conyers was knocked off the top of his car. According to Pearson the police stood by, still under orders not to shoot. The criminal element, white as well as black, were thereby given liberty to burn, loot, and murder. They took full advantage of it. Drug stores were broken into—food, appliances, furniture, clothing, fire arms were carried away by the armful and by the truckload. The National Guard was not ordered in until late Sunday evening. What conceivable excuse is there for such delay? Is it because the elected representatives of that district were fearful that they would lose votes if the police interfered with the "liberty" of the rioters?

H. Rap Brown, the Negro national chairman of the so-called Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, was "liberated" from Alexandria jail at 1:05 a.m. on Thursday, July 27. At 12:00 Noon on the same day he held a press conference at which he described the President of the United States as a Texas outlaw. This statement was made

by this Negro leader at a time when he was free on \$10,000 bail from a Virginia court arising from his arrest as a fugitive from Maryland. How long will this sort of conduct on the part of irresponsible elements of our society be countenanced? If the only way the law abiding segment of our society, white or black, can survive is by exterminating the arsonists, the thieves and the murderers, then, unhappily, that may well be the only solution to the problem.

We are shamefully deluding ourselves by thinking this crisis in our national affairs can be remedied, or even ameliorated, by poverty programs, hand-outs, civil rights legislation, pleas of reconciliation, and any other step other than prompt and strict repressive measures to restore law and order. It must be clear to all, particularly to those of us who are lawyers, that the time has come to make it perfectly clear to the criminal element of this country, whatever their race or color, that the nation intends to maintain order on its streets; and that local, as well as national authority, is committed to the responsibility of protecting the lives and property of its citizens. It is obvious that the millions that have been spent in aiding the dissident elements has done nothing to relieve the problem.

The Federal Government plans, I believe, on spending 24 billion dollars for maintaining the war in Vietnam during the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1967; and plans on spending an additional 5.3 billions for aid abroad, including military aid, food for peace, peace corps, and other world programs. The present administration seems committed to the proposition that if we can't obtain friends by diplomacy, we will pacify them by napalm. It continues a program of bombing women and children in Vietnam, whose only crime against society is that they are the wives, sisters, or children of the men who are fighting for the protection of their own territory. We do this on the weakest of pretexts that we are under a commitment to Vietnam to prevent the spread of Communism in that country. We take the posture that we have been appointed by Providence to show Southeast Asia how they should live and yet we are unable to prevent in our own cities, riots, insurrection, arson, murder and rape. How long will this be tolerated?

Although I do not know Senator Spong, I am sending a copy of this letter to him so that he can be aware of the views of at least one of his constituents.

Cordially yours,

HARDEE CHAMBLISS.

RIOTS AND RACIAL INSURRECTION

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the riots and racial insurrection in American cities in this July of 1967 calls for punishment of those guilty of criminal acts, aid for the innocent sufferers, and attack upon the conditions which create needless human suffering in America consistent with equal justice and recognition and respect for the rights and privileges of all Americans, and subject to debate on means, methods, and priorities which is essential to the enactment of good legislation and the preservation of a society which still values freedom above security as it struggles to improve both for the benefit of its citizens.

The country casts about for scapegoats and one of the most convenient scapegoats is this Congress with special emphasis upon the failure of the House to pass the Rat Control Act. The very simplified interpretation is that which equates a vote against the act as a vote against Negroes and in support of ghettos. Certainly the legislation was supported as an attack on ghetto conditions. By many of us, however, the act was further considered within the context of other principles, as well, such as the extent of responsibility and decisionmaking which should be borne by local government, by State government and by the Federal Government; the consideration of whether this program could be successful without massive appropriations extending into the billions rather than the startup \$40 million requested by the act for use in only a small part of the Nation's urban centers, and the consideration of priorities under conditions which bring us face to face with expanding wars, expanding debt, and pressure for increased taxes. We have a responsibility to attack poverty. We also have a responsibility to the self-reliant and to the conditions which encourage self-reliance.

Just as it is a responsibility of an elected representative to submit readily to criticism, and I pay sincere tribute to our critics, including responsible citizens, the press, the scholars, and the clergy, for they are the citizens' best defense against bad government, so too it seems to me is our responsibility in appropriate circumstances, to respond to the critics rather than to be silent and ignore the issue raised. At this point, I parenthetically cite a personal case in point.

In a recent article in the Salt Lake Tribune I was identified as supporting a 5-percent cut on a Utah project of which I had claimed full support. Specifically, I supported the 5-percent cut in the Public Works Appropriations bill which carried an appropriation of \$8 million plus for the Bonneville unit of the central Utah reclamation project in behalf of which I have been working hard because I view the enactment of wise legislation providing for the proper use and development of our Nation's scarce water supplies to be one of our most serious responsibilities.

Disclosure of all the facts would reveal that funds for this Utah project would have been cut less than half a million dollars, a small price to pay for total savings under this appropriations bill if the 5-percent cut had been successful, which would have been \$230 million on the total bill carrying a \$4.6 billion price tag. I believe it to be Utah's responsibility to share in the cutting of domestic expenses so vital, as I see it, to the Nation's total welfare today.

I have necessarily detoured briefly from my subject today which is the insurrection and rioting in American cities. I have stated that those guilty of criminal acts should be punished. I hope the other body will act favorably upon the anti-riot legislation which we have already passed and that it will be enacted into law by the President's signature. I believe the most recent activities of Stokely

Carmichael should be brought to the attention of the House.

This advocate of racial rioting occupied a seat of honor last Wednesday night in Santiago, Cuba, with Communists from Latin America and Vietnam, as Fidel Castro spoke to a half million Cubans on the occasion of the 14th anniversary of the Cuban revolution. This week Carmichael is in Havana as an invited observer attending the meeting of hemisphere Communists in convention of revolutionary movements called the Organization of Latin American Solidarity. Representatives of the Vietcong are prominently in attendance.

The anti-riot bill has been dismissed by some as merely a political self-serving attack against Stokely Carmichael. There is little doubt in my mind that Carmichael has committed the type of offenses against which the bill was aimed, but the shoe was made not alone for the foot of Carmichael but for any foot that fits.

It becomes increasingly clear that the shoe fits Carmichael's foot. In Communist Cuba, Carmichael is lavish in his praise for Cuba, for Castro and for his exported revolutions. He is bitter in his denunciation of the United States. Castro hailed him Wednesday night as "the representative of the Negro people of the United States."

Carmichael has said that the guerrilla tactics of the Cuban revolution have been applied in the Newark riots. And, he said:

We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas for our defense in the cities. . . . It is going to be a fight to the death.

While Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins, Whitney M. Young, Jr., and A. Philip Randolph plead for an end to the rioting both on grounds of lawlessness and the obvious punishment inflicted upon innocent Negroes, Carmichael preaches race hatred, revolution, and riot.

His actions in Cuba are overriding evidence that whether or not he is a card carrying Communist, he alines himself with Communists, he advocates the Communist methods of agitation, and the provoking of chaos and bitterness of race riots as he plays a leading role in the breakdown of respect for law and order.

He has been denied reentry into Great Britain where he spent 10 days before going to Cuba. In Britain he is charged with advocating racial violence. This country should make certain that he is denied a passport which would at least prevent him from spreading anti-American propaganda while encouraging racial violence abroad.

Mr. Speaker, the preamble of the Constitution of the United States states a purpose of establishing the Constitution to be to preserve domestic tranquillity. Stokely Carmichael participates in creating domestic violence with accompanying illegal acts. Article III, section 3, defines treason as adhering to the enemy and giving him aid and comfort. Stokely Carmichael proudly shares the platform with Fidel Castro and the Communists of Vietnam with whom we are in armed conflict. Incitement to riot is a crime in the United States and in the District of Columbia. Stokely Carmichael

willfully incites. The revoking of his passport is not enough. If he has committed criminal acts, the fact that he is a Negro should not provide him a shield.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, we are all shocked and grieved at the wave of lawlessness that has swept the country in recent weeks. I hope that the antiriot bill which has already been adopted by the House will soon clear the other body and be signed promptly into law by the President. I just do not believe that these riots are spontaneous. Those who have incited and participated in them should be punished.

But, Mr. Speaker, the business of the Congress must go on and I wish to mention another matter which is deserving of consideration this morning.

Mr. Speaker, the Government recently closed its fiscal year 1967 books \$9.9 billion in the red.

The deficit at the end of the current year is estimated to be somewhere between \$20 and \$30 billion.

If the deficit this year reaches \$30 billion, this will mean that during just 4 years this administration will have accumulated \$53.8 billion in deficits, all of which had or will have to be borrowed. Following is a year account of this dismal record:

Deficit	Billion
1964	\$8.266
1965	3.435
1966	2.251
1967	9.937
1968 (estimated)	30.000
Total	53.849

Confronted with this depressing prospect, some of us who serve on the House Committee on Appropriations early this year set a goal to reduce budget requests by at least \$5 billion in order to avoid a tax increase which the administration estimates will produce \$4.7 billion in additional revenue.

So far this calendar year, the House of Representatives has made reductions of \$3.4 billion in requests for new appropriations.

We still have for consideration requests calling for \$13.9 billion out of which we hope to cut \$1.6 billion to reach the \$5 billion goal.

This goal can be attained without damaging any essential activity. The hard pressed taxpayers of the Nation are assured that Republicans on the Appropriations Committee and in the House are going to work very hard to accomplish this objective. All Members who believe in fiscal responsibility are invited to join in this effort.

RIOTS IN MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if you had asked me to identify the one large American city where race riots would not occur, I would have named Milwaukee, Wis.

Sadly, I must report that the riots came to Milwaukee last night. They came in a manner that indicated thorough discipline, planning, and preparation. Molotov cocktails were widely, indiscriminately, and cruelly used. One aged woman is dead and one other body, tentatively believed to be that of a policeman, charred beyond immediate recognition, has been found. More than 100 arrests have been made. The National Guard is in the city. There is no panic, but there has been violence, arson, and death.

Mr. Speaker, each such incident makes it more clear that these are not isolated nor coincidental riots. These are part of carefully developed plans to intimidate decent citizens, to blackmail the Government of this Nation.

The Cramer bill must be passed.

The confidence of our law-enforcement officials must be restored. The blatant cry of anarchy, "Give us what we want or else" must be repudiated. Respect for law, adherence to the orderly processes of government of law, must be the prerequisites of any concessions to those who are threatening this Republic and its institutions.

CARMICHAEL SHOULD BE APPREHENDED, CHARGED WITH TREASON, AND HELD WITHOUT BOND

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, loyal Americans of every race, color, creed, and economic status are outraged by this Government's tolerance of agitators who roam the Nation advocating the violent overthrow of the United States.

The time to call a halt is long past due.

On Friday, July 28, I sent the following telegram to the President, the Attorney General, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

I request that the moment Stokely Carmichael sets foot on American soil he immediately be apprehended, charged with treason and held without bond. It is reprehensible to me and to loyal Americans of every race, creed and color that this character can openly advocate from Castro's Havana, the Communist bastion in this hemisphere, open rebellion in our country.

I am shocked and dismayed that H. Rap Brown was freed on bond after being arrested in nearby Washington and is now using the Nation's Capital as a forum for his shocking and treasonous statements. Only last night in a Washington church he told his audience we should do more shooting and less looting.

Stokely Carmichael's statements are even worse. These two hoodlums should not be given the freedom of this country to advocate its overthrow. They should both be locked up permanently.

For the RECORD, I include articles from the Baltimore Sun, the Washington Post, and the Washington Star:

[From the Baltimore Sun, July 27, 1967]

BROWN SAYS U.S. PRACTICES GENOCIDE AGAINST NEGROES

(By James Macneese)

WASHINGTON, July 27.—H. Rap Brown, the militant director of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, asserted tonight that America is practicing genocide "against black people."

Speaking to an emotion-charged Negro audience at St. Stephen and the Incarnation Church, Brown said this nation's "black people have been conditioned to accept genocide."

"American courts are legal genocide," he shouted. "The war in Vietnam is military genocide."

RECURRING THEME

In a 75-minute exhortation to a packed house, Brown, who is free on \$10,000 bail pending a hearing on a Virginia charge of being a fugitive from another state, urged a recurring theme:

"You are going to have to decide who your enemy is, where you are going to kill him, and how you are going to kill him!"

Brown said "black people" should do "more looting and shooting. If you're going to loot, loot yourself a gun store. You got to arm yourself, brother."

WAY TO STOP RIOTS

Black people, Brown said "work in the most strategic places in America—we work in their homes."

Earlier, at a noon press conference, the S.N.C.C. official said "only the election of a black President" would stop the riots tearing apart the nation's cities.

Speaking to reporters in the basement headquarters of S.N.C.C. in a Negro section of this city, Brown opened his news conference with a statement blasting President Johnson as "a wild mad dog, and outlaw from Texas" who is responsible for the growing slum riots, "because he intentionally perpetuates the conditions" which give rise to them.

WOULD VOTE FOR WALLACE

Brown said he saw no difference between President Johnson and ex-Governor George Wallace of Alabama, except that "one's wife has cancer." Both, he added are "honky, red-neck peckerwood crackers." Given a choice, Brown said he would vote for Wallace for President.

He said the question had arisen numerous times "Why does the black man fight for his country?" The answer, Brown said, is that "black men have a strong will for freedom, and that same will will make them fight this country."

"America is not a stable and just society," he remarked. "Each time a black church is bombed or burnt, that is violence in our community. When a black worker can't be protected against being shot, that is anarchy."

"If you folks want to play Nazis, we black people are not going to play Jews," he declared. "We will be free by any means necessary."

Brown ridiculed an editorial in today's Washington Post suggesting Federal aid to those store owners whose shops have been burned in the riot area.

"Those buildings were burned because they belonged to white people," he asserted. "Black people don't want them in their communities. We're going to control our own communities by any means necessary."

Extolling actions of Plainfield (N.J.) Ne-

groes who displayed automatic weapons in the face of police lines recently, Brown urged all black people to arm themselves.

"Rebellions have become legitimized in this country," he declared. "The poor people recognize that is what it takes to get the man off your back."

He continued that if there was "one thing" the black people should take from the white man's culture "it is your violence."

Asked where he drew the line between "Negro" and "black people," Brown sneered that "Negro is a coined word that has no significance to black people."

"Black people were looted from Africa," he said. "America is the biggest thief of all time and we're going to get it back."

The S.N.C.C. leader was asked whether he approved of a statement issued yesterday by the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins and Whitney M. Young, Jr., pleading for an end to mob rule.

Brown and supporters standing behind him, guffawed. He replied, "If black leaders continued to aid in the oppression of black men, they will be our enemy too."

The S.N.C.C. leader said there was a "strong possibility" he would go back to Cambridge.

[From the Baltimore Sun, July 27, 1967]

CARMICHAEL ASKS MORE DISORDERS

HAVANA, July 27.—A Cuban newspaper quoted Stokely Carmichael today as urging the creation of more Vietnams for the United States and saying that "Detroit and New York are Vietnams."

It was Carmichael's only reference to current United States racial disorders in an interview published by the Communist youth newspaper, *Juventud Rebelde* (Rebel Youth).

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star July 30, 1967]

A CHURCH FORUM FOR H. RAP BROWN—ST. STEPHEN PASTOR MODELS POLITICS ON CHRIST

(By Philip Shandler)

"I would much rather have him in the church than on the street corners . . . I think we must take some risks."

This is the Rev. William A. Wendt, a white minister, talking about H. Rap Brown, preacher of Negro violence, and why Brown was allowed to speak at Wendt's church.

About 1,000 persons in St. Stephen and the Incarnation Church on Thursday night heard Brown, national chairman of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, urge Negroes to arm themselves for a rebellion. Many cheered.

Father Wendt said in an interview he did not invite Brown to speak at the church; that he granted the forum in response to a request from Lester McKinnie, SNCC chairman here, after consultation with Episcopal Suffragan Bishop Paul W. Moore.

But Brown's appearance at St. Stephens, 16th and Newton Streets NW, did not surprise those who know Father Wendt. It is consistent with what the greying, crew-cut cleric regards as the role of the church in modern urban society.

He has made St. Stephen the headquarters for the draft-resistance movement here.

He has provided housing for ex-convicts and alcoholics.

And he has encouraged associate ministers at his church—who have included Baptists, Presbyterians and Catholics—to join in the politics of the antipoverty program.

His model, he tells those who ask why, is Jesus Christ.

"I believe our Lord was a very political person. Most of all he was a very radical person in his day and age . . . radical in the good sense. I think the church sometimes falls to realize this," Father Wendt said.

"The association of Jesus with many strange people is very well known," he said. "At the same time, he didn't associate

Himself with their particular activities. This is obviously true of our situation.

"Certainly the church does not associate itself with looting or rioting, nor do I."

His judgment on the activities of St. Stephen is based "simply and purely on the fact that God created the world . . . and that the church has a prime concern about what happens in the world."

This includes providing a forum for anyone with a similar concern, regardless of how that person proposes to deal with the problems.

Indeed, Father Wendt believes, making a church such a forum may in itself work good.

"In the sanctuary, an influence can be given . . . which is healthful and helpful to the community," he said.

"I hope the church can act as a good influence in trying to build bridges between the several groups that are having difficulty in living with each other.

"I would hope that Brown and the others would see that there are ways of still talking . . . that people don't have to go underground . . . that there are ways of expressing one's concern without having to resort to other means.

"I'm not saying we would do it (again) tomorrow or the next day," he added. "At the moment we felt it was a decision that was good."

Father Wendt said he fully considered the fact that violence has resulted from Brown's talks elsewhere. But he added:

"I don't believe in fear. This is one of the reasons the church has its doors open."

He said he hopes Brown's appearance will "deepen the concern of black and white to the terrible times in which we are living," and stimulate "immediate steps to increase the dialogue and to help overcome what can only lead to more suffering."

His opening of the church to Brown did not imply he supports black separatism any more than black violence, he said. But he does support "what we call loosely black power, whereby the Negro can have dignity as a person."

"The black man in the city must realize, must know and feel his importance as a person and I think the black power movement is going to be very beneficial to help establish this importance . . . a new awareness of himself," he said.

"This does not mean there need be violence," he emphasized. It does mean "giving full opportunity to the Negro to realize his full personhood . . . that he is not degraded or kept away from any of the benefits of society because of blackness . . . that he can have a vote and own a business."

This is why St. Stephen has involved itself so deeply in the activities, for example, of CHANGE, Inc., the antipoverty agency in the upper Cardozo area, and its related Neighborhood Planning Council. In both, there occasionally has been sharp debate over who should be hired and what programs should be financed with the increasing flow of federal money.

"To me politics means being involved in the life of the people, in the best sense . . . in the same way that our Lord was.

"I don't think He would frown on running for political office," he said.

Some of his colleagues have told him he may be going too far. But he insists that the church itself is caught in the "agonizing process" of change.

"We are all suffering through it," he said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, July 30, 1967]

ARE THE RIOTS SPONTANEOUS OR PLANNED?

As the rioting eased off, at least temporarily, in Newark and Detroit, not to mention a score of other cities large and small, both official and public attention in Washington began to focus on the story behind the killing, the burning and the looting.

What brought on this "time of violence and tragedy" in July, 1967? Were the riots more or less spontaneous eruptions on the part of oppressed Negroes? Was there at least some measure of planning and organization behind them? Did the Communists play a part, and if so what was their role?

It is doubtful that all of the questions can ever be answered. But the effort will be made. There is much pressure on Capitol Hill for an investigation by some congressional committee. And the President acted on Thursday night to establish an 11-member commission to conduct an investigation in his behalf.

In the address in which he announced the appointment of this commission, Mr. Johnson said that "the only genuine, long-range solution for what has happened lies in an attack—mounted at every level—upon the conditions which breed despair and violence. All of us know what they are: ignorance, discrimination, slums, disease, not enough jobs . . ."

This, as far as it goes, is true enough. But there are two things to be said about it. One is that this is indeed a long-range solution. It will take a decade or more to remedy the conditions enumerated by the President. Nor can the riots in places such as Detroit and Plainfield be explained away by reference to slums and lack of jobs. For those conditions were not present in any significant degree.

Furthermore, if even one of these riots was the product of some other cause than slums and unemployment, this country cannot wait 10 years to uncover that cause and destroy it. The price which will have been exacted by continuous rioting is much too high.

What we have in mind is the rather widely held belief that at least some of the riots, and perhaps the worst ones, were planned, organized and directed by sinister forces embarked upon a policy of rule-or-ruin.

The President passed this over lightly. He said his commission will have access to facts gathered by the FBI and that J. Edgar Hoover's agency "will continue to exercise its full authority to investigate these riots, in accordance with my standing instructions, and to continue to search for evidence of a conspiracy."

This is a somewhat ambiguous statement. As far as we know there has not been a full-scale investigation of the riots, and, since the authority of the FBI is supposed to extend only to violations of federal law, what did the President mean when he said the agency will "continue to exercise its full authority" to investigate the riots? Furthermore, the comment that the FBI will "continue to search for evidence of conspiracy" implies that no such evidence has yet been found.

Perhaps there has been no conspiracy, and if not it follows that there would be no evidence of one. For our part, we are not aware of the existence of any such evidence in the strict sense of the term.

There is, however, a considerable body of information to suggest that there has been a conspiracy.

In the absence of any planning or organization or training, it is difficult to account for the widespread sniper activity in Detroit. In a dispatch from Havana a few days ago, Stokely Carmichael is quoted as follows: "In Newark, we are applying the tactics of guerrilla warfare. We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas for our defense in the cities." Chicago's Mayor Daley has said: "We know this is a national program of outlawry and violence." Some other local officials have said much the same thing.

In its issue of July 28, Life magazine tells of a "clandestine" meeting between its reporters and some of the Newark snipers. These snipers belong to an organized group of former civil rights workers in Mississippi. According to the magazine, one of the snipers said there were more than 50 members

of the group, more than half coming from Newark. "Others had been moved in for the action from California, Ohio, Pennsylvania." This certainly is not inconsistent with the remarks attributed to Stokely Carmichael in Havana.

More positive indications of organization and conspiracy can be found in a book by Phillip Abbott Luce, until recently an active Communist. The Luce book, "Road to Revolution," is reviewed on Page G-3 of today's Star.

Exposés by former Communists are suspect, as Whittaker Chambers learned in the Alger Hiss case. But The Star has been reliably informed that Luce's break with the party is real.

In any event, what he has to say is interesting. It can be and should be checked out carefully.

Luce begins by saying that the Communists are "counting on the premise that most Americans will discount the possibility of a guerrilla war in their country. The notion of a guerrilla war in the United States is so outrageous and improbable to Americans that they would receive it as the product of a deranged mind." Well, many Americans and most "responsible" Cubans felt the same way, to the subsequent dismay of the latter, when Fidel Castro and his tiny band of followers first went ashore in Cuba.

Luce, noting that Communists exploit trouble rather than incite it, goes on to spell out in detail the Communist plan to foment racial trouble in this country and then to exploit it through guerrilla tactics. He reminds us that a grand jury which investigated last summer's Cleveland riot found that "the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals at this business." He also recalls that the Harlem riots in 1964 produced similar findings and that one Bill Epton, a Communist, was indicted and convicted of criminal anarchy for his role in those riots.

None of this may amount to "evidence" in the legal sense as far as this month's riots go. But, taken together, it strongly suggests that there is a conspiratorial underpinning of the current riots, and it is a possibility which deserves more serious attention by the investigators than is invited by the President's casual reference to it.

A crucial matter at stake now, or so it seems to us, is the struggle for control of, or direction of, the Negro community. Who will prevail? Such men as Martin Luther King Jr., A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins and Whitney M. Young Jr.? Or will it be the H. Rap Browns and the Stokely Carmichaels?

A great deal more than the future of civil rights depends on the answer. It is conceivable, quite conceivable, that what really hangs in the balance is the choice between a race war in the United States and a state of affairs in which the white and colored communities can live together in peace.

This is why it is so important to put politics aside and dig up the truth, the whole truth, about the riots and their causes. And this is why it is also so important for the members of Congress and the people they represent not to yield to what the President spoke of as "fear and bitterness"—to any state of mind which would indefinitely delay reconciliation and reconstruction at a dreadful cost in human lives and human values.

DEFINITIVE STUDY OF THE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN CONGRESS BY THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend

my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the Association of the Bar of the City of New York will conduct a 2-year definitive study of "ethical standards and conflict of interest" in the Congress. Russell D. Niles, president of the association, announced the study this morning and indicated that it will be financed by a \$160,000 grant from the Ford Foundation.

The study will be directed by a special committee headed by Louis M. Loeb, the able former president of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, and presently chairman of the mayor's committee on the judiciary.

In my judgment, this study can be an important step toward filling the ethical vacuum in which the Congress has been operating. However, as I have urged on several occasions, interim steps—particularly full financial disclosure—must be taken by the Congress promptly if it is to regain the confidence of the American people in the legislative process.

Specifically, I think we must take immediate action to require full disclosure of all gifts, income, and financial associations, and the implementation of an interim code of ethics by a standing committee of the House with enforcement powers. While it may take some time to find answers to all the problems of congressional ethics, there are certain basic standards upon which we can all agree today and these ought to be put into effect without delay.

Congress has lived by a double standard for too long, requiring strict adherence to tough conflict-of-interest provisions by the executive and virtually none by Members of Congress and their staff assistants. It is my hope that the association's study will help provide some leadership in altering this state of affairs.

The House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, appointed on April 14, 1967, has not yet held any hearings preliminary to recommending the adoption of a code of ethics. I hope that the committee will meet promptly and hold hearings soon, hopefully this week. The American people will not tolerate delay and unconcern on the part of the Congress.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the New York Times story announcing the study this morning as well as the "Man in the News" column from today's Times which features an interview with Mr. Loeb.

CITY BAR TO STUDY CONGRESS ETHICS—TWO-YEAR INQUIRY FINANCED BY FORD FUND CALLED RESULT OF DEMAND BY PUBLIC

(By Clayton Knowles)

The Association of the Bar of the City of New York announced yesterday that it was undertaking a two-year definitive study of "ethical standards and conflict of interest" in the Congress.

Russell D. Niles, president of the local association, said that the \$160,000 study, financed by the Ford Foundation, was in response to popular demand for "an objective study by knowledgeable citizens of unimpeachable integrity."

Recent disciplinary actions in the Congress against Representative Adam Clayton Powell and Senator Thomas J. Dodd were cited by Mr. Niles as factors touching off the outcry.

"There is a discernible crisis of confidence in the legislative process among all segments of the population," he declared.

A special committee, head by Louis M. Loeb, a former bar association president, will conduct the study. Mr. Loeb, chairman of the Mayor's Committee on the Judiciary, also served as vice chairman of the Temporary State Commission on the Courts.

Research will be directed by Prof. James C. Kirby Jr. of the Northwestern University Law School, who served from 1961 to 1963 as chief counsel of the Senate Judiciary subcommittee on Constitutional amendments.

COMMITTEE TO BE CHOSEN

Mr. Niles said the full membership of the committee would be announced in early September.

He stressed that a course of corrective action against official misconduct in Congress could not be mapped in "instant, 'reform' confined to individual cases."

"What is required," he said, "is a calm searching, objective inquiry into an intricate and delicate problem that has plagued representative legislative bodies since their earliest establishment."

Concurring in this view, Mr. Loeb said in an interview that a similar bar study, undertaken in 1958 and completed in 1960, produced many recommendations that were incorporated into the ethics code governing administrative employees of the Federal Government.

"I hope to enlist some of the best brains in the country in our examination of this subject," Mr. Loeb said.

He said nonresident members of the association would be drafted to assist if their qualifications and interests would further the committee's work.

He also said he planned to consult with existing ethics boards, including the one established here a decade ago to draw the line between proper and improper conduct by all city employees. The five-member board, headed by Cloyd Laporte, has S. Stanley Kreutzer as counsel.

MODEL CODES PLANNED

The city code, which opened new ground in the enforcement of ethical conduct, is one of the strongest in the nation.

Mr. Niles said the association planned to publish the report of its special committee in full and to distribute it widely. One of the study products, it is hoped, will be model statutes and drafts of codes of ethics.

The difference in the treatment of Representative Powell and Senator Dodd by the respective houses of the Congress has perturbed the Negro community and contributed to the demand for a strong, uniform code of behavior.

Mr. Powell was denied his seat in the 90th Congress on the ground that he misused official funds and defied the courts of New York in failing to meet the terms of a settlement of a defamation of character decision. Winner in a special election last spring, he has made no effort to take his seat.

Senator Dodd, on the other hand, received a 92-to-5 vote of censure in the Senate for using campaign and testimonial dinner funds "for his personal benefit." The Senate dismissed other charges that he sought double reimbursement for air travel expenditures.

More recently, the Senate Ethics Committee, headed by Senator John Stennis, agreed to consider charges of misconduct against Senator Edward V. Long of Missouri to determine whether an investigation is necessary.

WITTY PILLAR OF THE BAR

(Louis Melville Loeb)

In stereotype, a pillar of the bar is a starchy, humorless fellow, an altogether for-

bidding figure who ought to look like Charles Evans Hughes.

One trouble with the cliché is that it has no relevance to Louis Melville Loeb, a warm, witty, generous man who really is a pillar of the bar.

"I always think of him acting the part of Tamberlaine the Great under the direction of Monty Woolley at Yale," an old Blue in the class of '19, said of him yesterday.

Yet it was no surprise to the legal community that Mr. Loeb was chosen yesterday to head the city bar association's study of Congressional ethics.

At 69, Louis Loeb can look back at a long and distinguished career at the New York bar, including two years as president of the prestigious Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

NO TIME TO LOOK BACK

However, Mr. Loeb gives no indication of looking back at anything. Aside from his new appointment, he serves as chairman of Mayor Lindsay's judicial screening committee, is a member of the Board of Health, sits on the board of governors of New York Hospital and is a member of the board of the Walter E. Meyer Research Institute for Law.

Apart from these "extra-curricular activities," as he calls them, he is an active partner in Lord, Day & Lord, where he says, he "specializes in The New York Times." He has been general counsel of The Times since 1948.

In fact, he does many other things at his law firm, particularly in the corporation and estate fields.

"But," he said yesterday at his home in Greenwich, Conn., "the heaviest responsibility I've ever had since I began practicing law involved the series of libel suits against The Times. It also turned out to be the most satisfying experience, though it was the most worrisome."

Mr. Loeb was referring to the lawsuits that resulted in United States Supreme Court rulings that public figures could not recover for libel unless they could prove actual malice or reckless disregard of the facts on the part of newspapers.

"Louie Loeb," his partner and old Yale colleague, Sherman Baldwin, says, "is a good lawyer."

"He is also a first class raconteur and is the perennial toastmaster of all functions thrown by our Yale class," Mr. Baldwin adds. "And he loves to do it, too."

At Yale, Louis Loeb was not only an actor but a swimmer, specializing in an event called the plunge, now obsolete in college competition. Its object was to see which swimmer could go farthest without taking a stroke after diving into the pool.

"All you needed in that event was a large expanse of blubber, and I was always well endowed with that," Mr. Loeb once explained.

He has a pool at his Connecticut home, but a serious operation last year keeps him from enjoying it much.

"It also keeps me from drinking martinis," he says, "but for some reason Scotch is O.K. thank heavens."

He keeps a room at the Ritz Tower in New York for the occasions when work keeps him in the city, but ordinarily he catches the 4:45 for Greenwich, where his wife, the former Janet Cook, keeps the ice ready for "the pleasantest moments of the day."

"Why don't you ask me about my wife," Mr. Loeb said after a few minutes on the telephone yesterday. "She is quite a person in her own right, an accomplished, avid sculptress, and a very busy woman. She was the first president of the adoption service in Westchester and is still active in adoption work."

The couple, married 41 years, lived in Mount Kisco until 1956, "when our kids left the bed and board."

They have a son, Robert, who is a lawyer on the staff of the poverty administration in Los Angeles, and a daughter, Mrs. Anthony V. Lombardi, who lives a mile away from the Loeb in Armonk, with her three children, two girls and a boy. Robert has a son and a daughter.

After all those years of marriage, Mr. Loeb confesses to one problem with his wife.

"Wild horses can't get her to New York, and so when I want to go to the theater, which I love, I have to take her to London."

THE CONGRESSIONAL INTERNS FOR PEACE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, recently the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] called our attention to certain questionable activities of some congressional interns.

He pointed out that they have organized what is known as the Congressional Interns for Peace. Instead of concentrating their efforts on learning at firsthand about the workings of their Government—and certainly this ought to be the purpose of the intern program—we find that a few seek to play the role of policymaker.

Like all other Americans, these young people have a right to voice their opinions. But as the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] has reminded them:

You are here to study and to learn, and to perform whatever service the member asks you to perform. The intern program is not a political convention and it is not a forum for the propounding of your own political, economic, or social philosophy.

Actually, the interns who have formed the Congressional Interns for Peace are being used as pawns by the leaders of a group known as Vietnam Summer, which was organized by one Martin Luther King.

It was King's group which promoted a mailing to interns last week, again calling on them to sign a letter urging President Johnson to begin "the de-escalation of the Vietnam war." Strange as it may seem, the letter makes no mention that there ought to be some reciprocal action by the Communists.

The mailing was sent to the interns by inside mail. It came in a plain, white envelope with no indication as to the sender. Interns desiring to sign the letter were instructed to call 387-8090. That happens to be the telephone number of the Washington office of Vietnam Summer.

I have no idea as to how this outfit obtained permission to use the congressional inside mailing service but I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that steps will be taken to insure that it does not happen again. I also suggest that Martin King ought to be billed for the mailing.

Mr. Speaker, if any interns are unwilling to conduct themselves in the same manner expected of regular congressional employees; if they do not

wish to work and learn, I suggest there are many college students not now participating in the intern program who would welcome the chance to replace them.

RIOT CONTROL

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I proposed a two-step course of action regarding the recent riots of civil disturbances in our major cities. The first of these steps was contained in a resolution which I introduced in the House calling on the Federal Bureau of Investigation to immediately investigate the disturbances in order to determine if any conspiracy or violation of Federal laws was involved.

I was not then and am not now opposed, by any means, to a congressional investigation of the riots. The Congress certainly has the ability and the obligation to study this subject, but it seems to me to be essential that such investigation have benefit of a thorough FBI study of the situation. I was, therefore, especially pleased to hear the President's statement last Thursday night in which he ordered the FBI to continue its investigation of the riots and report back to him and to the Congress.

Last Thursday I also pointed out that this problem is primarily one for local and State law enforcement. At that time, I stated that the Governors of the States have an especially great responsibility in this area and I suggested that the Governors themselves should be the focal point for State cooperation in seeking to prevent and to control any future riots.

Action has already been taken to implement this second proposal. The President in his eloquent speech announced his decision to establish a special Presidential Commission to investigate the causes of the riots under the direction of Gov. Otto Kerner of Illinois. The President wisely included on this Commission other representatives, not only of State but also of local governments. Strong representation on the Commission of local and State authorities reflects the Constitution's assignment of primary law enforcement responsibility to the States rather than to the Federal Government.

In addition, I am pleased to report that in response to my telegram suggesting a national Governors conference on the subject of riots, Gov. William Guy, of North Dakota, chairman of the conference, has advised me that the executive committee of the conference will meet on August 26 in Osage Beach, Mo., to discuss general problems related to riots and civil disorders. I commend Governor Guy for taking leadership to assure effective cooperation in this regard.

Already, with 50,000 vacancies presently in our local police departments, we

are hearing cries for the establishment of a national police force. Obviously, something needs to be done but I am opposed in taking any action to set up a national police force. Our local law-enforcement people and our Governors must be given every opportunity and assistance to deal with this problem themselves. I favor giving the States whatever backing the Federal Government can; but I think that if we are going to continue to have the kind of democratic government that we all want, it is essential that police power remain in local and State hands.

THE SPRING MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in last Friday's Washington Post under date of July 28, there appeared a news article entitled "Brown Tells Negroes To Shoot, Loot," and "Brown Scores Rights Leaders." The article covered the speech of H. Rap Brown, delivered at St. Stephen's Church, in which he said:

If Washington, D.C. don't come around, Washington, D.C. should be burned down.

It is interesting to note that this same St. Stephen's Church is the Washington headquarters of the Spring Mobilization Committee, and this committee, you will recall, is supported by such civil rights leaders and agitators as Julius Hobson of ACT, the Reverend James Bevel, Anthony Thomas of the Young Socialist Alliance, and Lester McKinney of SNCC.

On July 20 I made the point on the floor of the House that many of our congressional interns were being asked to associate themselves with the activities of this so-called Spring Mobilization Committee, and that I doubted whether more than a handful of them knew what they might be getting themselves in for. It should be abundantly clear to all after H. Rap Brown's diatribe just what this thing is all about, and I doubt seriously whether there would be more than a handful of congressional interns who now would like to have their name associated, however remotely, with this cause.

LOOKING BACK 7 YEARS

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, the August 7, 1967, issue of the U.S. News & World Report carries an article on page 20 of its "Newsgram" section which contrasts the pre-Great Society days with those of today.

The article reads as follows:

People, troubled by war, race riots, run-away crime in city streets, may start to look back with longing at the more tranquil Eisenhower days.

The "New Frontier" and the "Great Society" were supposed to "get things moving," to bring all kinds of good things so that everybody could be happy.

Looking back seven years to pre-"Great Society" days:

Race riots: Absent then. Now breaking into a rash. Street crime: Then moderate. Now epidemic. Schools: Calm then. Now in growing trouble.

War: Then none. Now big and costly. Vietnam: Then 773 U.S. advisers. Now 466,000 U.S. troops engaged. Vietnam cost: Then 300 million dollars as a maximum. Now 24 billion as a minimum. War casualties: None then. Now at a rate approaching 75,000 a year, including 11,000 or more dead youths.

Draft calls: 86,000 a year then. Now 260,000. U.S. alliances: Then active, strong. Now dormant, disintegrating.

U.S. world leadership: Accepted then. Lost or negligible now.

Federal spending of cash: 100 billion dollars then. Now 155 billion annually. Defense cost: Then 47.7 billion. Now 71.7 billion, up 50 per cent. Nondefense: 51.8 billion then. Now 83.6 billion, up 61.4 per cent.

Personal income: In 1961, first-quarter rate 406 billions. Now up to 618 billions. Factory pay: Then \$89 a week. Now \$113. Living cost: Then 104 per cent of 1957-59. Now 116 per cent. "Real income" up only 13 per cent.

It's clear that the U.S. has been moving, but whether in the direction the country expected is, at the least, a matter of dispute.

TUESDAY TO THURSDAY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to two editorials commenting on our failure to work a full workweek, which was brought to public attention by the recent railroad strike.

We acted rapidly on Monday after the strike had been called, but there were no sessions on the Friday previous to the strike, nor were the conferees on legislation dealing with the threatened railroad strike even in session.

Mr. Speaker, as these editorials properly point out, this episode is damaging to the image of the Congress. One of the editorials is from my hometown of St. Louis—the St. Louis Post Dispatch of July 24, 1967, entitled "Tuesday to Thursday." The other is from the New York Journal of Commerce, of July 28, 1967, "Never on Friday?"

The Journal of Commerce editorial properly points out that our Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress in its final report of July 28, 1966, strongly urged a full workweek for Congress and, particularly the scheduling of committee sessions on Mondays and Fridays, to the end that the Congress could complete its work by July 31, the date set for adjournment in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this provides an

occasion for calling attention to the lack of progress in the consideration of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967 in the House of Representatives.

This measure, which resulted from over 2 years of arduous work by a 12-member joint, bipartisan committee and which passed the Senate by a vote of 75 to 9 on March 7, is still languishing in the House Rules Committee and there are no visible signs of activity with respect to it.

Mr. Speaker, if our failure to be in business and deal with the threatened railroad strike detracted from the image of Congress, I venture to assert that the failure of the House of Representatives to act on congressional reform in this session of the Congress will be even more destructive of the congressional image.

The editorials follow:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, July 24, 1967]

TUESDAY TO THURSDAY

The slow pace and lackluster performance of the Ninetieth Congress may be attributed to several factors, one of which assuredly is the extraordinary amount of leisure time Congressmen seem to require. A Congressional Quarterly study shows that since Congress opened in January it has conducted most of its business on a three-day-a-week basis; which, indeed, is more an extension of a trend than a novelty.

For years there has been criticism of Congressmen from states near Washington who return home for long weekends and speech-making or relaxation and disrupt orderly business, mainly in the House. Last year a joint committee noted that "over the years it has been difficult to obtain working quorums on Fridays and Mondays because of the absentees." The committee recommended that both houses schedule committee and floor sessions on a five-day work week basis.

There are any number of instances that show how difficult it is to get Congress to perform legislative work after midweek. An example is the recent railroad crisis. The railroad shop unions served notice that they were rescinding their no-strike pledge at midnight Saturday, July 15. House-Senate conferees met the previous Thursday on a bill to ward off the threatened strike, but could not agree. They failed to schedule a Friday meeting; neither the House nor the Senate held a session. The railroads were shut down, and Congress rushed back on Monday to pass legislation banning the strike. Perhaps the nation should have been grateful that the members did not wait until Tuesday.

It would be easier to condone this way of doing business if debate and legislation moved along briskly from Tuesday to Thursday. But there is precious little to show this year for more than six months of effort, and the legal time for concluding the session is July 31. The record shows that of 25 important pieces of business, action has been completed only on five—ratification of the consular treaty, extension of the teacher corps program in modified form, extension of the military draft, restoration of the investment tax credit and enactment of a Vietnam supplemental appropriation.

Although some progress has been made on other legislation, there is unfinished business in the fields of East-West trade, social security, air pollution, elementary and higher education, educational television, poverty amendments, civil rights, crime, foreign aid, model cities and others. Debate on congressional reorganization and on the cases of Senator Dodd and Representative Adam Clayton Powell have been time-consuming but not very constructive.

As usual, we suppose, Congress will engage in a last-minute rush and get essential

legislation out of the way. But it still looks like a pretty dismal session, vulnerable to criticism that if the honorable members had worked longer hours they might have accomplished more.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal of Commerce, July 28, 1967]

NEVER ON FRIDAY?

When Congress enacted the bill that stopped the railroad strike on July 17, the whole nation breathed a sigh of relief and the more charitable of its citizens perhaps felt there was nothing remarkable about it. After all, the legislators had been debating the issues during the previous week and the strike had lasted barely two days. An overworked Congress could be forgiven that much delay, couldn't it?

Yes, it could, if it were an overworked Congress. But that phrase would hardly apply to the present session. Perhaps the most remarkable thing about the final vote is that it was taken on a Monday, one of two days in the average week when both houses have difficulty in even rounding up a quorum.

But that was because nobody had been doing anything on Friday. Having had clear notice that the six railroad shop unions were rescinding their no-strike pledge at midnight on Saturday, Congress could easily have enacted on Friday the bill it rushed back to the Capitol to pass on Monday, thus averting any strike at all. But what had happened on Friday? Neither House nor Senate was in session. Their conferees, who had been wrangling over differences between the emergency measures previously passed by both, gave up on Friday. They didn't even schedule a meeting on that date.

This, unfortunately, has been the work pattern of the present Congress ever since January, as underlined by a study recently concluded by Congressional Quarterly Inc., a service supplied to editorial clients.

In the first six months of the 90th Congress, the House took no roll-call votes on Fridays. It took 12 out of a total of 92 roll calls on Mondays, leaving 87 per cent of the voting to be done between Tuesdays and Thursdays. In the Senate there were 13 roll calls on Fridays and 19 on Mondays—leaving 76 per cent of its voting for the Tuesday-Thursday period.

Even legislative debating is getting sparse on both ends of the working week—plainly because few of the more conscientious legislators want to get up and speak when no one is listening. The Senate in this respect was more responsible than the House. Out of the 26 Mondays and 27 Fridays, the Senate debated legislation on 20 and 10 of them respectively. The House debates were limited to 13 Mondays and two Fridays.

This is not a very inspiring record for a Congress too busy with other things to act in sufficient time to block a rail tieup of which it had ample—and even repeated—warning.

The Tuesday-Thursday work week and the four-day weekend did not, of course, originate with the present Congress. But far from being modified during the present session, it seems, if anything, to have become more firmly entrenched than ever.

This is disappointing because it was only last year that the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress urged marked changes in this practice.

"Both houses," the committee said, "should schedule committee and floor sessions on a five-day work week, so that the business of a session may normally be completed by July 31, the time for Congressional adjournment as provided by law . . . Every effort should be made to encourage legislative business in order to meet the legal adjournment date."

The committee admitted that it is "rather common knowledge that the Congress generally is inclined not to subject itself to heavy

or even average scheduling of work, either on the floor or in committees, on Fridays and Mondays . . . The practical side of the matter is that over the years it has been difficult to obtain working quorums on Fridays and Mondays because of the absentees and, accordingly, much of the legislative workload has tended to concentrate from Tuesday to Thursday."

Obviously, a legislator cannot be attending a committee meeting and on the floor at the same moment. So the simultaneous scheduling of floor sessions and committee meetings on only three days of the week compounds a malaise that was bad enough to begin with.

Of course Congressmen like to get off for the long weekend. Who wouldn't? Who doesn't? And we don't even begrudge them a reasonable number of such, enough anyway to enable them to keep in touch with their constituents.

But when the urge to "get off on Friday," or maybe even on Thursday evening, is allowed to get in the way of important legislation, and when it is given priority even over the need to block a big rail strike, then it is time that something rather drastic is done about it.

After all, members of the 90th Congress don't even have the excuse of campaigning for office this year. What can we expect of them next year when they will have it?

NO NEED FOR ANOTHER CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest here to the numerous Members who have risen in the well of the House today to pay their respects to the recent anarchy which has been going on in the streets of our great urban centers.

I, like other Members and like all good citizens, am very much alarmed, and disturbed about these riots, about this state of anarchy.

We have, of course, different ideas concerning what brought all this about. The bleeding hearts have one idea, which is usually joined in by the politicians, those who are constantly catering to the minority groups.

We passed an antiriot bill recently, over the objections of many of those people. It was predicted it would amount to nothing. Yet the very things which have happened in recent days demonstrate it is a meaningful act.

I have particular reference, of course, to this man Rap Brown, whose recent activities in Maryland undoubtedly would come under this antiriot bill which we passed in the House, and hope that the Senate will soon pass.

Mr. Speaker, we have passed the 1960, 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965 acts, and attempted the 1966 additions to the civil rights bills, yet we have had riots, and they are on the increase. We have had anarchy.

Tomorrow my committee has committed itself to take up the 1967 edition of the civil rights bill. I assume it will be reported out, and I assume that many of

those who are decrying these riots will be pitching for it on the floor.

We need another civil rights bill just like we need another Watts, Newark, or Detroit.

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Congress will awaken to the facts of life. Yes, I wonder if the politicians and the do-gooders will cease their efforts to appease, to mollify, and to appeal to these minority groups. I wonder how long the harangues of the Kings, the Carmichaels, the Browns, and others will receive the plaudits of the do-gooders and the politicians. Is there anyone here today who doubts that the appeal of these people for civil disobedience is largely responsible for these riots?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Commission, just appointed by the President, will also realize the facts of life and will not follow, in its recommendations, the familiar line of the current liberal thought that the answer to this problem, like their answers to all other problems, is, namely, the spending of billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

TRIBUTE TO GOV. OTTO KERNER, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the President has conferred a great honor and placed a grave responsibility upon the Governor of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt if ever there was a man called to the performance of a task upon which well may hang the course and very duration of our civilization who was better qualified than Governor Kerner. He was a major general of troops in bitter fighting in a combat zone. He won his spurs as a soldier and wrote his name gloriously on the rolls of heroism. He was U.S. district attorney in Chicago, and he was an outstandingly great prosecutor. He was a judge in our courts. As head of the militia of Illinois, he placed the militia of Illinois in an enviable position of superiority. Now he is in his second term as Governor, one of the towering and really great chief executives of our Nation.

I have never known a finer man. I have never known a keener brain than that of Otto Kerner. I have never known a courage and a sense of rightness upon which I could place more dependence than the courage and the sense of determination between right and wrong of Governor Kerner.

I am very happy and I am most reassured. We are all troubled at what has happened throughout our country and we have a vital interest in the finding of sane answers. This is a time altogether too serious to jump at conclusions.

Governor Kerner is very close to Mayor Daley, whom the people of Chicago just recently have reelected by a tremendous majority and who is regarded by many as the greatest chief executive of a big city in the history of the world.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am tremendously happy that the Vice Chairman of this Board, headed by the Governor of Illinois, is the mayor of the city of New York, our former colleague here in the House of Representatives. Here we will have working together Governor Kerner, with his rich experience, and his stout and experienced friend, the great mayor of the great city of Chicago, Mayor Daley, with the great mayor of the great city of New York, Mayor Lindsay, and two of the most respected Members of this body, the Honorable WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, and the Honorable JAMES C. CORMAN, an able and distinguished majority member of the Judiciary Committee from California.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that Governor Kerner is qualified not only by his own accomplishments, his industry, his dedication, his administrative genius, but he is enriched by the noble precepts and the examples in public service of those who went before—his father, one of the greatest and most beloved judges in the courts of Illinois, and his father-in-law, the martyred Mayor Cermak of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun Times of July 29, 1967:

KERNER A FINE CHOICE

President Johnson's selection of Gov. Otto Kerner of Illinois to head a commission to seek the causes and cures of riots was virtually symbolic of the theme of the President's talk to the nation.

Mr. Johnson spoke with compassion for those who live in misery in slums but he spoke with cold anger against those who riot and called for swift action against them. Gov. Kerner has been a leader in efforts to alleviate slum conditions and to improve racial relations but he also has moved strongly and forcefully to quell civic rebellion when it has broken out.

Thus Gov. Kerner goes into his new assignment with fine credentials. He has shown courage and forthrightness in the area of civil and human rights and also as an enforcer of public peace and order. He has gone up against the real estate industry in taking action against discrimination. He has been a leader for fair employment practices. But at least three times, Kerner, a World War II major general and a former head of the Illinois National Guard, has swiftly dispatched the national guard to put down civic uprisings, the latest last week in Cairo. Kerner has been a U.S. district attorney and a Cook County judge.

There will be no lack of information and advice for the Kerner commission. There have been investigations upon investigations of conditions in the nation's crowded cities. There are extremes of viewpoints from the wild men who are calling for more violence in the streets to those, blind to reality, who cannot see that the problems of the slums cannot be solved by police power alone. Even among those who have worked for rational solutions there is a feeling of futility and despair that even the best and most conscientious efforts to date haven't begun to show real results.

The Kerner commission faces a hard and what may turn out to be a thankless task. But with Kerner as its chairman and Republican Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York as vice chairman it should steer a practical, pragmatic course toward just and workable solutions to the nation's greatest problem.

Mr. Speaker, I am further extending my remarks to include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of July 29, 1967:

TIMELY WARNING

Mayor Daley has laid down a no-nonsense warning that violence is not going to be tolerated in Chicago. He said that the national guard is under a standing alert and that thousands of militia can be on the streets in little more than an hour. "There will be no substitute cartridges and no ammunition that won't be live," the mayor said.

Mr. Daley has issued a timely warning. It is greatly to his credit that he did not stand mutely aside and wait, as the administrations of so many other cities have done, for trouble to develop. He acted to head it off before it started, and troublemakers had better pay heed to him. The mayor, the police, and the guard aren't going to fool around.

Prevention is always the best cure, and Mayor Daley has had the courage to spell out what awaits rioters. He was particularly indignant at hysteria peddlers and rumor mongers who have been whispering that "Chicago is next on the list." The city, he said, is not tense. Such hints come only from out-of-state agitators who try to implant the notion that Chicago inevitably will be a target.

Mayor Daley issued an impressive list of measures taken to avoid tension and overcome deprivation.

"There are some—a tiny minority—who say the violence occurring in the streets of some of our cities is helping to achieve these constructive objectives," he said. "Nothing could be further from the truth.

"These acts of violence, arson, and looting are acts of criminals and hoodlums. The victims are helpless people who live in the areas in which the acts occur. Further, this violence will destroy the constructive programs which seek to eliminate injustice, discrimination, and lack of opportunity by alienating and dividing our people.

"They are acts of anarchy without reason. As mayor of Chicago, I speak for every neighborhood, for every resident, when I declare that law, order, and justice will prevail in our city and that every possible means to prevent violence will be used immediately in Chicago."

In Detroit Negro citizens were bitter that police did not act forcibly to restrain rioting and looting from the moment disorders began. Police were equally bitter that they were issued shotguns but were ordered at the outset of the violence to keep them locked in the trunks of their patrol cars, lest mob sentiment be inflamed.

This isn't going to happen here. Anyone looking for trouble is going to get it. He has the word of Mayor Daley on that.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CIVIL DISORDERS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include the remarks made by the President of the United States to the Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Illinois in congratulating the President upon the high quality of the men and women he has chosen to serve on the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

I join the gentleman also in his words of commendation of the great Governor of the State of Illinois. In my opinion, Governor Kerner is one of the outstanding chief executives of any State in the Nation. Governor Kerner will make an outstanding chairman of this very important Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I also join the gentleman from Illinois in his comments upon our distinguished former colleague, the present mayor of New York City whom the President has elected as Vice Chairman of the Commission.

I hope that my colleagues will pardon me if I say that those of us who live in Oklahoma are mighty proud of the appointment to the Commission of the Honorable FRED HARRIS, a distinguished Oklahoman and an outstanding Member of the U.S. Senate. In my judgment, Senator HARRIS is one of the ablest men that have appeared on the political horizon in recent years. He is knowledgeable, dedicated, resourceful, enthusiastic, and possesses boundless energy. He is ideally equipped for service on the Commission and without any doubt will do an outstanding job. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this opportunity pass to mention the two distinguished colleagues now serving with us in the House whom the President has wisely chosen to serve on the Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. I refer, of course, to our able and articulate young Member from California, JIM CORMAN, who in a short period of time has established himself as one of our finest Members. I refer also to the distinguished and able gentleman from Ohio, ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, BILL McCULLOCH, whose contributions to important legislation in the field of civil rights have been second to none in recent years. Our colleagues will further distinguish themselves as they proceed to the important task which the President has given them.

The Nation is indeed fortunate in having a President who faces national problems head on, without backing away, without playing politics, without temporizing.

The establishment of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders is another excellent initiative by President Johnson.

This is not going to be just a talk or study commission. It is charged by the President with finding out the why and the wherefore of the riots. It is charged with producing recommendations which will prevent or control such outbreaks in the future.

President Johnson has done more to try to solve urban problems than any President before him.

His administration is already well on the way to making broad inroads into age-old urban problems of poverty, inadequate housing, transportation, discrimination, job training, health deficiencies, education, and many others.

Yet, the riots did occur. Relations between groups of citizens have been damaged. New programs will have to be built. Cities will have to be reconstructed. Human relations will have to be restored.

One thing the President made absolutely clear—this Commission is above politics. There is no politics in riots. There will be no politics in finding solutions to national problems.

The beneficiaries of the Commission's work will be the American people and their society. They must be made whole again after having been sundered in the past few weeks.

I insert in the RECORD the statement which President Johnson made on July 29, as the Commission convened for the first time.

I add my good wishes to those who have volunteered for this duty. And I again commend the President for the quality of the men and women he has chosen to do this important job for the country.

The President's statement is as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON ISSUING AN EXECUTIVE ORDER ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CIVIL DISORDERS, THE FISH ROOM, JULY 29, 1967

This morning I have welcomed the members of the Commission on Civil Disorders to the White House for its first meeting. The Commission is chaired by Governor Kerner of Illinois. The Vice Chairman is Mayor Lindsay of New York. They are both here with me.

I have commended these 11 citizens for what they have agreed to do for this Nation. They are undertaking a responsibility as great as any in our society.

The civil peace has been shattered in a number of cities. The American people are deeply disturbed. They are baffled and dismayed by the wholesale looting and violence that has occurred both in small towns and great metropolitan centers.

No society can tolerate massive violence, any more than a body can tolerate massive disease. And we in America shall not tolerate it.

But just saying that does not solve the problem. We need to know the answers, I think, to three basic questions about these riots:

What happened?

Why did it happen?

What can be done to prevent it from happening again and again?

Beyond these basic questions there are others—the answers to which can help our Governors and our mayors, our chiefs of police and our citizens all over the country to cope with their immediate and their long-range problems of maintaining order:

Why riots occur in some cities and do not occur in others?

Why one man breaks the law, while another, living in the same circumstances, does not?

To what extent, if any, there has been planning and organization in any of the riots?

Why have some riots been contained before they got out of hand and others have not?

How well equipped and trained are the local and State police, and the State guard units, to handle riots?

How do police-community relationships affect the likelihood of a riot—or the ability to keep one from spreading once it has started?

Who took part in the riots? What about their age, their level of education, their job history, their origins, and their roots in the community?

Who suffered most at the hands of the rioters?

What can be done to help innocent people and vital institutions escape serious injury?

How can groups of lawful citizens be en-

couraged, groups that can help to cool the situation?

What is the relative impact of the depressed conditions in the ghetto—joblessness, family instability, poor education, lack of motivation, poor health care—in stimulating people to riot?

What Federal, State and local programs have been most helpful in relieving those depressed conditions?

What is the proper public role in helping cities repair the damage that has been done?

What effect do the mass media have on the riots?

What we are really asking for is a profile of the riots—of the rioters, of their environment, of their victims, of their causes and effects.

We are asking for advice on short-term measures that can prevent riots, better measures to contain riots once they begin, and long-term measures that will make them only a sordid page in our history.

I know this is a tall order.

One thing should be absolutely clear: this matter is far, far too important for politics. It goes to the health and safety of all American citizens—Republicans and Democrats. It goes to the proper responsibilities of officials in both of our Parties. It goes to the heart of our society in a time of swift change and of great stress. I think the composition of this Commission is proof against any narrowness or partisanship.

You will have all the support and cooperation you need from the Federal government, as the Chairman and the Vice Chairman lead this Commission in this study.

Sometimes various Administrations have set up commissions that were expected to put the stamp of approval on what the Administration believed.

This is not such a commission. We are looking to you, not to approve our own notions, but to guide us and to guide the country through a thicket of tension, conflicting evidence and extreme opinion.

So, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Vice Chairman, let your search be free. Let it be untrammelled by what has been called the "conventional wisdom." As best you can, find the truth, the whole truth, and express it in your report.

I hope you will be inspired by a sense of urgency, but also conscious of the danger that lies always in hasty conclusions.

The work that you do ought to help guide us not just this summer, but for many summers to come and for many years to come.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in President Johnson's statement to the Commission that will study the civil disorders in our cities he warned against "narrowness and partisanship" in seeking to place blame for these tragedies.

The President said:

One thing should be absolutely clear: this is far, far too important for politics. It goes to the health and safety of all American citizens—Republicans and Democrats. It goes to the proper responsibilities of officials in both of our parties. It goes to the heart of our society in a time of swift change and great stress.

And the President concluded:

I think the composition of this commission is proof against any narrowness or partisanship.

Mr. Speaker, last week in mentioning the absolute necessity for maintaining law and order and putting down riots wherever they may occur, I stated here on the floor that this was an American problem and not a partisan one.

I repeat that mean and irresponsible party debate will help solve nothing. The riots—their cause, their prevention—are problems that confront every American regardless of political affiliation. This is indeed a national crisis. This is indeed a time for statesmanship and leadership. It is not a time for opportunism, demagoguery, or political wrangling.

The American people have every reason to be alarmed by the lawlessness and violence. Responsible people throughout our Nation have condemned mob action.

The best politics in this situation is the politics of cooperation to put an immediate end to these civil disorders, to impartially enforce the laws and impose the penalties for violating them, to punish the guilty, and to repair the damage inflicted upon our society and our institutions.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has made an important first step toward answering many of the complex questions that are involved in the summertime riots that are erupting across the Nation.

These are questions that must be answered if we are to avoid future summers of turmoil. For these questions are at the heart of the unrest and despair that is so easily triggered into violence.

The President has charged his newly appointed National Advisory Commission to come up with the answers to such vital questions as—

Why do riots occur in some cities and not in others?

Are these riots carefully planned and organized? And if so, what groups are involved?

Who has taken part in the riots? And who has suffered most from them?

What are the best methods to contain riots and prevent them?

The answers to these and other questions posed by the President dealing with widespread civil disorders this summer offer a unique opportunity for his Commission to make a lasting contribution to a stronger and more progressive society.

The tragedy of Detroit and Newark are history. But the work of this Commission can truly create a history for the future that will be free of needless destruction of life and property in American cities.

These riots can and must be avoided. And the task of the President's Commission is to find the answers as to why riots occurred this year and what can be done to avoid them in the future.

In his remarks Saturday, the President stressed that this is not a rubber stamp commission, "expected to put the stamp of approval on what the administration believed."

Instead, the President said:

We are looking to you, not to approve our own notions, but to guide us and to

guide the country through a thicket of tension, conflicting evidence and extreme opinion.

I commend the President for this vital mandate. I am certain that the American people will support the work of this Commission and will heed its final determinations.

Let the record show that this Commission is bipartisan in composition, scope, and character. Able and distinguished Republicans and Democrats are working together on one of the most pressing problems confronting American society.

There is no room on this Commission for partisan faultfinding or narrow political wrangling. And, I might add, there is no room for partisanship in any form or from any source in this grave matter.

I hope and trust that the Members of Congress—on both sides of the aisle—will join with the President and with the distinguished members of his Commission in burying partisan politics in favor of joining together in the national effort to end these riots forever.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the appointment by the President of the Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

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

There was no objection.

THE 1-MINUTE SPEECH

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make a 1-minute speech on the subject of the 1-minute speech.

I am always impressed to hear my colleagues in 60 fleeting seconds tell us how we can deal with Vietnam, how we can win the war, what to do about Castro, what to do about Red China, and how to prevent riots, all in 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will never extend the time to 2, 3, or 4 minutes, because if we speak that long we might have to go into the subject in more depth, and might realize that there are no simple, black-and-white answers, and we might then get out of the Alice in Wonderland in which many of us are living.

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

PROGRAM PAYS OFF ON MIGRANT GROUP

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to a promising Office of Economic Opportunity project which was described in the Dallas News on July 9, 1967. I refer to a special program aimed at keeping migrant workers at home with the enticement of an education and jobs which is being jointly sponsored by the Texas Education Agency, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Labor.

Under this program a total of 1,600 persons remained in the cities of Rio Grande and Laredo who would not have done so otherwise. There these older pupils received additional education, pre-vocational training, and encouragement to remain in school during the summer months through part-time jobs with the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

As I feel that this article would be of considerable interest to the Members of this body, I insert it in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM PAYS OFF ON MIGRANT GROUP

AUSTIN, TEX.—A special program aimed at keeping migrant workers at home with the enticement of an education and jobs is paying off, the State Board of Education was told Saturday.

The project—a joint venture of the Texas Education Agency, Office of Economic Opportunity and Department of Labor—is getting its trial in Rio Grande City and Laredo. Staff members told the board upon approval of \$100,000 in federal funds for the project that it is "having some effect" in both border cities.

A total of 81 parents in Rio Grande City and 68 in Laredo enrolled for the summer program "and had not joined the migrant stream."

A May 22 report indicates a total of 1,600 persons remained in the cities "either directly or indirectly because of the program."

A total of 333 migrant pupils who are above the grades taught in the regular 6-month migrant education program are taking part in the special project.

The primary purposes of the project are to give the older pupils additional education, to provide pre-vocational training and to encourage them to remain in school and not leave during the summer months by providing part-time jobs through the Youth Corps program.

"During the regular school year the 150 students in Rio Grande City and the 183 in Laredo attended special school classes, and were tutored in small groups on Saturdays, particularly in oral English, reading, writing and spelling," a staff report said.

The pupils are in a day-long program this summer which consists of academic work, pre-vocational training, supervised recreation and the Neighborhood Youth Corps work programs.

The board approved a total of \$2.3 million in federal funds for the migrant education program, which allows children of migrant workers to go to school in regular terms in an effort to educate them in the periods before they leave on their annual trek north.

The board approved \$2,085,000 in direct assistance to 20 school districts operating 6-month extended day school programs and 21 others operating modified migrant programs.

The 6-month programs are in operation at Brownsville, Cotulla, Crystal City, Donna, Eagle Pass, Edcouch-Else, Edinburg, Harlingen, Laredo, McAllen, Mercedes, Mission,

Pharr-San Juan-Alamo, Poteet, Raymondville, Rio Grande City, Robstown, San Benito, Santa Rosa and Weslaco.

The modified program is in effect at Calallen, Carrizo Springs, Del Rio, El Campo, Gregory-Portland, Hereford, Hidalgo County Consolidated, La Feria, Lasara, Plainview, Progreso, Riverside, Roma, San Felipe, San Marcos, Sinton, South San Antonio, United Consolidated, Uvalde, Waelder and Zapata.

The \$2 million will be used to employ additional teachers, aides, nurses and other specialized personnel.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND FINANCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—PERMISSION TO SIT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—PERMISSION TO SIT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit during general debate on August 1, 1967.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution authorizing the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX EXTENSION ACT OF 1967

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6098) to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. MILLS (during the reading of the conference report). Mr. Speaker, with the

understanding, of course, that Members and conferees will take sufficient time to explain the conference report, I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers on the part of the House be considered as read, and printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 518)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6098), to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 4, 16, and 24.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, and 20, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with the following amendments: On Page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 6, strike out "30" and insert "22.5".

On page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 9, strike out "II (C)" and insert "II (B)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with the following amendments: On page 10 of the Senate engrossed amendments, beginning with line 16, strike out all through line 8 on page 11, and insert the following:

"(e) SALES EFFECTED BY PARTICIPATING FIRMS IN CONNECTION WITH EXEMPT ACQUISITIONS.—A participating firm selling, or effecting the sale of, stock of a foreign issuer or a debt obligation of a foreign obligor may issue a written comparison or broker-dealer confirmation, which indicates the exemption for prior American ownership and compliance provided in subsection (a) applies to such acquisition, only if such participating firm has in its possession (except in the case of a sale for another participating firm or a participating custodian to which paragraph (4) applies) a statement, upon which such participating firm relies in good faith, executed under penalty of perjury by the person making the sale, establishing that such person is a United States person and is the owner of all stock of foreign issuers and debt obligations of foreign obligors carried in the records of such participating firm for the account of such person; and either—"

On page 12 of the Senate engrossed amendments, in the last line, after "agent" insert "or registrar".

On page 13 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 1, strike out "from the seller".

On page 16 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 12, after "records" insert "(on a trade-date basis) as of the close of business".

On page 17 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "that" in line 5, and strike out lines 6 and 7, and insert the following: "by the person for whose account the delivery is being made, establishing that such person is a United States person and is the owner of all stock of foreign issuers and debt obligations of foreign obligors car-

ried in its records for the account of such person."

On page 18 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 19, strike out "or".

On page 18 of the Senate engrossed amendments, in the last line, strike out "on" and insert "in".

On page 21 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 11, after "filed" insert "on or".

On page 23 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 17, strike out "(b) (1) (A)" and insert "(b) (1)".

On page 24 of the Senate engrossed amendments, before the second line from the bottom of the page, insert the following:

"(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 4920 (a) (5) is amended by striking out 'execute a certificate of American ownership (within the meaning of section 4918)' and insert in lieu thereof 'be considered a United States person'."

On page 24 of the Senate engrossed amendments, in the second line from the bottom of the page, strike out "(f)" and insert "(g)".

On page 25 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 5, strike out "(g)" and insert "(h)".

On page 25 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 11, strike out "(h)" and insert "(i)".

On page 25 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out the sixth line from the bottom of the page, and insert "written comparisons, broker-dealer confirmations, and".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 30 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 15, strike out "(h)" and insert "(g)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "(h)", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "(i)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert "(j)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with the following amendments: On page 32 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 19, strike out "(l)" and insert "(k)".

On page 32 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 21, strike out "(k) (2)" and insert "(j) (2)".

On page 34 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 13, after "dealers" insert "or distributors".

On page 36 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 2, after "corporation" insert "(or such other domestic corporation)".

On page 36 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 11, after "corporation" insert "(or such other domestic corporation)".

On page 36 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 17, strike out "stock or".

On page 38 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 14, strike out "(k) (3)" and insert "(j) (3)".

On page 39 of the Senate engrossed amendments, line 10, strike out "for which" and insert "after the date of such notice during which".

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,

CECIL R. KING,

HALE BOGGS,

JOHN W. BYRNES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL LONG,

GEORGE SMATHERS,

CLINTON ANDERSON,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS,

FRANK CARLSON.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6098) to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 4, 8, 10, 12, 14, 18, 20, 21, and 22 are technical or clerical in nature. With respect to each of these amendments the House recedes or, in conformity with other action, either the Senate recedes or the House recedes with a conforming amendment.

Amendment Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6: The bill as passed by the House and Senate authorizes the President to raise or lower, by Executive order, the interest equalization tax rates. As passed by the House the minimum and maximum rates which may be prescribed in an Executive order are limited to the rates under existing law and rates closely approximating 50 percent higher. Under Senate amendments Nos. 1 and 2 there is no limit on minimum rates and the maximum rates are double the rates under existing law. Under the conference agreement with respect to Senate amendments Nos. 1 and 2 there is no limit on minimum rates and the maximum rates are the rates prescribed by the bill as passed by the House. In conformity with the authority to lower rates below the rates provided by existing law, Senate amendments Nos. 3, 5, and 6 provide that any such lower rates provided by Executive order shall apply to acquisitions pursuant to commitments held on January 25, 1967, pursuant to options or similar rights held on such date, or as the result of foreclosure by a creditor pursuant to an instrument held on such date. Under the conference agreement, the House recedes on Senate amendments Nos. 3, 5, and 6.

Amendment No. 7: Under existing section 4918 of the code, the interest equalization tax does not apply, in general, to an acquisition of stock or a debt obligation of a foreign issuer or obligor if acquired from a U.S. person. There are two principal ways of establishing entitlement to the exemption: (1) The receipt of a certificate of American ownership in connection with the acquisition, or (2) the receipt of a "clean confirmation" (a confirmation of purchase which does not indicate that the securities may be subject to tax) from a broker-dealer which is a member or member organization of a national securities exchange or a national association of securities dealers registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Senate amendment No. 7 revises section 4918 and makes other related amendments to the code. Under the amendment, the interest equalization tax is not to apply if (1) the stock or debt obligation is acquired from a U.S. person, and (2) such person has either paid the tax with respect to his acquisition of the stock or debt obligation or acquired it without liability for payment of the tax. Proof of this exemption for prior American ownership and compliance is evidenced by a validation certificate issued by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate

and filed in accordance with regulations or by an "IET clean confirmation" (a written confirmation from a "participating firm" acting as a broker or dealer which contains no reference to liability for tax). In addition, provision is made for furnishing other evidence to establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the exemption is applicable.

In general, a "participating firm" is a member or member organization of a national securities exchange or association registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission which notifies the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that it (1) agrees to comply with the provisions of the code relating to the tax and with the documentation, recordkeeping, reporting, and auditing requirements prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate to implement such provisions, and (2) if the notification is made after August 14, 1967, is complying with such provisions and requirements.

During a transition period commencing July 15, 1967, and ending August 14, 1967, the following firms are deemed to be participating firms: All members and member organizations of the New York and American Stock Exchanges and those members of the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., which reported a net capital of \$750,000 in their latest financial statement filed before July 13, 1967, with the Securities and Exchange Commission or which effected at least 300 transactions in foreign securities during either the week commencing July 2, 1967, or July 9, 1967.

Status as a participating firm is required to be terminated if the firm requests termination or the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate has reason to believe that the firm is failing to comply with the statutory provisions and procedural requirements and notifies the firm of such noncompliance.

A participating firm which acquires foreign securities for a customer may issue an IET clean confirmation to the customer primarily in two cases. First, an IET clean confirmation may be issued to the customer if the firm received a written comparison or broker-dealer confirmation, which indicates that the exemption for prior American ownership and compliance applies to the acquisition, from another participating firm which acted as the selling broker in the transaction. Second, an IET clean confirmation may be issued to the customer if the acquisition was effected by a participating firm on a national securities exchange and if the Secretary or his delegate has determined that the rules of the exchange require transactions in securities which are subject to the exemption for prior American ownership and compliance to be carried out in such a manner that the new procedures are satisfied. Similarly, an IET clean confirmation may be issued in the situation where the selling participating firm and the buying participating firm are both members of a national securities association and the association has been determined by the Secretary or his delegate to have the necessary rules.

The amendment also provides procedures under which foreign securities may be transferred between and among participating firms and participating custodians thereby enabling U.S. persons owning such transferred securities to sell them under the exemption without the necessity of obtaining a validation certificate.

A participating custodian is a trust company or bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which gives the Treasury Department notice similar to that required of participating firms. During a transition period from July 15 through August 14, 1967, all Federal Reserve member banks classified as reserve city banks are treated as participating custodians. Rules for the termination of this status similar to those

applicable to participating firms are also provided.

The House recedes with clerical and technical amendments.

Amendment No. 9: Under existing law, a branch office of a domestic corporation or domestic partnership is treated as a foreign corporation or foreign partnership if there is in effect an election that it be so treated and the office is engaged in the foreign securities business. In general, if the corporation or partnership transfers money or other property to the branch office it is deemed to have acquired stock of a foreign corporation or partnership in an amount equal to the value of the money or property transferred. Under the Senate amendment, this rule is not to apply to the extent the transfer is in payment of a commission on a transaction initiated by the branch office and the commission is not in excess of the commission the corporation or partnership would pay to another domestic corporation or partnership in a similar transaction entered into at arm's length. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 11: Under the bill as passed by the House, the interest equalization tax is not to apply to the acquisition of debt obligations arising from the sale of real property located outside the United States and owned, on July 18, 1963, by the person acquiring such obligation. Under the Senate amendment, the exemption will also apply where the real property was owned on such date (1) by a decedent who was a U.S. person on the date of his death, if the real property was transferred to the person acquiring such obligation by reason of the death of the decedent, or (2) by a U.S. person who after July 18, 1963, transferred the real property to a trust created by him for the benefit of members of his family, if such trust is the person acquiring such obligation. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 13: Under existing law, the interest equalization tax does not apply to the acquisition from a foreign obligor of a debt obligation arising out of the sale of tangible personal property or services to such obligor by a U.S. person if an agency or wholly owned instrumentality of the United States guarantees or insures payment of the obligation. The effect of the Senate amendment is to remove the requirement that the purchaser of the property or services must be the obligor. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 15: Under existing law, the interest equalization tax does not apply to the acquisition of a foreign debt obligation where, in general, the obligation arises out of the sale of American goods or services. If the debt obligation is transferred to a person other than a U.S. person and is reacquired the tax applies. Under the Senate amendment, the tax is not to apply on reacquisition by the U.S. person from the person to whom the debt obligation was transferred if tax liability would not have been imposed by reason of section 4914(j)(1)(A)(iii) if the transfer had been made to a U.S. person. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 16: This amendment provided that the interest equalization tax shall not apply to an acquisition made before September 2, 1964, by a U.S. person of stock of a Canadian corporation or a debt obligation of a Canadian obligor if such acquisition was made, in general, with funds held in Canada on July 18, 1963. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 17: Under existing law, the interest equalization tax does not apply to the acquisition of stock or a debt obligation of a less developed country corporation. The definition of a less developed country corporation includes a corporation 80 percent or more of the income of which is derived from the use in foreign commerce of aircraft or ships registered under the laws of a less developed country and 80 percent or more of the assets of which are used in the

shipping or air transport business. The effect of the Senate amendment is to add the requirement that such a corporation be owned, to the extent of at least 80 percent of each class of its stock, by U.S. persons or by residents of one or more less developed countries. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment no. 19: Under existing law, the President may exclude from the interest equalization tax acquisitions of original or new issues of stock or debt obligations of a foreign person if he determines that the interest equalization tax will have such consequences for a foreign country as to imperil or threaten to imperil the stability of the international monetary system. The exclusion applies to an acquisition only if a notice of such acquisition is filed with the Treasury Department. With respect to such an acquisition before the Interest Equalization Tax Extension Act of 1965, failure to file such notice within the time prescribed by regulations resulted in a loss of the exclusion and thus, in effect, imposed a 100 percent penalty. In the case of such an acquisition after the Interest Equalization Tax Extension Act of 1965, failure to file a timely notice does not result in the loss of the exclusion, but there is, in effect, a penalty imposed equal to 5 percent of the tax which would otherwise be applicable for each 30-day period or fraction thereof during which the failure to file continues, with a maximum penalty of 25 percent of such tax.

Under the bill as passed by the House, the penalty applicable to acquisitions after the enactment of the 1965 Act is made applicable to acquisitions before the enactment of such Act. The Senate amendment retains this provision and, in addition, reduces the 5 percent penalty to 1 percent, and the maximum 25 percent penalty to 5 percent, with respect to acquisitions before and after the enactment of the 1965 Act.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 23: The bill as passed by the House permitted a domestic corporation to elect to be treated as a foreign issuer or obligor if (1) substantially all of the business of the corporation consisted of financing sales abroad by its domestic affiliates (80 percent directly or indirectly owned), (2) 15 percent of the sales price of each sale was attributable to sales or the performance of services by such affiliates, and (3) none of the funds which the corporation lent in its financing operations was obtained from U.S. persons.

The Senate amendment modified the House provision, chiefly to allow the corporation to finance sales of products of affiliated companies both domestic and foreign. Under the Senate amendment the corporation may acquire debt obligations—

(1) Arising out of the sale of tangible personal property—

(A) Produced by a domestic or foreign affiliate of such corporation (50 percent directly or indirectly owned),

(B) Received as consideration in the sale of property described in (A) above,

(C) Received as consideration in the sale of property described in (B) above,

(2) Arising out of the sale of tangible property, certain intangible property or services by a domestic affiliate, if 15 percent of the sales price is attributable to sales or the performance of services by such an affiliate, or

(3) Arising out of loans to dealers or distributors of property described in (1) above for use in their business.

The Senate amendment also provided that 90 percent of the debt obligations acquired by the corporation must be debt obligations of the specified types.

The Senate amendment modified the requirement in the House bill that none of the funds which the corporation lends in its

financing operations can be raised from U.S. persons by providing in addition that the funds generally cannot be borrowed from a foreign partnership or foreign corporation in which a tax-free direct investment could otherwise be made. In addition, if the corporation borrows short-term (less than 1-year maturity) funds, other than pursuant to an overdraft arrangement, the company must lend at least an equal amount on a short-term basis.

Under the House bill, only a domestic corporation was allowed to make the financing company election. The Senate amendment added a provision to the bill which provides similar treatment for a foreign corporation which is at least 50-percent owned (directly or indirectly) by a domestic corporation (or affiliated corporations) and which would be entitled to make the domestic financing company election except for the fact that it is a foreign corporation. In the absence of such a provision, the foreign corporation would be treated as "formed or availed of" to make otherwise taxable acquisitions of foreign securities, and, accordingly, the exclusion for direct investments in the corporation would be denied.

The House recedes with technical amendments.

Amendment No. 24: Under existing law, a foreign corporation is not considered a foreign issuer with respect to a class of stock if more than 65 percent (50 percent if traded on a national securities exchange) of such class was owned by U.S. persons prior to July 19, 1963. Only those shares which possess identical rights in the control, profits, and assets of the corporation are considered to constitute a single class of stock. The Senate amendment provided that shares which would qualify except for a restriction as to the right to receive dividends for a specified period shall (upon the expiration of such period) be treated as identical. The Senate recedes.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I have often heard the Speaker make reference to his love of the House of Representatives. He has frequently asserted his respect for the House, and spoken in its defense. Like the Speaker, I too respect the House as one of the great institutions of freedom.

Yesterday, in a nationwide television hookup, the mayor of the ill-fated city of Detroit, the former president of the National League of Cities, made a frontal and unwarranted attack upon the Congress. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to express resentment and help let the truth be known. I believe we must all undertake to let the American people know what the attitude of the Congress is—especially in the light of the unprovoked and indefensible attack which has been leveled at Congress.

The mayor of Detroit has attacked Congress on previous occasions, but his latest assault is perhaps the most extreme. His inflammatory words have

tended to create discontent and incite violence. Yesterday was no exception.

Detroit is one of the most favored cities in the Nation. Who can say but that the attitude of its mayor and his inflammatory words over the months were not in part responsible for that city experiencing our most destructive riot of the century?

Having failed to provide peaceful leadership in his own city, he seeks to wash his hands by making a whipping boy of the Congress, and I for one propose not to let the matter go unanswered.

One would think from reading the remarks of the mayor that the Congress has done nothing for the cities and has done nothing for the poor.

He speaks of rats. He has shown some interest in rat extermination, but why did he, months ago, not lead a spirited and effective campaign to enlist the help and support of all the good people of his city in a successful rat extermination program? Is he utterly opposed to all forms of self-help at the local level?

Can he only look to Washington for more handouts? Handouts from Washington and more Federal money is, seemingly, an obsession with him. Does he think that money, especially Federal money, is the answer to everything? He does not seem to understand that leadership—and he has not provided it in Detroit—he does not seem to understand that leadership and discipline are more important.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress, since 1960, has provided \$100 million to the city of Detroit in grant reservations for urban renewal. One wonders, what is being done with that money? Did it do great good?

One would think from many of the statements in the press that the Congress has done virtually nothing for the poor in the past and is doing little or nothing now. Let us inform the American people on this issue, my colleagues.

The mayor yesterday spoke of additional violence which, he said, "might lift the veil off the eyes of the Members of Congress." Please get the beam out of your own eyes, Mr. Mayor, before trying to get the mote out of the eyes of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I denounce these flamboyant statements which were televised nationally, and resent his arrogant attack. No doubt he wants to defend himself from his own leadership gap by an unprovoked assault on the Members of the Congress.

What has the Congress done for the poor?

On page 28 of the budget message of last January, the President shows that for benefits and services which aid the poor, the current fiscal 1968 expenditure is estimated at \$25.6 billion.

Nothing for the poor, Mr. Speaker?

The corresponding figure for fiscal 1967 was \$22 billion. The comparable amount for 1960 was only about a third of the 1968 amount.

The mayor did not mention these tremendous sums. Regretfully, nobody else has recently put the spotlight on the vast spending programs which Congress has funded. It is time for somebody to take note of what Congress is trying to do for

the poor. We are not required to lie down or hide or crouch in a corner as though we were afraid of some of these arrogant misrepresentations. There are those who do not want the people of the Nation to know the truth.

Yes, what has Congress done for the poor and for the cities?

For housing and community development, for example, as it is classified in the President's 1968 budget, the estimate for 1968 is \$3 billion. That is five times what it was in fiscal 1960. The House has made some adjustments, based on the justifications, but it has provided very substantial sums—as it has, in fact, in previous years.

For the model cities program, which is a new program that has not yet gotten to its feet, we have provided \$237 million in the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, for urban renewal we appropriated in the House this year, \$750 million. That is several times what the appropriation was in 1960. The city of Detroit, as I told you, has received \$100 million for urban renewal since 1960 in grant reservations. I do not know how much, if any, of it went up in smoke because of the leadership gap.

For this year, in public housing, the House provided \$275 million, which is double the 1960 level.

For urban planning grants, the House provided \$40 million in this year's bill. This is many times the 1960 level.

For open-space land grants, the House this year provided \$75 million, a new program since 1960.

For mass transportation, \$175 million has been provided.

For water and sewer grants, \$165 million has been approved this year by the House.

Yet, the mayor said it was hard to get \$75 million from the Congress for the Office of Economic Opportunity summer programs. The President asked for the \$75 million on April 28 and in less than a month the bill was on his desk providing the full amount—a month before summer began.

We cannot let these ill wishers who seem to be unsatisfied with our system of government destroy the institution of which we are Members, my colleagues.

In 1962, the Congress passed the Manpower Development and Training Act, and we have appropriated in this House, this year, \$394 million which will provide for 280,000 trainees.

For grants to States for public assistance, this House has passed appropriations for fiscal 1968 of over \$4 billion, and it was every dollar that was authorized and requested. This is more than twice the amount appropriated for 1960. Is this niggardly, Mr. Speaker?

For grants to the States for maternal and child welfare, this House this session has passed an appropriation of \$235 million—five times what it was in 1960—and yet we are attacked by this arrogant mayor who failed to do his job in the city which elected him. And he wishes to

remove what he says is a veil over the eyes of Members of Congress.

For educational improvement of the handicapped, this House has passed this year an appropriation for \$53 million—every dollar that was requested.

For medical research and training, a program of long-term but nonetheless of direct benefit to the poor and the disadvantaged, this House passed an appropriation for the National Institutes of Health this year of over \$1.4 billion, which is three times what it was in 1960.

And yet the mayor, in an attempt to divert attention from the breakdown in leadership in Detroit, is trying to make a whipping boy of the people who have done all of these things for the poor of the land.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is directly aimed at helping the disadvantaged to secure a better education. The mayor did not mention that. This House has passed an appropriation for over \$1.6 billion, at this session, for this program. And yet we are doing nothing for the poor? How misinformed and misleading can a public official, who was formerly the head of the National League of Cities, be? Certainly such irresponsibility deserves a rebuke, which I am undertaking to give today on the floor of the House.

For grants for vocational rehabilitation services and facilities, a program obviously aimed at helping the disadvantaged to participate gainfully in our economy, this House this session has provided \$311 million. That is over six times the amount that was appropriated in 1960. And yet Congress is alleged to be niggardly.

There are those who think we are going too far and in some respects we are, in the opinion of many, overextending ourselves.

Continuing a recitation of Federal benefits, for hot lunches this callous Congress has provided—in this House, at this session—\$400 million for school lunches and milk. There is nothing heartless about that.

We have approved \$300 million this year for the food stamp program and other food distribution programs; \$150 million for loans and grants for rural water and waste-disposal systems; \$400 million for low-income rural housing loans; and \$500 million for farmers' loans to produce the food and fiber to feed and clothe the people in the cities and rural areas of the land.

And I could go on, Mr. Speaker.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that there are some calculating individuals who would undertake to take advantage of the disgrace and shame into which our Nation has been led by launching a campaign for a big splurge in Federal spending.

Spending is not the answer to these problems. But this does not, of course, mean that we should abandon our efforts or scuttle worthwhile programs. They should be improved, but the problem is not one of dollars but of discipline. Discipline, self-respect, and some degree of law and order enforced on the local level by the local people is vital.

The more we have appropriated for these programs, the more violence we

have had. This refutes the idea that money alone is the answer to this problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say it is time for cool heads and it is a time to nail unwarranted attacks on the Congress—an important institution of freedom, and the best hope of the people of the Nation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, we have before us the conference report accompanying H.R. 6098, a bill that passed the House of Representatives in March of this year and which provides for a 2-year extension of the interest equalization tax.

Mr. Speaker, we face a number of problems, one of which has been alluded to today. This bill deals with another problem that I think is also very serious, the balance-of-payments deficit of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this bill by itself does not provide all that is required to correct the balance-of-payments situation. In this legislation we are only attempting to place a degree of control over the purchase of stocks from, and the lending of money to, foreigners. I must agree with some who are critical of other aspects of our balance-of-payments problem. We do not seem to be doing enough in the government sector, for example. Because we are not doing enough there, however, is not reason in my opinion to discontinue the degree of control which is exercised through this legislation, for without it I think the problem would be much worse than it is now.

Mr. Speaker, in 1964 Congress approved the Interest Equalization Tax Act in order to strengthen the balance-of-payments position of the United States. The act imposed a temporary excise tax on purchases by U.S. persons of foreign stocks or debt obligations from foreign persons. The purpose of the tax is to raise the interest cost which foreigners must pay in order to obtain capital from U.S. persons. The tax rates provided by the original legislation—15 percent in the case of stocks and long-term bonds and proportionately less in the case of short-term bonds—were designed to raise the cost to foreigners of obtaining capital in U.S. markets by the equivalent of a 1 percentage point increase in the rate of interest paid on borrowed funds.

The tax has made the U.S. capital market less attractive for foreigners and has consequently been instrumental in reducing the outflow of U.S. private capital to manageable levels. Had outflows continued at their pretax pace, it might have been necessary to enact more drastic measures to protect the balance of payments.

Balance-of-payments problems have persisted, however, in part because of the demands of the war in Vietnam. It became apparent that it was necessary to extend the life of the interest equalization tax beyond midnight tonight, the expiration date provided by existing law. Therefore, the House on March 15 approved this bill, H.R. 6098, which extends the tax for an additional 2 years or until July 31, 1969.

In major respects, the bill agreed to

by the conferees does not depart from the bill passed by the House. The bill as reported by the conferees extends the life of the tax until July 31, 1969, as provided by the House bill. Furthermore, it authorizes an increase in the rate of tax of up to 50 percent above the present rates to insure that the tax will remain effective even if there is an increase in the differential between U.S. interest rates and interest rates in other developed countries. It also grants the President the authority to vary the rate of tax when he finds such a change is necessary to limit total acquisitions by U.S. persons of foreign stocks and bonds to a level consistent with the balance-of-payments objectives of the United States. Finally, the bill approved by the conferees contains all the minor perfecting amendments approved by the House.

The conferees did agree, however, to accept two important Senate amendments to the House bill as well as a number of minor amendments. All these amendments are germane.

The most important Senate amendment agreed to by the conferees is one which the House would have approved, I am sure, had the facts been available at the time we considered the bill. I refer to the Senate amendment which provides a new system of administration designed to prevent evasion of the tax in connection with the exemption which is provided when Americans buy foreign stocks and bonds from other Americans.

When this bill was considered by the Ways and Means Committee and when it was before the House, the known instances of evasion consisted of sporadic, crude attempts to defraud the Government. Some of these resulted in criminal prosecutions. It subsequently came to the attention of the Treasury, however, that evasion was being carried out on a larger scale and in a more organized fashion by persons operating in foreign countries where they could not readily be prosecuted by U.S. authorities.

These persons obtained fraudulent certificates of American ownership from naive Americans resident abroad. These false certificates were then used to defraud the Government in sales in which foreign stocks were sold in the American market at the premium which shares that are not subject to tax often bring. The fraud was perpetrated in part because smaller American brokers relied upon foreign brokerage firms in determining whether certificates of American ownership were legitimate.

The new procedure requires that an American who sells foreign stocks must show evidence not only of his U.S. citizenship but also that any interest equalization tax obligation in connection with the foreign securities has been paid. A certificate of prior American ownership will no longer be enough to exempt the transaction from tax. Proof of compliance under the new procedures will be given in the form of a validation certificate which must be obtained from the Internal Revenue Service. This validation certificate will not be necessary, however, if the foreign securities are purchased and sold through a group of designated broker-dealers that have agreed

to comply with the reporting and record-keeping regulations connected with the system.

The conferees on the part of the House agreed to this new system because they were concerned over the amount of evasion that has taken place, and because they are advised that this new system will put an end to it. The new system is preferable to other solutions which have been suggested to meet the problem. It is preferable, for example, to imposing a tax on all transactions involving foreign stocks and bonds. There is no reason to tax transactions between Americans since these transactions have no effect on the balance of payments. The new system is also preferable to a complete exemption from tax for transactions involving outstanding foreign securities. In the latter case, new issues would be sold to foreigners and outstanding issues would be sold to Americans. In this way, the sale of outstanding securities would be substituted for the sale of new securities to Americans; and the tax would simply be avoided, seriously weakening its balance-of-payments impact.

The second important Senate amendment agreed to by the conferees concerns the authority granted the President to vary the rates of tax. The House bill authorized the President to raise the rates of tax to a maximum of 22½ percent. That is, under the House bill the President could raise the rates of tax from the equivalent of a 1-percent increase in interest costs to foreign borrowers to the equivalent of a 1½-percent increase. The President was authorized to impose these higher rates when he found it necessary to do so in order to achieve national balance-of-payments objectives. Once the President had raised the rates of tax above current levels, the House bill permitted him to reduce those rates at such time as he saw fit provided he did not reduce the rates below the level of the rates in force at the present time.

The Senate gave the President wider authority to vary the tax rates. On the one hand, the Senate authorized the President to double existing tax rates—that is, to raise them to the equivalent of a 2-percent increase in interest costs to foreigners. The Senate also authorized the President to vary the rates anywhere between zero and this 2-percent equivalent.

The conferees on the part of the House were determined to retain the maximum rate provision contained in the House bill. We prevailed. The Senate conferees, however, remained adamant that the President should be permitted to reduce the tax rates below existing levels—even to zero—if he finds such action to be necessary to the achievement of our balance-of-payments objectives. The House conferees receded on this question.

The bill as reported by the conferees therefore grants the President the authority to change the rates of tax from the present 1 percent interest rate equivalent to an interest rate equivalent between zero and 1½ percent. Of course, the President can make such a change only when he finds it is necessary to the achievement of our balance-of-payments objectives. Furthermore, the authority is limited in the sense that distinctions

cannot be made between types of foreign securities. The existing relationships between the tax rates on foreign stocks and on foreign debt obligations with various dates to maturity must be retained.

Let me emphasize that this grant of discretionary authority to the President is not a precedent for the grant of similar authority in connection with income tax rates. The interest equalization tax is a regulatory measure, not a revenue measure. It is more closely related to the exercise of the monetary authority than to the exercise of the taxing authority. Grants of discretionary authority have traditionally been more frequent in the area of monetary policy. Finally, this grant of discretionary authority is similar to authority previously granted the President under the interest equalization tax to apply the tax to bank loans and to designate less developed countries.

The other Senate amendments which the House conferees agreed to are relatively minor, and can be summarized briefly. In three cases, they involve amendments to provisions of the House bill.

The bill approved by the House provided an exclusion from the tax with respect to debt obligations acquired by Americans in connection with the sale of real property located outside the United States provided the seller acquired the property on or before July 18, 1963, the date the tax was first imposed. The Senate extended this provision to exclude debt obligations acquired by an estate or by the heirs of a decedent in connection with the sale of foreign real property acquired by the decedent on or before July 18, 1963. The Senate also extended the provision to exclude debt obligations acquired by a trust in connection with the sale of foreign real property transferred to the trust by an American who acquired the property before the interest equalization tax was imposed and who created the trust for the benefit of his family.

The House conferees agreed to a Senate amendment which reduces the penalty for failure to file timely notice of the acquisition of new Canadian securities. The House bill had provided a uniform penalty of 5 percent of what the tax would have been in the absence of the exclusion for new Canadian issues for each month the notice was late up to a maximum of 25 percent. The Senate conferees reduced this penalty to 1 percent of the tax that would have been applied but for the exclusion for each month the notice is late up to a maximum of 5 percent. This reduced penalty is reasonable in view of the fact that the failure to file timely notice in no way affects the balance of payments. It is also apparent that some of those who have failed to file timely notice are not used to filing Federal tax returns. Some, for example, are tax exempt institutions.

The House bill provided that a U.S. corporation which borrows funds abroad and uses those funds to finance sales by affiliated domestic companies may elect to be exempt from the tax with respect to debt obligations it acquires as a result of these business activities. The exclusion was only to apply, however, where 15 percent of the property or services sold con-

sisted of U.S. property or the services of U.S. persons. The Senate made several modifications to perfect this amendment. These modifications provide greater flexibility for this type of financing arrangement.

The conferees on the part of the House also agreed to the following new provisions added to the bill by the Senate.

One provides an exemption for debt obligations acquired in connection with export transactions guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank or similar Government instrumentality. This exemption broadens a provision in present law which provides for an exclusion only if the debt obligation is issued by the importer.

A second Senate amendment tightens up the definition of a less developed country corporation to make sure that corporations in the shipping business which are owned by citizens of developed countries cannot borrow funds free of tax in the United States simply because they have their ships or planes registered under the flag of a less developed country.

Another Senate amendment permits the U.S. offices of a U.S. securities firm to transfer funds earned from commissions on business generated by a foreign branch to that branch free of tax.

A final Senate amendment exempts from tax debt obligations which are reacquired from foreign lenders in cases in which the acquisition of the obligations was initially free from tax because it arose from certain export-related transactions.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the Senate signed the conference report. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], the gentleman from California [Mr. KING], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGES], and I also signed it. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], the fifth conferee on the part of the House, did not sign it. He is not for the legislation and has not been for the legislation since its inception. But I believe even the gentleman from Missouri will agree, when he takes the floor to discuss the conference report, that if this program is to be continued for another 2 years these amendments which we present as a part of the conference report should be a part of the law. They correct some inequities that have developed and have been brought to the attention of the House and of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will accept the conference report, because I believe it is the best that could have been developed from the conference with the Senate.

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

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

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me on this rather technical bill we have before us. I believe that many people have some misconception about the purpose of the bill and what is covered and what is not covered. That is the reason why I should like to ask the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee several questions.

My own interpretation is that we are not trying to affect American business particularly, but are trying to stop for-

eigners from coming to this country to borrow at lower interest costs, because of their high rates of interest.

May I ask the gentleman two or three specific questions which have come to my attention? These are hypothetical questions.

Company A is a domestic corporation organized in 1935, and all of its capital voting stock is owned by U.S. citizens.

Company B, a foreign corporation, has been a wholly owned subsidiary of Company A since 1959.

One of the principal stockholders of the domestic parent corporation is a U.S. estate which owns over 10 percent of the common voting stock of the domestic parent corporation. The stock was owned by the decedent prior to the passage of the Interest Equalization Tax Act.

This estate wishes to sell and/or transfer certain foreign assets of the estate, consisting principally of foreign real estate, to the wholly owned subsidiary of the domestic parent corporation in exchange for nonvoting preferred stock to the foreign subsidiary. The foreign assets were owned by the decedent prior to the passage of the Interest Equalization Tax Act. I would ask whether or not this transfer by the U.S. estate of its foreign assets to the foreign subsidiary for nonvoting preferred stock of the subsidiary would be subject to the Interest Equalization tax?

Mr. MILLS. There are several provisions contained in the law which might be applicable to this hypothetical case which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] brings to our attention. Permit me to state a few of them.

If the estate owns 10 percent or more of the voting power of the subsidiary, the direct investment exclusion would be applicable. The gentleman from Ohio did say that the estate owned 10 percent or more of the voting power?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. MILLS. Now, under the bill, if debt obligations are received from the foreign subsidiary in connection with the sale of foreign real estate acquired by the decedent before July 19, 1963, the tax would not apply.

Mr. BOW. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. Chairman, I have two other questions, if I may impose upon the gentleman from Arkansas further.

Mr. MILLS. All right.

Mr. BOW. Again, going back to a hypothetical question, company A is a domestic corporation organized in 1935 and all of its capital voting stock is owned by U.S. citizens. Company B, a foreign corporation, has been a wholly-owned subsidiary of company A since 1959. Company B, desires to borrow \$1.5 million from U.S. sources and the loan is to be secured by a first mortgage on foreign real estate.

My question is this, would the mortgage loan be subject to the Interest Equalization Tax Act?

Mr. MILLS. It generally would. The gentleman refers to one of the typical types of cases; the borrowing by foreign entities of U.S. funds.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, and if I may go

one step further, if the domestic parent corporation borrowed the money and in turn loaned it to the subsidiary, would the transaction be subject to the interest equalization tax?

Mr. MILLS. It generally would not in that instance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MILLS. In general, when an American firm makes a loan to a subsidiary of its own, the tax does not apply.

Mr. BOW. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas and say the gentleman has clarified some very important questions on my behalf.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the House will agree to the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means, of course, has set aside its work on the social security legislation in order to deal again with this very difficult problem of our international balance of payments.

I am sorry that the problem of coordinating the work of the various House committees as it relates to a single issue is so little advanced. I tried to bring this matter before the House in the last week in discussing two other matters that bore upon this same issue—one from the Committee on the Judiciary that had to do with further restrictions upon financial transactions through giving the Government the power to create, in effect, a Government-sponsored cartel to restrict the private financial institutions in their investments abroad.

And the other was the extending of the Government investments abroad through the soft loans of the Inter-American Development Bank. The point I was making, or trying to make, was that we need have some syntheses in the Congress in regard to these total issues: In this instance the international balance of payments, in the other instance, in respect to the Ways and Means Committee work on social security, the big problem of poverty in our society. Of course, the bulk of our Federal poverty programs are in the Committee on Ways and Means because they are involved in the social security legislation.

I could not fail to remark that the complaints the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], was registering against the tactics of the mayor of Detroit were essentially the complaints Republicans make against the same tactics that President Johnson has been employing against those who dare oppose what he wants to spend in Federal programs which he says will solve poverty. President Johnson wants to throw money out in exactly the same way that he now objects to, when mentioned by someone else.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] now finds that someone else can engage in that game; namely, the mayor of Detroit, claiming that by just throw-

ing Federal money at it, you can solve it.

So we have a dispute not between those who are trying to get at the bottom of how to spend money wisely and spend it well to eliminate poverty, but between those who have the same technique of just throwing Federal money at it. If anyone dares to interpose a suggestion that they might look at the Federal programs themselves, to see if any were well designed in the first place, they are promptly accused of not being interested in solving the problems of humanity and the problems of poverty.

And so in the same way this issue before us in this conference report which is supposed to be dealing with the subject of international balance of payments, which involves less developed nations and human beings in the long run, cannot be solved by throwing Government money at it, and here believe me, there is ample opportunity to seek the solution of the problems of war and peace which are involved in these international transactions of finance and trade if we just will dig into the details. And if we do not pay attention to the details we are not going to come up with the proper solution of those problems. In the same way that the administration has tried to solve the poverty problem by throwing money at it, and calling it inhumanity when anyone criticizes this approach, so in this field of international balance of payments we find the administration continuing in its program of restricting private capital investment abroad, which is one of our pluses in the international balance of payments, and doing nothing about Federal spending programs abroad. In fact, I should modify that to say actually asking for expansion of Government programs abroad, whether it is foreign aid or whether it is the development loans through the Inter-American or the Asiatic Development Bank, or whatever it is.

Now, this is a conference report, of course, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], the chairman of the committee, has pointed out that I have opposed this legislation from its inception, and that I probably would say some of the things done in the Senate bill were steps forward. Well, in a sense yes, but in a larger sense no. And that is why I oppose the conference report and recommend that it be turned down.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I would say to the gentleman that I had reference primarily, I think, to the amendments in the Senate; that the amendments were germane to the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, and I thank the gentleman, because it is true that for years I have argued back and forth in conference, and now it is getting to be a matter of a little levity, which I enjoy, when I seek to determine whether the Curtis formula has been adhered to. In other words, whether the Senate has refrained from putting nongermane amendments on bills the House sends

over to the Senate. I am happy to report to the House that every one of the amendments the Senate had on this bill were germane to the bill, so there is progress in this area.

Also in substance in a very modest way these amendments would make a very bad bill seem less bad.

Now, why would I oppose the conference report on that basis?

It is because it further creates the deception that by patching a rotten piece of cloth, we thereby are doing something so we thereby can rely on it. In other words, put these good pieces of cloth on here to patch it up is actually going to keep us from looking to the source of the problem so we can correct it. It distracts us, it beguiles us, and it does no real good.

The Senate amendments do two things. They deal with the following. But first I might say one deals with a matter which was not presented to your committee in late February of this year. We were told then by the administration that this act had proved effective and that they were having no problems to speak of in compliance. It is the same story we have heard every time this act has been presented to us and extended, because this is a temporary act—supposedly—presented to us back, when was it, in 1962, as a method of meeting the balance of payments.

Since the House acted on this bill, however, a real problem of enforcement has been revealed. I am going to quote from a Washington Post editorial that I placed in the RECORD of July 24, 1967. This editorial was on July 19. The heading of the editorial was "A Mischievous Tax"—referring to this tax.

Now I am quoting:

Now the Treasury reveals there is wholesale evasion of the IET by sharp operators.

Then skipping, it says further:

The Treasury is confronted by illegal transactions that can be running as high as \$1 billion a year.

In our conference with the Treasury officials in attendance on this particular bill, or on this particular conference report, the Treasury officials under some interrogation by those of us at the conference, said they had not even dreamed that there was this kind of evasion. Well, there is a real question about their dreams and let me make that quite clear.

But the fact of the matter is that your committee, your Committee on Ways and Means, has had no opportunity of digging into the depths of this wholesale evasion of this law because the Treasury officials did not present it to us.

I might say when the act was first passed back in 1962, I referred to it as our Berlin wall and that it would be no more successful in keeping investment money from flowing to freer climates of investment than the Berlin wall would keep people from going to freer climates.

As they close up one tunnel under or one place to go over or where they had made a gap in the wall, others would open up.

I asked the Secretary of the Treasury if we really were not confronted with a kind of prohibition law such as we ex-

perienced in this country in the twenties and the early thirties, in other words a law that was unenforceable, and I do believe we have that exact situation. What it does, of course, is penalize the proper operators and those who try to abide by the law. Those who go in other directions are the ones who benefit by it and by increasing the penalties as this bill does, we of course are simply increasing the margin on which the illegal operators can proceed or spur legitimate operators to find new ways of avoiding the effect of the law.

So the conference report before us does that. It seeks to close the latest loophole. Let me mention another thing too—another point that was made before the Committee on Ways and Means in February on the issue of whether this law has been effective in curbing our international deficits. The administration said it had been.

In the two debates last week that bore on this subject of the balance of international payments, I called attention to the statistics for the first quarter of 1967 on our balance-of-payments deficit. That is the very thing this law seeks to improve. This is its sole reason for enactment.

On the liquidity basis—and there are two ways of measuring it—there was a \$1.3 billion deficit in 1966. The first quarter of 1967 shows a \$2.2 billion deficit on an annual basis. So very clearly there is not improvement and we did not have these figures before Ways and Means in February. Had we had them, we would have been asking even further questions: Why is not this law effective?

But on the official reserves transactions basis, which is the other way of measuring the international balance of payments, and the one that the administration wanted in there because in the past 3 or 4 years it was looking less grim than on the liquidity basis—last year for example, it was a plus \$225 million, but in the first quarter of 1967 it shows a whopping minus \$7.3 billion—why, if that figure had been before the Ways and Means Committee, I am satisfied that the members of the committee would never have recommended an extension of a measure like this which has so clearly proved to be ineffective.

As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has pointed out, the Senate amendment would seek to stop this new loophole, this new evasion. But that is what we have been doing each time. Each time we come in here and plug up a new one. I think it is futile, because we are dealing with a rotten piece of cloth.

The other thing that disturbs me equally is that the other Senate amendments make a few more legal exceptions to the law. One of the amendments, which, thank goodness, we did not accept, was limited almost to a single company. But these are exceptions on the basis not really of equity because the inequities are legion but of who has the most political muscle to come in before Treasury and sell their bill of goods, or before the other body. Those who do not have the political muscle, small businesses and others, would not be able to obtain the extensions. Undoubtedly we are dealing with the problem of inequity in this act, be-

cause it is inequitous across the board. Many people have no way of coming in here to present their case.

I think we have a law that invites this kind of operation; this invites corruption. I am not saying there is corruption. I say it invites it.

The trouble with our international balance of payments is not private investment abroad. This is a plus in both its aspects. The first aspect is the return that we get on our investment portfolio abroad. That is a very healthy plus. And because our exports exceed our imports, that is the second plus we have. And exports are based upon private investment abroad, restrict private investment abroad and you restrict our exports. Actually, by pursuing this course of restricting private investment, you are worsening the problem of international balance of payments. Each day that passes makes it worse.

The problem is in the governmental sector quite clearly. I was pleased to have the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], point out that it is the Government, Government spending, Government so-called lending or investment abroad where the trouble lies. Those are not loans, these 40-year things that the development banks are lending out from the taxpayers' money. They are thinly disguised grants, not even soft loans.

I want to emphasize again that I am in favor of the theory of foreign aid, but, my heavens, not with the poor expenditure policy the administration has been pursuing in recent years. Reexamine the Marshall Plan and early point IV and we see the difference between disciplined and well planned expenditure and just throwing money around.

I referred to the problem in the poverty program in context with foreign aid. I said that the essence of good programs lie in good expenditure policy properly disciplined. We are considering the matter of policy and discipline in the Ways and Means Committee—and I want to commend the chairman—the concept of welfare is to get people on their economic feet, not to keep them in welfare. Money carefully spent can put them on their feet. Money extravagant-ly spent can keep them in welfare.

And so also the program of foreign aid, which is a form of welfare. It should be designed to put nations on their economic feet, not to put them on permanent welfare. If we just throw Federal money at these problems, we will worsen the problems of individuals who are poverty stricken and we will worsen the problems of the less developed countries. I think we have done so, regretably, in both instances.

We ought to vote down this measure. We ought to go back to considering our expenditure policies and the discipline or lack thereof in them, when foreign aid comes out, when Public Law 480 comes out, and when these various development banks come to us for more money, and the Export-Import Bank. We should look carefully over their expenditure programs. This will move us toward the solution of the seri-

ous problem we have in an international balance of payments. Let's get on with this job and not make matters worse by restricting the plusses we have, namely our private investments abroad, through poorly conceived and poorly executed programs like this misnamed interest equalization tax.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to quote excerpts from a speech given by J. W. Keener, president of the B.F. Goodrich Co., at the annual meeting of the Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., dated June 8, 1967. The entire speech is well worth reading, but the parts I wish to emphasize are as follows:

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS IN PERSPECTIVE

Leaving the deficit period before 1958 to history, I will confine my remarks to the more recent period, 1958-66, and to the future outlook. During these past nine critical years, 1958-66, the uninterrupted string of deficits has totaled \$24 billion. These have been financed by a massive build-up in U.S.A. liabilities to foreigners and by a loss of \$9.3 billion of our nation's gold supply. I hate to think of what such another nine years would do, not only to the international financial integrity of the United States, but to the economic stability of the entire world.

In its international financial transactions, every nation has areas that create deficits and areas that create surpluses. It is the overall net that, over the long pull, must be in balance.

PRIVATE DEFICIT CATEGORIES NAMED

For the United States the largest net private deficit category is that of overseas travel and transportation costs, which really include government costs for these services, as well. Over the past nine years, this category has cost us \$10.7 billion in total net outflow.

A second major private deficit category is that of investments in stocks, bonds, and notes of foreign businesses and governments made by American investors and investing institutions. During the past nine years, the income received from such investments has fallen short of new funds invested overseas by \$8.5 billion.

A third private sector deficit is that of investments by foreigners in the stocks, bonds, and notes of American businesses and governmental bodies. For the past nine years, the income remitted to these foreign investors has exceeded the sum of their new investment in the U.S.A. by some \$2.5 billion.

Other private sector remittances, including personal gifts and private funds deposited abroad, have totalled about \$9.1 billion in the past nine years. Altogether, in the above named categories, the private sector has developed a rather sizable nine year deficit of \$30.8 billion.

PRIVATE BUSINESS PICTURE BRIGHT

But what has the private sector of the economy brought in in the way of international financial surpluses? This—the area of private business—is the brightest one of the whole picture.

First, the excess of our exports over our imports for the last nine years has totalled \$38.9 billion. This, alone, has exceeded all of the private sector deficits by more than \$8 billion.

Add to this private sector gain of \$8 plus billion the excess of income from American direct investments—plants, branches, selling companies, etc.—over our new investment outflows to establish or expand such businesses. This excess has totalled \$8.7 billion over the past nine years, bringing the private sector surplus to about \$16.8 billion.

Then add to this the excess of services income—technical fees, royalties, etc.—over the outgo for such services—a nine year total

of \$10.2 billion—and the private sector total surplus for this period has reached \$27 billion.

PUBLIC SECTOR DEFICIT \$51 BILLION

I indicated earlier that our nine year international balance of payments deficit had totalled \$24 billion. I have just stated that our nine year private sector surplus was \$27 billion. This adds up to a public sector deficit of \$24 billion plus \$27 billion, or \$51 billion.

I am intimately familiar with the arguments in favor of foreign economic gifts and grants. I am equally familiar with the arguments in favor of foreign military support, gifts, and grants. I am sympathetic with many of the arguments in favor of aiding the developing nations to realize, to the extent they can, the potentials that some of our social, political, and economic theoreticians visualize for them.

But my main thesis is this. The United States should do as much as, in the long run, it can economically afford to do. We should expect and require other nations to pick up a larger share of the burden. We should see to it that the total burdens are not too large, year by year, for the economically able nations to afford. And, by all means we should avoid the overspending by the public sector that will topple the world's economic pyramid, of which the United States stands at the base.

U.S. EXPORTS EXCEED IMPORTS

The major surplus in America's international balance of payments is the excess of our exports over our imports. This surplus is being threatened from two sides. One of these is the combined result of the shortage of labor—due to our low birth rates between 1928 and 1948—and the legally monopolistic position of unions which has been created by legislation, plus misinterpretation of that legislation by both the NLRB and the Supreme Court. The inevitable result of this, as we all know, is exorbitant increases in employment costs and less competitive U.S.A. export prices in relation to our foreign antagonists.

The other threat to export growth arises from limitations on direct investment abroad. We are presently tied by the cords of the "Voluntary" Program which limits us to ever more restrictive allowances. It does urge us to invest abroad by borrowing abroad at, until recently, considerably higher interest rates, while, at the same time, it urges us to reinvest less of our foreign earnings and remit more in dividends.

To the extent that such restrictions limit or curtail foreign investments, we, as a nation, are injured in two ways. The first is that our excess of interest and dividend income over direct investment outflow will stop growing, even though it has nearly doubled in the last nine years.

AFFILIATES IMPORTANT TO U.S. EXPORTS

More important, however, is the deterring effect the lack of direct investment will have on the surplus of our American produced exports over foreign produced imports. Department of Commerce studies show that about 25% of all U.S.A. goods exported go to or through U.S.A. direct investment affiliates. In 1966, 42% of all goods exported by The B. F. Goodrich Company were ordered by our own affiliates, mainly for resale. In fact, our company's exports in 1966 were 26% higher than they were in 1965, and all of the increase came from our foreign affiliates. To the extent that "voluntary" or compulsory controls limit our direct investments, to that extent we are limiting future balance of payment surpluses, both in the form of income and fees from such investments, and in the form of export surpluses that such investments generate.

RESTRICT GOVERNMENT SPENDING

While these and other measures can aid considerably over future years in reducing our net balance of payments deficits, they cannot do the whole job. The Federal Government, as the consistent creator of the largest share of our deficits, must do more than it has done so far to contain its appetite for spending abroad.

While the government normally spends heavily to maintain multitudinous civilian offices and activities abroad, its largest contributions to our balance of payments deficits arise from economic assistance and military spending abroad.

Insofar as possible, we must reduce or eliminate economic assistance to countries that are financially able to stand on their own feet. I think it is not only fair, but necessary, to require foreign countries to document their needs and meet sound requirements for aid. Further, where aid is provided, we should insist that larger proportions be tied to expenditures in this country. Considerable progress has been made in this area, but more can be done. Finally, we must continue to insist that those nations that have profited from earlier U.S.A. assistance must assume a larger share of the total burden. The United States cannot afford to be the welfare agency of the non-communist world.

In the area of military spending and assistance abroad, I am convinced that we cannot afford the cost of maintaining such large military forces, families, and military services abroad, particularly in Western Europe. Where such forces are essential, they should be kept to minimum numbers and we should continue to twist the arms of the nations benefited to make military equipment purchases from us to the full extent of our troop maintenance costs.

Our military expenditures overseas in 1966 amounted to \$3.6 billion. However, our sales of military equipment and supplies brought in \$900 million, leaving a net military deficit of \$2.7 billion. We have heard considerable talk about the adverse effect on our balance of payments of our increased military expenditures in Vietnam. Information on the 1967 Vietnam balance of payments burden is not available, but our 1966 military spending deficit was no greater than in the 1957-58-59-60 period. And we can still do things, as I said earlier, to spend less elsewhere as we have to spend more in Vietnam.

I would guess that, by this time, you have surmised that I think the Federal government must exercise a good deal more restraint in its foreign spending and commitments if we are ever to regain a sound and continuing payments balance. As vigorous and productive as the U.S. economy is, its back is not strong enough yet to carry the balance-of-payments load being imposed upon it.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as I look at the issue before us, it is not a question of whether or not we should have an interest equalization tax. That issue was before the House earlier this year, when we passed the bill which went to the Senate. The Senate added some amendments, and we are now dealing with the conference report.

As a conferee, I look at my obligations simply in terms of making sure that the agreement reached with the Senate on the differing texts of the legislation was appropriate.

I must report back to the House that I think the House conferees did a splendid job in preserving the House positions

on the crucial decisions. For instance, the Senate increased this tax by a maximum of 200 percent rather than the 150 percent maximum provided for by the House bill. In conference, the House prevailed on its version of the increase.

We did yield to the Senate in the matter of the discretionary authority of the President. The House gave the President discretion to vary the rates between 100 and 150 percent of the rates in present law. Under the Senate provision, the President was given discretion to vary the rates between zero and 200 percent of the rates in existing law. Under the conference report we bring back, the President is given discretion to vary the rates between zero and 150 percent of those in existing law. Consequently, the President can reduce this tax below either the current level or the level that is projected by this legislation.

I must say as far as the merits of the program are concerned, I have a very serious question. I opposed the legislation when it was first put on the books. However, a majority decided that it was a tool that was advisable to use in coping with our balance-of-payments problem.

In 1965, the administration proposed legislation extending the tax. It is my attitude at that time that since this tool was then in use, it would worsen our balance-of-payments problem to repeal it. The administration had not focused on the basic causes of our balance-of-payments problem, and they still are not focusing the real causes. But since we have the problem, it seems to me this legislation, as distasteful a tool as it is to me, still provides a tool if its repeal would cause a worsening of the situation.

Therefore, the basic merits of the bill are not really before us. The question is: Is this conference report, the agreement we have been able to work out with the Senate, an appropriate one? If I were to judge the bill, I would say we have a better bill today, as we bring back this conference report, than when it left the House. Some provision to close the abuses that have been discovered have been added, and I think we have changed the law to avoid certain inequities which the law now produces, but which neither the Congress nor the executive branch anticipated. Some of those inequities have been corrected by this legislation.

So, I support this conference report, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MILLS. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for yielding me this time to comment briefly on this conference report and the subject of the conference report, which, of course, is the bill itself. I see two objections to the bill:

First, it is ineffective in practice; and second, in my judgment at least, it is wrong in principle.

So far as the question of the ineffectiveness of the bill in practice is concerned, I would certainly associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri, who did point out in his statement a few minutes ago the fact that the bill and this tax are not having

the kind of impact on international transactions and on our balance of payments which was anticipated. Therefore, since it is an ineffective measure, there is a very serious question that it should be continued on our books.

The effectiveness of the tax and, in fact, the effect of it, was the subject of an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post for July 19, which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, at page 19885. In that editorial the tax was devalued as "an ill-disguised, partial devaluation of the dollar."

The editorial is entitled "A Mischievous Tax." The conclusion of the editorial comes to this point:

To the extent that the IET is effective, it inhibits the integration of international capital markets and perpetuates the very interest-rate differentials that force foreign borrowers into this market. To the extent that it is evaded, and it surely will be, the IET will engender demands for additional bureaucratic controls.

As the gentleman from Missouri pointed out, the only alternative to the Congress year by year, as we continue this tax, will be to run around plugging up the loopholes.

Now let me say a word as to the principle involved here, because I believe it is perfectly clear this is a bill intended to impose Federal controls—Federal controls on capital.

I believe we have to devote a little attention to the rising degree of control we are witnessing in this country. Just the other day we found it necessary to impose wage controls on our railroad workers. Day by day those who follow the commodity markets and observe the operations of the Secretary of Agriculture see them very effectively controlling crises in the commodity market. On occasion we see the basic items in our economy, such as steel, controlled by the white heat of publicity from the White House.

We can observe, in this perspective, the other vital segments of our economy, such as pension plans and investment trusts, which are in the target area for Federal controls.

No one likes Federal controls. You do not like them. I do not like them. The American people do not like them.

If we have a war, either a hot or a cold war, which makes controls necessary, then of course I admit we have to bow to that necessity. But Federal controls of this sort should be debated fully and should be understood fully. They should not only be advertised as temporary but should be repealed and removed when they are ineffective or outmoded.

As I said, we may have to accept some degree of control in times of national danger, but these controls should not be creeping controls. They should not be things which gradually build up without warning until all of a sudden we find our economy is in harness. They should be only such limited restrictions as we deliberately and prudently deem absolutely necessary.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is not the case in this matter of the interest equalization tax. It is a control on capital. It is an ineffective measure for improving

the balance of payments. Therefore, the conference report on this subject should be rejected.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

NOTWITHSTANDING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE UNTIL TOMORROW, THE CLERK BE AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER BE AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ANY ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED BY THE TWO HOUSES AND FOUND TRULY ENROLLED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until tomorrow, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why is this necessary?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Because the very conference report we are considering is one of the matters that would have to be signed today should the House get through before the matter is engrossed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX EXTENSION ACT OF 1967

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

Mr. Speaker, just a closing comment on the conference report which is now pending before the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that it should be borne in mind by all of us that the act with which this conference report deals, whether it be considered good or bad, will expire at midnight tonight unless this legislation is passed by favorable vote on the part of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation passed the House of Representatives in March. It is now back before the House at this late hour because of delays elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the precise results would be if suddenly we had no means of controlling the volume of investments by American citizens in the shares and debt obligations of foreign corporations. However, I think that there would be an additional outflow of American dollars, an outflow that would have a bad effect upon an already bad balance-of-payments situation. Thus, I

would hope that the House will readily agree to this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 224, nays 83, not voting 125, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]
YEAS—224

Abernethy	Galifianakis	Moss
Adams	Gathings	Multer
Albert	Gettys	Murphy, Ill.
Annunzio	Gilbert	Natcher
Arends	Gonzalez	Nichols
Ashmore	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.
Aspinall	Griffiths	O'Hara, Mich.
Ayres	Gubser	Olsen
Bates	Gude	O'Neal, Ga.
Battin	Halleck	Ottinger
Bell	Hamilton	Passman
Bennett	Hanley	Patman
Bevill	Hardy	Patten
Blester	Harrison	Pelly
Bingham	Hathaway	Perkins
Blanton	Hays	Pettis
Boggs	Hechler, W. Va.	Pickle
Bow	Henderson	Pike
Brademas	Herlong	Poage
Brinkley	Hicks	Poff
Brooks	Hollfield	Pool
Brookfield	Holland	Price, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Horton	Pryor
Broyhill, Va.	Hosmer	Pucinski
Burke, Mass.	Hull	Quale
Burleson	Hungate	Railsback
Burton, Calif.	Jacobs	Randall
Bush	Jarman	Rees
Byrne, Pa.	Joelson	Reuss
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Rhodes, Pa.
Cabell	Johnson, Pa.	Riegle
Cahill	Jonas	Rivers
Carter	Jones, Ala.	Roberts
Casey	Jones, N.C.	Rodino
Clark	Karsten	Rogers, Colo.
Cohelan	Karth	Rogers, Fla.
Collier	Kazen	Rooney, N.Y.
Colmer	Kee	Rooney, Pa.
Corman	Keith	Rosenthal
Cowger	Kelly	Roth
Culver	King, Calif.	Roybal
Daddario	Kirwan	Ryan
Daniels	Kluczynski	Satterfield
Dawson	Kyros	St. Onge
de la Garza	Latta	Schneebeli
Delaney	Leggett	Schweiker
Dow	Lennon	Selden
Dowdy	Long, La.	Shibley
Downing	McCarthy	Shriver
Dulski	McDade	Sikes
Eckhardt	McDonald,	Skubitz
Edmondson	Mich.	Slack
Edwards, Calif.	McFall	Smith, Iowa
Edwards, La.	McMillan	Snyder
Ellberg	Machen	Staggers
Erlenborn	Mahon	Stanton
Evans, Colo.	Marsh	Steiger, Wis.
Everett	Mathias, Calif.	Stratton
Evins, Tenn.	Matsunaga	Stubblefield
Farbstein	Mayne	Sullivan
Fascell	Meeds	Teague, Calif.
Feighan	Meskill	Teague, Tex.
Fisher	Michel	Tenzer
Flood	Miller, Calif.	Tuck
Flynt	Mills	Tunney
Foley	Minish	Ullman
Ford, Gerald R.	Mink	Van Deerlin
Fraser	Monagan	Vander Jagt
Friedel	Montgomery	Vanik
Fulton, Tenn.	Moorhead	Vigorito
Fuqua	Morris, N. Mex.	Waldie

Walker
Wampler
Watts
White
Whitener

Whitten
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wylie
Wyman

Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—83

Adair
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Blackburn
Bolton
Bray
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Cederberg
Clawson, Del
Conte
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Duncan
Edwards, Ala.
Esch
Gardner
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Haley

Price, Tex.
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schwengel
Scott
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Okla.
Springer
Steiger, Ariz.
Taft
Talcott
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, Wis.
Utt
Whalen
Widnall
Williams, Pa.
Winn
Wolf
Wylder
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—125

Abbitt
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson,
Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Baring
Barrett
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brasco
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burton, Utah
Button
Carey
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen,
Don H.
Cleveland
Conable
Conyers
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Davis, Ga.
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dwyer
Eshleman

Fallon
Findley
Fino
Ford,
William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gialom
Gibbons
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gurney
Hagan
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hawkins
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Howard
Ichord
Irwin
Jones, Mo.
Kastenmeier
Kornegay
Kupferman
Laird
Landrum
Lipscorn
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClure
McEwen
Macdonald,
Mass.
Madden
Mailliard
Morgan
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.

Mr. Waggonner for, with Mrs. Dwyer against.
Mr. Brasco for, with Mr. Findley against.
Mr. Wyatt for, with Mr. Fino against.
Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.
Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Halpern against.
Mr. Boland for, with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts against.
Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.
Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Morton against.
Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Reinecke against.
Mr. Gialmo for, with Mr. Sandman against.
Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Robison against.
Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Watkins against.
Mr. Carey for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Cleveland against.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Chamberlain against.
Mr. William D. Ford for, with Mr. Quillen against.
Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. O'Konski against.
Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Nelsen against.
Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Buchanan against.

Until further notice.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Button.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Steed.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Howard.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Long of Maryland.
Mr. Gibbons with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Hagan.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Roush.
Mr. Hanna with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Irwin with Mr. Udall.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. MacGREGOR and Mr. BRAY changed their votes from yea to nay.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the conference report just passed.

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

There was no objection.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Watson against.

Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Kupferman against.

Mr. Stafford for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota against.

Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Anderson of Illinois against.

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Brock against.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Cunningham against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Derwinski against.

BANKING COMMITTEE ENCOURAGED BY SBA REPORT ON RIOT AREAS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Banking and Currency Committee met in executive session to hear from the newly appointed Small Business Administrator, Mr. Robert Moot, concerning that agency's activities to aid small businessmen in the riot areas of this Nation.

The committee was greatly encouraged by the report given by Mr. Moot. He said that SBA has some \$200 million in its disaster fund and another \$250 million in its regular business loan program. He also repeated what had been stated over the weekend that SBA would immediately begin making disaster loans in the Detroit area. He pledged that he would give full consideration to making disaster loans in the other riot areas. These disaster loans carry a 3-percent interest rate and can range as high as 30 years in maturity. The loans are for rebuilding of damaged small businesses as well as homes that were damaged by the riots. The loans will cover only that portion of the loss which was not insured.

I am hopeful that the financial institutions in the riot areas will participate with SBA in making these disaster loans so that SBA's funds can be used to a greater advantage. Mr. Moot reported that the insurance industry indicated to him this morning that it would honor all of its insurance commitments in the riot areas and would not seek to find loopholes in existing policies. He added that the insurance industry estimates the insured loss in Detroit alone to run some \$200 million.

The Banking and Currency Committee feels that there are adequate laws on the books at this time to provide loans to small businessmen and homeowners in the disaster areas. However, we will continue to look at this problem to make certain that all possible approaches are covered.

Mr. Robert C. Moot, Acting Administrator today but who will be Administrator commencing tomorrow, issued a release on the hearing, which is inserted herewith:

NEW SBA ADMINISTRATOR COMMENTS ON HEARING THIS MORNING CONCERNING DISASTER RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESS IN RIOT TORN CITIES

Robert C. Moot, Acting Administrator of the Small Business Administration, reported to the House Banking and Currency Committee in a special Executive Session today on the assistance available from the Agency to the people of Detroit who have suffered losses as a result of the riots there last week. On Saturday, President Johnson directed that SBA implement its disaster authority in Detroit.

Committee Chairman, Wright Patman, announced the special meeting last Thursday to determine actions necessary to help the small businessmen and others who have been devastated as a result of recent riots.

Mr. Moot, who takes over SBA as Administrator tomorrow, reported to the Committee that the SBA Regional Director in Detroit, Robert Phillips, had been in constant communication with President Johnson's personal representative on the scene, Cyrus Vance, and that the Agency is prepared to support expanded activity in Detroit as the needs require. SBA's "Disaster Loans" are available to cover loss of property which is not covered by insurance. The "Disaster Loans" available may be granted for periods up to 30 years if the individual situation warrants at an interest rate of 3%.

Chairman Patman made it clear that the Committee would do all possible to support any needs that SBA might require. Mr. Moot indicated to the Committee that the Agency did not foresee any necessity for further legislative authority.

AUTHORIZING THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CIVIL DISORDERS TO COMPEL THE ATTENDANCE AND TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES AND THE PRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 98) authorizing the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the sponsor of this Senate joint resolution if under this unanimous-consent request the gentleman proposes to yield time, and how much time is to be taken in the consideration thereof.

Does the gentleman from California propose to yield for any questions concerning the Senate joint resolution?

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

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

Mr. CORMAN. I am perfectly willing to yield for questions in order to explain the joint resolution to the best of my ability.

Mr. GROSS. How much time does the gentleman propose to take on this resolution?

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, such time as is necessary to explain it to the satisfaction of the membership of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. How much time will be taken on this Senate joint resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that if the unanimous-consent request is granted, the resolution comes before the House under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 98

Joint resolution authorizing the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) for the purposes of this joint resolution, the term "Commission" means the Commission appointed by the President by Executive Order 11365, dated July 29, 1967.

(b) The Commission, or any member of the Commission when so authorized by the Commission, shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation by the Commission. The Commission, or any member of the Commission or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purpose, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place within the United States at any designated place of hearing.

(c) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person under subsection (b), any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

(d) Process and papers of the Commission, its members, agent, or agency, may be served either upon the witness in person or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the residence or principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same, setting forth the manner of such service, shall be proof of the same, and the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Commission, its members, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

(e) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to a subpoena, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture (except demotion or removal from office) for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

(f) All process of any court to which application may be made under this Act may be served in the judicial district wherein the

person required to be served resides or may be found.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word. Mr. Speaker, the President has appointed an 11-man Commission to study the problems of civil disorders in this Nation. We met with the President on Saturday, the 11 of us, and discussed the question of whether or not it was advisable to ask for subpoena powers. We were unanimous in our decision that we should request that authority.

Mr. Speaker, the other body has passed Senate Joint Resolution 98, which grants this authority.

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

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. Can the gentleman from California state to the membership of the House as to who shall issue the subpoena and what method the subpoena is to be issued?

Mr. CORMAN. Yes; (b) of the resolution reads as follows:

The Commission, or any member of the Commission when so authorized by the Commission, shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation by the Commission.

Which would mean, I assume, in the event there were a dispute. However, I hope the majority of the Commission can authorize one of the members.

Mr. POOL. Can any one member of the Commission issue a subpoena?

Mr. CORMAN. If he is designated to do so, or authorized to do so by the Commission.

Mr. POOL. How does it read? It does not say that, does it?

Mr. CORMAN. It says the Commission or any member of the Commission when so authorized by the Commission, and I would assume that that would mean when authorized by a majority of the Commission, can issue a subpoena, and that he would then hold that authority as long as it was authorized.

Mr. POOL. The gentleman is satisfied that it is spelled out sufficiently?

Mr. CORMAN. Yes.

I would observe also that this is identical with the subpoena power which was issued to the Warren Commission. There are those here who served on that Commission, and they might be able to enlighten us on whether or not it operated well with them or not. I do not know.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California yielding at this point. I believe this resolution is appropriate in light of the fact that the gentleman just mentioned that it is identical to the resolution which was approved by the Congress at the time of the formation of the Warren Commission in early December 1963, in which the subpoena power was given, and that it might be necessary to use that power in light of the fact there may be some witnesses who would not desire

to help the Commission in its investigation.

The existence of the subpoena power was a very beneficial one to the Warren Commission in that most witnesses, if not all, appeared voluntarily. I believe the act that we had the authority was somewhat persuasive in securing the full cooperation of all witnesses. As I look at the individuals who may be called by the new Commission, it is my impression that the Commission may need the help of the subpoena power if these individuals are to testify. For that reason, and based on my experience as a member of the Warren Commission, I wholeheartedly support favorable action on this particular resolution.

Mr. Speaker, may I add a postscript? I hope and trust that the activation of this particular Presidential Commission does not preclude the possibility of congressional action in many of these areas, or on a joint House-Senate basis. I have faith in the Commission that has been appointed by the President, but time may be of the essence, and committees of the Congress, or a joint House-Senate committee, may be in a better position—and I say "may be"—to act immediately. For this reason I hope the appointment of the Commission and the giving of this authority does not preclude any congressional activity in specific fields, or in the broadest of areas.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, has the Commission laid down any ground rules for its own conduct up to this point.

Mr. CORMAN. No, we have not. We have had one meeting. We met with the President and he outlined to us what he expected from us. We will meet again tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

Mr. GROSS. So in passing this resolution, we would be acting on the assumption, as stated by the gentleman, that a majority of the Commission would control the issuance of subpoenas, but without knowledge of what constitutes a quorum or any other details of that kind; is that correct?

Mr. CORMAN. That is correct. But I would observe that the President indicated to us before we accepted that he expected us to attend all of the Commission meetings and impressed upon each of us the importance of attendance at the meetings. I would be hopeful, therefore, that we would have the proper attendance as we proceed in our investigations.

Mr. GROSS. A few weeks ago Vice President HUMPHREY made a speech in New Orleans, I believe, in which he made a statement to the effect that if he were living in a slum he would be constrained to resort to some of the force and violence that we have been seeing around the country. I noticed on one of the wire services a few minutes ago that HUMPHREY now says in effect at Boston that the Congress has been derelict in its duty. I am sure HUMPHREY did not hear the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MAHON] earlier this afternoon when he made his splendid speech to the House of Representatives, which was directed to the attention of the mayor of Detroit, Mich., who also has seen fit to

castigate Congress for its alleged slowness.

It would be my hope that someone calls the attention of the Vice President to the speech made this afternoon by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and it would be my hope that the investigating Commission would find it advisable to call the Vice President and find out what he means by some of these speeches and statements he is making. If necessary, and if the House sees fit to grant the authority requested this afternoon, in the absence of a voluntary appearance, perhaps the Commission should subpoena him. The Vice President seems to have no scruples in urging certain people to take to the streets and no scruples about lambasting Congress. The Commission, if it functions properly, ought to hear him explain these activities.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I am constrained to remark in view of the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan previously that it appears that there will be a committee or committees of the House; and a committee or committees of the Senate; and possibly a joint committee of the House and Senate—all of whom will be investigating the same subject matter and all of whom will have the right to subpoena witnesses.

Now you are suggesting that the President of the Commission will also have the right of subpoena. It seems to me, it is very likely that the subpoenas will cross and that witnesses will be subjected to testifying by at least five, or possibly five, committees, investigating the same subject matter; is that correct?

Mr. CORMAN. It may be that there will be particular information that all of these bodies will have to have. I would think that this is the kind of inquiry that would really get into almost every phase of our domestic problems in this field. I am sure, for example, the Committee on the Judiciary, the problems that the Committee on the Judiciary deals with and handles are concerned with problems of civil disorder.

The Committee on Appropriations almost every day is grappling with these problems. Every committee has to deal with these problems. Perhaps there may be a special committee making inquiries. I believe that this Presidential Commission is sound and I believe that they need the subpoena power and that we would do our best not to harass witnesses.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and I hope that it is unanimously agreed to. This will serve a good public purpose and I urge its adoption by the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL GROUP LIFE AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11089) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for Federal employees, and to strengthen the financial condition of the employees' life insurance fund, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 513)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11089) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for Federal employees, and to strengthen the financial condition of the Employees' Life Insurance Fund, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That (a) section 8704(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) An employee eligible for insurance is entitled to be insured for an amount of group life insurance plus an equal amount of group accidental death and dismemberment insurance, in accordance with the following schedule; which schedule shall be automatically extended correspondingly whenever the rate of annual pay assigned by section 5313 of this title to positions of level II of the Executive Schedule is increased:

"If annual pay is—		The amount of group life insurance is—	The amount of group accidental death and dismemberment insurance is—
Greater than—	But not greater than—		
0	\$7,500	\$10,000	\$10,000
\$7,500	8,250	11,000	11,000
8,250	9,000	12,000	12,000
9,000	9,750	13,000	13,000
9,750	10,500	14,000	14,000
10,500	11,250	15,000	15,000
11,250	12,000	16,000	16,000
12,000	12,750	17,000	17,000
12,750	13,500	18,000	18,000
13,500	14,250	19,000	19,000
14,250	15,000	20,000	20,000
15,000	15,750	21,000	21,000
15,750	16,500	22,000	22,000
16,500	17,250	23,000	23,000
17,250	18,000	24,000	24,000
18,000	18,750	25,000	25,000
18,750	19,500	26,000	26,000
19,500	20,250	27,000	27,000
20,250	21,000	28,000	28,000
21,000	21,750	29,000	29,000
21,750	22,500	30,000	30,000
22,500	23,250	31,000	31,000
23,250	24,000	32,000	32,000
24,000	24,750	33,000	33,000
24,750	25,500	34,000	34,000
25,500	26,250	35,000	35,000
26,250	27,000	36,000	36,000
27,000	27,750	37,000	37,000
27,750	28,500	38,000	38,000
28,500	29,250	39,000	39,000
29,250	-----	40,000	40,000".

"(b) Section 8707 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 8707. Employee deductions; withholding "During each period in which an employee is insured under a policy of insurance purchased by the Civil Service Commission under section 8709 of this title, there shall be withheld from the pay of the employee his share of the cost of his group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance. The amount withheld shall be at the rate, adjusted to the nearest half cent, of 60 percent of the level cost of each \$1,000 of insurance, as determined by the Commission."

"(c) Section 8708(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For each period in which an employee is insured under a policy of insurance purchased by the Civil Service Commission under section 8709 of this title, an amount equal to 40 percent of the level cost, as determined by the Commission, of the insurance shall be contributed from the appropriation or fund which is used by pay him."

"Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the sixtieth day following the date of enactment of this Act, but shall have no effect in the case of any employee who died, was finally separated, or retired before such date of enactment. In the case of an employee who dies or retires during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending immediately before the effective date of such amendments, the amount of insurance shall be determined as if such amendments were in effect during such period."

And the Senate agree to the same.

THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
DAVID N. HENDERSON,
DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
JAMES T. BROYHILL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

MIKE MONRONEY,
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
FRANK CARLSON,
HIRAM L. FONG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11089) entitled "An Act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance, and to strengthen the financial condition of the Employees' Life Insurance Fund," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text. The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment and that the Senate agree to the same.

Except for technical and minor drafting changes, the differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are set forth below.

The insurance schedule contained in the House bill was geared progressively to \$1,000 of insurance coverage for each \$750 multiple, or portion thereof, of annual salary.

The insurance schedule contained in the Senate amendment provided a minimum \$10,000 amount of insurance; \$2,000 additional insurance coverage for employees earning over \$8,000; limiting employees earning over \$27,000 to \$30,000 of coverage.

The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment by providing a minimum \$10,000 amount of insurance for employees earning \$7,500 or less.

The House bill established the employee's share of the cost of each \$1,000 insurance at 60 percent of the total level cost, adjusted to the nearest half cent. It provided for a like adjustment in other than bi-weekly pay periods.

The Senate amendment established the employee's share of the cost, likewise, at 60 percent, but did not provide for adjustment to the nearest half cent.

The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the House bill, but strikes out the second sentence of such provisions as non-essential.

The House bill provided that the agency contribution be computed at two-thirds of the amounts contributed by employees.

The Senate amendment provided that the agency contribution be equal to 40 percent of the total level cost of the insurance.

The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision, deeming it to be consistent, for administrative purposes, with the intent and effect of the House provision.

THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
DAVID N. HENDERSON,
DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
JAMES T. BROYHILL,

Managers of the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the unanimous adoption by the Senate-House conferees of this excellent legislation is, indeed, a tribute to my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits.

I am grateful to the subcommittee members for their cooperation and in keeping faith with Federal employees in a matter that is of vital importance to them and their families. Particularly do I commend the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. DULSKI] for his dedication to the merits of this bill, and the energies expended by my fellow conferees in bringing before the House a compromise that will significantly overcome the inadequacies and financial deficiencies of the Federal employees' group life insurance program.

This legislation will fulfill, to a marked extent, the insurance needs of employees earning less than \$7,500 by providing a minimum policy of \$10,000, and improving by 33 percent the coverage of employees earning over \$7,500, while realistically relating maximum coverage of \$40,000 to present-day salary levels.

Not only will it provide for full financing of the improved benefits by a 3 to 2 cost-sharing formula, but eliminate the recurring \$40 million deficiencies in the insurance fund.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11089, as amended, offers an answer to the objectives of a meaningful and progressive life insurance program. I urge its unanimous approval.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND THE IMPROVED HEALTH OF THE NATION

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ex-

tend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, recently President Johnson made one of his many visits to the National Institutes of Health to praise the assembled doctors and researchers for the tremendous job they are doing in finding causes and possible cures for diseases such as measles, cancer, stroke, and heart disease.

The President obviously enjoys such visits. He knows that advances made at the National Institutes of Health are advances for all the people.

Too few Americans know the magnificent work of the NIH, where trained men and women, doctors, biologists, chemists, psychologists, and other men of science delve into the secrets of nature and find ways to make men live longer and better.

The President said in his remarks that science today needs political leaders to advance its ends, just as political leaders needed science to make life more worthwhile and healthier.

There are few men alive who can make such a statement with such authority, because Lyndon Johnson has a tremendous record of achievement in health to back it up.

The record is there—medicare—regional centers to combat heart disease, cancer, and stroke, mental health centers, community health services, expanded medical education, water pollution control, the Allied Health Professions Act, new and expanded health services for millions of poor people through the antipoverty program; the list is long and impressive.

President Johnson and the Congress both believe the resources of our Nation can be used, and ought to be used, to make men's lives better, happier, and healthier.

This is a good guide for the Congress in the days ahead when a series of human resources bills will come before us for a vote.

We will soon vote on the extension and expansion of the much-needed anti-poverty program, which has meant so much to my home State of West Virginia.

We will be asked to vote for full funds for the Model Cities Act.

Critical educational and urban aid bills will come before us.

These are all human measures, just as health bills are human measures, and they are all necessary in today's America.

We ought to recall, as we are tempted to criticize what has not been done, that President Johnson has probably completed more of the unfinished business of America than any other President.

He has the people's needs constantly before him, and we—representing the people's voice—should support him fully.

Under unanimous consent, I include the remarks of the President at the National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md., on July 21:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT IN THE AUDITORIUM OF THE CLINICAL CENTER AT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH, BETHESDA, Md.

The thing that I want to say first is that I wish very much each of you could have been with me and seen the enthusiasm and hope, and heard the encouragement that came from these great scientists, these doctors, who are doing so much to make life better and longer in this world.

We ran overtime and we had to eliminate some of our briefing. Our topics were what we are doing in the field of vision, in the field of hypertension, in the field of cancer, in the field of that dread number one killer—heart diseases, all of which will very quickly confront each of you out there when you reach that milestone in life when these things appear.

Then you will wonder why for 50, 60 or 70 years you have given no thought, no support, or no attention to it. Then it will be too late for you to do much about it because there will be a good many people standing around your room trying to preserve your life.

This is a billion dollar success story—NIH. This is where I like to come once a year—and more often if possible—to learn what they are doing, in order to try to help them more.

The Gospel of St. John tells of a place where the lame and the halt and the blind went to be cured. That ancient place was called Bethesda.

Two thousand years later, this place called Bethesda also is the place where the sick and the injured can have some hope.

This morning we heard about the modern miracles of healing which have been discovered here—in the last year particularly—and the progress that has been made since we were here last.

Dr. Shannon and the other NIH Directors have given me a rather full report. They have responded with knowledge and candor to all the questions that we propounded. They have given me a report on some of the matters that we raised last year when we met at the White House.

I should like for them to know—and for all the world to know—that I regard these men as my Chiefs of Staff in this war on the ancient enemies—sickness and diseases. We constantly review our strategy for attacking these major health problems that confront this Nation and other nations in the world.

The progress we are making is slow. I am glad to say, though, we are going up instead of going down.

Some, I am sure—the hotshots—would think we have reached what you might call a stalemate, because we have not found all the answers to all the questions in all the 365 days since we last ran our check—our final exam.

There are two or three little things I want to point out, as kind of guiding beacons.

Two years ago, for example, there was an outbreak of rubella—German measles—in America. It caused 30,000 abnormal pregnancies. It killed thousands of little babies. It left thousands of others cruelly afflicted.

There lived near my home, very close to me, some people who work with me who were afflicted by deafness and mental defects.

But in two years, today as a result of research here where you are this morning, a new vaccine to prevent a mother from ever getting German measles has been developed.

Our scientists are working day and night so that we can have an adequate supply of this vaccine in the 1970's when the next outbreak of rubella is predicted for this country.

This is one small example of how this place affects the lives of all of you and of all Americans.

Dr. Shannon has just reported to me that the latest statistics show that infant mor-

tality during the last 12 months took its sharpest downward drop in 10 years. It meant 4,700 babies lived this year who would have died the previous year. It meant 9,400 babies lived this year who would have died, if they had just been born 10 years ago.

Ten thousand lives saved in 10 years. Maybe that is not many, but if you are one of the families affected by one of those 10,000, it is everything.

Research supported by NIH has developed new chemicals and new techniques which are saving thousands of Americans every year from blindness.

We talked this morning about what new procedures could be evolved to detect eye problems at an early age, to detect heart problems, high blood pressure—or to detect hypertension problems—blood clots, blood problems, high blood pressure—or to detect cancer before it spreads and it is gone and it is beyond hope.

Maybe we ought to get some of the time people spend detecting the deficiencies in our automobile and examining our brake, testing our steering, and testing our headlights to test our children.

Because, as I said yesterday, if we can spend literally millions to protect our cows from the screwworms, why can't we spend a little money to protect our children from the rats.

Nine hundred thousand women were tested for cervical cancer this past year under a program here at NIH—one million women. Three thousand cases were found—early enough to do something about them and to cure them. Three thousand more lives saved.

I don't know how much you put on life, but that is what was done here.

NIH research has speeded the development of new chemicals for high blood pressure which have already reduced death by 50 percent.

I had a young man in my office whose life was preserved for years because of a great discovery that was made in this field. It meant a lot to me personally, because I saw this great doctor here in Washington keep him living day to day, when most of them had given him up.

One person out of every two who would have died of high blood pressure 10 years ago is living today. One person out of five, under the age of 65, who would have died of a stroke 10 years ago is living today.

All of these achievements are not the fruits of the Presidency of the Democratic Party or the Federal Government. They are the fruits of the world's greatest research enterprise. It knows no partisanship, no dictator, or no ruler. They are all aimed at just one thing—just one goal: a better, freer, happier, healthier life for all people.

That is something that ought to unite even the most controversial among us. Even the most cynical should be able to embrace that goal.

This morning I came here to renew my commitment to that goal; to applaud the efforts of these men—just a small percentage of whom are here on the platform—and their attempts to help us reach it—and to discuss with all those I could our future endeavors and to plan our future programs.

If we are to build a society which guarantees good health for all, we must build it upon very solid foundations.

First and foremost is basic research: the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. Because we are human, we explore; we seek to understand the deepest mysteries of our world. The government supports this creative exploration because we believe that all knowledge is precious; because we know that all progress would halt without it.

But tomorrow's healthy society rests not on our scientists or our medical men only, but it rests also on our political leaders. As

you can observe, what they did yesterday may affect what these men do tomorrow.

We have long passed the day when medical research is a job just for some screwball or some lonely, makeshift laboratory. Research involves armies of trained technicians, batteries of computers, staggering sums of money.

I remember when I first came here, hearing Frank Bane tell the story of the man in the Virginia State Senate deploring the waste that had occurred when they hired some young college boy, who ran up and down the highways with his shirt tail out peeping through some little instrument. Why would the people of Virginia be called upon to waste their money on this college kid to just run up and down the roadway trying to survey it?

Well, when you drive through some of Virginia's roads today, you can see.

So the driving force in this country today for research is Government. There is a reason for that: Government is the only one that can really provide the means.

Today the Federal Government supports nearly two-thirds of the total Nation's expenditures on health research. Two-thirds of everything spent in this Nation on health research, the Federal Government spends.

And you here at NIH spend 60 percent of all the Federal Government spends. So we are here where, as I said, this is a billion dollar success story. I want that story to be known by 200 million Americans.

Today the scientists and the medical men decide how to attack a major medical problem, but they depend on the public men making political decisions to decide whether to attack that problem.

I have spent hours in appropriations hearing listening to health problems presented—and a good many of them ignored.

I remember on my way out of that room this morning where I heard these men testify, walking out of the Appropriations Committee one time and hearing them testify about wanting money to use on flies to prevent the development of screwworm to keep the screwworm from getting into cattle, and to keep it from destroying the cattle and killing the baby calves.

Every time a baby calf was born, he was subject to the screwworm. Some lived and some didn't. To save great labor that ranchmen spent going out and picking up the little calves that were half dead, finally the Congress went along and endorsed a proposal.

Now the whole Southwest no longer knows the screwworm. Through the appropriations the Congress passed—the cattlemen supplemented—we no longer have to have labor to ride out and pick up every little baby calf.

Someday we are going to get intelligent enough to treat our children the same way.

We made some progress with 10,000 of them this year. But we are not going to have to wait until they get into the 10th or 11th grade to see that their eyes have been affected all their lives.

You wouldn't want to test an automobile that had been driven 11 years before you decided it was fit for the highway.

Somehow we are going to find ways to detect the vision problems, the hearing problems, the blood pressure problems, the hypertension problems—all of those, in our children and ourselves—and the cancer problems, before they are too far gone.

There is no use in opening someone up and saying, "It is too far gone. I can't do anything about it."

It can be done. It must be done—with the help of God. And it will be done.

Thank you.

NATIONWIDE PROTEST ON JUNK MAIL RATES

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a nationwide protest has rolled in following the action of the House Postal Rates Subcommittee last week, raising first-class and airmail rates but going easy on third-class "junk mail" rates, I submit for the RECORD two editorials, from the Washington Post of July 29 and the Huntington, W. Va., Herald-Dispatch of July 28, which document the nature of this angry protest.

If these rates are not substantially raised by the full committee when it marks up the bill, there will be overwhelming support on the House floor for overturning the committee's recommendations. People are fed up with subsidizing junk mail, and carrying the cost of junk mail in higher and higher first-class and airmail rates.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 29, 1967]

POSTAL RATES

The postal rate increases proposed by a House subcommittee on Thursday are an affront to the American public. They make it plain that the subcommittee members are more interested in placating those who generate "junk mail" than they are in rationalizing the postal rates or meeting the needs of their constituents.

The subcommittee gave its approval to a scheme that would raise first-class rates by one penny and airmail by two pennies while eliminating special rates for postcards and Christmas cards. But for third-class mail—principally the direct-mail advertising that fills our mail boxes fuller each year—the subcommittee has proposed an increase of less than one penny spread over three years. The effect is to continue the subsidy for junk mail that we pay each time we mail a letter.

Surely there are members of Congress who are sensitive to the resentment around the Nation toward third-class mail. Surely that resentment will continue to grow as more and more voters learn that the Post Office makes a profit on the letters they mail but loses substantially on each piece of junk mail. A wise Congress would do something about that resentment now. We have seen the lack of wisdom of the subcommittee; we can now only hope that the rest of Congress is in better touch with reality.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Dispatch, July 28, 1967]

EXTORTION AT THE POST OFFICE

For weeks now we have been urging the people of the Tri-State Area to protest against the six-cent postage stamp for letters and postcards and the 10-cent airmail stamp.

These higher postal rates are almost sure to come unless the American people convey to Congress the depth of their indignation over the extortionate increases in first-class schedules.

A House Post Office subcommittee has approved the boosts in first-class mail rates, while going easy on the rates for second, third and fourth-class mail. These are the real culprits in the postal deficits that crop up every year.

First-class mail is the only postal classification which not only pays its way but shows the department a profit. Why, then, should the letter-writer have to pay for the deficits created by the big commercial mailers and in particular the mailers of "junk"

that arrives in every home unsolicited and unwanted?

Americans appear to have very short memories. Otherwise, they would protest these postal increases with more vigor and greater indignation.

For not only have the rates advanced in the first-class category at a faster pace than in other classifications, the deterioration of service has been most pronounced in first-class mail deliveries.

Many people seem to have forgotten that it was once customary to have two deliveries of first-class mail each day. Now there is only one, and the technology of postal operations in the cities has failed so abysmally to keep pace with the volume of mail handled that it sometimes takes two days or more for a letter to be delivered in the same city in which it is mailed.

We would all like to see the Post Office Department operated as a business concern instead of an agency for the distribution of subsidies. Yet the fact is that newspapers, magazines and much other mailed material is subsidized by the government at the expense of the first-class letter writer.

Junk mail breaks the back of the mailman, annoys the householder and contributes to the annual deficit of the postal service. The least the public should demand is that it pay its proportionate part of the cost of doing business.

L. B. J.: AMERICANS A NATION OF REFORMERS THROUGH LAW

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a day before his recent address to the Nation on civil disorders, President Johnson made a too little publicized speech on American social reform to a gathering of young men from Boys Nation.

The President told the young men that "America has always been a nation of reformers."

But, to be a true reformer, the President said, is to be "responsible." It is to be a "remaker, not a wrecker." It is to be "a restorer, not a destroyer."

These are profound, accurate, and moving thoughts from our President.

Their truth is seen in the riots which have exploded in our Nation in recent weeks.

Riots build nothing. They destroy everything—cities and relations between men.

Reform through law builds societies and good will between men.

President Johnson has shown us—better than any other President—how to build the structure of a Great Society through laws and programs. He has helped pass more good reform legislation in 3½ years than most Presidents of the United States put together.

Let us continue America's reform programs. Let us continue President Johnson's programs. But let us restore law and order first, for that is what keeps society whole.

I insert in the RECORD the remarks of President Johnson before a group from Boys Nation at the White House, July 26:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE A GROUP
FROM BOYS' NATION

Good morning. I am glad that you could come over and visit with us. I am happy to welcome you to the capital and to the White House.

I want to commend the American Legion for giving you young Americans a chance to learn at first hand about your Government.

I want to speak to you today because you are young and because you have lives to live. Many of you may be looking forward to careers in business.

I would like you to consider an investment. I would ask you, after you have completed your education, to give careful consideration to the investment of a few years of your lives in the business of government, in the work of public service, in the cause of America.

Our country needs men and women who are young—young enough to dream of remaking America—as some of us did here in this capital when I came here more than 30 years ago.

We need young people who are confident in themselves and in their ability to meet the challenges that face us today. We need young people who care—who are willing to work for something more than a paycheck—for profits measured in human happiness and satisfaction gained from helping people to achieve human health and human dignity.

I asked that you consider applying yourselves, your industry, your brains, your talent and your imagination to the problems of the land in which you live.

Emerson asked: "What is man born for but to be a Reformer, a Remaker of what man has made: a Restorer of truth and good."

That is your birthright—to be Reformers. America has always been a nation of Reformers. And we have always been a people who knew and accepted the responsibilities that that role demands.

To be a Reformer is to be responsible. It is to be a Remaker—not a wrecker—of what man has made.

It is to be a Restorer—not a destroyer—of truth and good.

It is, beyond all else, to respect the laws of society—to rebuild society by changing laws, yes, by improving laws, yes, by using the laws—lest we accidentally or willfully weaken the foundations of law and bring all that we have achieved crashing down upon our heads.

We have been through great trials in the history of this Nation. We have faced problems and challenges before. In one of our gravest hours, one of our greatest Presidents left us the first commandment for a civilized society.

So here today, on the White House lawn, I should like to remind each of you—and for that matter, every American—of Abraham Lincoln's words:

"Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well-wisher to this prosperity, never to violate in the least particular, the laws of the country . . . Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the character of his own and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American—let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in Almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the Political religion of the nation and let the old and young, rich and poor, the grave and gay, of all sexes, tongues and color and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars."

Your role can be not only to respect the law, but to make it a living thing, make it more just, make it more effective.

We have our job cut out for us. It is ahead

of us. We have cities to rebuild. We have economy to maintain. We have children to teach. We have old people to care for. We have young people to find jobs for. We have human rights to protect and to enlarge. We have land to conserve and air and water to clean, a whole world to guard, and liberty and freedom to preserve.

Who will do these things? Who can we look to get this job done in the years ahead? You—and young men like you—your brothers, even those who today feel that they do not have a very big stake in our society. Even though sometimes you may feel you have no role to play in making it more just, the challenge is there waiting for you.

I am depending upon you.

You may choose to work in the great world of Washington. You may elect to be leaders in your own communities back home. The arena of action is not so important. The decision is. The need for leadership—for commitment and responsibility—is upon us. That need is the same in every State in this Land. It will always be so. It will always be your challenge, your opportunity—your responsibility, if you will only face up to and use it. I express the hope that you will rise to it—and I furthermore hope that America will rise with you.

We hope very much that you are inspired by the things you see and that you are improved by the things you learn. We will do what we can to make you enjoy your visit. We thank you for having come here this morning.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF DIVORCED OR SEPARATED TAXPAYERS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill that would remedy what I think is a serious defect in our present income tax structure. The bill involves the income tax treatment of divorced or separated taxpayers. The history of the income tax laws has demonstrated that the problems of income taxation in the context of broken families have been difficult ones. From time to time, Congress has been called upon to make adjustments to provide a fair and workable scheme for the taxation of income in these situations. One recent example of this is H.R. 6056, a bill dealing with \$600 dependency exemption for the children of divorced or separated parents, that we passed and sent to the Senate in March of this year.

The bill I have introduced is designed to reach a fair solution to another problem that arises upon the breakup of a marriage. In general, the bill provides for the nonrecognition of gain or loss on transfers of property by one divorced spouse to the other in satisfaction of obligations—other than the obligation to support children of the marriage—arising out of the marital relationship. For the purpose of convenience, I shall refer to the person making the transfers as the husband and the person receiving them as the wife.

More specifically, my bill is concerned with two situations, both of which involve

transfers of property by a husband in discharge of an obligation arising out of the marital relationship which is imposed or incurred by the husband under a decree of divorce or of separate maintenance or under written separation agreement.

The first of these situations includes transfers of property in trust or otherwise for the purpose of making periodic payments to the wife. Under present law, payments by a husband to a wife pursuant to a decree of divorce or of separate maintenance, or a written separation agreement are divided into two categories, "periodic" payments and all other payments. Periodic payments for this purpose are, generally, payments for an indefinite period of time—such as for life or until remarriage—or over a period of more than 10 years. If made directly by a husband to his wife, periodic payments are taxed in full to the wife and are deductible by the husband. If, instead of direct payments, the decree or agreement requires the husband to transfer property in trust or otherwise for the purpose of making periodic payments, the payments attributable to the transferred property are taxed in full to the wife and are excluded from the husband's income—without regard to any other rule of tax law.

In recent years, the Internal Revenue Service has taken the position that gain is recognized on the transfer of property by the husband in trust or otherwise for the purpose of making periodic payments to the wife, if the transfer is in complete satisfaction of the husband's marital obligations to the wife. The Service is applying this rule to situations where the only property transferred is a mere right to receive income in the future. Its position is based upon the longstanding general rule of tax law that gain is recognized upon the transfer of property in discharge of a legal obligation, and upon the case of *Davis v. United States*, 370 U.S. 65, in which the Supreme Court held that the value of the legal obligations discharged on these transfers—and consequently the measure of gain—is the value of the property being transferred by the husband. Where the property being transferred is merely a right to receive income in the future, the treatment of the transfer as a taxable event not only casts an undesirable burden on the taxpayers, but also, in my opinion, results in the taxation of the same income twice, once to the husband as a gain on the transfer and then again to the wife as a periodic payment under the rules previously discussed. In some circumstances both taxes will be at ordinary income rates.

The second situation to which my bill is addressed includes transfers by a husband to his wife pursuant to a decree of divorce or of separate maintenance, or a written separation agreement, where the transfer does not constitute a periodic payment. These transfers include lump-sum payments to the wife, and installment payments to her which are to be made in all events over a period of 10 years or less. In these situations, under present law, nothing is included in the gross income of the wife and the hus-

band is permitted no deduction. One variant of this type of situation is illustrated by the Davis case itself, in which the husband was obligated by the separation agreement to transfer specific shares of stock to his wife. The Service contended, and the Supreme Court agreed, that the husband was taxable on the gain realized on the transfer, the gain being measured by the excess of the fair market value of the stock over the husband's tax basis—generally cost—for it.

It is my opinion that the transfer of property in these situations is not an event upon which it is appropriate to impose an income tax. The usual divorce or separation of a husband and wife creates a substantial economic strain for both parties. It is difficult enough to be able to make a reasonable allocation of the economic resources of the family upon its dissolution without compounding the problem by imposing what, in many situations, is a significant tax burden because of these transfers.

Accordingly, my bill would amend present law to provide that where a husband transfers property in trust or otherwise for the purpose of making periodic payments to his wife, no gain or loss will be recognized on the transfer. This would not alter the rules of present law just explained which provide that the payments attributable to the property are excluded from gross income by the husband and are taxable to the wife. The bill merely provides that in this situation an additional tax on the husband will not be imposed because of the transfer. Where the transfer is to the wife and does not constitute a periodic payment, my bill provides that, except in cases where the marital obligation is stated in terms of money in the decree of divorce or of separate maintenance or in the written separation agreement, no gain or loss is to be recognized upon the transfer. In these cases, the tax basis of the property in the hands of the wife will be the same as it was in the hands of the husband immediately before the transfer. The effect of this carryover of basis is to prevent the gain realized on the transfer from escaping tax entirely. If the wife later disposes of the property in a taxable disposition she will be taxed on whatever gain is realized at that time.

In determining the payments to be made by the husband, and the property to be transferred by the husband to the wife in these situations the parties and the courts can take into account any potential tax liability that may be incurred by the wife as a result of her receiving property having a fair market value in excess of its basis.

I think my bill provides a significant step forward in a difficult situation and results in substantial improvement in the fairness and equity of the income tax laws.

A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF FRANCISCO THOMAS CELIS, M.D., M.S.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill on behalf of Francisco Thomas Celis, M.D., M.S., a competently trained plastic surgeon at the St. Louis County, Mo., hospital. Because of the dilemma in the medical practice laws in Missouri and their interrelationship with the laws relating to naturalization of foreign-born persons, Dr. Celis finds he must be a citizen of the United States before he can be issued a certificate to practice medicine in Missouri.

Dr. Celis was born in the Philippine Islands September 4, 1929, graduated from the school of medicine of the University of St. Thomas in Manila in 1954, and came to the United States June 15, 1955, on an exchange student visa. He served a 1-year internship at St. Louis St. Anthony's Hospital. Between 1957 and 1962 he was training at the St. Louis County Hospital, in Clayton, Mo., first as an intern and later as a resident in surgery. Upon completion of this residency training in surgery, he requested a change in status from exchange student to immigrant, but the waiver to stay an additional 2 years was denied in December 1961. For this reason he went to Montreal, Canada, where he trained further in plastic surgery and obtained a master degree in plastic surgery from McGill University. He returned to the United States on July 23, 1966, and in September 1966 he made a declaration of intent for citizenship.

Dr. Celis has a license to practice medicine in Canada, effective July 1966. He also recently passed his State board examination for the State of Maine, which gives him reciprocity with all States except New York. However, he cannot practice in Missouri since he is not a citizen, and will, therefore, probably leave if something is not done.

Dr. Sam J. Merenda, director of the department of radiology, St. Louis County Hospital, feels that Dr. Celis is an individual who would be a valuable addition to the community and upon whom St. Louis County has spent considerable time and money. He is of great value to the hospital, not only because of his training and knowledge of the hospital, but also because of his assistance in training other Filipino physicians now there.

Dr. Celis presents an impressive training record, yet he is unable to register with the Missouri State Medical Board because of his citizenship status. He has, in fact, spent over 10 years in this country, yet he has several more years to go before he can complete the requirements of the law. It is for this reason that I am introducing a bill which would have the effect of holding that his time in the country will be considered in compliance with title 8, section 1427 in the United States Code of the Immigration and Nationality Act as it relates to residence and physical presence.

NIKITA WAS WRONG—WE ARE BURYING OURSELVES

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the weekly radio broadcast of the Manion Forum for July 23 featured an interview on East-West trade with Senator KARL MUNDT of South Dakota which should be considered by all citizens who are concerned with our present policy of killing the Soviets with kindness while they supply implements to kill our servicemen in Vietnam. The U.S.S.R. has provided Migs, helicopters, antiaircraft guns and SAM bases, to mention but a few of their contributions to Ho Chi Minh's war effort.

I insert the July 23 interview of the Manion Forum with Senator MUNDT in the RECORD at this point.

NIKITA WAS WRONG—WE ARE BURYING OURSELVES; CONGRESS URGED TO ISSUE A CEASE-AND-DESIST ORDER ON RED TRADE

DEAN MANION: With me here at the microphone now is United States Senator Karl Mundt, of South Dakota. This distinguished man has been in the Congress of the United States for nearly 30 years, and is now serving his fourth term as United States Senator for his native state. It would be difficult to find a sounder statesman and a more patriotic American in official Washington today than the Honorable Karl Mundt. Senator Mundt, welcome back to the Manion Forum.

SENATOR MUNDT: Pat, it's always good to be here, and I want to say right now that the Manion Forum is one of the good, strong voices for sanity in government, for which all of us are mighty proud down in Washington.

DEAN MANION: Thank you very much, Senator. I want you to talk to our audience today about the pending Presidential proposal for more trade with Communist governments. Tell us what you think about that.

SENATOR MUNDT: I am unalterably opposed to it, Pat. To me it is as completely incomprehensible as it is indefensible even to be considering in Congress a proposal by the White House which suggests that we expand our assistance, economically, to the Soviet Government, at a time when the Soviet Government is providing the weapons which are prolonging the war and escalating our casualties in North Viet Nam.

Maybe we should set the stage by pointing out that all the petroleum being used by the Communists in North Viet Nam in this war comes from the Communist bloc. In addition, they provide, of course, the MIGs, because a MIG is as Russian as a Ford is American. The Communists—some of the satellite countries, but primarily Russia—provide helicopters, big ones, new ones, effective ones, which have taken away a great advantage we had in the early days of the war when our helicopters were able to operate so successfully.

They have over 7,000 antiaircraft guns, all made in Russia, distributed throughout North Viet Nam and in areas of South Viet Nam and, it's because of these that we have suffered so many, many casualties from the air. They now have a string of SAM bases—surface-to-air missile bases—scattered around the strategic points. They operate to force our planes from flying in the higher altitudes, to bring them down low where the antiaircraft weapons and the MIGs can knock them out of the air.

They've got a ground-to-ground rocket which is a gem of a weapon, a very effective weapon, and we read almost daily in the press now of how the long range guns are

able to shoot right into our headquarters' sites. In addition to that, they have provided a brand new weapon within the last few weeks, an antitank weapon. The best weapon that the Russians have. It can shoot through eleven inches of steel, and has been killing an awful lot of American kids in the last few weeks.

You could go on and on and on—the flame throwers, the radar defense system. All of the sophisticated weapons, without exceptions, that are being used to prolong this war come from the Communist countries to which President Johnson now suggests we expand our exports. That is why I say it is to me totally incomprehensible why our Commander in Chief would want to supply the forces that are killing his troops, and it certainly is completely indefensible.

DEAN MANION: Senator, you speak of "expanding" our trade with Communist governments, and that implies that we have a considerable amount of trade with them now even before this Presidential proposal has been voted upon.

SENATOR MUNDT: This is very true. Up until October 12 of last year, we shipped very little to the Russians because we imposed upon ourselves, as rightfully we should in time of war, an economic restriction which kept our exporters from shipping supplies to Russia, because the Russians were supplying whatever is required by the North Vietnamese to continue the fighting. But on October 12, 1966, by an Executive Order, issued after Congress—acting separately both Houses had frowned upon the idea—had indicated that they didn't want any trade with Russia.

In spite of that, President Johnson, October 12, 1966, issued an Executive Order providing for unlimited and unlicensed exports to Russia of over 400 separate items. He supplemented that this year by another 40 items. So we have now a total of 440, perhaps 450 items, of all different kinds, which our exporters may ship to Russia without restriction.

While some of those items are useable in the war machine itself, I agree with the General who testified before our Committee very recently. He said: "In time of war, this type of war, there is no such thing as a non-strategic weapon." And he pointed out that it doesn't make any difference whether we're sending them roller skates and bicycles and school books and clothing for their women, whatever we're sending them supplies their staggering civilian economy.

As soon as you send them anything that they can use in the consumer economy of Russia, you take the pressure off to the point where you release manpower, materiel, and equipment, so that they can divert from making civilian goods to making military goods. The great increase of exports these last six or eight months not only have enabled the North Vietnamese to continue the fight, but they're stepping it up, they're increasing the number of well-equipped troops that they now have down in South Viet Nam. We have been able so completely to assure them that we'll take care of their civilian economy needs and give them the things of which they are short, that they have been able to do that in North Viet Nam, while at the same time supplying Egypt and the Arab states with the war material they needed to kick off the conflict which occurred in the Middle East.

DEAN MANION: Then basically this ability of the Communist governments to do the job they're doing in supplying North Viet Nam is our fault. Isn't it?

HISTORY REPEATS

SENATOR MUNDT: Exactly. I had a letter from a father whose son was killed in Viet Nam, and he was incensed, of course, by the fact that his son was shot out of the air by a Russian MIG. He wrote, "On this flag-draped coffin they should put the words 'Made in

Moscow, with an assist from President Johnson in Washington.'" It is true that we ship the supplies that make it possible for them to accentuate the war.

You would think, Pat, that we would have learned something as a great sophisticated country. I don't think you supported probably FDR, any more than I did, but I do recall that we had a big contest just before Pearl Harbor. We were shipping a lot of scrap iron, we were making a lot of millionaires out of junk peddlers who were shipping scrap iron to Japan. There was a big nationwide debate about it. I was then touring the country saying, "Don't ship the scrap iron," as were many other people. But they let them do it, just as we're shipping things to Russia today.

But on Pearl Harbor Sunday, when they picked out of the bodies of some 3,000 American kids the little pieces of steel shipped over there by American war profiteers, at least let it be said for FDR that he didn't even wait for us to declare war at 2:00 the following Monday afternoon, he issued an Executive Order stopping the exportation of scrap iron to Japan.

But, believe it or not, in LBJ's order of October 12, opening up shipments to Russia, our old friends, scrap iron and scrap metal, are right back again, and the junk peddlers are sending it over to Russia to help with their Russian war machine.

DEAN MANION: That's very frightening, Senator. I read a laudatory account of your bird-dogging on these lists of strategic goods that go to Russia, and you found a geodetic instrument, so-called. That was a fascinating story. Tell us about it.

SENATOR MUNDT: Yes. I have two people on my staff who are working with me, scrutinizing these lists of supplies which are going over to Russia. One of whom has had a lot of training in the aviation and aeronautical part of warfare, and one day he said, "Look, here's a type of gravimeter that is necessary to have in order to trace the trajectory of missiles, and it is something which we have developed that only Americans can make and put together, and here is an order permitting them to ship one of these to Poland."

I said, "I'll write the Secretary of Commerce a letter and say, how do you call this non-strategic? How is this going to help the war, to give the Russians something which will enable them to kill even more American boys by tightening up the accuracy by which they can shoot these rockets and these missiles?" They wrote back shamefacedly and said it was a mistake, we're going to re-explore it, we're not going to send it. That's just one out of some 400 items. How many other such items are there? We found fuel for rockets, for example, among the things that we're shipping over there that are supposed to be non-strategic.

So I agree with the General who says there is no non-strategic supply. You're either trying to win a war or you're trying to lose it, trying to step up an American economy and make war profiteers by letting them ship stuff to Communist countries that will pay a fantastic price for what they need—because they don't buy for economic reasons; they buy for political reasons; they buy for military reasons. Usually they buy about one item of a kind and then they ignore the patents. They see the way the thing is made, the way it is put together, and build others themselves.

Anyway you look at it, it is unwise economically and, I think, utterly unjustifiable in the middle of a war, a war we presumably are trying to win and trying to shorten. Everything we send to Russia makes it more difficult to win, prolongs the war and expands American casualties.

DEAN MANION: Senator, we're still ahead of the consideration of the Presidential proposal to expand this East-West trade. Now there is another measure which I have read

about, this 50 million dollars to be appropriated by the Export-Import Bank for some sort of a Russian project. What is this?

SENATOR MUNDT: I'll tell you how that got into the picture, because they were just about to move on the Export-Import legislation when the war broke out in the Middle East and they dropped it. It became evident to everybody that the reason the war broke out was that the Russians were shipping all these fancy weapons to Egypt and the Arab states, arming and equipping them and causing them to become over-confident and arrogant. And so the war broke out—a second war being supplied indirectly by Americans at a profit, because we ship the stuff to Russia which relieves her economy so she can send materials both to Egypt and to Communist North Vietnam at the same time.

TAXPAYERS TAPPED AGAIN

But now, after the talk at the summit—and I'm not sure that I favor these summit talks when I look at ramifications which come after them. But anyhow, following the talk at the summit the President is asking Congress to approve a 50 million dollar loan, from American taxpayers, to build an automotive plant in Russia to be operated by the Fiat Motor Company of Italy.

This would mean that the American taxpayer would be guaranteeing the money and providing a loan from our hard-pressed treasury to the Communists to build an automobile plant, when a school boy knows that the first industrial complex you divert to a war economy when you move from peace to war, is an automotive plant.

We've done it many, many times in Detroit. The automotive companies have been tremendously helpful of building tanks, planes and weapons of war and, of course, the Fiat Motor Company, set up to build automobiles, could be changed overnight into another great big plant to produce the weapons of war; to arm the Arab states; to arm North Viet Nam; to prolong the conflict, if it runs on that long, in Hanoi.

DEAN MANION: Senator, in view of all of the things that can be done to help the Russians under present laws, what is the President seeking to establish by this new law expanding East-West trade?

SENATOR MUNDT: I think you have to divide that question into two parts. As far as the export of American supplies to Russia, with over 450 of them now going out, the President doesn't need any Congressional authority for that, except, I think, as a desire to make Congress assume part of the responsibility for this indefensible trade. He's demonstrated he can do it by Executive action, but he comes to us trying to get us to shoulder some of the responsibility because the country at large is alarmed as they hear about this. The people are tremendously disenchanted with the whole concept of trying to fight and feed an enemy at the same time.

So I think that is purely a political move, trying to make the Congress assume responsibility, then he can say to the world that the people of America and the Congress for the first time have placed such a low price tag on boys in uniform fighting at the fronts that they're willing to authorize this war profiteering and this trade with the enemy. Now the other part is that he has to come back to Congress to get the money. Because a 50 million dollar loan cannot be authorized by Executive action. If we're going to spend American money in these hard-pressed times building an automobile plant to be run by the Communists in Russia, that has to be passed by a special act of Congress. It's to be decided, I think, in the Senate within the next two or three weeks—up or down.

DEAN MANION: Does the support for this expansion of trade come from businessmen who want to make a fast buck out of all this?

SENATOR MUNDT: About the only place it comes from, actually, are a few people who want to get rich in a war, and I guess that's human nature. I'm for the profit system, but I am not for war profiteering. I'm not for making millionaires at the expense of American lives over there. You don't have to have a Harvard degree to realize that everything you send Russia places an additional American life in jeopardy on the fighting fronts of Viet Nam. And if we belong in Viet Nam at all, we're there to win, not to enhance the casualties and prolong the war.

DEAN MANION: Senator, from what you've said, I am sure that if everybody heard it there would be a quick and sudden death to these proposals to expand trade with our enemies. Is there a medium for popular information and action available to the American people now?

SENATOR MUNDT: Yes there is. It's a good one, it's brand new, only about a month old. It's headed by John Davis Lodge, a great American, known to many people. Of course, his brother Henry Cabot Lodge is even better known, but John Davis Lodge served in the House of Representatives; he was governor of Connecticut; he was the American Ambassador to Spain in the Eisenhower Administration. He and a number of other prominent Americans have established a new organization called C.E.A.S.E., the Committee to End Aid to the Soviet Enemy.

On the board of directors are Admiral Arleigh Burke, the Honorable William Knowland, editor of the *Oakland Tribune* out in California and former majority leader of the United States Senate, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Alex Parker, Admiral Arthur Radford, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Arthur Trudeau, and other men of their caliber. This great group of Americans, headed by John Davis Lodge, through C.E.A.S.E., it seems to me, represents the best opportunity we have in America to bring about a change in policy in Washington.

This organization is trying to get ten million American signers to petitions which would urge President Johnson and the Congress to take effective steps to end aid to the Soviet enemy. Those of you who are hearing this program, if you are interested in doing something beyond simply wringing your hands and wondering what is wrong in the country, you can write to C.E.A.S.E., Room 1061, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

Send for some petitions and circulate them in your neighborhood. Send them a check for a few dollars so that they can afford to put on some radio and television programs, and some full-page advertisements, letting Americans know what is happening in this country. You will be rewarded by knowing that you have played a part in shortening the war in Viet Nam, in making peace more likely and to come, in helping to correct a very serious situation in the Middle East.

DEAN MANION: Thank you very much, Senator Karl Mundt, of South Dakota, for what you have said, and more particularly for what you are doing to end this treasonable trade with our bloody enemies.

ROAD TO REVOLUTION: COMMUNIST GUERRILLA WARFARE IN THE U.S.A.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the *Record* and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, before the investigations into the cause of the

current riots throughout the United States get underway, it is extremely important that one aspect of the outbreaks—the role played by extremist and subversive elements—be placed in proper perspective. Regarding outside influences in riots and disturbances, Director J. Edgar Hoover had this to say before a House Appropriations subcommittee earlier this year:

For the most part the riots and disorders that have occurred in this country since the summer of 1964 were sparked by a single incident, generally following an arrest of a Negro by local police for some minor infraction of the law. Although most of the riots and disturbances have been characterized by spontaneous outbursts of mob violence dominated by young hoodlums, the involvement of other violent, lawless, subversive, and extremist elements became readily apparent as the rioting grew and spread.

Continuing his testimony, Mr. Hoover stated:

Communists and other subversives and extremists strive and labor ceaselessly to precipitate racial trouble and to take advantage of racial discord in this country. Such elements were active in exploiting and aggravating the riots, for example, in Harlem, Watts, Cleveland, and Chicago.

Without condoning or justifying lawless and violent action, it must be conceded that there are legitimate grievances in ghetto areas which have contributed to the unrest. But to overlook the possible involvement of violent, lawless, subversive and extremist elements is at once dangerous and unrealistic.

While the above statement by Mr. Hoover was made before the present rash of riots, indications are that there were elements active in exploiting and aggravating some of the latest riots. In its excellent lead editorial of Sunday, July 30, the *Washington Star* made reference to a *Life* magazine article on the Newark riot in which, according to the magazine, one of the snipers said there were more than 50 members of the group, more than half coming from Newark. Others had been moved in for the action from California, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

The *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* of July 31, in its editorial entitled "Extremists' Role in Riots," stated:

Gov. Agnew of Maryland in studying tactics of the rioters in Cambridge says he has found that tactics used in Cambridge bore a remarkable similarity to those used in Newark—such as the interception or police messages and jamming of their radios, the use of fire bombs, and the formation of sniper squads to attack firemen when they arrived to fight fires that had been set.

The above examples demonstrate that to some extent some of the riots did not lack a degree of preplanned extremist action.

The headlines of the last few weeks leave no doubt that every aspect of the riots must be studied with care. With respect to the involvement of extreme and subversive elements in the riots, one recent book which should be on everyone's must list is "Road To Revolution: Communist Guerrilla Warfare in the U.S.A." by Phillip Abbott Luce, a former member of the pro-Chinese Communist Progressive Labor Movement.

In June of 1964, just 1 month before

the Harlem riots shocked the American people, Phillip Luce met with four others in a secluded area of Central Park, New York City, to discuss the possibility of creating a guerrilla operation in the Negro ghettos. Later, all were briefed on individual responsibilities and each one armed with a pistol, having been told that groundwork had already been laid for the guerrilla operation. This was typical of the experiences which led Luce in 1965 to break with what is now known as the Progressive Labor Party. Since that time he has authored "The New Left" and numerous articles which have appeared in the *Reader's Digest*, the *Saturday Evening Post*, *National Review*, and other publications.

In "Road to Revolution," Luce not only deals with such organizations as SNCC, CORE, RAM, but offers a counter plan to assist in correcting inequities—unemployment, housing, sanitation, and so forth. He cites cases in which individual and organizational involvement are assisting in providing the basic wants of the needy. Also included is a portion of the FBI report on "Prevention and Control of Mobs and Riots," which Luce describes as the "best analysis and prospectus for the prevention and control of ghetto riots yet published."

The *Washington Star*, in the editorial of July 30, referred to above states that the Luce book makes for interesting reading and that its contents "can and should be checked out carefully."

The same edition of the *Star* provided a review of "Road to Revolution" by Allan C. Brownfeld, who received his law degree from William and Mary, was formerly on the editorial staff of the *Houston Press* and who received a *Wall Street Journal* Foundation award for his newspaper columns.

I include the book review of "Road to Revolution" by Allan Brownfeld, and the editorial, "Are the Riots Spontaneous or Planned?" both from the *Washington Star*, of July 30, in the *Record* at this point:

ROAD TO REVOLUTION

Already called the "Whittaker Chambers" of his generation, Phillip Abbott Luce has chosen an appropriate time for the publication of his second book "Road to Revolution."

In the midst of 1967's "long hot summer," Luce has provided us with a first-hand report of the perspective in which such events are held by Communists, to whom they are "rebellions," and not riots. Beyond this, his message is an alarming one. It describes in great detail, and with thorough documentation, the plans for guerrilla warfare in the streets of our cities already devised by domestic radicals.

Phillip Luce at 29 is a former leader of the "New Left," organizer of two student trips to Cuba in 1963 and 1964, an officer of the Progressive Labor Party and editor of its monthly magazine, *Progressive Labor*, until his defection in January, 1965. He has written about his experiences in his first book, "The New Left," and one of the major reasons for his disillusionment with communism came when he found himself "involved in a series of plans in which the participants had no idea of the consequences . . . I left when it became obvious that the individual lives of the members of PL, left alone society, meant less than an abstract Communist catechism as envisioned by the 'gurus' of the movement." According to Luce his de-

fection ranks him "somewhere near President Johnson and J. Edgar Hoover" as the "most maligned enemy" of PL.

STORED GUNS

Progressive Labor, the pro-Communist Chinese offshoot of the United States Communist Party, passed a resolution at its 1965 national convention stating that "black liberation" was the path for the coming guerrilla war in the United States. "The key to revolution in the United States," the convention declared, "lies within the interlocking interests in the black liberation movement and the working class struggle for socialism."

Just before the Harlem riots of 1964, William Epton, vice chairman of PL, said this to an open air rally: "We will not be fully free until we smash this state completely and totally . . . in the process . . . we're going to have to kill a lot of these cops, a lot of these judges, and we'll have to go against the army." Epton was later tried and found guilty of criminal anarchy.

Luce states: "While I was an officer of PL, I learned of a number of projects in which people were being prepared for a future guerrilla operation. Not only did we store guns in New York City, but target practice was held on Long Island prior to the Harlem riots. I was personally asked to find a hiding place suitable for target practice."

Another of the organizations planning such violent activity is the Revolutionary Action Movement, known as RAM. Max Stanford, leader of the group, said that "the black revolution will use sabotage in the cities—knocking out the electrical power first, then transportation and guerrilla warfare in the countryside of the South. With the cities powerless, the oppressor will be helpless."

VIOLENCE PLANNED

Luce points to a third organization which, he says, is rapidly becoming a part of this guerrilla movement—the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, no longer either nonviolent or dominated by students. He reports an August 29, 1966 SNCC fundraising dinner in Harlem that featured an interesting trio of speakers—Stokely Carmichael, then chairman, along with Max Stanford of RAM and William Epton of PL. Carmichael said that in "Cleveland they're building stores with no windows. All brick, I don't know what they think they'll accomplish. It just means we have to move from Molotov cocktails to dynamite." He added: "They say we're stupid and don't do anybody any good an we deserve to be called that, because if we had any sense we'd have bombed these ghettos long ago."

Luce makes it clear that most Negro leaders have condemned the concept of "black power," and the exhortation to violence. As a result, they are as much the targets of violence as the white community. Only recently members of RAM, including Max Stanford, were arrested in an assassination plot. The targets: Roy Wilkins of the NAACP and Whitney Young of the Urban League.

Phil Luce repeatedly stresses that Communists do not begin trouble but take advantage of it, incite it, and exploit it. He understands, as some seem not to, that there are real grievances in the ghettos, lack of jobs, poor housing, inadequate recreation facilities. Yet others tend to minimize the influence of these radical organizations and their very real plans for revolution on our city streets.

In a balanced and provocative volume, he does not blame all evil on "outside agitators." Yet the public should understand the plans which Communists have for our cities. Phase one, as recent violence indicates, has already occurred. Armed with Luce's warning and our own awareness of the problems which must be solved, we may yet be able to avoid phase two.

ARE THE RIOTS SPONTANEOUS OR PLANNED?

As the rioting eased off, at least temporarily, in Newark and Detroit, not to mention a score of other cities large and small, both official and public attention in Washington began to focus on the story behind the killing, the burning and the looting.

What brought on this "time of violence and tragedy" in July, 1967? Were the riots more or less spontaneous eruptions on the part of oppressed Negroes? Was there at least some measure of planning and organization behind them? Did the Communists play a part, and if so what was that role?

It is doubtful that all of the questions can ever be answered. But the effort will be made. There is much pressure on Capitol Hill for an investigation by some congressional committee. And the President acted on Thursday night to establish an 11-member commission to conduct an investigation in his behalf.

In the address in which he announced the appointment of this commission, Mr. Johnson said that "the only genuine, long-range solution for what has happened lies in an attack—mounted at every level—upon the conditions which breed despair and violence. All of us know what they are: ignorance, discrimination, slums, disease, not enough jobs . . ."

This, as far as it goes, is true enough. But there are two things to be said about it. One is that this is indeed a long-range solution. It will take a decade or more to remedy the conditions enumerated by the President. Nor can the riots in places such as Detroit and Plainfield be explained away by reference to slums and lack of jobs. For those conditions were not present in any significant degree.

Furthermore, if even one of these riots was the product of some other cause than slums and unemployment, this country cannot wait 10 years to uncover that cause and destroy it. The price which will have been exacted by continuous rioting is much too high.

What we have in mind is the rather widely held belief that at least some of the riots, and perhaps the worst ones, were planned, organized and directed by sinister forces embarked upon a policy of rule-or-ruin.

The President passed this over lightly. He said his commission will have access to facts gathered by the FBI and that J. Edgar Hoover's agency "will continue to exercise its full authority to investigate these riots, in accordance with my standing instructions, and to continue to search for evidence of a conspiracy."

This is a somewhat ambiguous statement. As far as we know there has not been a full-scale investigation of the riots, and, since the authority of the FBI is supposed to extend only to violations of federal law, what did the President mean when he said the agency will "continue to exercise its full authority" to investigate the riots? Furthermore, the comment that the FBI will "continue to search for evidence of conspiracy" implies that no such evidence has yet been found.

Perhaps there has been no conspiracy, and if not it follows that there would be no evidence of one. For our part, we are not aware of the existence of any such evidence in the strict sense of the term.

There is, however, a considerable body of information to suggest that there has been a conspiracy.

In the absence of any planning or organization or training, it is difficult to account for the widespread sniper activity in Detroit. In a dispatch from Havana a few days ago, Stokely Carmichael is quoted as follows: "In Newark, we are applying the tactics of guerrilla warfare. We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas for our defense in the cities." Chicago's Mayor Daley has said: "We know this is a national program of outlawry and

violence." Some other local officials have said much the same thing.

In its issue of July 28, Life magazine tells of a "clandestine" meeting between its reporters and some of the Newark snipers. These snipers belong to an organized group of former civil rights workers in Mississippi. According to the magazine, one of the snipers said there were more than 50 members of the group, more than half coming from Newark. "Others had been moved in for the action from California, Ohio, Pennsylvania." This certainly is not inconsistent with the remarks attributed to Stokely Carmichael in Havana.

More positive indications of organization and conspiracy can be found in a book by Phillip Abbott Luce, until recently an active Communist. The Luce book, "Road to Revolution," is reviewed on Page G-3 of today's Star.

Exposés by former Communists are suspect, as Whittaker Chambers learned in the Alger Hiss case. But The Star has been reliably informed that Luce's break with the party is real.

In any event, what he has to say is interesting. It can be and should be checked out carefully.

Luce begins by saying that the Communists are "counting on the premise that most Americans will discount the possibility of a guerrilla war in their country. The notion of a guerrilla war in the United States is so outrageous and improbable to Americans that they would receive it as the product of a deranged mind." Well, many Americans and most "responsible" Cubans felt the same way, to the subsequent dismay of the latter, when Fidel Castro and his tiny band of followers first went ashore in Cuba.

Luce, noting that Communists exploit trouble rather than incite it, goes on to spell out in detail the Communist plan to foment racial trouble in this country and then to exploit it through guerrilla tactics. He reminds us that a grand jury which investigated last summer's Cleveland riot found that "the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals at this business." He also recalls that the Harlem riots in 1964 produced similar findings and that one Bill Epton, a Communist was indicted and convicted of criminal anarchy for his role in those riots.

None of this may amount to "evidence" in the legal sense as far as this month's riots go. But, taken together, it strongly suggests that there is a conspiratorial underpinning of the current riots, and it is a possibility which deserves more serious attention by the investigators than is invited by the President's casual reference to it.

A crucial matter at stake now, or so it seems to us, is the struggle for control of, or direction of, the Negro community. Who will prevail? Such men as Martin Luther King Jr., A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins and Whitney M. Young Jr.? Or will it be the H. Rap Browns and the Stokely Carmichaels?

A great deal more than the future of civil rights depends on the answer. It is conceivable, quite conceivable, that what really hangs in the balance is the choice between a race war in the United States and a state of affairs in which the white and colored communities can live together in peace.

This is why it is so important to put politics aside and dig up the truth, the whole truth, about the riots and their causes. And this is why it is also so important for the members of Congress and the people they represent not to yield to what the President spoke of as "fear and bitterness"—to any state of mind which would indefinitely delay reconciliation and reconstruction at a dreadful cost in human lives and human values.

FOOD AND FIBER COMMISSION REPORT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican task force on agriculture, of which I am chairman, questions the merit of the report released this month by the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber.

The Commission's recommendations contain a blueprint of what the President and his administration first urged in 1965. At that time, the administration unveiled their plan to remove 2½ million farm families from the countryside. Now, the Food and Fiber Commission wants to entice farmers and rural residents to move to metropolitan areas by passing out moving-expense money and other lures, which is a continuation of the administration's original idea that agriculture could not provide a decent living for more than 1 million farm families, even with Government assistance.

The Commission's report says that an annual expenditure of up to \$600 should be made available to low-income rural workers as "underemployment compensation." Yet the Federal Government could terminate such assistance, according to the Commission's plan, if these rural residents failed to accept training and move. Moreover, by urging that certain rural residents be assured of a "minimum annual income opportunity" of the same amount, the Commission leaves the false impression that \$600 is the correct income standard for rural areas.

The report, supported by a majority of the Commission members, also recommends boosting Federal payments to "efficient commercial farmers," wiping out import quotas and export subsidies on agricultural products, and setting lower support prices.

If the Commission had its way, not even the farm price parity concept would survive. The report urges eliminating the farm price parity standard and substituting instead some other formula they refer to as a "parity of income," which they do not define, but which they say should become an "analytical tool" once it is drawn up. Obviously, this recommendation is based upon the Secretary of Agriculture's statement a year and a half ago that present farm parity is too high.

The Food and Fiber Commission, appointed by the President, believes that the farmer should increasingly depend upon direct payments from the Federal Government. But if the administration continues to hold farm prices down, we know full well that whatever profits accrue to the farmer are also going to be held down. Thus, the task force feels most strongly that such a proposal would not be in the best interests of American agriculture.

By promoting workmen's and unemployment compensation, collective bar-

gaining, and minimum wages for agricultural workers, the Commission has neglected to consider what effects these developments would have on, first, the cost of food production, and second, the ability of this Nation to grow the food and fiber we need without interruption.

If housewives think the cost of food is high now, they should wait until the grocer's price reflects the added production costs farmers would incur under the Commission's recommendations.

The prospect of work stoppages by farm help under collective bargaining would jeopardize our national security. And unless the United States remains able to meet its own food needs without fear of scarcity, our Government will never be in a position to provide even token assistance to the hungry nations of the world.

Regarding our foreign food and agricultural assistance, the task force makes several observations not included in the Food and Fiber Commission's report:

First. Since the resignation of the Secretary of State's Special Assistant for Food for Peace 7 months ago, there has been a deescalation of this program, making it just one of many duties of a junior administrative official.

Second. The administration has failed to make public the 1966 annual report of the Public Law 480 program. This was supposed to be submitted to Congress last April, pursuant to section 408 of the same act.

Third. Furthermore, the President has not issued an Executive order setting up an intra-Cabinet group to coordinate the food-for-peace effort.

In the entire report, no solutions are offered to help solve the basic problems that have plagued the American farmer for years. But this is no surprise to the House Republican task force on agriculture. At the time the Commission was established by the President in November 1965, we first pointed to the fact that Commission membership failed to include a single representative of the general farm organizations to which most American farmers belong.

Since the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber's report has obviously failed the American farmer, there is an even greater need for a U.S. world food study and coordinating commission as first proposed by the task force in the 89th Congress and again this year. We need to accurately and wisely ascertain the manner in which American agriculture can best assume an effective and rewarding role in the face of a world food crisis.

COMMISSION TO STUDY AND APPRAISE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined my colleagues who have previously introduced legislation which would establish a Commission to study and appraise the organization and operation of the executive and legislative branches of the Government. This is legislation and an endeavor which is long overdue.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and testimony before the many committees of the House consistently reveals evidence of duplication and overlapping of services, with wasteful and unnecessary expenditures. With the phenomenal growth of Government in numbers of programs and services it has felt a very glaring need for a clarification of both objectives and authority in administration. This legislation is designed to scientifically study and explore, by a 10-member Commission, every possibility for the elimination of duplication and waste. The duties and responsibilities of this Commission shall be as follows:

First, recommending methods and procedures for reducing expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions;

Second, eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;

Third, consolidating services, activities, and functions of similar nature;

Fourth, abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of Government;

Fifth, defining responsibilities of officials;

Sixth, eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise; and

Seventh, relocating agencies now responsible directly to the President in departments or other agencies if the result can be shown to increase efficiency.

Members of the Commission are to include six chosen from private life, two by the President, and two each by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The other four members shall consist of two Senators and two Representatives, one each from the two parties. The congressional members of this Commission shall be chosen from those who have been outspoken in their criticism of waste and duplication in Government, thereby insuring a complete and thorough investigation of Government operations.

Congress must recognize the need and assume the leadership for more responsible financial policies at every level of the Federal Government. For this reason, I have called for the Commission's study of the legislative as well as the executive branch of Government. Committee reports will be made directly to Congress as specified in the bill; however, so that appropriation reductions might be made without the need for legislation, the Commission will also report directly to the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of both the House and Senate.

The need for this kind of detailed study at this time is realistically evident by the very problems that confront the Congress during this session and particularly in the immediate future. It is no secret

that before this session is adjourned, major decisions will necessarily have to be made, in addition to those that have already been made, concerning our budget problems as aggravated by the war in Vietnam and excessive domestic spending.

The Congress already has added \$35 billion to the national debt limit from February of this year to July of next year and has yet to consider if a tax increase is to be enacted. Surely these factors are evidence of the great economic strain that confronts both the Nation and the taxpayers. The very least that Congress should do under the circumstances would be to grant the public some assurance that we have taken appropriate steps to administer Government programs and policies with the greatest possible prudence and efficiency. While these objectives should always be our purpose, they have become increasingly necessary because of the many hundreds of millions of dollars that are wasted annually by overlapping programs and facilities.

The taxpayer is already overburdened and faces further threats of inflation, increased interest rates, and a pronounced inability to pay for today's Government even during a time of prosperity. This certainly constitutes a sufficient cause for a thorough investigation of where savings could be made.

I am sure that Congress, and certainly the citizens throughout the country, would not want one single dollar to be wasted. The proposed Commission would be an investment in accomplishing such an objective which I am sure would save hundreds of millions of dollars without curtailing any Government services. In fact, I think in most instances it would rather improve those services by greater efficiency and better directed programs.

People throughout the country are demanding of Congress that we exercise every means available to us to hold spending to a minimum. This is one way that we could accomplish their desires. Taxpayers of the country are entitled to nothing less than our favorable consideration of this legislation.

THE KENNEDY ROUND: ITS BENEFICIAL IMPACT ON ONE AMERICAN CITY—DAYTON, OHIO

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHALEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, now that the Kennedy round has been successfully concluded and is now behind us, the question to be answered is what the specific impact of these negotiations will be.

I am convinced that the effect will be a positive one for the Nation overall. Both the consumer and the businessman will be the better for it.

In my own district, the question has been researched by a distinguished and highly respected executive of the Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Norvell Clarkson.

On July 13, 1967, Mr. Clarkson delivered a speech detailing the results of his study. His remarks were covered extensively by the Dayton area news media thus providing the public with an understanding of the local significance of this major international development.

Mr. Speaker, I believe many of my colleagues would find Mr. Clarkson's findings of great interest. I, therefore, am inserting the full text of his remarks in the RECORD:

WORLD TRADE IN DAYTON OR THE KENNEDY ROUND AND YOU

(By Norvell Clarkson, manager, World Trade Department, Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce)

I tell you at the outset that this is a most complex subject and that the final results—good and bad—will not be known for a long time. At the same time, I hasten to tell you, in the words of Ambassador William M. Roth, the Chief Negotiator for the U.S.,

"... we have reached commitments equal in value to those we have made. Moreover, I believe that this balance of mutual exchanges of trading opportunities should stimulate appreciably larger volumes of international trade. Economic growth at home should result."

From the information available at this time, I intend to tell you about the (1) background of GATT and the Kennedy Round, (2) the complicated side issues and "horse trading" that had a direct bearing on the tariff negotiations, (3) the over-all effect on the U.S., (4) the effect on Dayton, and (5) the challenge and opportunities that lie ahead. I am going to condense four hours of Washington talk into 20 minutes and spend the rest of the time bringing it down to Dayton.

The Kennedy Round negotiations came about because in 1962, the 87th Congress passed the Trade Expansion Act in response to President Kennedy's request for bargaining power to launch a major assault on barriers to international commerce. He was authorized to cut our tariffs by half in exchange for equally advantageous benefits from our trading partners.

The legislation also created the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, an innovation placing responsibility for the conduct of such negotiations in the Executive Office of the President. To this new post, President Kennedy appointed the distinguished former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, who directed the Kennedy Round with great spirit and wisdom until his death six months ago.

Armed with the new negotiating authority, the United States encouraged the convening of an international negotiating conference. An initial ministerial level meeting was held in Geneva in May, 1963. It took a year to establish the agenda, and negotiations formally began a year later, in May, 1964.

Thus, began the sixth negotiating round of GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), and it was called the Kennedy Round because it was during President Kennedy's term of office that the U.S. passed the necessary legislation. And whatever was to be accomplished through these negotiations, had to be accomplished before the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 expired at midnight on June 30, 1967.

Fifty-three nations, including the U.S., participated in the negotiations. Most of the major participants agreed to proceed on the basis of a 50-percent linear—that is, across-the-board—cut in tariff levels on nonagricultural products. Exceptions, or those items not to be subjected to the full cut, were to be limited to those required by reasons of overriding national interest. Exceptions lists were exchanged on November 16, 1964. There

followed a period of intensive examination of exceptions—each country making known its interests in the proposals of the other participants. Negotiators appeared to be horror-stricken at the protectionism of their trading partners.

In a few industrial areas of particular importance and complexity—chemicals, textiles, steel, aluminum, pulp and paper—negotiations took place on a sector basis.

It must be remembered that 53 countries were involved in these negotiations; little countries as well as big countries; poor countries as well as affluent countries; and developing countries still in the free world. There was much more than money involved in the negotiations, and certainly much more than money at stake. All of these facets—each one extremely important in its own right—had to receive their just consideration during the tariff negotiations.

In addition to these political and diplomatic ramifications, were the non-tariff barriers in each country that had to be dealt with; non-tariff barriers such as discriminatory taxation, customs valuation practices, and quantitative import restrictions (dumping).

Notable progress was achieved in two areas—antidumping and the American Selling Price system of customs valuation as it applies to imports of benzenoid chemicals. An anti-dumping code was negotiated committing other countries to fair and open procedures along the lines of present United States practices. The new common anti-dumping regulations that are being developed by the European Economic Community will conform with the code. Of special benefit to the United States will be the adoption by Canada of an injury requirement in its anti-dumping legislation. On the part of the U.S., it agreed to certain useful refinements of the concepts presently used in our anti-dumping investigations.

An agreement was concluded providing for the elimination of the American Selling Price system for benzenoid chemicals and the liberalization of other countries' trade barriers. For the domestic benzenoid chemical industry—a strong and efficient industry which has long demonstrated its international competitive strength—the U.S. is confident that the new rates of duty in the agreement will provide a sufficient level of tariff protection, one, by the way, well above that of the other major chemical producing countries. For this and the other sectors of the overall chemical industry in this country, which has an export surplus of about \$1.7 billion, the agreement affords very significant new export opportunities into rapidly expanding markets in Europe. In addition, the American Selling Price agreement provides for the elimination of discriminatory automobile road-use taxes in France, Italy, and Belgium, which have long hampered exports of the larger U.S. cars to those countries.

Now, enough on the non-tariff barriers and the other ramifications that affected our tariff negotiations.

What did the U.S. get out of it? On the basis of trade coverage the U.S. received tariff concessions of mostly 50 per cent reductions on about \$7 billion of our exports. Close to another \$1 billion was bound in a duty-free status so that the total package runs close to \$8 billion.

These concessions are spread proportionately among our major export markets. Over \$5 billion of our exports are subject to concessions in the European Economic Community, the European Free Trade Association countries and Japan. Another \$1.3 billion will benefit by concessions made by Canada with the remainder spread among a number of smaller countries.

You will remember that about five or six years ago when the foreign traders of this country were alarmed at the prospects for their markets once internal tariffs were eliminated in the EEC and EFTA. To many

U.S. businessmen the choice seemed to be between getting into one or both of these blocs with plant and sales organizations or run the risk of being excluded from the vast European market by external tariff barriers. Passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 gave them some hope that the two blocs might be persuaded, if the other large trading nations joined in, to move towards freer trade rather than adopt an inward-looking attitude. At the time, the schedule for eliminating the internal tariffs between countries of the two blocs was being accelerated so that the element of time was very important. The facts are that the EFTA countries eliminated internal duties completely on industrial goods at the beginning of this year while the EEC will complete its customs union and remove internal tariffs completely in July, 1968.

Now, these external tariff walls are to come down sharply. For the EEC it will be a reduction by 35 percent in all major trade categories. Most of the duties of the EEC's common external tariff, which is effective next July, are in the medium-low range rate, that is, 10 to 15 per cent. Next July they will start to come down. In the EFTA countries the national tariffs apply to goods outside of the free trade area. For most countries in the EFTA, duties were already low with the United Kingdom having the highest rates. These are also coming down with the high U.K. rates, generally 33 per cent, being reduced by 50 per cent.

Approximately one-quarter to one-third of our exports move to Western Europe, so that it is fairly obvious what the implications for U.S. exporters might be without the Kennedy Round now that the internal barriers of the European countries are in the final stage of elimination. Now that the Kennedy Round is over, the challenge passes to the U.S. businessman, to take advantage of the new opportunities it will open up over the next few years.

Our trade with Canada continues to rise to the mutual benefit of both countries, and our agreement with Canada in the Kennedy Round is a sweeping reduction of tariff barriers. Duties were eliminated on a number of categories of goods, most significant of which are softwood lumber, some hardwood lumber, wood flooring except oak, most fresh or frozen fish and a variety of other products. Canada eliminated her duty on coal and the United States eliminated its duty on nickel. In the field of manufactures, the U.S. was able to obtain a reduction in the protective level of the Canadian tariff by about one-fourth. Protective duties generally run 20 to 25 percent in Canada's tariff; and Canada, which at the outset of the negotiations said that it could not join in a 50 percent linear tariff cut because of her relatively lower industrial status as compared with the advanced countries, has reduced this level to about 15 to 17½ percent. This is a major contribution by Canada which heretofore has not found it politically or economically feasible to make significant reductions in its protective tariff rates.

One of the most important Canadian concessions to the United States which will affect hundreds of American exporters is the reduction in the Canadian tariff on production machinery from 22½ to 15 percent. For machinery which is "not made in Canada" the current duty of 7½ percent will be eliminated. When these concessions are implemented, all machinery which is not available in Canada will benefit from duty-free treatment. In this one sector, namely, production machinery, the Canadians have told us that their import entries number over 240,000 per year, so from this one concession duty reductions will most significantly assist a broad range of U.S. exporters. There are many more concessions from Canada which will benefit American exporters.

Japan's willingness to participate substan-

tially and actively in the Kennedy Round was a welcome surprise, since many felt that Japan's rationale would be that since she was doing well with the present set-up, why join in a tariff cutting exercise? The answer probably is that Japan's export boom has led it to the conclusion that its economic prosperity could increase enormously if it could develop the markets for its products in countries other than the United States. Japan did join in and agree to most 50 percent reductions in her tariff. It is the hope that these reductions by the Japanese will open up areas for U.S. products which have heretofore been closed to the U.S. because of high duties. You sometimes hear it said by U.S. manufacturers that they cannot sell in Japan because of low price competition. The fact is that we do sell large volumes of manufactured goods in Japan, and Japan's increasing prosperity, which should grow with the Kennedy Round settlement, creates a demand for more American products to Japan and take another healthy look at the market for their current products.

The Kennedy Round package is balanced. We came out with a reciprocal bargain, which was our goal. We reduced all our tariffs by an average of about 35 percent. Other countries' average tariff reductions are in this same area.

The items excluded from U.S. tariff cuts are basically those which are experiencing severe import competition and those which in the judgment of the U.S. negotiators would be likely to suffer adversely if they were subject to a 50 percent reduction. So the U.S. removed a large number of articles from negotiation or made less than 50 percent cuts when it judged such a reduction was called for in light of import sensitivity.

With regard to labor and world trade and the Kennedy Round, Under Secretary of Labor James J. Reynolds stated that

"... every billion dollars of goods we export support close to 100,000 jobs... We believe that the substantial tariff reductions... will encourage expansion of U.S. exports and enable us to preserve and expand export-related employment opportunities in the U.S. In total, we do not anticipate any unmanageable situations of labor dislocation resulting from the stimulus of increased imports although it could be that particular firms and groups of workers may be adversely affected. The combination of gradual implementation of tariff reductions over a five-year period and rapidly expanding manpower programs, in addition to adjustment assistance, will enable workers and firms to adjust to increased imports with minimum personal and corporate losses... Between 1960 and 1965, unit labor costs in manufacturing declined by about 2 percent in the United States. Only Canada showed signs of matching that performance. For our other major trading partners we note that unit labor cost increased about 16 per cent for the United Kingdom, about 8 per cent for Sweden, 20 per cent for Japan, and between 25 and 37 per cent for France, Germany and the Netherlands... Nearly 7 per cent of total manufacturing employment was related to the export of goods and services."

What does this all mean to Dayton? In simple language, it means a lot.

I say that Dayton will benefit nearly twice as much as the rest of the United States and this is because Dayton does twice as much international business, in proportion, as the rest of the United States.

The U.S. is exporting, as of the end of 1966, at the rate of \$31.2 billion per year, while we are importing at the rate of \$26.4 billion per year, giving the U.S. a favorable balance of trade of some \$5 billion. Actually, later month-by-month figures show imports catching up some, but we still export more than we import.

It is well to remember that a great many of our imports, we have to import—like tin

and rubber, and many other raw materials—non-competitive materials.

The U.S. is giving concessions—reducing import tariffs an average of 35 per cent on industrial, non-agricultural, commodities—on about \$8 billion of imports, and receiving like concessions on about the same amount of our exports to other countries.

This opens up markets in other countries for Dayton in the same proportion that Dayton shares in world trade—greater in proportion than the U.S. average.

Undersecretary of Labor Reynolds said that nearly 7 percent of total U.S. manufacturing employment was related to the export of goods and services. In Dayton, we know that 12 percent of our value-added-by-manufacturing is exported, and we conclude that 12 percent of our manufacturing employment is related to export.

Dayton is a scientific research center of national and international repute. It is obvious, then, that many of our manufactured products are highly sophisticated. This in itself creates a demand by the rest of the world for Dayton products. Dayton products are unique—we build a better mouse trap.

The great American domestic market is no longer the private preserve of the American businessman—just as there are no "private" markets in the other countries of the world. And we here in Dayton must realize this, must accept it, and should take full advantage of the opportunities it creates.

World trade is not greatly different than your domestic trade. You manufacture, you sell, you ship, and you put the U.S. dollars in the bank.

Sure, there are differences in people, differences in politics, and differences in monetary units. But these are not hard to cope with. And there are all kinds of help available to you. Never in the history of our country has it been better prepared or more eager to help you participate—profitably—in world trade.

For those of you who are already engaged in world trade, know that these tariff reductions by other countries open up and expand the markets for you. For those of you who have not yet participated in the world markets, the incentive to start participating is certainly there now.

There are all kinds of tools available to help you—all you need is the desire and willingness.

The U. S. Department of Commerce Field Office in Cincinnati has all of the information and counseling you need to participate in world trade. Thomas E. Ferguson is the Director, and Felix Turel is the world trade specialist. They have a competent staff and this results in one of the finest Field Offices in the U.S.

The Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce is a Cooperative Office of the U.S. Department of Commerce and as such, we have access to all of the materials and helps the Field Office has to offer. And when between us we don't have the answers—and sometimes we don't—we go directly to Washington.

Addison Skaggs, Export Sales Manager, Hobart Manufacturing Company in Troy; Jack Russell, Kircher, Helton & Collett, Dayton, and I are three who at this time are serving as members of the Cincinnati Regional Export Expansion Council to help expand exports and to help those interested in participating in world trade.

Trade Missions are a good way to find and exploit world markets. A Trade Mission is a group of businessmen who visit certain predetermined countries and carry with them firm trade proposals to offer buyers in these countries. Gov. James A. Rhodes headed an Ohio Trade Mission to Japan with huge success. And he plans another to South America this fall, and a big repeat one to Tokyo next spring, to which it is anticipated that 300 Ohio businessmen will accompany him. These are open to you and you should take

advantage of them. They can pay big cash dividends.

Involved in world trade are financing, insurance, transportation, brokers, forwarders, agents, distributors, and often licensees or subsidiaries. All of these things are available to you here in Dayton, or through Dayton channels.

Certainly our Dayton banks are knowledgeable in international finance and handle it every day. Local insurance companies can and do handle marine insurance to insure your shipments abroad, and your banks and insurance companies can help you determine and transact the best financial arrangements. Our government helps you give the best financial terms to be most competitive in the world markets and at the same time to guarantee the financial transaction through the Export-Import Bank and the FCIA.

Trans World Airlines serves Dayton, as well as Europe and Asia, and is quite accustomed to handling international shipments. American, Delta and United also handle international shipments and each does serve countries outside of the U.S.

All of our truck lines and rail lines carry international shipments and many have arrangements with the steamship companies to offer you fast, efficient international service.

What I am trying to tell you, is that we have right here in Dayton all of the know-how and facilities you need to participate profitably—in world trade. And when you use these Dayton facilities, you not only add to the Dayton economy by spending your dollars in Dayton, but you also have immediate access to your servant in the event any problems show up.

World trade is a two-way street. We must import if we want to continue and expand our exports. We insist on being paid in U.S. dollars and the other countries' biggest source of dollars is their selling to us. Also, we have to import certain things that we do not have in the U.S. Furthermore, some of the things we import are incorporated in things we export and we sell it right back outside the U.S.

The Dayton businessman, the housewife, the Dayton citizen, if you will, although not directly involved in world trade, are directly affected by the Kennedy Round negotiations and the reduction in U.S. import duties.

We all know that competition is good and the imported consumer goods are competition to the U.S. domestic consumer goods. This competition not only keeps the U.S. manufacturer on his toes, but also the merchant. The consumer benefits.

The reduction in duty on a given \$10 or even a \$100 item is not great. Suppose the U.S. import duty is now 20 percent and it is cut 50 percent to 10 percent at the rate of 2 percent per year. On the \$10 item, the savings to the merchant amount to 20 cents. The housewife can expect a 20-cent reduction in the price she pays, and eventually a savings of \$1.00 on the \$10 item.

Even though we are talking about only a few cents savings on each item, we are talking of a total savings of 35 percent average in five years on Dayton's total import duties, which were about \$785,000 in fiscal 1967. This 35 percent savings in five years amounts to \$274,750. And that is \$274,750 added to Dayton's economy—to be used to best advantage by the one who saves it, be it the housewife, the merchant or the manufacturer.

You can be sure that the figure will be greater than \$274,750, because these reductions in tariffs will generate a greater volume of trade.

The housewife may use her savings to buy steak instead of hamburger, or take the husband out for dinner, or buy more merchandise.

The merchant may pass the savings on to the consumer, thus generating more sales.

The manufacturer may use his savings to reduce his unit manufacturing cost, to be even more competitive.

In any event the \$274,750 will be added to the Dayton economy, and for the most part will generate more jobs and more money. It will certainly be beneficial, not detrimental.

In Dayton we have an efficient and cooperative U.S. Customs Office and any imports we have can be cleared right here in Dayton. It has been natural for us to clear U.S. Customs at the seaports, because it is so often necessary to change carriers at that point, and the U.S. Customs officers are right there to facilitate the clearance.

However, with the cooperation and agreements between carriers now and the one through bill of lading that can be written, it is easier and better to have the shipment sent directly to Dayton, in bond, and clear U.S. Customs through our own office. We now have a U.S. Customs Broker here in Dayton and I understand there are no delays in receiving international goods. As a matter of fact, a new system recently implemented, allows you to have imported goods in your hands within three hours after they arrive in Dayton.

Again, use of this Dayton facility and service not only allows faster and more efficient service, but spends dollars in Dayton and actually saves some unnecessary handling—and money—at the coastal ports.

Know about all of these services and facilities available to you right here in Dayton—investigate them thoroughly, and use them, when you find them to your advantage. Use of such services and facilities generate additional new facilities and services, such as International Airport designation and Customs facilities there. And containerization, which can handle the smaller shipments and reduce damage and eliminate pilferage, and thus save you money.

SUMMATION

What does it all mean? And what will be the effect on the U.S. and on Dayton?

Certainly the Kennedy Round GATT negotiations, involving 53 nations, was a tremendous undertaking. It was indeed the greatest step ever taken by all of the nations to increase world trade on a fully reciprocal basis. Some \$40 billion of world trade will be effected by the tariff reductions, about \$16 billion—\$8 billion export and \$8 billion import—for the U.S. In industry, the U.S. and other countries agreed on cuts averaging about 35 percent. The total number of items effected is about 60,000. The tariff reductions will be made over a five-year period in five equal increments, beginning January 1, 1968. The impact, although great and stimulating of trade, will be over the five-year period.

Dayton, being heavily industrialized and for the most part manufacturing sophisticated products, will benefit more because of the increased demand abroad caused by the lower tariffs, while a lesser amount of "competitive" products are imported into the Dayton area. For example, in the July 3 issue of International Commerce, put out by the U.S. Department of Commerce, it says

"U.S. foreign trade in business machines holds a revealing mirror up to our entire world business situation. About 80 percent of U.S. exports were sophisticated business machines and parts. Conversely, over 80 percent of imports were for conventional business machines and parts. And both set new records in 1966; exports up 16.5 percent to \$558.8 million, imports up 33.2 percent to \$191.3 million."

So, you see we have a very favorable balance in this category, as I believe we have in most categories.

Dayton imports increased from a total of 3,089 entries in fiscal 1963 to 4,577 in 1967. Of these, 816 in 1963 and 1,427 in 1967 were commercial and industrial.

Duty collections on these Dayton area imports ranged from \$217,950 in 1963 to \$784,613 in 1967. Assuming an average of 20 percent duty, you have \$1 million in imports in 1963 and nearly \$4 million in 1967. This compares with our present rate of exports from the Dayton area of over \$200 million per year.

World trade favorable to Dayton? You bet! World trade can be good. Each company has to take a good, hard look and determine how best it can participate in world trade. Some may find it is not for them, but I believe most will find it beneficial.

The doors to world trade have been opened wider, and many barriers removed, by these Kennedy Round tariff negotiations. It is now up to the American businessman to meet the challenge and take advantage of the opportunity.

We certainly have our share of smart businessmen in the Dayton area, I'm proud to say, and I'm sure they will take twice the full advantage of the opportunity, because Dayton is twice as good as the national average.

Your U.S. Department of Commerce, and other government agencies, and your Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce stand ready to help you in any way we can.

Thank you.

PHASE 1—PHASE 2

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, against the fiery background of our riot-torn cities, a monstrous possibility has arisen—that this is only the beginning. Now, Milwaukee has been hit, damaging this great city.

Max Stanford, extremist leader of Revolutionary Action Movement, is quoted as saying:

The black revolution will use sabotage in the cities—knocking out the electrical power first, then transportation, and guerrilla warfare in the countryside of the South. With the cities powerless, the oppressor will be helpless.

This and other significant quotes are to be found in a stimulating review of Phillip Abbott Luce's new book, "The Road to Revolution," by Allan C. Brownfeld, a rising young thinker, which appeared in the Washington Star of July 30, 1967.

Mr. Luce gives us the benefit of his experience in radical and extremist groups on the guerrilla warfare that confronts us. I urge attention be given his book.

Faced with the possibility of an even wider war in America, I commend the Washington Star for its thoughtful editorial, also in the July 30 edition, "Are the Riots Spontaneous or Planned?" The editorial makes it clear it is ludicrous to consider the rioting part of the traditional upward social mobility of minority groups. No oppressed group in America has, or ever will, advance by burning cities and beating people to death. This is not the American dream; it is the road to revolution, the revolution of the nihilists.

The violence that is mushrooming not only precludes the possibility of social progress; it raises the specter of all-out war in the United States. The failure to deal sharply with the mugger and the common criminal has encouraged the lawless elements to believe that no authority will ever touch them.

We are fighting in Vietnam. In how many operations do we employ 11,500 men as was necessary in Detroit? How many times do we cause hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of damage in North Vietnam, as has been done to our cities? The war in America does not directly weaken our efforts in Vietnam any more than our bombing has stopped Communist infiltration of the south. Yet, each war absorbs the energies of the Nation. Every firebomb weakens America by diverting resources and energy, not to build but to repair.

If we fail to deter the urban guerrilla fighters, we will, in effect, be saying to the nihilists who are waiting for the outcome of the battle for the cities, "America is too stupid, too soft, too weak in our thinking, to survive."

The editorial of the Star, Mr. Luce's book, and Mr. Brownfeld's review are evidence to the contrary.

The editorial and review follow:

ARE THE RIOTS SPONTANEOUS OR PLANNED?

As the rioting eased off, at least temporarily, in Newark and Detroit, not to mention a score of other cities large and small, both official and public attention in Washington began to focus on the story behind the killing, the burning and the looting.

What brought on this "time of violence and tragedy" in July, 1967? Were the riots more or less spontaneous eruptions on the part of oppressed Negroes? Was there at least some measure of planning and organization behind them? Did the Communists play a part, and if so what was their role?

It is doubtful that all of the questions can ever be answered. But the effort will be made. There is much pressure on Capitol Hill for an investigation by some congressional committee. And the President acted on Thursday night to establish an 11-member commission to conduct an investigation in his behalf.

In the address in which he announced the appointment of this commission, Mr. Johnson said that "the only genuine, long-range solution for what has happened lies in an attack—mounted at every level—upon the conditions which breed despair and violence. All of us know what they are: ignorance, discrimination, slums, disease, not enough jobs . . ."

This, as far as it goes, is true enough. But there are two things to be said about it. One is that this is indeed a long-range solution. It will take a decade or more to remedy the conditions enumerated by the President. Nor can the riots in places such as Detroit and Plainfield be explained away by reference to slums and lack of jobs. For these conditions were not present in any significant degree.

Furthermore, if even one of these riots was the product of some other cause than slums and unemployment, this country cannot wait 10 years to uncover that cause and destroy it. The price which will have been exacted by continuous rioting is much too high.

What we have in mind is the rather widely held belief that at least some of the riots, and perhaps the worst ones, were planned, organized and directed by sinister forces embarked upon a policy of rule-or-ruin.

The President passed this over lightly. He said his commission will have access to facts gathered by the FBI and that J. Edgar Hoover's agency "will continue to exercise its

full authority to investigate these riots, in accordance with my standing instructions, and to continue to search for evidence of a conspiracy."

This is a somewhat ambiguous statement. As far as we know there has not been a full-scale investigation of the riots, and, since the authority of the FBI is supposed to extend only to violations of federal law, what did the President mean when he said the agency will "continue to exercise its full authority" to investigate the riots? Furthermore, the comment that the FBI will "continue to search for evidence of conspiracy" implies that no such evidence has yet been found.

Perhaps there has been no conspiracy, and if not it follows that there would be no evidence of one. For our part, we are not aware of the existence of any such evidence in the strict sense of the term.

There is, however, a considerable body of information to suggest that there has been a conspiracy.

In the absence of any planning or organization or training, it is difficult to account for the widespread sniper activity in Detroit. In a dispatch from Havana a few days ago, Stokely Carmichael is quoted as follows: "In Newark, we are applying the tactics of guerrilla warfare. We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas for our defense in the cities." Chicago's Mayor Daley has said: "We know this is a national program of outlawry and violence." Some other local officials have said much the same thing.

In its issue of July 28, Life magazine tells of a "clandestine" meeting between its reporters and some of the Newark snipers. These snipers belong to an organized group of former civil rights workers in Mississippi. According to the magazine, one of the snipers said there were more than 50 members of the group, more than half coming from Newark. "Others had been moved in for the action from California, Ohio, Pennsylvania." This certainly is not inconsistent with the remarks attributed to Stokely Carmichael in Havana.

More positive indications of organization and conspiracy can be found in a book by Phillip Abbott Luce, until recently an active Communist. The Luce book, "Road to Revolution," is reviewed on Page G-3 of today's Star.

Exposés by former Communists are suspect, as Whittaker Chambers learned in the Alger Hiss case. But The Star has been reliably informed that Luce's break with the party is real.

In any event, what he has to say is interesting. It can be and should be checked out carefully.

Luce begins by saying that the Communists are "counting on the premise that most Americans will discount the possibility of a guerrilla war in their country. The notion of a guerrilla war in the United States is so outrageous and improbable to Americans that they would receive it as the product of a deranged mind." Well, many Americans and most "responsible" Cubans felt the same way, to the subsequent dismay of the latter, when Fidel Castro and his tiny band of followers first went ashore in Cuba.

Luce, noting that Communists exploit trouble rather than incite it, goes on to spell out in detail the Communist plan to foment racial trouble in this country and then to exploit it through guerrilla tactics. He reminds us that a grand jury which investigated last summer's Cleveland riot found that "the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals at this business." He also recalls that the Harlem riots in 1964 produced similar findings and that one Bill Epton, a Communist, was indicted and convicted of criminal anarchy for his role in those riots.

None of this may amount to "evidence" in the legal sense as far as this month's riots go. But, taken together, it strongly suggests that there is a conspiratorial underpinning of the current riots, and it is a possibility which deserves more serious attention by the investigators than is invited by the President's casual reference to it.

A crucial matter at stake now, or so it seems to us, is the struggle for control of, or direction of, the Negro community. Who will prevail? Such men as Martin Luther King Jr., A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins and Whitney M. Young Jr.? Or will it be the H. Rap Browns and the Stokely Carmichaels?

A great deal more than the future of civil rights depends on the answer. It is conceivable, quite conceivable, that what really hangs in the balance is the choice between a race war in the United States and a state of affairs in which the white and colored communities can live together in peace.

This is why it is so important to put politics aside and dig up the truth, the whole truth, about the riots and their causes. And this is why it is also so important for the members of Congress and the people they represent not to yield to what the President spoke of as "fear and bitterness"—to any state of mind which would indefinitely delay reconciliation and reconstruction at a dreadful cost in human lives and human values.

BOOK REVIEW

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

("Road to Revolution." By Phillip Abbott Luce. Viewpoint Books. 165 pages. Paperback, \$1.)

Already called the "Whittaker Chambers" of his generation, Phillip Abbott Luce has chosen an appropriate time for the publication of his second book, "Road to Revolution."

In the midst of 1967's "long hot summer," Luce has provided us with a first-hand report of the perspective in which such events are held by Communists, to whom they are "rebellions," and not riots. Beyond this, his message is an alarming one. It describes in great detail, and with thorough documentation, the plans for guerrilla warfare in the streets of our cities already devised by domestic radicals.

Phil Luce at 29 is a former leader of the "New Left," organizer of two student trips to Cuba in 1963 and 1964, an officer of the Progressive Labor Party and editor of its monthly magazine, Progressive Labor, until his defection in January, 1965. He has written about his experiences in his first book, "The New Left," and one of the major reasons for his disillusionment with communism came when he found himself "involved in a series of plans in which the participants had no idea of the consequences . . . I left when it became obvious that the individual lives of the members of PL, let alone society, meant less than an abstract Communist catchism as envisioned by the 'gurus' of the movement." According to Luce his defection ranks him "somewhere near President Johnson and J. Edgar Hoover" as the "most maligned enemy" of PL.

STORED GUNS

Progressive Labor, the pro-Communist Chinese offshoot of the United States Communist Party, passed a resolution at its 1965 national convention stating that "black liberation" was the path for the coming guerrilla war in the United States. "The key to revolution in the United States," the convention declared, "lies within the interlocking interests in the black liberation movement and the working class struggle for socialism."

Just before the Harlem riots of 1964, William Epton, vice chairman of PL, said this to an open air rally: "We will not be fully free until we smash this state completely and totally . . . in process . . . we're going

to have to kill a lot of these cops, a lot of these judges, and we'll have to go against the army." Epton was later tried and found guilty of criminal anarchy.

Luce states: "While I was an officer of PL, I learned of a number of projects in which people were being prepared for a future guerrilla operation. Not only did we store guns in New York City, but target practice was held on Long Island prior to the Harlem riots. I was personally asked to find a hiding place suitable for target practice."

Another of the organizations planning such violent activity is the Revolutionary Action Movement, known as RAM. Max Stanford, leader of the group, said that "the black revolution will use sabotage in the cities—knocking out the electrical power first, then transportation and guerrilla warfare in the countryside of the South. With the cities powerless, the oppressor will be helpless."

VIOLENCE PLANNED

Luce points to a third organization which, he says, is rapidly becoming a part of this guerrilla movement—the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, no longer either nonviolent or dominated by students. He reports an August 29, 1966 SNOC fund-raising dinner in Harlem that featured an interesting trio of speakers—Stokely Carmichael, then chairman, along with Max Stanford of RAM and William Epton of PL. Carmichael said that in "Cleveland they're building stores with no windows. All brick. I don't know what they think they'll accomplish. It just means we have to move from Molotov cocktails to dynamite." He added: "They say we're stupid and don't do anybody any good and we deserve to be called that, because if we had any sense we'd have bombed these ghettos long ago."

Luce makes it clear that most Negro leaders have condemned the concept of "black power," and the exhortation to violence. As a result, they are as much the targets of violence as the white community. Only recently members of RAM, including Max Stanford, were arrested in an assassination plot. The targets: Roy Wilkins of the NAACP and Whitney Young of the Urban League.

Phil Luce repeatedly stresses that Communists do not begin trouble but take advantage of it, incite it, and exploit it. He understands, as some seem not to, that there are real grievances in the ghettos, lack of jobs, poor housing, inadequate recreation facilities. Yet others tend to minimize the influence of these radical organizations and their very real plans for revolution on our city streets.

In a balanced and provocative volume, he does not blame all evil on "outside agitators." Yet the public should understand the plans which Communists have for our cities. Phase one, as recent violence indicates, has already occurred. Armed with Luce's warning and our own awareness of the problems which must be solved, we may yet be able to avoid phase two.

HALPERN ACCUSES SOVIETS OF RETALIATION AGAINST RUSSIAN JEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, reports filtering out of Russia despite the Kremlin's tight clamps of censorship disclose the shocking fact that the Soviets have embarked on a program of retaliation against Russian Jews because of the Israel victory in the Middle East war.

The puppet press of the U.S.S.R. has exploited racial disturbance in Detroit, Newark, New York, and other U.S. cities. It has molded its half-truths to fit the

Kremlin line by misrepresentations on the issue of minority rights in America.

It is about time for the world to know the full story of how the Kremlin has cruelly and cynically taken vengeance against Russian Jewry because Israel defeated the Arabs in a Soviet-instigated war.

This has taken the form of increased pressures against individuals, against community affairs, and against religious and traditional observances. The Russian oppressors have even tried to force Jews to hold anti-Israel protest meetings.

The world is well aware of the increased warmongering of the U.S.S.R., which seems bent on bringing the world once more up to the brink of world war III.

The irresponsible resupplying of aggressive weapons by Russia to the Arabs, coupled with the Nazi-like efforts to coerce Jews within Russia, should cause the Government of the United States to view with skepticism any ideas of so-called detente with the Soviets.

Certainly I, for one—and I am sure there must be many more in this House who feel as I do—will find it difficult to look with favor upon any proposals by the State Department that we make concessions of any kind for the benefit of Russia.

If the U.S.S.R. has any illusions that Congress might support any East-West trade arrangements favorable to Russia, then let the Kremlin be told in no uncertain terms that Russia must first review its own treatment of minorities and its efforts to stir up religious war in the Middle East.

IMPROVING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 11869, a badly needed bill to expand and improve our vocational education system. The bill is identical to H.R. 8433, introduced by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS], and H.R. 8525, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI]. These bills already have been the subject of hearings by the General Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is the subcommittee chairman.

In my district of Minneapolis, one reason for wanting this bill enacted is that two institutions, the University of Minnesota Hospital and the Glenwood Hills Hospital, are ceasing their training programs for practical nurses. To take up the slack created by the discontinuation of these programs, the program offered by the Minneapolis Area Vocational-Technical School is being expanded. Currently there are 60 students enrolled in practical nurse training. Enrollment next fall is expected to grow to 94.

But, because of the great demand for licensed practical nurses, the Minnesota Hospital Association, and other groups, would like to see the facilities expanded to accommodate as many as 500 student nurses. One section of this proposal would increase the authorization for practical nurse training from the presently authorized \$5 million to \$50 million annually. Through such an increase, I would hope that funds would be available for the additional expansion at Minneapolis.

Following, Mr. Speaker, is a brief summary of the bill:

SUMMARY OF H.R. 11869 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

Increases authorizations for fiscal year 1969, and each year thereafter, to \$400,000,000 in lieu of the \$225,000,000 presently authorized for vocational education activities.

EXEMPLARY AND INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS OR PROJECTS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Authorizes \$30,000,000 to be appropriated for fiscal year 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for the 4 succeeding fiscal years, to develop, establish, and operate exemplary and innovative occupational education programs or projects to use as models in vocational education programs.

Projects may be designed to broaden the occupational aspirations and opportunities of youth, familiarize postelementary school students with the broad range of occupations, and the requisite skills for such careers, provide for intensive counseling, guidance, and initial job placement, and broaden and improve vocational education curriculums. No program or project may be funded for more than 3 years.

Programs may provide for educational experiences through cooperative work-study arrangements, public or private employment, or volunteer work. Preference in compensation for work under such projects will be given to students from low-income families. Compensation will only be given for work performed for a public or private nonprofit employer.

WORK-STUDY

There is authorized \$30 million for the work-study program for fiscal year 1968, and for each fiscal year thereafter. The Commissioner is to pay each State up to 90 percent of the sum of—

First, the amount it expends for compensation of students under work-study; and

Second, the amount it expends for development and administration of its State

¹The Commissioner of Education is authorized to reserve an amount not to exceed 2% of each fiscal year's appropriation. This sum shall be apportioned among Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, according to their needs for assistance.

Of the remaining 98% of each year's appropriation, the Commissioner must apportion \$150,000 to each State. The remaining funds shall be distributed to each State in the same proportion as the number of its 15 to 19 year olds compares with the number of 15 to 19 year olds in all the States.

Any funds not necessary to the carrying out of a State's program will be available for re-apportionment to the other States in accordance with their need.

plan—not to exceed 1 percent of the State's allotment or \$10,000, whichever is greater.

Payments to students under the work-study program shall not be regarded as income in computing compensation under title IV of the Social Security Act—aid to families with dependent children—for a minimum of 12 months, and not to exceed a period of 24 months.

RESIDENTIAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SCHOOLS

There is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, of which each State will be apportioned \$100,000; \$100,000,000 is authorized for fiscal year 1969, and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years.²

In order to demonstrate the feasibility and desirability of residential vocational education schools, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to the States. Except for fiscal year 1968, during which the Federal share of the cost of planning residential school facilities shall be 100 percent; the Federal share of the cost of planning, construction, and operation of such facilities shall not exceed 90 percent of such cost during fiscal year 1968, and 1969, and 75 percent of such costs thereafter. Federal funds are to supplement, and in no case supplant State and local funds.

In developing plans for the construction of facilities, consideration shall be given to the inclusion of works of art, provided that the cost of acquisition does not exceed 1 percent of the cost of the facility.

The residential school facility is to provide vocational education for youths, aged 15 through 21, who need to study full time on a residential basis in order to benefit from such an education. No fees, tuition, or charges would be required of enrollees. Course offerings would be in those fields in which labor market analysis indicates a present and continuing need for trained manpower.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FELLOWSHIP AND EXCHANGE PROGRAMS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND EDUCATORS

There is authorized to carry out the cooperative exchange program \$20,-

000,000 for fiscal year 1969, \$30,000,000 for fiscal year 1970, and \$35,000,000 for fiscal year 1971, and each of the 2 fiscal years thereafter.

The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to the State boards of education to pay the costs of carrying out such cooperative arrangements for the training of experienced vocational education teachers and administrators. Exchanges may be made between vocational education schools, or between such schools and private industry, commercial enterprise or other educational institutions. Grants may be used for in-service training programs or for the operation of short term, or academic year institutions.

There is authorized to carry out the fellowship program \$1,500,000 for fiscal year 1969, \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 1970, and \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1971, and each of the 2 fiscal years thereafter. For fiscal years 1974, and 1975, there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary in order to permit persons to complete the program for which they were awarded fellowships.

For fiscal year 1969, and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, the Commissioner is authorized to award 100 fellowships to persons pursuing, or intending to pursue, careers as vocational education teachers and researchers. For fiscal year 1969 the Commissioner is authorized to award 150 fellowships to persons pursuing or intending to pursue careers as vocational education administrators. For each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, he is authorized to award 200 fellowships for this purpose.

Each fellowship shall be for a maximum of 3 years of study, and shall include a stipend for subsistence, in addition to \$2,500, applicable to tuition costs per academic year.

PRACTICAL NURSE TRAINING (20 U.S.C. 15aa)

Increases authorizations for vocational education in practical nurse training to \$50,000,000 in lieu of the \$5,000,000 presently authorized.

Following is the full text of H.R. 11869:

H.R. 11869

A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Vocational Education Amendments of 1967".

INCREASE OF AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN EXISTING PROGRAMS

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 35a) is amended by striking out "and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each fiscal year thereafter, \$225,000,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$225,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and each fiscal year thereafter, \$400,000,000."

EXEMPLARY AND INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS OR PROJECTS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 35c), is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) (1) There are authorized to be appropriated \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for the four succeeding fiscal

years, to be used by the Commissioner for making grants to or contracts with State boards or local educational agencies for the purpose of stimulating and assisting, through programs or projects referred to in paragraph (3), the development establishment, and operation of exemplary and innovative occupational education programs or projects designed to serve as models for use in vocational education programs. The Commissioner also may make grants to other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions, or contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, or institutions, when such grants or contracts will make an especially significant contribution to attaining the objectives of this subsection.

"(2) (A) From the sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for each fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine and shall apportion such amount among Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, according to their respective needs for assistance under this subsection.

"(B) From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall apportion \$150,000 to each State, and he shall in addition apportion to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to any residue of such remainder as the population aged fifteen to nineteen, both inclusive, in the State bears to the population of such ages in all the States.

"(C) Any amount apportioned to a State under this subsection for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for grants for programs or projects in that State during the period for which such apportionment is available shall be available for reapportionment by him from time to time to other States in accordance with their respective needs.

"(D) For the purposes of paragraph (2) (A) and (B) of this subsection, the term 'State' does not include Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(E) The population of particular age groups of a State or of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"(F) The amount apportioned under this section to any State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall be available for obligation for grants pursuant to applications approved during that year and the succeeding fiscal year.

"(3) Grants or contracts pursuant to this subsection may be made by the Commissioner, upon such terms and conditions consistent with the provisions of this section as he determines will most effectively carry out the purposes of paragraph (1), to pay part of the cost of—

"(A) planning and developing exemplary and innovative programs or projects such as those described in subparagraph (B), or

"(B) establishing, operating, or evaluating exemplary and innovative vocational education programs or projects designed to broaden occupational aspirations and opportunities for youths, with special emphasis given to youths who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps, which programs or projects may, among others, include—

"(i) those designed to familiarize post-elementary school students with the broad range of occupations for which special skills are required and the requisites for careers in such occupations;

"(ii) programs or projects for students providing educational experiences through work;

"(iii) programs or projects for intensive occupational guidance and counseling during the last years of school and for initial job placement; or

² The Commissioner shall apportion to each State amounts derived from each of the two computations:

1. that amount which bears the same proportion to 50% of all funds available for apportionment to the States as the number of children, aged 5 through 17, in each State bears to the total number of such children throughout the United States and

2. that amount which bears the same proportion to 50% of all funds available for apportionment as each State's population bears to the total population of the United States.

Any funds not necessary to the carrying out of a State's program in the view of the Commissioner will be available for re-apportionment on dates fixed by the Commissioner to other States in the same proportion as their original funds were distributed, but with a proportionate amount of any State whose funds are so re-apportioned reduced to an amount the Commissioner deems appropriate.

Beginning with fiscal year 1968, \$200,000 is appropriated for apportionment by the Commissioner among Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa according to their needs. For each of the four succeeding fiscal years, this sum is increased to \$5,000,000.

"(iv) programs or projects designed to broaden or improve vocational education curriculums.

"(4) (A) Programs or projects referred to in clause (ii) of paragraph (3) (B) may include cooperative work-study arrangements, other educationally related public or private employment, or volunteer work. Preference in compensated work under such programs or projects shall be given to students from low-income families.

"(B) No grant or contract shall be made by the Commissioner under this subsection with respect to any such program or project unless—

"(i) such program or project will not involve the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for secretarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(ii) such program or project will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services.

"(C) Funds appropriated under this subsection shall not be available to pay any part of the compensation of a student involved in a program or project referred to in clause (ii) of paragraph (3) (B) if the work is performed for any employer other than a public or private nonprofit agency, organization, or institution.

"(5) (A) In determining the cost of a program or project under this subsection, the Commissioner may include the reasonable value (as determined by him) of any goods or services provided from non-Federal sources.

"(B) Financial assistance may not be given under this subsection to any program or project for a period exceeding three years.

"(6) In administering the provisions of this subsection the Commissioner shall consult with other Federal departments and agencies administering programs which may be effectively coordinated with the program carried out pursuant to this subsection, and to the extent practicable shall—

"(i) coordinate such program on the Federal level with the programs being administered by such other departments and agencies; and

"(ii) require that effective procedures be adopted by grantees and contractors to coordinate the development and operation of programs and projects carried out under grants or contracts pursuant to this subsection with other public and private programs having the same or similar purposes."

WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

SEC. 4. (a) Section 13(a) (1) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 35k (a) (1)) is amended by striking out "From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 15 and determined to be for the purposes of this section" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for each succeeding fiscal year. From the sums appropriated pursuant to this paragraph".

(b) (1) Section 13(e) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) From a State's allotment under this section for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall pay to such State an amount not exceeding 90 per centum of the sum of (1) the amount expended for compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs under the State's supplementary plan approved under this section, and (2) the amount (not to exceed 1 per centum of such allotment, or \$10,000, whichever is the greater) expended for the development of the State's supplementary plan and for the administration of such plan after its approval by the Commissioner. No State shall receive payments under this section for any fiscal year in excess of its allotment under subsection (a) for such fiscal year."

(2) The amendments made by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall apply only with respect to amounts expended after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) Section 13 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of title IV of the Social Security Act, a State plan approved under section 402 of such Act shall provide that for a period of not less than twelve months, and may provide that for a period of not more than twenty-four months, the compensation paid to a student under this section shall not be regarded (A) in determining the need of such student under such approved State plan, or (B) in determining the need of any other individual under such approved State plan.

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, no funds to which a State is otherwise entitled under title IV of the Social Security Act for any period ending before the one hundred and twentieth day after the adjournment of the State's first regular legislative session which adjourns more than one hundred and twenty days after enactment of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1967 shall be withheld by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents such State from complying with the requirements of paragraph (1) of this subsection."

RESIDENTIAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SCHOOL PROGRAM

SEC. 5. (a) Section 14 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 35l) is amended to read as follows:

"RESIDENTIAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SCHOOLS

"Sec. 14. (a) (1) (A) There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. From such sum, the Commissioner shall apportion \$100,000 to each State. The remainder of such sum shall be apportioned among the States in accordance with subparagraph (C).

"(B) There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for each of three succeeding fiscal years. Such sums shall be apportioned among the States in accordance with subparagraph (C).

"(C) From the sums available for apportionment under this subparagraph the Commissioner shall apportion to each State—

"(i) an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such sums as the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the State bears to the number of such children in all the States, and

"(ii) an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of all the States.

"(D) For purposes of this paragraph—

"(i) the term 'State' does not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and

"(ii) the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, and the total population of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

"(2) In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$200,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of \$5,000,000 for each of the four succeeding fiscal years. Such sums shall be apportioned by the Commissioner, among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs for assistance under this section.

"(3) The amount apportioned under this subsection to any State for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1968, shall be available for payments to applicants with approved applications in that State during that year and the next fiscal year.

"(4) The amount apportioned to any State for a fiscal year under this subsection which the Commissioner determines will not be required for the period for which that amount is available shall be available for reapportionment from time to time, on such dates during that period as the Commissioner may fix, among other States in proportion to the amounts originally apportioned among those States under this subsection for that year, but with the proportionate amount of any of the other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates that State needs and will be able to use for that period; and the total of these reductions shall be similarly reapportioned among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced.

"(b) (1) For the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility and desirability of residential vocational education schools for certain youths of high school age, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants from the sums allotted to a State under subsection (a) for a fiscal year to the State board for such State, or, with the approval of such State board, to public educational agencies, organizations, or institutions within such State to pay the Federal share of the cost of planning, construction, and operation of residential school facilities for providing vocational education (including room, board, and other necessities) for youths, at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the time of enrollment, who need full-time study on a residential basis in order to benefit fully from such education. In the administration of the program conducted under this section, special consideration shall be given to the needs of areas having substantial or disproportionate numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed.

"(2) For purposes of this section—

"(A) the Federal share of the cost of planning, construction, and operation of residential school facilities shall not exceed (i) 90 per centum in the case of costs incurred in the fiscal years ending on June 30, 1968, and June 30, 1969 (except as provided in subparagraph (B)), and (ii) 75 per centum in the case of costs incurred thereafter; and

"(B) the Federal share of the cost of planning residential school facilities shall be 100 per centum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

"(c) The Commissioner shall require, as a condition to the receipt of a grant under this section for planning, construction, or operation of residential school facilities, that the recipient of such grant give satisfactory assurances that—

"(1) adequate provision will be made for the appropriate selection, without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin, of students needing education and training at such school;

"(2) the residential school facility with respect to which the grant was made will be operated and maintained for the purpose of conducting a residential vocational education school program consistent with the provisions of this section;

"(3) vocational education course offerings at such school will be in fields for which labor market analysis indicates there is a present and probably continuing need for trained manpower, and that the courses offered will be appropriately designed to prepare enrollees for entry into employment in such fields;

"(4) Federal funds made available under this section will be used to supplement, and, to the extent practicable, increase the amount of State and local funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for residential vocational education

schools, and in no case supplant such State and local funds;

"(5) provision will be made for minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, directors, and others having responsibilities at such school;

"(6) the recipient will adopt such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to such recipient under this section;

"(7) in developing plans for the construction of facilities, due consideration shall be given to excellence of architecture and design and to the inclusion of works of art;

"(8) the requirements of section 7 will be complied with on all construction projects assisted under this section;

"(9) the recipient will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this section, and keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

"(10) no fees, tuition, or other charges will be required of enrollees.

Grants under this section shall be subject to such other terms and conditions as the Commissioner may by regulation prescribe in order to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(d) For purposes of this section:

"(1) The term 'residential school facility' means a school facility (as defined in section 8(3)) used for residential vocational education purposes. Such term also includes dormitory, cafeteria, and recreational facilities, and such other facilities as the Commissioner determines are appropriate for conducting a residential vocational education school.

"(2) The term 'operation' means maintenance and operation, and includes the cost of salaries, equipment, supplies, and materials."

(b) Section 8 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 35g) is amended by inserting at the end of paragraph (4) (relating to definition of construction) the following new sentence: "For purposes of section 14, such term also includes the cost of acquisition of works of art for a residential school facility (to the extent that such cost does not exceed 1 per centum of the cost of construction of such facility)."

ESTABLISHMENT OF FELLOWSHIP AND EXCHANGE PROGRAMS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AND EDUCATORS

SEC. 6. Section 15 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 35m) is amended to read as follows:

"FELLOWSHIP AND EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 15. (a) (1) There are authorized to be appropriated \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, to carry out cooperative programs under this subsection.

"(2) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to State boards to pay the cost of carrying out cooperative arrangements for the training of experienced vocational education teachers and administrators and of other persons pursuing or planning to pursue a career in vocational education or vocational education administration, in order to strengthen educational programs supported by this Act and the administration of schools offering vocational education. Such cooperative arrangements may be between schools offering vocational education or between schools offering vocational education and private industry, commercial enterprises, or other educational institutions (including those for the handicapped and delinquent).

Grants under this subsection may be used for projects and activities such as—

"(A) exchange of vocational education teachers or school administrators with skilled technicians or supervisors in industry (including mutual arrangements for preserving employment and retirement status, and other employment benefits during the period of exchange), and the development and operation of cooperative programs involving alternate periods of teaching in schools providing vocational education and of experience in commercial, industrial, or public employment related to the subject matter taught in such school;

"(B) in-service training programs for vocational education teachers and other staff members, to improve the quality of instruction, supervision, and administration of vocational education programs; and

"(C) the operation of short-term or academic year institutes for the provision of training to improve the qualifications of persons engaged in or preparing to engage in teaching, counseling, supervising, or administering vocational education programs. Each individual who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this subparagraph, shall be eligible for the period of his attendance at such institute (after application therefor) to receive a stipend (including an allowance for subsistence and other expenses for such person and his dependents) at a rate determined by the Commissioner to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

"(3) A grant may be made under this subsection only upon application to the Commissioner at such time or times and containing such information as he deems necessary. The Commissioner shall not approve an application unless it—

"(A) sets forth a program for carrying out one or more projects or activities which meet the requirements of paragraph (1), and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

"(B) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this subsection for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for purposes which meet the requirements of paragraph (1), and in no case supplant such funds;

"(C) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this subsection; and

"(D) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this subsection, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) (1) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry the fellowship program established by this subsection \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; and \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and the succeeding fiscal year, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary in order to permit persons awarded fellowships under this subsection in fiscal years ending before June 30, 1974, to complete the programs for which they were awarded fellowships.

"(2) (A) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the Commissioner is authorized to award one hundred fellowships to persons pursuing or intending to pursue careers as vocational education teacher educators and researchers, and one hundred and

fifty fellowships to persons pursuing or intending to pursue careers as vocational education administrators; and during each of the four succeeding fiscal years he is authorized to award one hundred fellowships to persons pursuing or intending to pursue careers as vocational education teacher educators and researchers, and two hundred fellowships to persons pursuing or intending to pursue careers as vocational education administrators. Such fellowships shall be for periods of study not in excess of three academic years.

"(B) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this paragraph but vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded. A fellowship awarded under this subparagraph shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine.

"(3) The Commissioner shall award fellowships under this subsection to individuals for study in graduate programs approved by him under this paragraph. The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding—

"(A) that such program is designed to substantially further the objective of improving vocational education through increasing the opportunities for graduate training of vocational educational administrators and of university level vocational education teacher educators and researchers.

"(B) that in the acceptance of persons for study in such programs, preference will be given to persons interested in teaching in vocational and technical education programs in institutions of higher education or in the administration of vocational education programs.

"(4) The total of the fellowships awarded under this subsection for pursuing a course of study in a graduate program at any institution of higher education may not exceed a limit established by the Commissioner in the light of the objective referred to in paragraph (3) (A).

"(5) (A) The Commissioner shall pay to each person awarded a fellowship under this subsection a stipend (including an allowance for subsistence and other expenses for such person and his dependents) which he determines to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

"(B) In addition to the amounts paid to a person pursuant to subparagraph (A), there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study, \$2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition.

"(6) A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this subsection shall continue to receive the payments provided in paragraph (5) (A) only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to, study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded, in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment, other than part-time employment by such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities, approved by the Commissioner.

"(c) In order to meet the needs for qualified vocational educational instructors, administrators, and teacher educators in vocational education programs in all the States, the Commissioner in carrying out this section shall equitably allocate among the States (1) the funds for cooperative arrange-

ments available under subsection (a), and (2) the fellowships available under subsection (b), taking into account such factors as the State's vocational education school enrollment, and incidence of youth unemployment and school dropouts in the State. Fellowships allocated to a State may be awarded only to residents of such State, but a person to whom a fellowship is awarded may study at an institution with an approved program in any State."

MINOR, TECHNICAL, AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Sec. 7. (a) Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 3(a) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 35b(a)) are each amended by striking out "in the preceding fiscal year" and inserting in lieu thereof "(based on the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce)".

(b) Section 3(d)(4) of such Act is repealed.

(c) (1) Section 4(a) of such Act (describing permitted uses of Federal funds under approved State plans) is amended by changing the period at the end of paragraph (6) to a semicolon and inserting immediately after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

"(7) The planning, establishment, operation, and evaluation of programs or projects of the kind described in subsection (d), whether or not previously assisted by a grant or contract under such subsection."

(2) Section 5(a)(2) and section 6(b) of such Act are each amended by striking out "and (6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(6), and (7)".

(d) Section 6 of such Act is amended by striking out subsection (a) and redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as (a), (b), and (c), respectively.

(e) Section 6(b) of such Act (as so redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) is amended by striking out "each area vocational school facility project" and inserting in lieu thereof "all area vocational school facility projects in such State for such fiscal year".

(f) (1) Section 6 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) If, during the public benefit period for any vocational education property acquired or constructed in whole or in part with Federal financial assistance under this part—

"(A) the agency which acquired or constructed such property (or its successor in title or possession) ceases or fails to be a public agency, or

"(B) such property ceases to be used for purposes of vocational education,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from such agency (or successor) an amount which bears the same ratio to the then market value of such vocational education property as the aggregate Federal financial assistance made available for the acquisition or construction of such property bore to the cost of acquisition or construction of such property. Such market value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection:

"(A) The term 'vocational education property' means real property consisting of an area vocational school or a residential school facility (as defined in section 14(d)(1)), or personal property consisting of equipment. Such term excludes any portion of such property which did not constitute a part of an approved project (for purposes of receiving Federal financial assistance under this part).

"(B) The term 'public benefit period' means—

"(1) in the case of real property consisting of an area vocational school, a period of twenty years;

"(2) in the case of real property consisting of a residential school facility, a period of thirty years; or

"(3) in the case of personal property consisting of equipment, a period established by the Commissioner, after consultation with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, consistent to the extent practicable with the useful life (for the purpose of computing depreciation allowances under section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) of similar equipment used by taxpayers.

Such period shall begin on the latest date on which any portion of the property was acquired with financial assistance under this part (or, in the case of construction, on the latest date on which construction of any portion of the property was completed with financial assistance under this part).

"(C) The term 'Federal financial assistance under this part' means assistance made available from the allotment to a State under section 3 or section 14(a)."

(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall apply only with respect to property which was acquired, or the construction of which was begun, after the date of enactment of this Act with funds appropriated for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967.

(f) The second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 8 of such Act (defining the term "vocational education") is amended by inserting "(individually or through group instruction)" immediately after "counseling", and by inserting "or for the purpose of facilitating occupational choices" immediately after the word "training" the first time such word appears in that sentence.

(g) The first sentence of section 5(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "this part" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3".

(h) The heading of section 6 of such Act is amended to read "PAYMENTS", and the following sentence is added at the end of subsection (c) of such section (as so redesignated by subsection (d)): "Other payments pursuant to this Act may be made in installments, in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments."

(i) Section 4(c) of such Act is amended by inserting "or to make contracts with private agencies, organizations, or institutions for, (1)" immediately after "cost of"; by striking out "and of" immediately preceding "experimental" and inserting in lieu thereof "(2)"; and by inserting immediately prior to the period the following: "or (3) for the dissemination of information derived from the foregoing programs or from research and demonstrations in the field of vocational education".

(j) (1) Paragraph (6) of section 8 of such Act is amended by striking out "and American Samoa" and by inserting in lieu thereof "American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

(2) Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 3(d) of such Act are amended by striking out the words "and the Virgin Islands" each time they occur and by inserting in lieu thereof "the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

(k) Section 10(c)(1) of such Act is amended by adding before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: "and less than one-third of any amount so allotted (or apportioned) need be applied to part-time schools or classes for workers who have entered upon employment".

(l) Section 201 of the Act of June 8, 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15aa), is amended by striking out "\$5,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$50,000,000".

AMEND TITLE II OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-

man from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House an outdated and unjust law which is causing severe hardship on the families of many of our soldiers who have fought and died in Vietnam—title II of the social security law which requires that a husband and wife be married for more than 1 year in order for the wife to receive a social security pension. It is outrageously unjust to ask our soldiers to risk their lives for freedom in the far-flung corners of the world while at the same time their dependents are unfairly discriminated against in our social security law. Action should be taken immediately to correct this injustice. To this end, I urge Congress to amend title II of the social security law to provide that a husband and wife need not be married for any particular length of time prior to the husband's death in order for the wife to qualify as a widow and to collect the benefits to which she is entitled provided her husband was a member of the Armed Forces drawing combat pay when he died.

I am sure the present law, which provides only for a small lump-sum death gratuity and no survivors benefits unless a child was born or conceived before the husband's death, was framed with the best intentions. But the law was enacted 30 years ago. Although this was just 4 years prior to our entrance into World War II, the war was foreseen only by a few men of exceptional foresight and vision and consequently little or no consideration was given as to how this provision would affect the families of recent or newly married men who were killed in the war or in the Korean war which followed it.

It is deeply regrettable that this provision went unchanged throughout the Second World War and the Korean conflict. The same provision in the law is bringing the same injustice to the widows of servicemen killed in Vietnam. While we all hope and pray for an honorable peace as quickly as possible, the present situation demands that we act now to avoid further undeserved sacrifices to the families of our soldiers who have given their lives in the cause of freedom.

I am aware of the original argument in favor of this provision which was intended to prohibit unscrupulous persons from taking advantage of the social security benefits which are available to deserving Americans. Specifically, it was aimed at preventing young women with children from knowingly marrying a man with a terminal illness in order to collect social security benefits. But under the present law, these unscrupulous people are equated with soldiers who have made the ultimate sacrifice for their country. This is patently unjust and quick and favorable action on my amendment would rectify this situation.

Two recent cases which have come to my attention will demonstrate to the

Congress the injustice of the present law and why this amendment is of the utmost importance. The first case involved Pfc. Andrew York from the little town of Chelsea, Maine. After his platoon was overrun by a battalion of Vietcong and both his legs were shattered by a mortar, he escaped from his Communist captors by chewing through the ropes that bound his wrists. Had he died, his wife whom he had married on May 5, only 1 week before leaving for Vietnam would have received no social security benefits. This blatant injustice compels me to introduce my amendment.

The second case concerns a young Marine sergeant who was killed in the act of singlehandedly destroying a Vietcong position. His heroic action brought him a posthumously awarded Navy Cross, our Nation's second highest military honor. Although he had contributed to social security for 13 years, his wife and his 8-year-old daughter by a previous marriage were advised that they were ineligible for social security benefits because he was killed 5 days before their first wedding anniversary.

After giving his life for his country, that same country refused to recognize its responsibility to his widow and child. His widow can be proud of her husband's valor while we must be ashamed of our neglect. To award him a medal is most fitting but it is not enough. We must prove our gratitude by recognizing our responsibility just as he recognized his responsibility. We must act quickly to eradicate this injustice from our laws. Let it not be said that we excused this intolerable situation by our inaction.

LAW AND ORDER MUST PREVAIL

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I join our colleagues in commending President Johnson for his swift reaction to the needs and demands of our country. He has always been alert to them and has never needed any prodding to do the right thing in any given instance.

His orders and directives in connection with the riots and civil disorders throughout the country have been firm and immediate.

His latest action in appointing a commission of outstanding public servants and citizens to determine the cause of this civil commotion will be applauded by all right-thinking persons.

This is but one more instance where every branch of our Government must cooperate in the best interests of all. This must be done on every level—municipal, State, and National—and in every department of government—the executive department through its law-enforcement agencies, the courts in expeditiously pursuing the judicial process, and the legislature in enacting new or additional laws wherever needed.

The appointment of this Presidential

Commission is not intended to take the place of any of our congressional committees but rather to assist them in their work.

This very morning the Banking and Currency Committee in executive session considered what, if any, legislation within its jurisdiction needed amplification or clarification to meet the necessities of the day. This was pursuant to the call of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. Without waiting for any suggestions or requests from any other sources, on his own motion he last week sent out the notice for this morning's meeting.

This job is not for one man or for any one group of men. All of us, in and out of government, must move forward together. With the aid of our citizenry we can solve the problem, provided we all agree that in this country there is no room for riots and civil commotion and that law and order must prevail. Our Constitution guarantees to each of us the rights of free men but imposes upon each of us the obligation to respect the rights and privileges of all.

No individual or group of individuals may take the law into their own hands. When we make it clear that those who do will be dealt with promptly and severely in accordance with law, all of us can again follow our daily pursuits without fear or favor.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S RESPONSE TO RIOTS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a commentary by TV correspondent Joseph F. McCaffrey. Mr. McCaffrey has made a lucid statement with respect to President Johnson's response to the riots in our urban centers. The chaos which prevails there is scarcely greater than that which the President's detractors have tried to create in the mind of the public.

As Mr. McCaffrey has pointed out, the facts show that the President is dedicated to serving all the people of the United States. The President's course has not been altered by the fact of the riots. His efforts to deal with urban problems predated the riots by years; but he has refused to have the Nation intimidated by crime and destruction. No President in time of travail has acquitted himself with greater distinction than President Johnson. Our people can be proud to have in the White House a man who has held firmly to a course both right and constructive while enduring the unreasoning and unfair criticism of those whose motives are highly suspect. Mr. McCaffrey's comments follow:

A BROADCAST COMMENTARY FROM JOSEPH McCAFFREY, JULY 25, 1967

This might be a good time to put in a kind word for President Johnson. He's the man in the middle.

Years ago they used to refer to Lucky Lyndon, but that luck has taken a sabbatical. The Viet Nam situation gets worse the longer it continues, while here at home the riots continue. The Republicans blame Mr. Johnson for the riots. Yet, what about the other side of the coin? President Johnson came under attack at the infamous black power conference. Why? Because, according to the attack, he offered aid in putting down the Newark riots, and that showed he was against the Negro.

Is being for law and order, being against the Negro? Who has lost the most in the Detroit riots, besides the merchants who were burned out or looted out, and the property owners who saw their investments leveled to the ground? The Negro who was burned out of his home . . . that is who lost the most. Doesn't law and order help the Negro as much as it helps the white man?

Yet, President Johnson earned the scorn of the black power spokesmen, by standing for law and order. It is time that all of us made a choice, and this means those who are black as well as those who are white: We are either for law and order, or not. We either cast our lot with sanity and civilization or with the reckless, irresponsible spokesmen of black power, who have nothing and so have nothing to lose, and who would have nothing no matter what kind of a system they lived under.

President Johnson has many problems, more perhaps than any man who has ever occupied the White House. If any man needed the prayers of his people, he does. We shall overcome, law and order will overcome, but these times are a great trial for all of the country, but none of us can be suffering the shame, the sorrow and the despair as the man who serves all of us, as President of the United States.

RESOLUTION ON RHODESIA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, last week, I introduced, along with 56 other Members of the House of Representatives, a resolution to affirm the support of the House for the United Nations program of sanctions against the minority regime in Rhodesia and for the principle of majority rule before independence for the people of Southern Rhodesia.

It is my belief that the United Nations represents a hope for peace which can, nevertheless, be fulfilled only to the degree that its members support the principles of the charter and the actions voted by the collective body.

I think we have to admit that all too often we have not met our obligations in this respect. All too often, we have bypassed the international machinery of the United Nations to pursue what we judge to be necessary according to our own national interest. This I believe to be destructive of the strength and competence of the United Nations.

I shall continue to urge our national policy as one of consistent support of the U.N. and where there are international disputes, that we refer these disputes to the U.N. for mediation and settlement.

In the case of Rhodesia, we have a clear-cut decision, having been debated and approved without dissent in the Security Council, to apply economic sanctions against the unrepresentative, undemocratic Government of Rhodesia. The United States supported this decision as a part of our traditional policy of self-determination for all peoples. And, finally, the President has issued an Executive order for our participation in the U.N. sanctions.

I believe it incumbent upon the Congress to indicate our support of these sanctions and to reaffirm our faith in the United Nations as an international body for seeking peace among all nations. I urge the House to consider this resolution and act favorably upon it as soon as possible.

HOUSE RESOLUTION ON SOUTHERN RHODESIA

Whereas the President of the United States has said, "As a basic part of our national tradition we support self-determination and an orderly transition to majority rule in every quarter of the globe. These principles . . . guide our policy today toward Rhodesia"; and

Whereas the Security Council of the United Nations on December 16, 1966, having voted without dissent to apply economic sanctions against the present minority regime in Southern Rhodesia; and

Whereas the United States supported this action in the Security Council and the President promulgated Executive Order No. 11322 to initiate United States participation in the United Nations sanctions; and

Whereas the success of the sanctions program would greatly enhance the future effectiveness of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security;

Now, therefore, be it Resolved that it is the sense of the House of Representatives

That it affirms its support for continuing United States participation in the program of sanctions voted by the Security Council of the United Nations; and

That it affirms its support for the principle of majority rule before independence for the people of Southern Rhodesia.

OUR PRIORITIES ARE OUT OF BALANCE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Jerome Cavanagh made a forthright and eloquent statement about the tragedy which engulfed Detroit last week. He did not indulge in any political blame-shifting. Each question asked by the reporters on the "Meet the Press" program yesterday was answered fully and honestly. We desperately need in this Congress the courage and frankness shown by Mayor Cavanagh. The Washington Post this morning carried substantial excerpts from the Mayor's statements, headlined "Our Priorities Are Out of Balance."

Sunday's Post contained two articles on the financial page which forcefully support the Mayor's conclusions. I request unanimous consent to have the

three articles printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following these remarks:

OUR PRIORITIES ARE OUT OF BALANCE

(Excerpts from Mayor Cavanagh's appearance on the television program "Meet the Press")

ON THE RIOT'S CAUSE

It is a national malady, that which occurred in Detroit, and could just as easily have happened in any other major American City . . . I think Detroit by anyone's standards had done at least all the textbook things in relation to dealing with some of these urban problems, and still it broke out. Basically we were confronted with the thousands of people that felt alienated from our society . . . that are outside of our society. Not just a white society, but the society in which most of the Negroes and most of the whites belong. And, given the slightest provocation, in many instances even no provocation is needed, the law is taken into their own hands.

ON COMMUNICATION

I don't know of any government in America, local government, or national government, or any institution for that matter, that is communicating in any way or carrying on any kind of a dialogue with the so-called have-nots.

ON POLICE TACTICS

Sunday morning in any big city is almost like Pearl Harbor on Sunday morning. We are at our weakest. There are fewer men on the streets . . . And when our police department moved in, the crowd just overwhelmed them and we were attempting to protect firemen when they were fighting fires . . . Now it was their (police officers') judgment out on the street that morning that these rioters and looters were just going to overwhelm them if they shot into the crowd . . . But I think in all candor that I would have to say to you that the role of the police officer and the definition of his authority and his authority to act out on the street should be more clearly defined.

ON CONGRESS'S ROLE

We have, gentlemen, in my judgment at least, a highly reactionary Congress in the broadest sense of that term, and this is reflected, unfortunately, at times, even in the Administration. But there is no question about the fact that the Administration has proposed program after program to the Congress and the Congress just seems to ignore it. They laugh and holler and rail when they vote down a minor rat-control bill for the cities, and yet pay two or three or four times that amount of money just for the storage of cotton in any one year.

We have great difficulty even getting through Congress a \$75 million appropriation for summer programs. And yet, compare that to the \$70 billion that this country has committed for defense.

There is a madness in the country and the Congress reacts by being indifferent. Sometimes not just indifferent, just by being completely negative about it.

So I think there is a lot of things that can be done and one of the first things certainly is a change on the part of the attitude of the people in this country and hopefully it will be reflected in Congress.

ON NATIONAL PRIORITIES

What will it profit this country if we, say, put our man on the moon by 1970 and at the same time you can't walk down Woodward Avenue in this city without some fear of violence?

And we may be able to pacify every village in Vietnam, over a period of years, but what good does it do if we can't pacify the American cities?

What I am saying . . . is that our priorities in this country are all out of balance . . .

Maybe Detroit was a watershed this week in American history and it might well be that out of the ashes of this city comes the national resolve to do far more than anything we have done in the past.

ON WHAT CAN BE DONE

We could demonstrate, by examining the records of the four or five thousand people that have been arrested, that they just have not been very significantly . . . involved in our educational process. So education certainly speaks . . . to the cause of riots. So does the provision of jobs. So does housing. Our housing situation in this country is a national disgrace.

Until we start to do these things, provide some guarantee of money or income for all of our people in this country, and until the Congress begins to realistically deal with the problems of the cities, we are going to have not just a continuation but I'd say—and it is terrible to contemplate—we are going to have some things far, far worse.

It may well be that Washington, D.C.—and I hate to think of this, and I would pray that it would never happen, but if what happened in Detroit this week happened in Washington, D.C., this might lift the veil off the eyes of the members of Congress.

ON THE ROLE OF CITIES

They have the fewest resources and as Professor Galbraith once said, you couldn't structure a worse design than we have in America. The cities and the local governments, the mayors, have all the problems of crime, delinquency—we can tick them all off—the states traditionally have ignored their responsibility in this area and the Federal Government deals almost semi-apologetically with them.

[From the Washington Post]

RACE BIAS COSTS NATION BILLIONS

(By Hobart Rowen)

The conservative guess is that the property damage in Detroit, as a consequence of the terrible riot, was \$200 million—or somewhat more than the cost of Watts.

But this is a mere pittance, a shadow of the real economic cost of racial discrimination in the United States—and the economic damage itself pales alongside the human and social costs.

The economic impact of racial discrimination—which is a loss for the whole country, and not just for Negroes—can serve as a dim guide to the larger tragedy.

The estimates are necessarily crude. But they are suggestive of the incredible price the Nation pays for making second-class citizens of its Negroes.

Former Economic Council Chairman Walter W. Heller, for example, estimated in 1965 that if 10 million among the poor were able to earn just \$1000 more a year each, the Nation's total gross national product would increase by \$14 billion.

Last year, the Council of Economic Advisers estimated the economic cost of discrimination at \$27 billion—equal to 4 per cent of GNP.

That, it might be observed, is also about the same as the cost of the Vietnam war—and if part of those costs had been directed instead to the war against poverty, there might not have been so much terror in the slums last week.

The bulk of the \$27 billion that the CEA estimates to be the dollar cost of racial discrimination, \$22 billion, is traced to lack of education and training among Negroes. In turn, this reduces their average productivity, or potential.

Social and economic policies that keep Negroes out of jobs, thus hiking the unemployment rate above the average white rate, account for the other \$5 billion.

None of these figures can be considered precisely accurate, or even totally realistic.

Equalization of White and Negro productivity rates can't be achieved overnight; perhaps that can't be done in this century.

Moreover, a proper and meaningful investment in our human resources, Black and White, will require some billions of dollars to begin with.

But somewhere between zero and \$27 billion—and Heller's \$14 billion is as good a horseback estimate as any—there is a tremendous economic loss underscoring the national disgrace that is shaming the cities and the Nation.

The senseless and passionate rioting, meanwhile, will make life in the ghettos even worse than before. Insurance companies tend to pull out, or to raise their rates to abortive levels. Thus, some stores and facilities destroyed by fire and looting never get replaced. But the Nation's bill for public assistance, and fighting crime and delinquency gets bigger instead of smaller.

Back in 1962, the Economic Report of the President said: "Discriminatory practices in education, training, employment and union membership impede the development and utilization of human resources. They reduce the efficiency and slow the growth of the economy, at the same time they alter—and alter inequitably—the distribution of the fruits of economic progress."

No one argued with that simple statement. But too few did too little about it.

And no one argues with it now. But who is doing anything about it?

[From the Washington Post, July 30, 1967]
ECONOMISTS DOUBT THE VALUE OF VIETNAM'S DOLLAR INFUSION

(By Richard Harwood)

SAIGON, July 29.—"Your American Aid," Dr. Phan Quang Dan remarked, "is like an iron lung. It keeps the patient alive. But if we do not learn to breathe ourselves, we will become a nation of beggars."

Dr. Dan, a member of the National Assembly and a candidate for vice president this year, was talking about a problem that worries both Americans and South Vietnamese: How can the country be made self-sufficient?

It is potentially one of the richest agricultural lands in Southeast Asia. But as the war has dragged on it has ceased to be able to feed itself. Saigon will import more than 700,000 tons of rice this year from the United States and other countries.

LIVE ON AMERICANS

Most nations at war, Dr. Dan has said, at least develop an industrial base to meet their military requirements. "But we produce nothing," he says. "We just live on the Americans."

Officials in the American economic mission are in substantial agreement.

"We have practically paved this country with airstrips," said one. "But I don't know what these people will do with them when the war is over. I guess they'll tear them up to plant rice."

"We've put very little of value in here," said another economist. "There have been a few textile and plastics plants, but not much. And in any case this country has no industrial future. Its main future lies in the countryside, in agriculture."

SUPERFICIAL PROSPERITY

On the surface, the cities of South Vietnam are prospering greatly from the war. The streets are jammed with motorbikes and imported cars. Saigon has a new department store offering everything from air conditioning units and television sets to expensive Scotch whisky. The mini-skirt has arrived.

But to the economists, it is a synthetic prosperity, underwritten by American dollars.

Before the Americans arrived in force in 1965, the economy here was stagnant. Unemployment was high. But under the impact of U.S. spending, cities like Saigon became a commercial paradise for the merchant class.

The government bureaucracy in Saigon expanded enormously with U.S. subsidies that make up 35 per cent of the national payroll. Today nearly a million Vietnamese are on the government payroll, including more than 300,000 civilians. Another 200,000 or so Vietnamese found jobs with American Government agencies and private American contractors. Thus, the unemployment problem was licked.

FEW PRODUCTION WORKERS

But to most economists and to politicians like Dr. Dan these are temporary solutions. The industrial labor force still contains fewer than 100,000 production workers. Hundreds of thousands of refugees are in government camps, unable to return to their farms because of the war. Dock and harbor installations are teeming with activity. But if the American logistical effort were to decline or cease, they would become idle again.

Dan blames the government of Premier Ky for the lack of economic development. "They have said," according to Dan, "that they have so many American dollars they don't know what to do with them. There is no new industry. Agriculture is paralyzed. Land reform is a critical problem but it has not been carried out vigorously. We should have an agrarian revolution."

Similar complaints are heard from other Vietnamese. A prominent attorney, Vu Van Huyen, has asked how the government can justify new hotels for Saigon "when peasants are starving." Gen. Nguyen Duc Thanh, Minister for Revolutionary Development, argues that there can be no revolution in the countryside so long as the Saigon night clubs and other symbols of the affluent life continue to flourish.

American officials argue, however, that U.S. dollars already are trickling down to the poor. In 1965 and 1966, they said, the main beneficiaries of U.S. spending were the urban merchants and middlemen. But within the last year, they say, the working classes have enjoyed major income gains that have not been wiped out by inflation, which is at the current rate of 40 to 50 per cent a year.

FARM PROGRESS SEEN

Even the farmers, the Americans maintain, are beginning to share in the prosperity. The price paid to delta farmers for rice has doubled and they have begun acquiring substantial quantities of consumer goods.

But the problem of building a permanent and self-sustaining economy remains and there is little evidence that either the Ky government or its American advisers have done much planning toward that goal.

"When," an American adviser in a delta province asked recently, "is the last time you heard about the Mekong River project?"

No one could recall.

THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, the Judiciary Committee reported favorably on H.R. 5037, as amended, the administration's safe streets and crime control bill, renamed the law enforcement and criminal justice bill by the House committee. I am introducing an identical bill at this time as an indica-

tion of my full support for this legislation.

The Government Operations Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs, of which I am chairman, has recently been holding hearings on the Federal effort and capabilities to combat organized crime. It is abundantly clear to me from these hearings, from the newspapers, and from the statistics, that immediate and more effective action must be taken against crime in all its various manifestations.

The statistics are appalling. FBI reports indicate that since 1958 crime has been increasing at a rate more than six times greater than the rate of population growth. During the first 3 months of this year there were 20 percent more crimes than during the same period in 1966, representing the highest rise recorded during the 9 years the FBI has been keeping records. Crime during this period was up in every category, in all parts of the country, and in all types of communities. Crimes of violence, up 20 percent, showed the highest increase by category. The West showed the highest area increase, up 21 percent. The 22-percent increase of crime in the suburbs topped the 20-percent increase in the cities—a situation which it appears will be reversed for this third quarter of 1967.

The evidence overwhelming indicates that the problem of crime in this Nation requires and must receive, from all levels of government, attention commensurate with that now given such recognized social issues as health and education. We must check the current ominously dependable steady increase in crime recorded every 3 months by the FBI. Enactment of the law enforcement and criminal justice bill would seem to be a significant step in this direction.

The emphasis of this legislation is on planning and coordination, expansion and improvement of existing resources and programs, research, and innovation. The requirement that the action programs be preceded by the development of fairly comprehensive law enforcement and criminal justice plans, preferably encompassing one or more States or units of local government, seems to me particularly valuable. All branches of our criminal justice system suffer both from the absence of coordinated planning and from the objective assessment of results. As a first step to improvement, our criminal justice system must be viewed rationally and realistically, as amenable to analysis, planning, and systematic organization.

The emphasis on research seems equally important. The Science and Technology Task Force of the President's Crime Commission noted in their separate report that basic research is the biggest single need throughout the criminal justice system. This Nation currently spends more than \$2 billion each year on crime control. According to the task force report, we have virtually no knowledge of the effectiveness of the measures on which this money is being spent. Some statistics arrived at by the task force's computerized investigations would seem to indicate that these measures are less effective than they might be: The average lawbreaker can be expected to be ar-

rested three or four times for serious crimes, and will cost society \$12,000 to process through the criminal justice system.

The Attorney General said aptly in his testimony on this bill that it, and I quote, "seeks to create and guide new investment." We need new investment in this field, and both new and old investment alike would clearly benefit from informed guidance. The need is urgent and the time is now. I urge that this bill be passed.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN OFF-BASE HOUSING

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I think that the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, is to be commended for his effective and intelligent action with regard to equal opportunity for military personnel in the rental of off-base housing. By his action in declaring off limits those apartment houses which discriminate against military personnel because of their race, he has brought new hope to many discouraged servicemen and their dependents. I hope that his action in the Washington, D.C., area will be followed by similar action throughout the country.

It is unthinkable that men who are serving their country well should be told by a landlord that they are not welcome. It is also most damaging to their morale.

It is ironic that our Military Establishment must lead the way for civilians in obtaining equal rights. This development started when President Harry S. Truman truly integrated the armed services, and I am pleased that it is continuing with regard to the right to obtain decent housing. I commend Secretary McNamara on his action, which is in the best tradition of what should be expected of the military arm of a democracy.

COMMENT ON RIOTS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, for some while now I have been planning to comment on the riots which our Nation has endured in the past few days. I had wanted to try to point out the nature of the crisis the country faces, and the fact that while the incredible misery of our urban slums does not justify these riots—indeed, nothing could justify them—it does help to explain them.

But yesterday, His Eminence Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, sent to the Catholics of his diocese a pastoral letter, which was read from every Catholic pulpit. The cardinal's letter so eloquently states the nature of the civil unrest we are facing, the root causes, and the sensible remedies that I feel I have nothing left to say on the subject. The cardinal has put in to a powerful letter all that has to be said. Under unanimous consent I include his letter in full at this point in the RECORD:

My dear people in Christ: Our President spoke for all of us when he said last Thursday evening, for all the world to hear that "we have endured a week such as no nation should live through: a time of violence and tragedy." Now that the violence, at long last, has subsided—permanently, we hope and pray—some of us may be sorely tempted to throw up our hands in utter despair and to settle, in a mood of bitter hatred and cynical frustration, for an uncertain and uneasy stalemate, a state of permanent martial law. This would be a fatal mistake and one which would only compound the frightful tragedy of recent days.

We would be better advised to look for signs of progress and hope on the darkened horizon of urban America. For my own part, I see at least a glimmer of hope in the fact that so many Americans, instead of pinning the blame on someone else as a kind of sacrificial scapegoat, are now willing, perhaps for the first time, to examine their own conscience and to assume their own full share of responsibility for the disastrous events of the past few weeks.

Under no circumstances, can the violence and lawlessness which have paralyzed so many of our urban centers be excused or condoned. Every right-minded citizen must concur with the solemn judgment of four of the nation's most respected Negro leaders, namely, that "killing, arson and looting are criminal acts and should be dealt with as such." The President of the United States has already assured the nation that these crimes will most certainly be dealt with as such, but he has also * * * and with all the solemnity that his high office can command that we cannot be satisfied with "the uneasy calm of martial law" but must look for "a public order built on steady progress in meeting the needs of our people."

We believe that God is calling each of us to respond to this urgent challenge in terms of our religious faith and to do so with complete honesty and with a firm resolve to amend our ways and to make reparation for our past failures and past sins of omission.

NEEDED—UNDERSTANDING AND COMPASSION

We are obliged, as followers of Christ, to be ambassadors of reconciliation. We must bring to our disorganized and demoralized urban centers a healing ministry, a ministry of understanding and compassion.

We need to probe beneath the violence and destruction of the recent riots and to try to understand their underlying causes. We must do everything within our power to remedy, without delay, the long-standing injustices and festering grievances which are the natural breeding ground of lawless rebellion.

We must come to realize that riots, however senseless they may be, are the frenzied cry of alienated people who are trying to tell us, out of a sense of enervating despair and utter hopelessness, that they want to be heard and want to participate as full-fledged American citizens in the economic, social and cultural life of our cities and our nation. Riots are a way—a completely irrational way, if you will, but for some people, unfortunately, the only way they can think of—to get their message to the rest of us who

have long since achieved the rights and benefits and privileges which they are now determined, after many generations of neglect and delay, to achieve for themselves and their children.

We Christians, following the example of our Lord and Master who had compassion on the multitude and showed a special predilection for the poor and underprivileged, must listen humbly and attentively to this desperate call from the festering slums of America and must repentantly strive to see the hand of God's judgment in the shattering events of recent days.

We must be willing to acknowledge our own responsibility for perpetuating a system which sooner or later, as the recent riots have tragically demonstrated, was inevitably bound to erupt in violence.

We must honestly recognize and admit that we have not done many of the things that we should have been doing and have too often done things which we ought not to have been doing in the field of social justice.

TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE

Our efforts to eliminate segregated slum housing have been feeble. Our support of desperately needed programs of job training and job opportunities for unemployed Negroes in our ghettos has been far less than adequate. Our education system throughout the nation moves at a snail's pace in its faltering efforts to readjust to the rapidly changing situation in our crowded urban centers and to provide the kind of education needed in the inner city. Our programs of urban renewal have not been designed primarily to meet the needs of disadvantaged low income families. Too often, to the contrary, these families have been the victims rather than the beneficiaries of urban renewal. Our welfare programs have too often been paternalistic, demeaning, and inadequate and have weakened family life.

We have tolerated the commercial exploitation of ghetto residents by excessively high prices, inflated credit rates, and inferior products. We have been too insensitive to the intimidation of inner city residents and too slow other governmental agencies.

We have too often taken it for granted, all too paternalistically, that we, as outsiders, know what is best for people in the ghetto. We have not fully understood that they need and want—desperately want—to participate in the making of decisions which affect their lives; that they need and want to find a sense of dignity and human worth in responsibly working out their own destiny. We have too readily assumed that we have a "model" city, unmindful of the fact that for tens of thousands of our fellow citizens the nation's capital is a blighted ghetto.

INTERFAITH ACTION

I have already noted that I see some hope in the fact that so many Christians—and so many of our fellow citizens of our faiths—are approaching the current crisis in this spirit of honest self-examination and sincere repentance. This is a good beginning, but we must now be prepared to pay the price of our religious convictions. As the President has pointed out, "This is not a time for angry reaction. It is a time for action, starting with legislative action to improve life in our cities."

In response to this challenge, we should immediately adopt certain priority measures designed to meet the immediate crisis and must do so, in the words of the President, "not because we are frightened by conflict, but because we are fired by conscience." At the national level, we need, at the very minimum, dramatic and far-reaching improvements in the anti-poverty program of the Federal government, whatever the cost of these improvements. We also need a far-reaching program of Federal public works to provide employment for the great mass

of unemployed Negro youth and a vastly expanded health and welfare program, together with an adequate program of rent supplements.

LOCAL NEEDS

Here at the local level we need: An adequate system of local self government.

An increased budget for our public schools. A Model Cities program.

A substantial increase in the number of low and moderate income housing units either at the Bolling Air Force Base or at the National Training School site.

All of these legislative programs will cost money and may call for an increase of taxes. Let us not selfishly reject them for this reason and, above all, let us not use the costly war in Vietnam as a feeble excuse or rationalization for postponing action on them in the Congress. We are not faced with a choice between guns and butter—between the tragic war in Vietnam and a vast program of domestic, social and economic reform. Whatever the cost of the war, we have no choice but to meet our responsibilities here at home. To refuse to do so and to rationalize our refusal in the name of the war, would be a tragic distortion of the meaning of true patriotism and might well result in a national disaster much worse than any defeat which we have ever suffered in a time of war.

Needless to add, the list of legislative reforms referred to above is not meant to be exhaustive, nor is it meant to suggest that legislation alone can be expected to solve the present crisis. On the contrary, private initiative is absolutely indispensable on many fronts. We therefore appeal to the business community, to organized labor, realtors, investors and every other influential group in the private economy to begin to look for new and imaginative methods of helping to solve the explosive problems of our blighted cities. In turn, we solemnly pledge the full support of the Catholic Church in the Archdiocese of Washington in this common effort to make up for lost time and to develop "a public order built on steady progress in meeting the needs of our people."

Faithfully yours in Christ,

PATRICK CARDINAL O'BOYLE,
Archbishop of Washington.

THE GREATEST CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, needless to say, every law-abiding American citizen regardless of race, creed or color, is concerned over the recent riots and their increasing number. I have stated several times that the greatest civil right is that of the protection of one's life and property against the willful violators of our criminal laws. This bill does not purport to affect any civil rights legislation, but it is an attempt to assist the law-abiding American citizen with their property rights; therefore, we might term this bill a "property rights bill."

The Department of Justice and the Federal courts enforce the 1964 Civil Rights Act under the premise of our interstate commerce, for under the Pure

Food and Drug Act, the Supreme Court has clearly upheld the right of the Federal Government to follow goods to the time they are sold to the ultimate consumer. Surely it is reasonable that the same Department of Justice should have the right and the duty to assist the States in this most important aspect of law enforcement for the same reason.

We have seen in recent days in spite of a noble attempt on the part of local and State law enforcement agencies, that it is not enough to cope with the unlawful rioting and looting, and so I think it appropriate that the resources of the Federal law enforcement agencies should be combined with those at the local level in this serious fight against the breakdown of law and order. This bill simply defined, does nothing more or less than make it a Federal offense to engage in the act of looting during a period of rioting.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A BIPARTISAN GOVERNMENT PROGRAM EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the United States is facing a very serious budgetary situation. The costs of the war in Vietnam have mounted to the point where we will spend about \$77 billion on the national defense. This gigantic military budget, more than any other single Federal expenditure, is responsible for our growing budget deficit and our national debt.

The Appropriations Committee of the House, in its action on 11 of the regular 14 appropriation bills for the current fiscal year, has already trimmed over \$3 billion from the administration's requests.

In an effort to find effective, intelligent and extensive guidelines for expenditure control, I am cosponsoring legislation calling for the establishment of a bipartisan Government Program Evaluation Commission to conduct a complete evaluation of existing Federal programs to determine their importance and their effectiveness. Congress needs to have a better understanding of the relative priorities of all the Federal activities in order to continuously exercise intelligent expenditure control.

There is no end in sight for our struggle in Vietnam, and with its costs so high, there will be greater pressure on the domestic portion of the budget to compensate for the rising defense budget. In my judgment, there are some domestic programs which cannot be reduced or postponed. For example, I feel that we must proceed with the model cities program.

There are literally thousands of Federal activities and programs, and the Congress has need for the best thinking it can find to develop an intelligent sys-

tem of priorities to phase out nonessential programs, to stretch out or postpone spending on less essential programs, and to move vigorously on those domestic activities which continue to be of the utmost importance. Congress must make choices among the national wants and needs, and I believe that the creation of the Government Program Evaluation Commission will assist us in making these choices.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to include a recent editorial from the Syracuse Post-Standard on this proposed legislation.

HOW TO CUT SPENDING

Passage of a bill increasing the national debt limit by \$22 billion, to \$358 billion, has set Congress to wondering how it can control the growth of federal expenditures more effectively.

Rep. Wilbur D. Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, suggests a new approach.

He would establish a bipartisan Government Evaluation Commission of 12 members appointed by the President, the House and the Senate.

The commission would hold hearings, evaluate programs and decide which ones should get priority in the allocation of funds.

It would guide the House in determining where cuts should be made, and provide information not now available.

Congressmen simply do not have the knowledge necessary to curb spending nor the time to study the programs involved in vast government operations. A bipartisan commission should be able to simplify decisions.

Congress must rely to a large extent on the recommendations of the executive branch in dealing with financial matters. It often does not know whether a program should be continued or has become so obsolete it should be junked.

Rep. Mills is an old hand at wielding the ax on appropriations. If he thinks a commission would help in reducing expenditures, his plan deserves support.

MOST REV. FRANCIS ZAYEK, D.D., FIRST BISHOP OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH MARONITE EASTERN RITES IN UNITED STATES, VISITS ST. ANTHONY'S CHURCH, SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Most Reverend Francis Zayek, D.D., first bishop of the Catholic Church Maronite Rites in North America, made his first visit to St. Anthony's Maronite Church in Springfield, Mass., on May 10 and 11. Bishop Zayek received a very warm welcome in my home city, concelebrated an evening Maronite liturgy Mass in Our Lady of Hope Church and, confirmed 80 children of St. Anthony's Church.

The Maronite diocese of North America and the United States was created by Pope Paul VI in 1966 and Bishop Zayek was appointed by His Holiness as the first Eastern Maronite bishop, with

Detroit as the cathedral city of his see. Pope Paul created the new Eastern Maronite diocese to show his awareness of the spiritual needs of Maronites in the United States and because the Holy See wished to fulfill the decrees of the Ecumenical Council Vatican II.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the telegram I sent to the dinner reception honoring Bishop Zayek, and newspaper accounts of the bishop's visit, taken from the Springfield Sunday Republican of May 7, the Springfield Union of May 8 and 11, and the Springfield Daily News of May 11, 1967:

MAY 11, 1967.

Mrs. SIMON A. SIMON,
Arrangements Chairman, Bishop Zayek Reception, East Longmeadow, Mass.

Please permit me to use this means to extend my warm welcome to Greater Springfield to the Most Rev. Francis M. Zayek, Apostolic Exarch and first Maronite Rites bishop in the United States. Profoundly regret that I am unable to personally join with the Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon, Roman Catholic Bishop of the Springfield Diocese, members of the clergy, the religious and the laity for this momentous occasion. House Appropriations Committee budget hearings necessitate my remaining in Washington, but I can assure you that I am with you in spirit tonight. Everyone in our community is aware of the splendid contributions, religious, patriotic and culturally, of the members of the Maronite Rites of the Eastern Catholic Church to the American way of life. We especially appreciate the significant post-Vatican II Ecumenical Council recognition by His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, in assigning Bishop Zayek as shepherd of the Maronite Rites flock in North America. Please extend my very best wishes to Bishop Zayek on his first visitation with the parishioners of St. Anthony's Church. I join them in prayer that His Excellency may have a long, fruitful and blessed ministry in his North American see.

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Member of Congress.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Sunday Republican, May 7, 1967]

FIRST MARONITE RITE BISHOP OF NORTH AMERICA WILL BE GREETED FOR CITY TOUR WEDNESDAY

The Most Rev. Francis Zayek, first bishop of the Catholic Church, Maronite rites to North America and the U.S., will arrive in this city, Wednesday on his first official visit to Western Massachusetts.

In 1966, the Maronite Diocese of North America and the United States was created by Pope Paul VI, and Bishop Zayek named the first bishop of the Eastern Maronite rites to this part of the world.

Bishop Zayek will spend two days here in a closely packed schedule of religious affairs, meetings, and social events, which will draw Maronite rite priests from all over the east coast.

Rev. Maurice Karam, pastor of St. Anthony's Maronite Catholic Church on Island Pond Rd., will greet Bishop Zayek, together with Tofie A. George, who is general chairman of the two-day event. A motorcade is being organized to leave Fynchon Park at 12:30 Wednesday and meet Bishop Zayek's plane at Bradley International Airport, in Windsor Locks, Conn.

KEYS TO CITY

Entering this city, the bishop will be met at City Hall where he will be presented the keys to the city by Mayor Ryan. At 7 p.m., Bishop Zayek will concelebrate in the Maronite liturgy mass at Our Lady of Hope Church, Carew and Armory Sts. This will be

followed by confirmation for some 80 children of St. Anthony's Church.

Bishop Zayek will be the guest of Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon, bishop of the Springfield Diocese, while in this area and on Thursday will be the guest of honor at luncheon and then at the grand banquet in the evening in the Willow Glen, East Longmeadow.

During the day, he also will visit the proposed site of the new St. Anthony's Church on Island Pond Rd., where the church will build a new sanctuary to replace its old structure which lies in the urban renewal area.

Designated as the first Maronite exarch of the U.S. and North America by Pope Paul, Bishop Zayek was born in Cuba in 1920 of Lebanese parents and served as an altar boy at the Catholic church near Guantanamo Bay. When his father realized that the boy desired to become a priest, the youth learned for the first time of the Maronite or Arabic language rites, and also learned that members of his family had been the parish priests in Ghajir, Lebanon for more than 120 years.

He went to Lebanon, the youth's uncle, Rev. George Zayek, pastor of the Church of Our Lady there, supervised the boy's education and his instruction in Arabic, French and Syriac, rather than his fluent Spanish. In 1939, after schooling in Beyrouth, he was admitted to the College for the Propagation of the Faith in Rome, and was ordained in 1946.

ASSIGNED TO CAIRO

He attended the Lateran University for Canon Law for two years, and then was transferred to the Cathedral in Cairo where he was appointed rector in 1951, and assigned as secretary of the apostolic internunciature. In 1956, he was appointed by the Pope to the Tribunal at the Rota in Rome, in charge of all cases pertaining to the Oriental Rites which were presented to the court.

With the awakening of renewed interest in Oriental Rites, Fr. Francis was appointed professor of Oriental Canon Law at the International College of St. Anselm in 1959 and in 1960 named papal chamberlain and professor at Lateran University, where he taught until 1962, becoming a monsignor.

At that time Msgr. Zayek was appointed bishop of the Maronite Rites in Brazil, in accordance with the Pope's desire to see the Eastern church flourish. This was the first time that a Maronite bishop had been appointed to a diocese outside of the Middle East. Thousands of Maronites greeted their new bishop at Rio de Janeiro in 1962, and a new cathedral was built there and the diocese expanded in the years that followed.

In 1966, Pope Paul, aware of the needs of the Maronites in the U.S. and wishing to fulfill the decrees of the Vatican Council, appointed Bishop Zayek to his present post.

A Maronite seminary, Our Lady of Lebanon Seminary in Washington, D.C., is training seminarians to serve as Maronite priests throughout the more than 50 parishes of the church in America.

SPECIAL EVENTS TO MARK MARONITE BISHOP'S VISIT

Members of St. Anthony's Maronite Catholic Church have planned a two-day program of events to honor the visit of Most Rev. Francis M. Zayek, Apostolic Exarch and first Maronite Rites bishop to North America and the United States, who arrives here Wednesday.

MOTORCADE

Bishop Zayek will be met at Bradley International Airport by a motorcade from Springfield which will form at Fynchon Park Wednesday at 12:30 p.m. Riding in the lead car with the bishop will be Rev. Maurice Karam, pastor of St. Anthony's Maronite Church here, Rev. Lee Ganim, the bishop's secretary; City Council President John M.

Sullivan of Springfield; and Tofie George, general chairman of the two-day event.

Upon his arrival in Springfield, Bishop Zayek will be welcomed at City Hall and presented the keys to the city by Mayor Ryan, and then will be escorted to St. Anthony's rectory.

At 5 p.m. at St. Anthony's rectory, a supper will be served for the bishop and his party together with visiting Maronite priests and priests from this area and invited guests. Mrs. Nelson Saliba heads this committee assisted by Mrs. Elias Thomas and Mrs. Norman Thomas.

At 7 p.m., at Our Lady of Hope Church, the confirmation of the children will take place in the Maronite rite, con-celebrated by Bishop Zayek. Approximately 80 children, their sponsors, parents, and visiting priests, nuns, and friends and parishioners will attend this service.

RECEPTION

At 8:30 p.m. there will be a reception and buffet at the Lebanese-American Club, Worthington St., sponsored by the Ladies' Guild and Men's Club for the congregation. Chairman of this event is Mrs. Joseph Stevens.

Thursday at noon, there will be a luncheon at the Men's Club on Worthington St., for the bishop, visiting clergy, and the Latin rites clergy of Springfield. An all-Arabic menu will be served by a committee headed by Mrs. Mary Deeb and Mrs. Jennie Zadie.

BANQUET PLANNED

Mrs. Alfred J. Ferris is chairman of the grand banquet Thursday evening at the Willow Glen, with Mrs. Simon A. Simon and Mrs. Joseph Kawie as co-chairmen and Raymond Stevens as the master of ceremonies. Ticket chairman is Victor Joseph and Beth Saliba is reservations chairman.

Invited guests and dignitaries who will be seated at the head table include Bishop Christopher J. Weldon, Cong. Edward T. Boland, Rev. Steven Papadoulas, and out-of-town clergymen.

MARONITE BISHOP ZAYEK CONFIRMS 80 DURING FIRST OFFICIAL VISIT TO AREA

Bishop Zayek was greeted at Bradley International Airport, Windsor Locks, Conn., by a large delegation from St. Anthony's Maronite Catholic Church, Island Pond Rd., and was escorted by motorcade to this city.

He was presented a key to the city by Mayor Ryan at City Hall and was then escorted to St. Anthony's parish house where he received visiting priests and guests.

Bishop Zayek participated in the concelebration of the Maronite liturgy mass in Our Lady of Hope Church, Armory St., and the confirmation of about 80 children of St. Anthony's Church.

A reception and buffet at the Lebanese-American Club in Worthington St., followed the mass with more than 200 parishioners attending.

Bishop Zayek said, "I have had a wonderful day and have been well received by the people and the officials of the city."

The bishop will have a press conference this morning at 9, followed by an inspection of the proposed site of the new St. Anthony's Church on Island Pond Rd., and a luncheon at noon at the Lebanese-American Club.

Bishop Zayek will be guest of honor at a banquet tonight at the Willow Glen House, East Longmeadow, Friday, he will leave for New Bedford and will return to his see in Detroit on Sunday.

CITY VISITOR—MUCH TRAVEL JUST PART OF BISHOP ZAYEK'S JOB

(By Claude Doig)

Fifty thousand miles in the past eight months—just part of the job for Most Rev. Francis Zayek, Maronite bishop of the United

States and North America, presently visiting here.

Bishop Zayek was appointed as the first Maronite exarch of this country by Pope Paul VI on March 9, 1966.

The bishop is making his first official visit to the 47 churches in his massive diocese. His host is St. Anthony's Catholic parish, one of seven Maronite churches in the state.

Churches of the Maronite rite of the Roman Catholic Church are situated in 19 different states and Washington, D.C. They are located from coast to coast.

Thus the 50,000 miles in the past eight months.

ASSUMING CONTROL

Until a Maronite bishop was appointed, the churches were under a co-operative jurisdiction of the Latin dioceses, which for St. Anthony's Catholic Church was the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield.

The property deeds and legal aspects were tied to the local diocese. Slowly, the Maronite bishop is assuming control of these properties.

"I am working with the Latin bishops studying any problems and the legal procedures involved," Bishop Zayek said today during an interview.

He pointed out that although the Maronite churches are already under his jurisdiction, he and the Latin bishops are beginning the steps necessary for title transfers. He said it will take about two years before this is completed for his whole diocese.

During his stay here, Bishop Zayek has been the guest of Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon, bishop of the Springfield diocese.

The transfer has been accomplished in a few of the 47 churches, Bishop Zayek said. They include three churches in Ohio, located in Akron, Cleveland and Youngstown; one in San Antonio, Tex.; and one being built in Boston. Cardinal Cushing recently donated land and a sum of money for the latter.

STRESSES CO-OPERATION

Throughout the interview, Bishop Zayek stressed co-operation with the Latin bishops. He said that the new church which St. Anthony's expects to begin building soon will be supervised by himself and Bishop Weldon.

Again, speaking of the Catholic Charities Appeal, Bishop Zayek said that St. Anthony's Catholic Church will continue to make a contribution. He said the Maronite group does not have hospitals and but a few schools; its members use those provided by the Latin diocese.

"I did not come here to separate the two dioceses. I came here in the spirit of co-operation," Bishop Zayek said. He added that the Maronites would continue to do their share and support the Roman Catholic facilities which they use.

"Separate jurisdiction, but co-operation," Bishop Zayek repeatedly said. With a warm smile, he said that he found all the Latin bishops co-operative and went to on praise Bishop Weldon for what he termed "gracious hospitality and understanding during my visit."

The Maronite bishop said he hopes to visit each parish at least once every two or three years. These would be his official visits, he said. "Of course, I will be attending special festivities in the Maronite churches as the occasions arise," he said.

EXCITING EVENT

Rev. Maurice Karam, pastor of St. Anthony's Catholic Church said that Bishop Zayek's visit here is an exciting event for his parishioners. "They are happy to at long last have a bishop of the Maronite rite," he said.

Bishop Zayek said that Fr. Karam will remain as pastor of St. Anthony's Catholic Church.

Presently, the church holds its weekday services in the chapel at Cathedral High School and its Sunday masses in the school's auditorium.

Fr. Karam said architects have started plans for the new church, which will be at 375 Island Pond Rd., in the vicinity of Cathedral High School. The church has about 1000 members, Fr. Karam said.

The church was originally on Liberty St., but had to vacate because of urban renewal.

Bishop Zayek will be the guest of honor at a banquet tonight at Willow Glen House, East Longmeadow. His next visit, tomorrow, will take him to New Bedford, after which he will return to his see in Detroit, Mich.

A BILL TO AMEND PUBLIC LAW 874 OF THE 81ST CONGRESS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which will shift the responsibility for the administration of the American overseas dependent schools from the Department of Defense to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This legislation will create within HEW a special board which will be responsible for operating these schools, and it is entitled "The National Overseas Education Act of 1967." Under its provisions the President will appoint eight members, five from civilian life and three from the military, to a National Overseas Education Board which will be a part of HEW and will operate on a direct appropriation from that agency.

The National Overseas Education Board will have full and complete responsibility for the maintenance and operation of all Government elementary and secondary schools for Defense Department dependents in foreign countries. It will make all decisions relating to curriculum, the opening and closing of schools as well as the use of the facilities, personnel policies and cases—pay, tenure, hiring, transfer, assignment, grievances, and so forth, and will also be directed to establish policies which will prevent discrimination because of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or marital status in the operation of the system.

From his eight appointees to the Board, the President shall choose a chairman and a vice chairman from the civilian membership. The civilians will serve 4-year terms and will be compensated at level IV of the Executive Schedule. The military members will receive no additional compensation besides their Government pay, will be nonvoting members of the Board, and will have their terms set at the pleasure of the President. I have chosen not to delineate the size of the staff which will be necessary for the Board to carry out its functions, but my bill rather will authorize the Board to make its own determination as to what staff it will need and what the salary levels shall be. The staff will be fully covered civil service employees, hired through merit examinations, except for the Executive Director who will be appointed by the Board and will have his salary level fixed by the Board.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing this bill in a sincere belief that a better educational system will evolve if we separate the administration of these overseas dependent schools from the Department of Defense. In the fall of 1965 I had the opportunity to inspect many of these schools. I personally saw the difficulties under which children studied and teachers taught. Education is not a primary mission of the Department of Defense, but by creating a special Board whose only function would be the administration of our overseas dependent schools, we will make an important move toward guaranteeing the children of American citizens serving our country in foreign lands a better education than they are now receiving. This independent Board will permit its teachers and parents to be freer to bring their suggestions for change and to express their concerns for improvement.

I am aware of a wide variety of staffing problems which undoubtedly affect the morale and thereby the quality of the teaching in dependent schools. Assignment of housing, problems of tenure, use of the commissary, and other problems with the Department of Defense can best be mediated by an independent agency through regular appeals procedure, much as other civilian employees now have recourse through the Civil Service Commission.

This bill seeks a fresh look. Changing patterns of family life need to be taken into consideration, the whole range of employee classification and tenure must be reexamined, and close attention needs to be paid to other benefits and working conditions in addition to compensation. Funds for our children overseas should be part of the general education appropriations of the Federal Government and made a part of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 which deal with the impact cost of education of these "Federal" children. The time has come for change, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that hearings on this legislation will bear out my contention that we need to establish a specific body which will be responsible solely for these overseas dependent schools and will serve as a sounding board and adjudicator for its needs and aspirations.

We have a unique opportunity to provide these children who are temporarily in a foreign country with an exciting educational experience. A select board of our Nation's best educators could direct our Nation's efforts towards this showcase of excellence. Instead of being just another extra housekeeping chore of our busy military commands, this new Presidential Board will provide the whole Nation with a challenge in education and be able to concentrate all its efforts in producing true quality education in the only worldwide school system for American youth.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CALL TO THE NATION SEEKS RECONCILIATION AND SOLUTIONS, NOT SCAPEGOATS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may

extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the President's eloquent speech to the Nation a few nights ago was a perfect example of a leader who would rather light one candle, than curse the darkness.

President Johnson has asked the Nation—black and white citizen, majority and minority—to light many candles of peace, law and order, friendship, opportunity, and reconciliation.

The riots were condemned as they must be.

The violence was deplored as it must be. No one, said the President, will be rewarded for violence. The President made it clear that only a minority of citizens were involved, and that the majority of the Negro community itself suffered the most from the riots and disturbances.

He made it clear, and I agree with him wholeheartedly, that peace cannot be maintained with the muzzle of a gun.

If civil peace, and law and order do not emerge from the hearts of a people, then that people is in trouble.

In the same vein, if equal rights and equal opportunity do not spring from the inner feelings of a people—and must be guaranteed only by laws—then a society founded on justice and right is also in trouble.

There are already those who call for cutting down urban and domestic opportunity programs—as the President inferred.

There are already those saying we have done too much to help the poor and the minorities.

But we have really not even begun to mount programs sufficient to meet the needs of our people in the 20th century.

Rather than cut back on programs, we must move ahead and fund them with even greater resources.

I know the Nation will respond to the President's call for reconciliation and solutions.

I know that we will not seek scapegoats. Rather, we will seek new means to prevent riots, new roads to cooperation, law and order, opportunity and progress.

I commend the President for his frank and honest appeal to the hearts of his countrymen.

CITY WILL MISS SHERMAN HUNT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district and my home city lost a dedicated public servant, and I have lost a valued friend and advisor.

Mr. Sherman M. Hunt, Jr., who was serving his third term as a member of the Metropolitan-Nashville-Davidson County Council, had survived military

careers in both World War II and the Korean war, where he served as a special agent with the U.S. Air Force.

He has served as executive officer for the Tennessee Air National Guard until being totally blinded by a gun accident in 1960.

For many persons, faced with the responsibilities of a growing family and who had led an active professional and civil life, such a handicap could have been a shattering experience resulting in withdrawal from active participation in community life.

But for Mr. Hunt it was a challenge. He was first elected to the council in 1961, and his courage and dedication in not only overcoming his handicap but in surpassing his past accomplishments stand as a tribute to him.

In 1964, when he made an unsuccessful bid as the Democratic candidate for sheriff, Mr. Hunt made a comment which should be studied by every public service worker when he said:

You can't stand still or you'll fall behind and I like to be part of a progressive movement, moving ahead simultaneously with progress and contributing something.

Those of us who knew him fully realize that his contributions made our city a better place in which to live.

I share with his widow and his three sons a deep sense of personal loss.

The sentiments of a city are expressed in an editorial carried by the Nashville Tennessean, which I submit for inclusion in the RECORD as a memorial to this civic leader:

CITY WILL MISS SHERMAN HUNT

Nashville has lost a valued citizen in the untimely death at 44 of Mr. Sherman M. Hunt Jr., a member of the Metro Council from the eighth district.

A native of the city, Mr. Hunt had outstanding careers as a military officer and as a public official. He was a veteran of World War II and Korea, serving in the later conflict as a special agent for the U.S. Air Force's Office of Special Investigation.

Mr. Hunt served as executive officer of the Tennessee Air National Guard until he was blinded by a gun accident in 1960. Despite the handicap, he was elected to Council the following year. He was serving his third term at the time of his death.

In his service with Council, Mr. Hunt earned a reputation as a well-informed and capable legislator. He was active in his church, Boy Scout work and other civic activities.

The city will miss the presence of such a conscientious public servant who contributed so much of himself to his community.

ISRAEL—A NATION TOO YOUNG TO DIE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for Look magazine, Mr. James A. Michener has written a thoughtful and vivid article on the background of the recent Arab-Israeli war and on the importance now

of wiping away the fantasies that still seem to prevent the Arab world from facing up to realities. Mr. Michener's article, entitled "Israel—A Nation Too Young To Die," follows:

ISRAEL—A NATION TOO YOUNG TO DIE

I remember when I first became aware of the unnatural tension under which the citizens of Israel have been obliged to live since the establishment of their nation in 1948. I had come to the seaport city of Haifa to do research on a book, and for well over a year, I stayed there, probing the various libraries at my disposal.

Almost every week, and often three or four times a week, my morning paper carried the news that one or another leading Arab politician, and not infrequently a head of state of one of the neighboring Arab countries, had announced his intention of leading an army that would "push the Jews of Israel into the sea," or that would "wipe them off the face of the earth," or perhaps, "strangle them forever." I suppose that the threats occurring during the time I worked in Israel totaled well over a hundred.

They came from more than a half-dozen countries, some as far away as Algeria and Morocco, whose preoccupation with Israel I could not understand. They did not come, so far as I remember, from Lebanon or Jordan, which have common boundaries with Israel.

Especially appalling to me were the five different times when some Arab head of state announced that he was going to blow up the city in which I sat working. I took even those threats without panic, for I have seen a good deal of war and bombing and do not frighten easily, but I must admit that when the Arab leaders narrowed down their target to the hotel in which I was sitting, and when on two occasions they gave a specific timetable for dispatching their rockets, I felt shivers run up my spine.

I lived for more than a year under those constant threats. I neutralized them by saying, "I'm free to leave Israel when I like. I have no personal attachments and no responsibility." But what must have been the accumulated anxiety for the head of a growing family in Haifa who heard these threats each week, not for one year but for nineteen? What must have been his feelings if he knew that he could not leave the threatened country, that he had a responsibility both to his family and to his nation?

Israel's apprehension was not a paper one. In addition to the threats, there were constant incursions into Israel, constant shootings across the borders, constant intrusions by groups as large as squadrons or small companies. If I went to do some research on the old synagogue at Korazim, I was somewhat taken aback to find that one day later, a pitched battle had been fought there and two Israeli civilians had been killed. If I went on a picnic to the Sea of Galilee, I was a bit shaken when two days later, there was a bombardment of Israeli boats. If I visited the kibbutz at Dan and waded upstream to the cool spring that forms one of the headwaters of the River Jordan, I was frightened to learn that, shortly before, a man had been lost doing that. And when I moved to Jerusalem, to work in the libraries there, I was sorrowful when children told me I must not walk down this alley by the Persian synagogue; gunfire had been coming in from the rooftops only 50 feet away.

And wherever I went, whether to Haifa, or to Korazim, or the Galilee, or Beersheba, there was the constant dinning in my ears of the threat, reiterated week after week, "We are going to destroy you. We are going to push you into the sea." The history of Israel is the history of ordinary people living ordinary lives under the incessant repetition of that threat, backed up by just enough Arab military activity to prove that the threat might be put into action at any moment.

To understand the problem of Israel, the outsider must imagine himself living in Washington, D.C., and reading each morning that neighbors in Baltimore and Alexandria have again threatened to blow Washington off the face of the earth and to push all Washingtonians into the Potomac. The threat, mind you, does not come from across the Atlantic or Pacific. It comes from a few miles away. And to prove the reality of the threat, actual military adventures occur from time to time, taking the lives of random Washingtonians.

What chance would you say there was for the citizens of Washington to go on indefinitely ignoring such behavior? This article is an account of why the citizens of Israel had to react to such a situation.

I must point out at the beginning that I hold no special brief for either the Israelis or Jews in general. I have lived too long among them to retain any starry-eyed visions. They are ordinary people marred by ordinary weaknesses and bolstered by the courage that ordinary men of all nations and races can at times draw upon. I worked among Muslims for ten years before I ever set foot in Israel, and on at least 50 percent of the characteristics by which men and societies are judged, I like Muslims at least as well as I like the Jews.

Furthermore, I am a professional writer who has worked in many contrasting societies, and I have found none inherently superior to all others. There have been many single aspects of Japan, or Polynesia, or Spain, or India, or Afghanistan that I have preferred, and to me, Israel is merely one more country. It happens to have certain characteristics that elicit enormous respect, but so did each of the Muslim countries in which I worked.

What we are concerned with here is a problem of worldwide significance: How can nations that must live side by side do so with a decent regard one for the other? In trying to reach a solution to this problem, Israel has as many responsibilities as its neighbors. However, this particular inquiry relates primarily to certain adjustments the Arabs must make before any kind of stability can be achieved in a region where stability is much to be desired.

Exactly how vicious were the verbal threats? It will be instructive, I think, to follow the behavior of one Arab country over a short period of time so that the non-Middle Easterner can catch something of the quality of the attacks that were constantly being made. For this purpose, I have chosen Syria, which has a common frontier with Israel and an internal political problem that makes verbal attacks on Israel an attractive form of demagoguery.

For some years, Syria's politics have been unusually volatile. During my stay in the area, there were several revolutions, three complete changes of government and continued violence. At one time, observers had hoped that Syria's political union with Egypt might produce a substantial and stable bloc of Arab power that would carry with it a sense of responsibility. But that union did not last long, and with its dissolution, Syria plunged into contortions that carried it first in one direction, then another. Consequently, Syrian politicians found that the one thing that united them was a common call for violence against Israel. This is how they spoke:

13 March 1966, the official newspaper, *Al Baath*: "It has become evident that our problem will only be solved by an armed struggle to expel the rapacious enemy, and put an end to the Zionist presence."

17 April 1966, the chief of state of the country, Nureddin Al-Attassi, in a speech at a military parade: "A total popular war of liberation is the only way to liberate Palestine and foil the plan of imperialism and reaction. . . . We shall work for the mobilization of all efforts for the needs of the total popular war of liberation."

12 May 1966, the Syrian commander in chief: "As for the statements of the so-called ministers and officials in Israel that they will punish states which support the commando forces . . . we tell them that we shall wage a liberation war against them as the Party has decided, and fear and alarm will fill every house in Israel."

19 May 1966, Radio Damascus: "When our revolution declared that the way to liberate Palestine is through a popular war, it knew beforehand that the meaning of this declaration is an open and decisive confrontation with Israel."

22 May 1966, Chief of State Al-Attassi: "We raise the slogan of the people's liberation war. We want total war with no limits, a war that will destroy the Zionist base."

24 May 1966, Syrian Defense Minister Hafez Assad: "We say: We shall never call for, nor accept peace. . . . We have resolved to drench this land with our blood, to oust you, aggressors, and throw you into the sea for good."

16 July 1966, Premier Yousef Zouayeh: "The popular liberation war which the Palestinian masses, backed by the Arab masses in the whole Arab homeland, have determined to wage, will foil the methods of Israel and those behind it. We say to Israel: Our reply will be harsh and it will pay dearly."

It must be remembered that the above quotations come from a period of relative stability along the Syrian-Israeli frontier. In the succeeding nine months, from September, 1966, through May, 1967, or just before the outbreak of armed hostilities, both the tempo and the inflammability increased. In those weeks when Syria was not threatening to destroy Israel, the heads of other Arab nations were. During my stay in Israel, I believe all the Arab states, excepting Jordan and Lebanon, made specific announcements that they were preparing a war that would drive Israel into the sea.

This constant incendiary barrage came to a climax in May of 1967, when war against Israel had pretty well been agreed upon, and perhaps that accounts for the exaggerated quality of these statements:

25 May 1967, Cairo radio, in a broadcast to all Arab countries: "The Arab people is firmly resolved to wipe Israel off the map."

26 May 1967, President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt: "Our basic aim will be to destroy Israel."

26 May 1967, the leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Ahmed Shukairy: "D-day is approaching. The Arabs have waited 19 years for this and will not flinch from the war of liberation."

29 May 1967, the same Mr. Shukairy: "The struggle has begun at the Gulf of Aqaba and will end at the Bay of Acre."

30 May 1967, Cairo radio: "Faced by the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, Israel has two choices, both of which are drenched with Israel's blood: Either it will be strangled by the Arab military and economic siege or it will be killed by the bullets of the Arab armies surrounding it from the South, from the North and from the East."

1 June 1967, the commander of the Egyptian Air Force on Egyptian television: "The Egyptian forces spread from Rafah to Sharm el Sheik are ready for the order to begin the struggle to which we have looked forward so long."

Now, I suppose that a logical man ought to reason: "If the leaders of the Arab states confine their threats to verbalisms, no matter how virulent, the citizens of Israel should adjust to the situation, for obviously the Arabs are using words in a way that need not be taken seriously." Speaking for myself, after my initial weeks of shock, I began to dismiss the blasts against Israel as bombast.

I tried to quiet my inner fears and become adjusted to this incessant barrage of verbal threats, but my ability to live with them did

not mean that I was immune to them. Not at all. For whether I liked it or not, I was living under an act of aggression. That it was psychological rather than physical made it the more insidious. I began to find that, although in public I dismissed the threats as evidences of temporary insanity on the part of those who made them, when I was alone, I had to worry about them. Against my will, I found myself concluding, "If Syria and Egypt and Iraq and the others keep on making such threats, they must in the end do something about them. And if Israelis continue to hear these threats week after week, they must in the end accept them as real and they, too, will have to act upon them."

In this way, not only were the airwaves polluted, not only was all intercourse between nations contaminated and all chances of peaceful coexistence frustrated, but the psychological processes of both those who made the threats and those who received them, was slowly and painfully corroded until both Arab and Jew knew that war was inevitable. On one visit to Jordan, which was one of the least psychotic areas, I talked with 16 young Arabs, and all said they longed for the day when they could march with the Arab armies into Israel and wipe it off the face of the earth. In Egypt, I found attitudes the same. And what was most regrettable, in Israel, where I knew thousands of persons who would speak frankly, a dull kind of resignation possessed them: "I suppose that one of these days we shall have to defend ourselves again."

It is because of the danger that thrives on verbal threats that English common law evolved the concept of assault and battery. Not many laymen appreciate that in law, the threat to do bodily damage is roughly the same as physically doing it. But society has learned that the continued psychological damage to the threatened victim is often graver than an actual punch in the nose might have been. The threat involves uncertainty and accumulating fear, whereas the physical release of an actual blow is over and done within an instant. Thus in strict legality, if I hold a gun and threaten, "I am going to shoot you," that is an assault. If I actually do the shooting, it is a battery. The important thing, however, is that the law holds the two things roughly equal, and a private citizen may be as quickly thrown in jail for one as for the other.

When assault is resorted to by nations, it is a violation of the United Nations Charter, Article 2, Principle number 4. Yet for 19 years, Israel lived under constant assaults.

In spite of my knowledge that a verbal assault is sometimes more destructive than a physical battery, in spite of my recognition of Arab behavior as aggression, and in spite of my experience with history that proves one aggression breeds another, I still cling to my hope that as long as the Syrians and the Egyptians confined themselves to wordy abuse, Israel could learn to live with it as one of the peculiarities of Arab politics. I even began to understand why nations as far away as Morocco, Algeria and Pakistan wanted to participate in the verbal campaign, for in this way, they kept their franchise as Muslim states. I was pleased to see that more mature Muslim sovereignties like Turkey, Iran and even Arab Tunisia wanted no part of this folly. Again and again, I told my Israeli friends and others who asked me, "As long as the Arabs confine themselves to verbal threats alone, no great damage will be done."

Unfortunately, the surrounding countries did not confine themselves to verbalisms. They also engaged in open acts of invasion, sabotage, terrorism and military action. I myself witnessed the aftermaths of three such actions.

One day in 1963, I visited the ancient black-basalt synagogue at Korazim because I wanted to see how Jews had worshiped in the time of Christ. It is believed that Jesus once lectured there, and I found ruins not

often visited by tourists. It was a remote area, peaceful, indifferent, as old almost as the hills. But on the next day, Syrian armed units invaded this rural scene and killed two civilians. Hotheads in Syria boasted that this was part of a planned program of harassment that would continue until all Jews were driven into the sea.

Again in 1963, I visited the Kibbutz Ein Gev for one of its famous fish dinners and a lazy afternoon of watching boats drifting across the Sea of Galilee. I also climbed up into the hills in back of Ein Gev to see the incredible kibbutz perched on the last half inch of Israeli soil. As I sat in the dining room, whose windows were shielded by a massive concrete bunker, a young Israeli girl explained, "We have to have the wall to keep out the Syrian bullets, for they shoot at us whenever we sit down to eat." Two days after my visit, a Syrian gun emplacement in the hills lobbed shells into the lake, sank a fishing boat and injured five fishermen. Once more, Syria publicly announced that this was part of a continuing campaign.

My most moving experience came when I visited the beautiful Catholic monastery marking the supposed site of Christ's Sermon on the Mount. It rests on the hills west of Capernaum, where Jesus sometimes argued with scholars, and while I was staying there, I learned that shortly before, in Israeli fields to the east, a Syrian patrol had planted land mines and one had exploded, killing two Israeli farmers.

I could go on through the years 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967, citing incident after incident in which acts of actual warfare were perpetrated in this region. From the high hills that Syria occupied to the east, gun positions pumped in random shots at workers on the Israeli farms. From protected emplacements along the shore of the Sea of Galilee, Syrian guns fired point-blank at Israeli fishermen. And night after night, marauding parties crept over the border to mine, to murder and destroy.

Now, no man in his right mind would claim that Israel in the meantime was sitting idly by in childish innocence, or that it accepted these invasions of its sovereignty without striking back. In self-respect, there had to be retaliations, and there were. These war-like Arab acts, backing up verbal threats, would have been suicidal for the Israeli Government to ignore. Arab leaders now began massing enormous armies with much first-rate equipment, and these gave every evidence of being able to crush Israel. What was most provocative of all, the leaders of this might openly announce that they planned to launch a full-scale war. If ever a nation was forewarned by word and act and specific promise of annihilation, it was Israel.

What were the odds against Israel? A quick glance at the figures—46 million in the surrounding Arab countries, 97 million in all, as against 2.6 million Israelis—might lead one to believe that the Arab states would have little trouble in overwhelming Israel, except that twice before, in 1948 and 1956, they had tried to do so and failed. Arab leaders grew adept in explaining away the somber fact that twice, a handful of Jews had resisted efforts to throw them into the sea. "In 1948," explained the leaders, "we were betrayed by Great Britain, and in 1956, it was the French and English armies that defeated us through their invasion of the Suez." By June, 1967, a persuasive legend had grown up, largely masking the truth that the Arab states had ever tested arms with the Israelis, and completely ignoring that in each war, the Israelis had been victorious. In a magic flood of words, history was repealed.

The Arab leaders created an enticing world of fantasy; one demagogue lived on the pronouncements of the other, and in time, all came to believe that facts were other than they had been. When the Arab armies were

able to import huge supplies of modern weapons from their East European supporters, they really believed that their peasant levies, with little stake in their society to fight for, would stand up against Israelis who had good homes, better universities and a deep moral commitment to their nation.

I have had two opportunities to witness the impact of this fantasy world upon rational Arabs. In one of my books, I described in some detail the manner in which, in 1948, Jewish youths captured the north Israel city of Safad against overwhelming numbers of Arab soldiers. At no point in my description did I deride the Arabs or cast aspersions upon them. Some dozen correspondents in the different Arab nations commented upon this favorably when they wrote to me complaining about the passage. What they objected to were the facts I presented. Some claimed that the Jews must have numbered 20 or 30 times their known strength. Others argued that Arab units that we know to have been in the city were not really there. Several explained that the loss was due to British perfidy in turning over to the Jews the best military sites, whereas the truth was just the opposite. And all expressed the opinion that I had been tricked by a legend that had not really happened. I had the strange feeling that my correspondents trusted that one morning, they would waken to find that Safad had never really been lost at all, that it was still in Arab hands and that maps and stories to the contrary had been mere propaganda.

Of course, in the preceding paragraph, I am generalizing from a dozen letters, none of whose authors did I see personally, and it may be that I am reading into their letters a greater evidence of fantasy than the writers showed. About my second experience, I cannot make such an error, for it I witnessed in person.

In the summer of 1964, I was vacationing in the lovely city of Alexandria, made famous by the writers of antiquity and by Charles Kingsley and Lawrence Durrell, and one day at sunset, as I was strolling along that unequalled boulevard that runs beside the Mediterranean, I came to a park where in the evenings, a concert of folk music was offered. Now, I am very partial to this form of entertainment, for one learns much from uncontaminated folk songs. So I bought a ticket for the performance.

At the concert, I found a large number of Egyptian families with their children. It was a splendid night, filled with stars and coolness, and we sat back to watch a first-class performance of folk song and dance. The choruses were strong, the dancers agile, and the evening compared with others I had enjoyed in Kyoto, Djakarta, Manila and Mexico City.

A rather large cast performed, and this made me wonder where the money to pay them came from, for the audience was not unusually big, and the prices we had paid were only nominal. I shrugged my shoulders and concluded that this was someone else's problem, but when the regular performance had ended, without a false note that I could detect, the bugles started blowing, excitement gripped the children in the audience, and the curtains parted to show a scene in the year A.D. 2000. In a park much like the one in which we were sitting, a group of children played about the statue of an Egyptian soldier while an old man watched. One of the children asked who the statue was, and by means of a dance, the old fellow explained. Years dropped from his shoulders. His cane became a gun. His ragged clothes fell away to reveal a military uniform, and as more bugles blew, ghosts of his former companions in arms appeared onstage, and in wonderfully choreographed pantomime, the Egyptian Army demonstrated how it had won the great war of 1956.

The scene was at Suez, where a handful of

heroic Egyptians held off and finally defeated not an Israeli army but invaders storming ashore from French and English battleships. For each Egyptian soldier, scores of Frenchmen and Englishmen rushed onstage, only to be overwhelmed by sheer courage. In the end, the invaders had to retreat, whereupon the Egyptian defenders fell into a tableau of victory as fine as any I had ever seen. The great powers had been driven off, and Egyptian honor was once more secure.

I looked about me at the audience, and it was apparent that the adults, many of whom must have participated in the events thus portrayed, had begun to accept this version as history. Their eyes glowed, and a real patriotism suffused their faces. As we left the park, I saw one young boy of nine or ten lunging out with an imaginary bayonet to hold off imaginary Frenchmen and Englishmen. When I made inquiries about the performance, I found that it was paid for by the government and was repeated throughout the year.

The whole thing was fantasy, of course, and certainly no worse than similar versions of English history offered in London or French history in Paris. I am sure that parallel perversions could be found in American folklore, and I doubt that much harm is done to children by this patriotic nonsense. But in the case of Egypt and the other Arab lands, there was an additional danger because adults, too, were accepting such fables: college professors, university students, newspaper editors, businessmen believed that Egypt had won a great victory in 1956. I could find no evidence that anyone in public life was willing to admit that in Egypt's military adventure against a handful of Jews, the latter had easily won.

All nations engage in fantasy, but few indulge themselves with so virulent a dream as the twofold Arab dream that Israel does not exist and that the Jews who presently occupy the land of Israel can easily be pushed into the Mediterranean . . . whenever the Arabs finally decide to do so.

Sometime in the spring of 1967, the Arab leaders decided that the time was ripe. Under incessant pressure from Ahmed Shukairy, leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization, who stood to win himself the sate of Palestine if he could goad Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Jordan and Saudi Arabia into declaring war on Israel, and with the full connivance of Gamal Abdel Nasser, who stood to win himself an emperorship if the war was successful, the Arab nations reached an understanding. These men who had lived so long on fantasy now conceived the supreme fantasy that they could quickly destroy the nation that had twice defeated them and had in the interim grown stronger socially, psychologically and morally, even though its airplanes and tanks had not kept pace in numbers with those of the Arabs.

On May 16, 1967, President Nasser initiated the two final moves. On that day, he elbowed the United Nations Emergency Force out of its peacekeeping positions along the Egyptian-Israeli border in the Sinai Peninsula and forced it ignominiously to retire from the area, thus depriving Israel of the one slim assurance it had that a surprise attack would not be launched from the desert. The fire engine that was supposed to protect the community scuttled out of town at the first smell of smoke. In its place, President Nasser moved up his own divisions, and the stage was set for war.

On May 22, 1967, he made his second crucial move. With the retreat of the United Nations troops, he found himself in sole control of Sharm el Sheik, the fortress commanding the strait leading into the Gulf of Aqaba. It was a simple matter for him to announce that henceforth, the Gulf would be closed to Israeli ships and even to ships of other nations carrying strategic materials

bound for Israel. None would be permitted to enter and none to leave. This was a hostile act and had to be construed as a declaration of war. That President Nasser was aware of the gravity of his act, he took no pains to hide: "Sharm el Sheik and the blockade mean real confrontation with Israel. Taking such a step means that we should be ready to enter full-scale war with Israel. It is not an isolated operation."

The Gulf has been recognized as an international waterway because four sovereign nations line its coast: on the east, Saudi Arabia; on the west, Egypt; on the north, Israel; and on the northeast, Jordan. But it is more important economically to Israel than to any of the other three, since Elath is a major port for handling oil and other heavy cargoes. If the Gulf of Aqaba were to be closed to all shipping, whether to Jordan or Israel, the blockade would damage Jordan, but it would prostrate Israel. However, ships intended for Jordan were allowed to pass, and during the exercise of the blockade was meant to be an act of war, and lest dan. This underlined the fact that the blockade was meant to be an act of war, and lest any misunderstand the intention. President Nasser proclaimed on May 26:

"The Arab people want to fight. . . .

"We have been waiting for the suitable day when we shall be completely ready, since if we enter a battle with Israel we should be confident of victory and should take strong measures. We do not speak idly.

"We have lately felt that our strength is sufficient, and that if we enter the battle with Israel we shall, with God's help, be victorious. Therefore, we have now decided that I take real steps.

"The battle will be a full-scale one, and our basic aim will be to destroy Israel."

Obviously, the major maritime nations of the world, having anticipated that such a blockade might one day be attempted, in which case their ship would be powerless to enter the narrow strait, had long been on record regarding two points: (1) the Gulf of Aqaba was an international waterway, and (2) as such, it must be kept open for all nations to use equally without let or hindrance.

By flouting international law and blockading the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping, President Nasser had effectively and somewhat cleverly cut Israel's lifeline to the south. If the blockade were allowed to continue unchallenged, Israel would experience what its Arab neighbors had been threatening for so long—its strangulation. This was war, but still only an indirect version, in the economic field. One could reasonably hope that from it, President Nasser might back away, but such hopes were dashed on May 28, when he announced over the radio: "We intend to open a general assault against Israel. This will be total war. Our basic aim is the destruction of Israel."

As the Arabs prepared for what they assured themselves was to be the final conquest of Israel, their morale was at high pitch. And because of what they had been told so continuously over the previous eight years regarding their victory over the British and French in 1956, they believed in all honesty that this time they were going to crush Israel, and fairly easily.

President Nasser encouraged this belief by his belligerent speeches. From Syria, Chief of State Al-Attassi thundered that his army was impatient to begin marching.

The foot soldiers, the aviators, the tank commanders and even the generals prepared to launch what they were convinced would be an easy, victorious sortie. In the fantasy world in which they had lived for so long, and to which they had contributed, words took the place of accomplishment, wishes took the place of military discipline, and inflated dreams of revenge superseded facts.

If the Arabs with their verbal assaults

had made life difficult for Israel, they had perpetrated a worse crime against themselves; for they had come to believe their own inflated nonsense.

At the hour of attack, the Voice of the Arabs radio station in Cairo issued this stirring call to its soldiers. It is the usual heartening battle cry that all nations use at a time of crisis and in general purpose is not much different from what Englishmen or Russians or Americans would shout to their soldiers, but in the cry for avenging 1948, one hears a unique and ominous overtone:

"Destroy, ruin, liberate. Woe to Israel, your hour has arrived. The Arab nation is on its way to render its account. O Israel, this is your end.

"Every Arab must take revenge for 1948, must cross the Armistice lines from all directions and head for Tel Aviv. We shall drive out of existence the shame of Zionism. Rescue the looted Palestine. Hit everywhere till the end.

"There is no room for Israel in Palestine. This is your responsibility, O Arab soldiers! Israel, taste death!"

It required less than 72 hours in June to deflate this bombast.

What can be done to awaken the Arab masses to the reality that Israel stands where it does and will presumably remain there for some centuries? In the aftermath of 1948, the rest of the world permitted and perhaps encouraged the Arabs to follow a policy of blindly refusing to admit that Israel existed. The armistice commissions, which should have worked out regional policies, were not permitted to operate effectively. Decisions upon which peace depended could not be made because the Arabs refused to acknowledge that history had produced an old-new nation that would prove most viable—that was too young to die. The normal intercourse between nations, such as is conducted between Russia and Germany, which were certainly as bitter enemies as Egypt and Israel, was forbidden, and the region fumbled its way to the war of 1956.

When Israel won handily, the refusal to admit realities persisted, and the same errors were allowed to continue. International commissions did not function, and normal intercourse between nations did not mature, even though the Arab portion of the region and the Israeli form a marvelous, interlocking whole—a unit whose various segments could well profit from economic, medical, educational, developmental and planning cooperation. The blindness and the arrogant folly that produced this stalemate also produced the speeches cited in this article. And they in turn produced the hysteria that led to a third war in less than 20 years.

If the world, in 1948, had insisted that the nations of this area sit down in honest consultation, 1956 might have been avoided. If the world, following the disaster of 1956, had insisted that the Arab nations at least awaken to the existence of Israel, the tremendous folly of 1967 could have been avoided. Now, the world has a third chance, and if some right decisions are made in the months ahead, the even greater of tragedy of 1977 may be avoided. What is necessary is a reasonable revision of boundary lines; a sensible settlement of the Palestinian refugee problem; a cessation of verbal assault and physical battery; and a union of talents and interests, of resources and abilities, so that the region can move forward to a creative society in which all members live infinitely better than anyone there now does.

Am I hopeful that the world will now sensibly tackle its problems when it refused to do so in the aftermath of 1948 and 1956? I am not. President Gamal Abdel Nasser pulled out of the hat one of the cleverest tricks of his career when, in first hours of defeat, he invented the enticing theory that once again it was not Israelis who were crushing his armed might from every direction but

English and American aviators. His explanation captivated the imagination of all Arabs, and within a few days was adopted as official dogma. In 1970, when I revisit the lovely waterfront of Alexandria, I expect to see a tableau explaining how, in a moment of travail in the spring of 1967, the Egyptians and their Arab allies stood bravely against the combined air might of Great Britain and the United States and repulsed it. That Israel was involved will not be mentioned.

At the moment when Egyptian armies were suffering their worst defeats, Egypt's undefeated radio was broadcasting the following careful analysis of the situation:

"The United States is the enemy. Its fighters and bombers gathered in large groups to provide for Israel an air umbrella that prevents the Arabs from bombing Israel's towns and villages, while it is moving fast all along the occupied frontiers of the Arabs. The United States, therefore, is the aggressor.

"The United States saw Israel about to collapse under the blow of death. The Chicago gangs moved; the state of gangsterism and bloodshed moved; it moved in order to protect its aggressive base in the Middle East. How vile and treacherous the United States has been in its collusion with the Zionists! It refrained from coming out openly to fight us. It refrained from facing the Arabs with an open and daring hostility. No, Arabs. The United States is too vile and too base to have the ethics of cavaliers. The United States threw, from all its airports and aircraft carriers in the Mediterranean, huge and continuous massings of its fighters and bombers in order to provide that air umbrella that protected Israel from the revenge of the Arabs, from the massings of the Arabs, and from the victory of the Arabs.

"The battle is continuing, United States. . . . It is going on until you become, as Britain became after the 1956 collusion, third-rate state. Here we shall bury the American international gangsterism. Here, Arabs, dig graves everywhere; dig them for every U.S. existence; dig them, Arabs. Dig all the homeland a grave for U.S. existence. Dig it, Arabs. Dig it, Arabs. Dig it, Arabs.

"The curse of all the Arabs, from the ocean to the gulf and from every corner of the globe, is on you, America, and on your lackey, Israel; together with the curse of all free peoples, the curse of free men everywhere."

On the night when the defeat of the Arab armies was known to the world as one of the most crushing in history, I discussed matters on an all-night radio show with Dr. M. T. Mehd, secretary-general of the Action Committee on American-Arab Relations, and he made these points: "Nothing has changed. Israel is worse than Nazi Germany, and the Arabs will have to drive her from the region. The war will continue precisely as it has been going for the past 19 years. And what the Americans and the English took away from the Arabs by their intervention, the Arabs will recover at the conference table. Peace talks, of course, will have to be conducted through third parties at the United Nations, because no Arab leader will ever agree to sit down and talk with an outlaw nation like Israel. You'll see. The United Nations will force Israel back to her 1948 boundaries, after which all Arab nations will unite in a war to exterminate her, because this is going to be just like the Crusades. For two hundred years, the Arabs will continue their fight and in the end they'll do exactly what they've said. Push Israel into the sea."

Nasser will probably gain more from the Arab world in defeat than he would have gained in victory. The war made him a tragic hero around whom the emotional Arabs can rally. Soon, his new crop of generals will be making the old speeches of 1948, 1956 and 1967. His people will believe them, for fantasy is impossible to eradicate if one's whole society is structured on the perpetuation of the Arabian Nights.

Yet we must dispel that fantasy. To do so is the job to which we are all committed . . . unless we are content to watch this pathetic farce of Arab self-delusion repeated in 1977, 1988 and 1999.

GEORGE GALLOWAY, HISTORIAN OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress were saddened to learn of the death on July 29 of Dr. George B. Galloway, the noted expert on congressional government. As a student of the practices and traditions of congressional operation, George Galloway held a position that was unique among American historians and political scientists.

His "History of the House of Representatives" is a fascinating document, replete with well-researched background and full of brilliant insights. In this volume, Dr. Galloway achieved the objective of every historian by making the present more understandable through his luminous delineation of the past.

Perhaps his greatest contribution to the effective functioning of Congress was his role as secretary of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Reorganization of Congress in 1945 and 1946. In spite of the demanding nature of his assignments, he was always available to individual Members of Congress for advice and counsel, and I can testify to his kindness and generosity in this regard.

Dr. Galloway also was particularly active in the movement to spread parliamentary institutions, and he served effectively for many years as executive secretary of the U.S. delegation to the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

In the passing of George Galloway, parliamentary government has lost an acute student and a firm supporter, and we who were his friends and the beneficiaries of his learning and counsel have lost an adviser and comrade who is truly irreplaceable.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK 1967 IN TAIWAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to accept the invitation of the Committee of Civic Organizations of the Republic of China in Support of Struggle for Freedom Behind the Iron Curtain to participate in Captive Nations Week in Taiwan.

The organization is doing an outstanding work under the leadership of Mr. Ku Cheng-kang, its chairman. This was evident to all who participated in the activities of the week which he had planned.

On Thursday, July 20, 1967, I delivered a lecture to approximately 600 leaders of government and educators in the Republic of China at a meeting held in the city hall in Taipei. I make this lecture a part of my remarks at this point in the Record:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK 1967

(Lecture by BASIL L. WHITENER, Member of Congress, Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China)

It is always a pleasure for me to come to Taiwan. A visit to your beautiful nation always reminds me of the great contributions which the Chinese people have made to a civilization that so respects and honors the human individual and the human family.

I am honored to come to this country whose Chief of State is one of the senior statesmen of our time and whose leadership and courage serve as an inspiration to you and to free men everywhere.

President Johnson, in his State of the Union Message of January 12, 1966, remarked that "history is on the side of societies as shaped from the genius of each people." Nowhere in the world is there a better example of a society shaped from the genius of its people than here.

The visitor to Taiwan is invariably struck by the extraordinary material progress which has been made here in an atmosphere of economic freedom, social freedom, and human dignity. Industrial and commercial development have proceeded apace. The cultural and artistic heritage of China has been preserved and advanced at the same time. The benefits of industrial and commercial progress have served to enrich the lives of the people.

What is more, I understand that, abroad, the Republic of China extends assistance in agriculture to some 23 other countries and thus cooperates in the War on Hunger, while at home three million two hundred thousand students are in school and, unlike students on the mainland, they are permitted to devote themselves to their studies. Here, of course, is the true "Cultural Revolution."

How different is the picture behind the bamboo curtain on the mainland. There, economic and social freedom are repressed, and human dignity and family ties are disregarded and even scorned. Students have had their studies interrupted and disorganized by the turbulent demands of the so-called "Cultural Revolution."

All this has been done in the name of progress, but the people on the mainland have little to show for the misery that has been inflicted on them. In fact, by all reports, their lives have been made even more wretched by the consequences of a misnamed "Cultural Revolution," that is, in large measure, a struggle for power with little regard for its effect on the well being of the common man.

Since the period of the Second World War, when Americans and Chinese fought side by side, the people of America have developed an increasing awareness of the important bearing that events in Asia have on them. This awareness has been sharpened by our friends from this side of the Pacific who have visited us and permitted us to see events here through their eyes.

Your Ambassador, Chow Shu-kai, has traveled widely in the United States and is a gifted public speaker and an able exponent of your country's ideals and policies. I am honored to have him as one of my close personal friends.

A distinguished recent visitor from your country to ours was His Excellency Vice President Yen. We were very pleased to have him in the United States. I am sure you know from news reports during his visit that his trip was an extremely successful one.

In Washington your Vice President met

with our President, with senior officials of the United States Government, with the press, and with members of the Congress. I was privileged to participate in a breakfast meeting with him before his departure from Washington. Elsewhere in our country, from Texas to New York to Hawaii, Vice President Yen met with our leaders and made many public appearances.

The Vice President brilliantly interpreted for Americans the meaning of the upheaval in Communist China. He spoke also of the achievements on Taiwan and of the relationship of these achievements to events elsewhere in Asia. He conveyed to the American people the full support of the Republic of China in the efforts of the United States and its free world allies to stem aggression in Viet Nam.

Everywhere he went the Vice President was received with friendship. He was listened to with respect. As I followed reports of his trip, I was once again impressed by the interest of the American people and their concern for what is happening on this side of the Pacific, their knowledge that events here are important, not only for Asians, but also for ourselves. And this, of course, is a conviction that lies at the root of American policy.

Those of you who know our country from first-hand experience well understand the essential elements of our policy in East Asia and the Pacific. We believe that the extension of hostile control over other nations or wide areas of Asia, specifically by the Chinese Communists, the North Vietnamese Communists, or the North Korean Communists, would soon create a situation that would menace all the countries of the area and present a direct and major threat to our own national interests.

We also believe that an East Asia and Pacific region comprised of free and independent states, working effectively for the welfare of their people, is essential to preventing the extension of hostile power and, more broadly, to our worldwide interest in peace and progress.

President Chiang Kai-shek pointed out in his Double Ten Day speech in 1964 that the Republic of China is a part of the Free World and that its fate is inseparable from that of its Asian neighbors.

Aware of these realities, the Republic of China makes a vital contribution to collective security in East Asia. Its military forces tie down considerable Chinese Communist forces on the opposite side of the strait.

To accomplish this it supports a heavy defense burden. It is heartening that it has been able to strengthen its economy and improve the standard of living of its people, notwithstanding the heavy financial and manpower demands it has in the defense program.

Another and, of course, at present the major contribution to collective security in East Asia is being made in Viet Nam. We believe that, unless a just and honorable peace can be achieved in Viet Nam, the security and confidence of other nations of Asia are bound to be greatly affected. We believe that Viet Nam must be able to work out its own future without external interference.

President Johnson said in the course of his remarks before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union January 10, 1967: "We have chosen to fight a limited war in Viet Nam in an attempt to prevent a larger war—a war almost certain to follow, if the Communists succeed in overrunning and taking over South Viet Nam by aggression and by force. I believe, and I am supported by some authority, that if they are not checked now the world can expect to pay a greater price to check them later."

There is reason to believe that the effort we are making to assist Viet Nam has already had an important effect in Asia. The countries of Asia in recent years had made sig-

nificant progress, of course, even before we made our major force and action decisions in Viet Nam.

Since those decisions were made, that progress has been accelerated in individual countries, and there has been a real beginning in true regional cooperation. This means that in the area as a whole there is now a much greater hope than at any other time in the past that East Asia can become the kind of region its people want and deserve.

Behind these changes there is an atmosphere of growing confidence. This atmosphere rests on the actual achievements of the nations of East Asia. It draws great strength also from the demonstration that we and others have provided in Viet Nam that we will assist, as necessary and where we are wanted, to provide security for these nations. It also depends deeply on the belief that essential assistance will continue to be provided by the United States and increasingly by those other developed nations in a position to assist.

In Viet Nam itself there is forward movement in all phases of the conflict. I visited Viet Nam in July of last year and again in March and April of this year. On my most recent visit, which lasted two weeks, I traveled to the Demilitarized Zone, to Pleiku, and to the area near the Cambodian border. Political developments, the progress of pacification, and marked military progress lead me to believe that overall trends in Viet Nam are now clearly moving in a favorable direction.

For example, by now, some 13,000 local officials have been elected in over 1,000 villages and 4,500 hamlets. Despite skepticism that free elections could be held in a country in the midst of a serious war, this has been the second major election successfully organized and carried through by the Republic of Viet Nam in less than one year.

Furthermore, since last fall there has been a sharp increase in the number of defectors from the Viet Cong. The national government has issued a proclamation offering those misled or coerced by the Viet Cong the opportunity to rejoin Vietnamese society with full rights of citizenship and protection under the constitution. This program of national reconciliation could be one of major military and political significance.

Elections for the President and Vice President, and for the Upper House, are scheduled to be held September 1, with Lower House elections to be held one month later. When the President assumes office, replacing the Directorate, the Constituent Assembly will acquire full legislative powers until installation of the newly-elected National Assembly approximately one month later.

Thus, by the end of 1967, South Viet Nam is scheduled to have an elected government and representative institutions from the bottom of the governing structure to the top. If this takes place as anticipated, it will constitute an almost unprecedented achievement in rapid political evolution under uniquely adverse circumstances.

The South Vietnamese have refused to be deterred from their exercise of "rice roots democracy" by Viet Cong terrorism and the upheaval of conflict. Whenever the opportunity arises, whether on the local or provincial level, Vietnamese citizens have turned out en masse to cast their ballots.

The United States has pledged that the people of South Viet Nam shall have the right to decide their own political destiny, free of external interference and force. Helping the South Vietnamese to defend this right is the principal purpose of the American presence in South Viet Nam.

In summary, our policy reflects the inescapable reality that we can no longer find national security in a world torn by violence and aggression.

We believe that one of our essential tasks is to pursue an organized peace in which each nation lives under institutions of its own

choice and in which all nations and peoples cooperate for their mutual welfare. We use our diplomatic resources and work within international bodies, such as the United Nations, to help find peaceful settlements for the many disputes in the world.

However, we do have a direct share in maintaining the peace. We have more than forty allies with whom we are mutually pledged to resist aggression. The purpose of these treaties is to let others know in advance that aggression against nations to whom we are committed will not be accepted.

The integrity of these alliances is at the heart of the maintenance of peace. If it should be discovered that the pledge of the United States is meaningless, the structure of peace would crumble and the idea of a world based on law and order would be meaningless.

For the past seventeen years we have sought to assist the non-communist nations of East Asia and the Pacific in working out their own future, in their own way, and in accordance with their own traditions.

Our actions have covered both security and economic development. To meet the security threat we entered into various bilateral treaty commitments. In support of these commitments we deployed major forces to the area and we cooperated with nations of the area in developing military forces appropriate to the threat that we faced.

But our actions and those of our allies have not been confined to security alone; we have participated in a widening pattern of programs to strengthen the economies and the societies of individual nations, and of the area as a whole.

I referred a few minutes ago to the phenomenon of regional cooperation. As I have indicated, I believe that there is today in Asia a new atmosphere of hope and confidence, created at least in part by our joint efforts—the efforts of thirty-one nations, including the Republic of China—to give support to South Vietnam. Our willingness to act together in the military defense and the civilian construction of Viet Nam has been a very important factor, I believe, in spurring Asian nations to accelerate the pace of regional cooperation.

The Republic of China was among the earliest to perceive the importance of Asian nations working together for their common benefit. Starting in the period immediately following the Second World War, your government's leading participation in the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East—ECAFE—paralleled its membership in the United Nations and the UN specialized agencies.

Your country has made regular contributions for many years to the Lower Mekong Commission. Your entrepreneurs have been investing in many areas of North and Southeast Asia; you have shared with others the valuable lessons of your land reform program, and you have sought to increase your contacts with your neighbors in the cultural and other fields that, although they may not bring direct economic benefits, do help create an atmosphere in which other types of cooperation more easily can take place.

The imaginative plan proposed by your Government, for a Regional Vegetable Center in Taiwan, is still another indication of things to come in what may be a new Asian age.

Elsewhere in the area, other nations are coming closer together. We all were gratified by the conclusion of the treaty between Japan and Korea in 1965. Another example is the communists' defeat in Indonesia and the emergence of a courageous new leadership. This was facilitated by the Free World's determination in Viet Nam.

The joining together of 19 Asian nations in establishing the Asian Development Bank,

although nations of other areas are participating, is a very important step forward. It is noteworthy that two-thirds of the capital of the Bank is being contributed from within your own region.

The recent meeting of the Asian and Pacific Council—ASPAC—was another step forward in regional cooperation. The careful work by participating nations composing and nurturing this organization bodes well for its future. ASPAC is perhaps the most dramatic demonstration of Asian and Pacific countries' sense of identity and interdependence.

When in 1965 it became clear that South Viet Nam would be taken over by force, unless the United States and other nations introduced major combat forces and assisted South Viet Nam in military action against growing external aggression, the United States responded effectively.

There was little doubt that by the dynamics of aggression, Communist Chinese and others' subversive efforts against the rest of Southeast Asia would have been increased and encouraged had the free world continued to ignore the threats. We would also have seen the drastic reduction of the will and capacity of the remaining nations of Southeast Asia to resist these pressures. Free nations elsewhere in Asia, of course, would have suffered as a result.

The efforts of the United States and the Free World allies in assisting South Viet Nam are directed toward the achievement of an enduring peace in which free societies can survive and flourish. Our prime task in working towards a reliable peace is to deter aggression.

Thus the goal of our actions in Viet Nam is to convince the Communists that we cannot be defeated. Once this goal is understood by all, the prospects for lasting peace will be enhanced.

I am convinced that free people of all lands, by continuing cooperation, can win the victory which we seek. The heavy hand of communist domination of the hearts and minds of freedom-loving people must be removed. It is my fervent hope that the cooperative efforts of the people of your great republic and ours will never falter as we meet the challenge of this era.

On Saturday, July 22, 1967, a rally was held in the city hall, Taipei, at which several thousand were in attendance. A proclamation by President Johnson, a statement by President Chiang Kai-shek, a statement from General Westmoreland, an address by Vice President C. K. Yen of the Republic of China, and an address by Mr. Ku Cheng-kang, president, Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League, were read to the assembled audience. I make each of these a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1967—A
PROCLAMATION
(By the President of the United States of America)

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas freedom and justice are basic human rights to which all men are entitled; and

Whereas the independence of peoples requires their exercise of the elemental right of free choice; and

Whereas these inalienable rights have been circumscribed or denied in many areas of the world; and

Whereas the United States of America, from its founding as a nation has had an abiding commitment to the principles of national independence and human freedom:

Now, therefore, I Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 16, 1967 as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twelfth day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-seven, and the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-second.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

PRESIDENT CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S MESSAGE TO THE TAIPEI CONVOCATION IN OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 22, 1967

People of the Republic of China are responding enthusiastically to the Captive Nations Week movement that had its inception in the United States. The observance of Captive Nations Week comes at a moment when perfidious international Communism is faltering and close to collapse. The Mao-Tse-tung regime on the Chinese mainland is a slave system that has viciously persecuted the people. Now the fierce Chinese Communist struggle for power has plunged the Mao regime into unprecedented confusion. Attempting to save themselves, the Maoists are cruelly depriving the people of their means of livelihood in order to develop hydrogen bombs for aggressive purposes. This is certain to result in widespread anti-Communist uprisings on the mainland and will bring the Mao regime into worldwide disrepute.

Humankind must always struggle for freedom and against enslavement. In the end, freedom will always prevail. The Mao regime has doomed itself to extinction by its oppressions of the last decade and more. The whole world has become the antagonist of the Maoists. Chinese Communist chaos of today is a result of the Republic of China's political offensive of the last few years. Conditions are becoming increasingly advantageous for our counterattack and national recovery.

On the centennial of our Founding Father, Dr. Sun Yat-sen, I called for a Chinese cultural renaissance movement. In my Youth Day message this year, I urged the establishment of a united front for the overthrow of the Mao regime and the attainment of national salvation. These are two vital tasks in our ideological march forward and in our political return to the mainland. Our struggle must be continued along these lines. Our confidence in the triumph of the benevolence of our mainland compatriots over the evil violence of the Communists must be unshakable. When the benevolent forces of the mainland unite with our counterattacking elements, the Mao regime will be crushed. Politics will serve as the spearhead and military action as the decisive factor in delivering our people from their sufferings and consummating our great endeavor of national recovery.

All the world knows that Communism is the root of aggression and that the Mao regime is the wicked core of the Communist system. The eradication of the Mao regime is the key to the elimination of all Communist enslavements everywhere. We express sincere hope that the free world will respond to this Captive Nations Week. If it is clearly understood that slavery cannot coexist with freedom, we shall be able to unite and consolidate all anti-Communist forces. At that moment we can increase the tempo of the anti-Communist struggle and raise up the

enslaved peoples from the abyss of blood and suffering that engulfs them. Thus, they shall enter upon a new epoch of equality, justice, and freedom.

JULY 22, 1967.

From Captive nations rally in Taipei.
To Gen. William C. Westmoreland, commander of the U.S. Forces in Vietnam, and officers and men of the expeditionary forces from the United States, the Republic of Korea, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, and Thailand.

Under the Chinese and Russian Communist instigation, the Vietnamese Communists have been persisting in their all-out aggression against the Republic of Vietnam in an attempt to enlarge sinister Communist subversion and infiltration. It is you, heroic officers and men of the allies fighting in Vietnam, who have helped beat the persistent enemy, thus frustrating the vicious Communist plot to seize the Vietnamese territory and enslave the Vietnamese people. You have won sympathetic acclaim by freedom-loving people everywhere in the world.

Today, July 22, 1967 we people from all walks of life in the Republic of China have held a mammoth rally in Taipei in response to the U.S. initiated Captive Nations Week movement. We have resolved to support the United States and other allies in carrying out their correct policy of aiding the Republic of Vietnam through positive actions. We are appealing to all nations to adopt an even stronger strategy of initiative so that the North Vietnamese Reds can be routed to achieve a clear-cut victory. We wish to pledge to you our most resolute support in the struggle for a free and independent Vietnam.

Out of our deep appreciation for your great contribution and sacrifice, we are hereby sending you our most sincere respect. May we wish you success in bringing about victory in the anti-Communist war at an early date.

VICE PRESIDENT YEN CHIA-KAN'S MESSAGE TO THE MASS MEETING IN SUPPORT OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 22, 1967

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It has been eight years since the President of the United States was authorized by a joint resolution of the Congress to issue a proclamation each year, inviting the people of the United States to observe the Captive Nations Week. It has since become a worldwide movement. The annual observance of this movement is not an occasion for celebration. Rather, it kindles in us a solemn sense of responsibility.

From the very beginning of this movement, it intends to continue until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world. The very fact that it is observed year in year out testifies that slavery still exists in this world. For instance, half of Europe, as well as half of Korea and Viet Nam, is now under totalitarian domination. As far as peoples are still being enslaved with their fundamental rights denied to them, as far as they are painfully longing for justice and freedom, the responsibility of the free world remains unfulfilled. Especially in the case of my country, the Republic of China, where 700 million compatriots are entrapped behind the Iron Curtain and persecuted under the tyrannical regime of the Chinese Communists, the situation is much worse than other captive nations. This gives us a deep sense of shame and makes us extremely conscious of our duty involved. We have long determined to recover the Chinese mainland in order to liberate our compatriots from under the Communist yoke. In organizing today this mass meeting to support the Captive Nations Week, we are therefore not only sympathetic towards all captive nations,

we want also to unite with them in a joint effort to eliminate slavery all over the world.

We learn from history that despots or groups of fanatics did repeatedly manage to enslave their fellow men by means of cruel and inhuman measures. They did so because they wanted to satisfy their beastly lust for power. As a result, an epoch of regression inevitably followed each of such ugly and tragic incidents. Human nature, however, is incessantly seeking freedom and justice. And in order to struggle for their inalienable rights, the enslaved peoples have been willing to pay any price in terms of human efforts and sacrifices. Their successes are often the brightest pages in the chronicle of man's progress. Today, we are confronting the ugliest despotism ever devised by man. Both the number of souls under its bondage and the area under its domination are unprecedented in history. It is even threatening the freedom of the whole world in a vicious way never dreamed of in the past. This is the totalitarian regime of the Chinese Communist under Mao Tze-tung.

Ladies and Gentlemen: We have today with us many fellow compatriots who have fled the Chinese mainland. They are in a position to witness for us what has happened under the bloody control of the Chinese Communists. I would like to invite your attention to the criminal records of the Chinese Communists as follows:

The Chinese Communists executed all civil leaders who were respected by the people, by means of "liquidation", "struggle", "public trial", etc. Because these leaders were considered by the Chinese Communists as anti-revolutionaries who should be got rid of.

Under the pretext of "land reform", the Chinese Communists murdered en masse land-owners and rich peasants in the rural areas, and confiscated their landed properties.

Also, during the "three antis" and "five-antis" movements, the Chinese Communists persecuted all those whom they referred to as capitalists and had their businesses taken over without compensation.

In the city, the Chinese Communists instigated clashes among the workers, and exploited and enslaved them under the alibi of "democratic reform".

Again, in an effort to "purge the anti-revolutionary", the intellectuals were persecuted. Thousands of them were murdered as a result.

These facts indicate that the sinister pursuits of the Chinese Communists are becoming increasingly evil. This can be further evidenced by other Communist activities such as, "contending and blooming movement", "three red flags", "anti-right deviationists", "socialistic education movement", "four purity movement", etc. All these, and many others, are cardinal crimes against human nature, and they culminate at the recent "cultural revolution" and "red guardism" which turned the Chinese mainland upside down. And "all hell broke loose". As far as we know, there are no less than 17 million Chinese people being kept in the labor-reform camps which the Chinese Communists set up all over the land. These compatriots of ours are literally living the life of the draft animal. This is the most inhuman form of slavery ever known to man.

I would like to point out, furthermore, that the crimes committed by the Chinese Communists against mankind are much more far-reaching than the above-mentioned. As early as 1950, the Chinese Communists already began aggressive activities against the free countries. They first instigated the Korean Communists to invade the Republic of Korea from the north and started the Korean War. Later, they applied the same conspiracy in Viet-Nam and provoked the armed hostilities there which are still far from over. They also sent armed forces into India. On the other hand, their subversive activities are hardly less menacing. By in-

filtration and conspiracy, they are undermining the political stability of many countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Consequently, the peace and order of the free world is seriously threatened. They even export "red guards" in recent months to Macao, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Burma, and India to create turmoil and chaos. They are certainly unmasking themselves and showing their true colors. But the most serious crime they are committing is their attempt to manufacture nuclear weapons. They have squeezed the last ounce of energy and resources from the Chinese people for this purpose, and they have so far detonated six tests in a row. It is evidently their evil intention to trigger a nuclear confrontation. They said that they would sacrifice half the Chinese population, if necessary, to conquer the free world. This is doubtlessly the most savage and most fantastic ambition ever cherished in the minds of men.

Ladies and Gentlemen: Let me ask what is the motivation of the Chinese Communists? It is their daydream of enslaving the whole world by means of their "world revolution". We will therefore solemnly denounce the Chinese Communists not only as traitors to our people but also as public enemies of mankind. For the sake of helping the captive nations to regain freedom and keeping the evil of Communism from plaguing our offsprings, we would like to make the following suggestions:

First, to free the captive nations calls for global effort; its focal point is now in Asia. The enslavement system imposed upon the people by the Chinese Communists, as well as their determination to threaten the peace of the world, is unparalleled in history. President Chiang has repeatedly told us, "All the trouble in the world today has its root in Asia. The world shall have no peace unless the Communist menace on the Chinese mainland is eradicated. Therefore the first step to free the peoples behind the Iron Curtain is to defeat the Chinese Communists". This statement of President Chiang points out the central-preoccupation of the Captive Nations Week. In other words, our efforts to support the captive nations should begin in Asia, and be extended to the whole world.

Second, our support, given to the captive nations should be thorough and unreserved. Let us make no mistake about the true nature of all the Communists especially the Chinese Communists. They will never change their ultimate goal of "world revolution" and "enslavement of the whole world". They will never deviate from their set course and co-exist with the free world in peace. We all love peace, but we love freedom better. We would die as free men rather than live as slaves. For this reason, we are wholeheartedly for the joint resolution of the Congress of the United States, initiating the Captive Nations Week, which specifies that its annual observance shall continue until all captive nations of the world are assured of freedom and independence. In order that this purpose be thoroughly carried out, we must help all captive nations in their efforts to free themselves. We have an old Chinese proverb to the effect that we should help virtues thrive but we should eradicate evils completely. This is exactly what we should do now. We should by all means wipe out the Communist tyranny completely so that men's freedoms will be fully restored.

Third, we need timely actions in order to set the captive nations free. The sufferings of the captive nations become increasingly unbearable as the tyrannical regimes continue to tighten their control. Although it is a historical truth that despotism cannot long last, yet we should not let our enslaved fellow men endure unnecessary misery. We should give them timely help so that they will be enabled to break the chains as soon as possible. Especially today when the Chinese Communists are being prepared to wage a nuclear war, we must first uproot Com-

munist from the Chinese soil. This is the only practical way to prevent a nuclear holocaust.

Ladies and Gentlemen: We all know that liberty and slavery cannot co-exist, but we also trust that freedom and justice will prevail in the long run. We would like to join hands with all freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples and cooperate with them in our common efforts to defeat despotism and liberate captive nations. We will march together toward victory.

I thank you.

ADDRESS BY MR. KU CHENG-KANG, PRESIDENT, CHINA CHAPTER, ASIAN PEOPLES' ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE

Distinguished Guests, Delegates to the Conference, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We are gathered here to hold the 13th Conference of the Chapter at a very important juncture of its history. The League is developing into a world-wide organization and our Chapter is charged with the mission to prepare for the convening of the First Conference of the World Anti-Communist League as well as the 13th Conference of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League. We are especially honored by the presence of the Hon. Basil Whitener, Member of the United States Congress representing the United States Captive Nation Week movement, who is going to address this assembly. I want to express to him our heartiest welcome and appreciation.

At the 12th APACL Conference held in Seoul last November a decision was made to develop the League into the World Anti-Communist League (WACL). This was the natural result of the continuous expansion of membership of our League and in consonance with the development of world situation. The WACL Charter provides for the setting up of six regional organizations in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, Europe, Latin America and North America. Thus the APACL will remain as one of these regional organizations.

Last December at our Chapter's Standing Committee meeting unanimous support was pledged to the mission entrusted to the Chapter to host the forthcoming First WACL Conference and the 13th APACL Conference in Taipei. A 25-member Preparatory Committee was elected to launch the preparations. And as of 1 April 1967 when the WACL Charter went into effect, our organization has two hats: China Chapter of both the WACL and the APACL. Our responsibility is of course similarly doubled.

This year happens to be the centennial of the publication of *Das Kapital* and the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet regime. But Communism is giving clear signs of decline, most outstanding ones are the sharp conflict between the Chinese Communists and the Soviet Union and the internal disruption on mainland China. The birth of the WACL is historically significant as it will mark the end of an old era and the beginning of a new one, and as it reflects the destined failure of Communism.

The selection of Taipei as the site of the First WACL Conference was not an arbitrary one. The Delegates meeting in Seoul had a number of reasons. They had in mind the rich experience and the firm stand of the Republic of China in fighting Communism under the wise leadership of President Chiang Kai-shek. They had in mind the active participation of our Chapter in the APACL activities and its virtual position as a binding force for the world's anti-Communist movements. Their decision has since been endorsed by anti-Communist leaders all over the world.

This mission is to us at once an honor and a heavy task. It is not going to be easy because peaceful co-existence and other misguided appeasement demands are visible everywhere and because time is so short. May

I submit the following thoughts and recommendations to you:

For the successful conduct of this unprecedented WACL Conference all available manpower, experience and wisdom are needed. Only two short months are left for us to finish all the necessary preparation. I ask from you Ladies and Gentlemen moral and substantial support. Be prepared to receive a call from us for assistance.

To cope with the development we must readjust our future policy and intensify our activities. The APACL has also maintained that the Asian peoples should unite to decide our own destiny, and that the Asian nations should safeguard our security collectively. We have contributed to the awareness of the nature of Communism among the Asian people and to the closer cooperation of Asian countries in defense against Communism. We believe that we have contributed to the normalization of relations between Japan and Korea, and to the present close cooperation among China, Korea, and Vietnam. We have called for an anti-Communist alliance among the Asian and Pacific nations, opposed the admission of the Chinese Communist regime into the United Nations, and developed contacts in areas where our government has not established diplomatic relations. We will push on to our objective of destroying the Iron Curtain in Asia so as to restore freedom to all enslaved peoples. Under the WACL we will fight for the universal freedom and world peace, by uniting all anti-Communist forces regardless of racial, regional, national and religious differences.

Opportunity is ripening for our recovery of mainland China, in which task we shall all want to play an active role. It is now obvious that the Chinese Communist gang has bogged down in internal confusion and has been rejected by all other countries, with the upheavals generated by the "great cultural revolution" and the Red Guards, and with the mad efforts of infiltration and subversion against all neighbors. Our President has launched two important movements as the most effective means to counter enemy action, to wit, the movement to revive Chinese culture and the movement to form a joint front for the destruction of Mao Tse-tung and the rescue of the nation. Our Chapter should take up both movements and apply ourselves to them.

For over a decade we have devoted ourselves to the defense of freedom. Now we can see the imminent proof that freedom prevails over all forms of enslavement. In this last stage of the battle let us all do our best to accelerate the advent of victory over Communism on the mainland.

In addition to the foregoing there were messages to President Johnson, to the enslaved people in the Republic of China, to the people of captive nations, and to the Chiefs of State of the Republic of Vietnam. These were presented to the audience and were received in an enthusiastic manner.

At this time it was my privilege to deliver a brief address which I make a part of the RECORD at this point, together with the messages above referred to:

MESSAGE TO U.S. PRESIDENT JOHNSON
His Excellency LYNDON B. JOHNSON, President of the United States of America:

The United States of America, out of a strong belief in its founding principle of freedom as well as of a spirit to prevent dangers and rescue the weak, has fought unflinchingly to protect the liberty of all mankind over an extended period. In this it has made tremendous and glorious contributions. It was the U.S. strength that had helped win World Wars I and II to safeguard free democracy, thus delivering millions of people from the militarist and Nazi domination. Since

the end of World War II, free mankind has been confronted with a greatest foe—the force of Communist slavery of which the Chinese Communist regime is the most vicious and maddest of all. In the past Korea war as well as in the present Vietnam war, the United States has never hesitated in making huge sacrifices to contain the spread of Communist evil in order to maintain a consistent stand in the defense of freedom. All this deserves admiration and respect by freedom-loving people the world over.

The present world situation clearly shows that the force of Communist slavery is seriously split. Internal conflict and difficulty has plunged it into an acute crisis. The superiority of the democratic system and of the free way of life has produced a profound spiritual impact on Soviet Russia and Eastern European countries. Hence there arises a mighty force for change and reform. But the incorrigible Chinese Communists have become all the more militant in their attempt to bring into full play the sheer cruelty and retrogressive barbarity of the tyrannical Communist rule. This is attested by the so-called "Great Cultural Revolution" that finds its expression in the "Red Guard" rampage. They have been stirring up troubles everywhere in the world and threatening to bury free humanity. They have emphatically proclaimed the United States their enemy No. 1. All their sinister maneuvers actually constitute a most flagrant challenge to freedom without precedent in history. The United States and the free world as a whole now are faced with a most serious test.

We have ample evidence to believe that the United States is not afraid of this challenge and is strong enough to meet this test. A great majority of the free people and the people behind the Iron Curtain have faithfully placed their hopes in the United States. For this reason, we think that the United States should adopt a more positive strategy to win the war in Vietnam. The United States needs no longer to tie its own hands in a struggle to make Vietnam fully independent and free. In Asia, in view of the current chaotic situation on the Chinese mainland, the United States must give practical and effective aid to all those who are fighting for freedom from Communist slavery so as to whip up a high tide of the movement against Communist tyranny. In the world as a whole, the United States must persist in the principle that freedom is indivisible. So long as Communist rulers have not relinquished their enslavement and tyranny, any talk of "peaceful coexistence" is but an illusion. In its endeavor, the United States can count on the support of all freedom-loving peoples in the world.

The Republic of China has always stood on the first front of the struggle against Communist slavery. We are under oath to destroy the Chinese Communist regime, the most vicious sort of Communist slavery, with our own hands in order to realize mankind's common goal toward an era of freedom at the earliest possible moment. On today's date, we people from all walks of life in the Republic of China met at a rally to support the freedom struggle of the people in captive nations in response to the Captive Nations Week initiated by the United States. Herewith we wish to send you our respect and also to pledge our determination to join the United States in a common struggle to defend freedom.

(From the mass rally in the Republic of China to support the Iron Curtain people struggle for freedom.)

DECLARATION ISSUED BY THE MASS RALLY HELD IN TAIPEI, TAIWAN, REPUBLIC OF CHINA IN SUPPORT OF ENSLAVED PEOPLES IN THEIR FIGHT FOR REGAINING FREEDOM

This mass rally attended by representatives from all walks of life in the Republic of

China is being held as part of the Captive Nations Week sponsored by the United States to express our hearty support for the captive peoples all over the world in their fight to regain their freedom. We are meeting at a time when there is a general confusion and turmoil on the Communist-controlled Chinese mainland, when the situation in Vietnam is becoming increasingly critical, and when the peoples in Eastern Europe are working feverishly for their political liberation. That this rally should be held at such a moment is significant in itself.

It is indisputable that all the trouble in Asia has been caused by the tyrannical regime set up by the Chinese Communists in mainland China. For 18 years since Mao Tse-tung and his gang captured political power, they have been enslaving the 600 million Chinese people and exploiting them to the last penny to develop and test hydrogen bombs for the purpose of intimidating their neighbors. In more recent years, they have been exporting violence and naked force and have directed their infiltration and subversive activities against Macau, Hongkong, Thailand, Burma, Malaysia, Japan, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Ceylon, and as far as Kenya. Reacting to the Communist intrigues, anti-Communist and anti-Mao Tse-tung incidents have broken out in all these countries. Therefore, we should like to call upon all anti-Communist nations in Asia and Africa to join forces to deal a mortal blow to the bellicose Peiping regime. It is only by destroying this hotbed of revolutionary fanaticism before the regime has perfected a nuclear delivery system that we can remove the threat to Asian peace and human freedom.

The Chinese Communists have clearly identified three great "enemies" with whom there can be no room for compromise. These are the anti-Communist democracies headed by American "Imperialism," the Communist revisionists headed by Soviet Russia, and the so-called "reactionary elements" headed by the Republic of China. From this it is clear that the Peiping regime has set itself not only against the free and democratic nations, but also against the Soviet bloc of nations. In other words, it has set itself against the whole world. Unfortunately, many people in the free world, duped by Communist lies and trickery and unable to differentiate between friend and foe, are prone to be appeasement-minded and to entertain vain hopes of peaceful coexistence with the Mao Tse-tung regime. We must call upon all free nations, especially the United States, Japan, and other influential countries, to give up their unrealistic dream of appeasing and coexisting with the Chinese Communists and, instead, to make use of their combined strength to cope with the common enemy of the world, the tyrannical regime at Peiping. The most effective way to do it would be to assist the anti-Communist countries on the periphery of the Chinese mainland to open a new front on the southwestern border of China so that the anti-Communist forces of the free world can join up with the anti-Communist forces behind the Bamboo Curtain. Whenever that happens, the people on the Chinese mainland will respond enthusiastically and the Mao Tse-tung regime will soon fall like an overripe apple.

From the recent Glassboro summit meeting between U.S. President Lyndon B. Johnson and Soviet Premier Aleksei Kosygin, it would seem that the United States could hardly hope to put an end to the war in Vietnam through U.S.-Soviet cooperation. In this connection we should like to remind our American friends that there is no other alternative in Vietnam except to continue the fight and to win it. To open talks with the enemy while the fighting is going on would not only be a severe blow to the military morale, but also afford the enemy an opportunity to mount sneaky attacks. We know only too well that owing to the heavy

losses and sacrifices incurred on the battlefields of Vietnam, the United States is anxious to end it as soon as possible. But as she has already paid so dearly in terms of material and human losses, she could not possibly want to end it halfway like what happened in the Korean War. As secretary of State Dean Rusk has pointed out, we cannot leave the freedom of the Vietnamese people without protection and encourage the Communists to further aggression. Therefore, we must admonish our American ally to adopt a "win the war" policy by intensifying the aerial bombardment and naval blockade of North Vietnam and forcing Hanoi to choose either destruction or peace. Only in this way can the Vietnamese people be protected, and the threat to Asian and world peace and security be removed.

Just as the captive peoples in Europe and Asia are struggling to liberate themselves and the Communist regimes are weakening from within, we cannot overemphasize that the Bamboo Curtain set up by the Peiping regime by brute force and aggression must be torn down by a still greater military might. Only thus can the source of evil to all free peoples be eliminated. As to the Iron Curtain in Europe, the matter should also be properly settled in the light of the current political situation and according to the aspirations of the captive peoples themselves so that their struggle for freedom and independence may be crowned with success.

This year happens to be the centennial of the publication of Volume one of Karl Marx's *Das Kapital* and the 50th anniversary of the Soviet Revolution in Russia. On looking back, we are firmly convinced that Communism is wicked in both theory and practice, that it is repugnant to a life of freedom for man, and that it is irrevocably doomed to final destruction. We are convinced that history is on the side of the free peoples and that the satanic forces of Communism will crumble before the onrush of the forces of justice and freedom. We hereby call upon all our brethren both at home and abroad to rally together in response to President Chiang Kai-shek's double appeal for a cultural renaissance, on the one hand, and for a united front against Mao Tse-tung and for national salvation, on the other. Let us unite together to form an impregnable entity and let us concentrate all our strength to destroy the Communist foe that has been posing a great threat to human freedom. We earnestly hope that all freedom-loving peoples of the world will give us all the necessary encouragement and support. Let us march forward hand in hand to work for the glorious victory of human freedom.

MESSAGE TO PEOPLE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

Dear friends behind the Iron Curtain: We presumed that you have heard the news of two great events that occurred this year concerning the Iron Curtain people's fight toward freedom. One was the defection of Mrs. Svetlana Alliluyeva, the only daughter of the late Soviet dictator Stalin, who has deserted her fatherland under slavery and evils to choose a new life in freedom. The other was the defection of Mr. Ma Sze-tung, a renowned Chinese pianist, who has risked untold hardships to escape Chinese Communist tyranny and "Red Guard" persecution. And now he and his family are living in a land of freedom and happiness.

These two persons represented but the most significant examples of millions of cases of the exodus to freedom against Communist tyranny. This shows that no one, be she or he a daughter of Stalin or an aloof musician and be she or he hailing from West or East, could ever tolerate for long Communist enslavement and persecution that are imposed on man's mind and body. They are the fortunate ones who have regained freedom. They remind us of you, numbering no less than 1

billion, who are still unfortunately leading a blighted hellish life in slavery. Therefore we feel that we owe you a sacred duty to support your struggle for freedom.

Nevertheless you are masters of your own destiny. The freedom fight is a way out for individual persons, but collective resistance against slavery can be a way out for all of you. What proves far more important is the liberation of all, not the salvation of a few. In this connection, we wish to pay our solemn respect to the freedom-fighters who have been working relentlessly for the liberation movement in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Romania. Thanks to their endeavors and sacrifices, the force of slavery has been compelled to retreat and collapse, thus creating essential conditions for the tearing down of the Iron Curtain. Now that the die is cast, the triumph of freedom has become irresistible!

In recent years, the United States has sponsored the movement of Captive Nations Week for the purpose of rallying all forces of freedom for a common struggle in the right direction. In response to this movement, we people from all walks of life in the Republic of China held on today's date an enthusiastic mass rally. We wish to reiterate our faith and our determination and joining hands with you to fight for the victory of freedom. In particular we want to extend to you sincere regards from the military and civilian people in the Republic of China.

(From the mass rally in the Republic of China to support the Iron Curtain people struggle for freedom.)

JULY 22, 1967.

His Excellencies Chief of State Nguyen Van Thieu and Premier Nguyen Cao Ky, the Armed Forces and the People of the Republic of Vietnam:

At a time when the war front in Vietnam has turned increasingly favorable to you, the Vietnamese Communists, goaded and aided by Chinese and Russian Communists with their increased support, have spurned successive offers for peace negotiations and persisted in subversive maneuvers to expand Communist influence. But Your Excellencies have undertaken to lead the Vietnamese military force and people in giving many a fatal blow on the enemy and thus thwarting the Communist thrust. In the meantime, you have also strengthened unity on the home front by promulgating a democratic constitution and making preparations for a national election. The undaunted spirit you have demonstrated in the struggle to protect your national independence and integrity and to maintain liberty and justice has won our profound admiration. We hereby wish to pledge our full support to your esteemed country so as to win a common victory at an early date.

In response to the U.S.-sponsored Captive Nations Week in 1967, we people from all walks of life in the Republic of China have held a mammoth rally in Taipei on July 22, 1967. We appeal to the U.S. government for the adoption of a resolute strategy to achieve a total defeat of the Vietnamese Communists in order to win the war. We also have appealed to the free world as a whole for even more positive and effective actions to provide assistance to the Republic of Vietnam.

Herewith is a reiteration of the determination that we people in the Republic of China have constantly possessed to fight shoulder to shoulder with the people of your country in a common struggle. May we wish your country success in the forthcoming national election and in winning the war of resistance against Communism at the earliest moment.

CAPTIVE NATIONS RALLY IN TAIPEI.

ADDRESS BY BASIL L. WHITENER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 10TH DISTRICT, NORTH CAROLINA, TO THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RALLY, JULY 22, 1967, TAIPEI, TAIWAN, REPUBLIC OF CHINA

I am honored to be in Taipei today and to have the privilege of participating in another of the historic Captive Nations mass rallies. The efforts of the Republic of China to give deserved recognition to the great importance of Captive Nations Week have been an inspiration to free people everywhere.

Chairman Ku is well known to my colleagues in the United States Congress. He has done much to bring together the people of your country and mine in carrying out these important observances.

Since President Eisenhower first proclaimed Captive Nations Week in 1959, it has been observed every year throughout the United States. Proclamations were issued last year by officials in scores of cities and towns in my country calling upon our people to participate in Captive Nations Week.

The fact that the people of America join the citizens of your country in celebrating this eventful week is conclusive evidence of a common determination that has characterized our relationship over such a long period. As we join together each year in these observances we are bound closer in the cause of freedom for all people.

I am privileged to represent in the Congress of the United States a portion of the people of America—more than 400,000 persons in seven counties of the highly progressive State of North Carolina. I can assure you that the fine citizens of my home state fully support the spirit of Captive Nations Week. As the descendants of the pioneers who gave American freedom its first expression, they appreciate the blessings of liberty and freedom.

Many of the brave sons of North Carolina are in the jungles and hills of South Viet Nam today. Led by one of our most distinguished Carolinians, General William C. Westmoreland, they are manning the ramparts of freedom to prevent the enslavement of a courageous people.

In Viet Nam the Free World's determination to resist aggression and to make possible the building of a healthy and free society is being tested. The sons of North Carolina are proud to be in Viet Nam. They, and the young men from other areas of our nation and in other free lands, recognize the truth of what your great President, His Excellency Chiang Kai-shek, said last year to this rally. They agree with his noble statement that "to combat slavery in the name of freedom conforms to the most basic requirement of humanity and the strongest aspiration of mankind."

Some of those who have recently escaped the tyranny of communism on the mainland of China have brought the message of communist enslavement to us in a very vivid manner. Almost without exception, they have pointed out that communist cruelty and insanity made them fugitives from their own homeland.

They have told us of the effects upon their daily lives of the terror suffered at the hands of the Red Guards and the oppressors of freedom who wear the communist mantle. Their experiences illustrate and dramatize the perversity of an ideology that seeks to strengthen a society by robbing its citizens of freedom and dignity as individuals.

Your distinguished Vice President told this rally last year: "We have full confidence in the bright future of free men. On the basis of this faith of ours, we offer cooperation to all peoples for freedom. Let us join together in this noble task and make all possible efforts to secure for all men their inalienable right of liberty."

This year Vice President Yen on his visit to our country approximately two months

ago spoke again—to our President, to members of Congress, and to the American press and people—of your great Republic's strong determination, under the dynamic leadership of President Chiang, to work with free peoples throughout the free world to achieve these noble ends.

Vice President Yen readily found in the United States great admiration for what you have accomplished in the Republic of China and for the contributions you are making to the important task of strengthening the world's free societies. I feel confident he found that Americans are determined to honor our commitments to our friends throughout the world.

This determination has been proclaimed by American Presidents of both political parties in recent years.

Fourteen years ago—six years before he issued the first Captive Nations Week proclamation—President Eisenhower told the American people in his first inaugural address:

"Realizing that common sense and common decency alike dictate the futility of appeasement, we shall never try to placate an aggressor by the false and wicked bargain of trading honor for security. Americans, indeed all free men, remember that in the final choice a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains."

In his inaugural address eight years later the late President Kennedy proclaimed:

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

And last year, in a ringing speech at Freedom House in New York, President Johnson promised:

"We will build freedom while we fight and we will seek peace every day by every honorable means. But we will persevere along the high hard road of freedom."

The testimony of Captive Nations Week—and the spirit of this rally today—is that we will persevere in the cause of freedom. As long as one man is fettered none of us is truly free.

Let us then resolve to rededicate ourselves at this critical period in history to the cause of freedom and justice for people everywhere. For the sake of the victims of despotism and for all those who sacrifice in war and peace to strike the chains of slavery, let us hold high the torch of hope for a brighter day for all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I am impressed by the dedication of our free Chinese friends to the cause of the preservation of liberty throughout the world. Their zeal is worthy of the support of all people of America and throughout the world who are dedicated to the cause of freedom.

I take this occasion to express to our distinguished U.S. Ambassador, Walter P. McCaughy, and those who work with him in our Embassy in Taiwan my heartfelt gratitude for their warm reception and cooperative attitude during my visit to the Republic of China. In my judgment Ambassador McCaughy and his colleagues on our Embassy staff are greatly contributing to the good relations which exist between the United States and the Republic of China. Their many contributions to the effort which I was privileged to make on this occasion far exceeded any reasonable requirement that one could place upon them. I express to them and to the Department of State my appreciation for these many acts of helpfulness.

I also would like to avail myself of

this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to the President and Madame Chiang Kai-shek for the warmth of their reception at a luncheon which I had with them and Dr. Fredrick Chien of the North American Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of China. This was a highlight of my visit to Taiwan, and I shall always remember the opportunity that I had to again meet with these outstanding world leaders.

The leaders of every branch of the Government of the Republic of China, particularly Vice President C. K. Yen, gave generously of their time and hospitality during the few days that I was privileged to be in their country. The conferences and briefings which I had with them are of inestimable value in bringing about a greater understanding of some of the problems being confronted by the free people of the Republic of China and Southeast Asia. The information which they so freely gave was extremely educational, and I know that it will be of great value as I seek to serve the people of my own district and of our great country in the Congress of the United States.

I salute our friends in free China for the efforts that they are making in the cause of freedom. Their work is most impressive. It is my fervent hope that the results which they will eventually obtain will be equally impressive.

WHILE WE FIDDLE, A NATION BURNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of time, man has sought a form of government that would allow the greatest possible freedom for the individual—the greatest opportunity for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The United States has suffered through wars, depressions, poverty, ignorance, and want. Its people have never ceased in their quest for our ageless dream.

Today we are caught up in a civil strife without equal since the Civil War.

Abraham Lincoln told us that we could not exist half slave and half free. Since that terrible conflict, we have moved from an agrarian to an industrial society, from a rural to an urban nation.

These changes have brought problems. These problems stagger the imagination and I would be the first to admit that I do not have all of the answers. I do know, however, that these problems will never be solved through hatred, violence, murder, looting, burnings, and pillage.

Lincoln said something that seems appropriate at this time.

Whenever the vicious portion of population shall be permitted to gather . . . and burn churches, ravage and rob provision stores, throw printing presses into rivers, shoot editors, and hand and burn obnoxious persons at pleasure, and with impunity; depend on it, this Government cannot last.

Events in the past weeks, more to the point the past several summers, lead us to wonder if this Government can long

endure the stresses and strains of the times.

We are shocked when we see tanks in American streets—machinegunning at snipers in apartment buildings.

Snipers on the streets of the United States. It just cannot happen.

The tragedy is that it has happened, and unless there is a drastic change in our attitude it will happen again—and more viciously.

Over 30 cities in this Nation have now suffered the blistering heat of rioting and violence in 1967.

Each succeeding summer has seen an increase in violence and disorder. Perhaps the day is not far off when this will become a year-round sport.

H. Rap Brown, SNCC chairman, the initials obviously being those identifying "Slobs Now Causing Chaos," has these brilliant words for America Wednesday:

I consider myself neither morally nor legally bound to obey laws made by a body in which I have no representation. We stand on the eve of the black revolution, masses of our people are on the move, fighting the enemy tit for tat, responding to counter revolutionary violence with revolutionary violence, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, and a life for a life. These rebellions are but a dress rehearsal for the real revolution.

This is the person who said:

Get your guns . . . If America don't come around, we got to burn it down.

Another sage of our times, Stokely Carmichael, is reported to have said in Cuba:

In Newark we applied war tactics of the guerrillas. We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas for our defense in the cities. The price of these rebellions is a high price that one must pay. The fight is not going to be a simple street meeting. It is going to be a fight to the death.

Here in Congress, we hear and see speech after speech that there is new concern.

I support the action of those calling for a congressional investigation. I think it is long overdue. However, if all we are going to hear when it is done is that there must be a massive infusion of Federal funds and that we are going to have violence if we do not pay tribute, then it will be a waste of time.

One thing that any investigation should take into very careful consideration is the method being used to finance the travels of men like Carmichael and Brown. I suspect that there are very serious ramifications to be drawn from such a study.

Someone, or something, supports their activity. They seem to have little difficulty in gaining funds to travel from city to city, inciting violence and hatred.

Yet, like an iceberg, those whose names appear in the papers are but the visible part of a number of such conspirators. Their goal is to see their Nation destroyed and replaced with a Marxist dictatorship. The words of Mao Tse-tung and not Lincoln, the hammer and sickle and not the Stars and Stripes, dictatorship and not freedom—this is their real credo.

It is time to stop comparing civil rights and rioting.

It is disgusting to excuse murder, looting, and burning because of a slum area.

Most important, this is not a Negro rebellion. Those who have been hurt the most, those who have suffered the most, have been the Negroes in the area of rioting.

They have had their homes burned down, their businesses burned, their property destroyed. Riot is colorblind.

Witness the reports in the news media of the intemperate and inflammatory statements of the criminal insurrectionists. It is carried on the front pages in bold headlines.

But the Negro leaders who plead and work to preserve law and order are given short notice. Yet, in truth, it is they that speak the hopes and the aspirations of the overwhelming number of their people.

Those participating are nothing more than criminals and hoodlums.

I saw a television news report the other night where a young Negro soldier had returned home from Vietnam, only to see his home burned to the ground. He and his mother knew not where they would lay their heads that night.

Americans are entitled to be safe in their homes. They are entitled to have their property protected, and they are entitled to be safe in their homes and on American streets.

A paragraph in a recent issue of U.S. News & World Report said this:

Negro militants are reported to be viewing riots as counterpart to labor-union strikes—with the use of force and force power to gain rewards. Payoffs to rioters by the Government are starting to be taken as encouragement to that view.

How many times times have we been castigated in the Congress with statements that we must pass a certain bill or face a riot.

This is no way to solve a problem. This is no way to legislate.

Legislation should be based on whether it is good or not. We should not be threatened with violence into passing any bill.

The President put it bluntly the other evening.

We will not tolerate lawlessness. We will not endure violence. It matters not by whom it is done or under what slogan or banner. It will not be tolerated. This Nation will do whatever is necessary to suppress and to punish those who engage in it.

He also said:

Pillage, looting, murder, and arson, have nothing to do with civil rights. They are criminal conduct.

That puts the issue in perspective.

We need law and order and not excuses for those who have participated. These riots are led by a small minority of criminals who either want something for nothing, or to destroy this Nation.

There are some reasons that we seldom hear much about when we hear floods of apology and forgiveness for those who riot.

The first is the fact that one successful riot leads to another. Had we stopped the first, perhaps we would not have had the second. Firm action at the outset would have saved many lives and millions in property.

A second has been a series of court de-

cisions that show concern for the criminal, but seldom for society. They are so caught up in sociology and rhetoric, that they pay scarce attention to precedent and the intent of the lawmaking branch of Government. The rights of the victims of crime are glossed over.

A third is the lack of respect for law and order. Here is one area where the entire Nation has been derelict. Instead of the friendly cop on the beat image, the policeman is often considered the enemy.

For a law official to be effective, he must have respect. But these very same law officers lose their patience as they arrest murderers, rapists, and criminals of every variety, only to see them released time and again to repeat the very same crime.

I feel sick in the stomach for the tens of thousands who live in the riot-torn areas. They could not halt the destruction and their lives were in mortal danger. Yet, those who could have come to their rescue, apologized and allowed the first sparks of disorder to become roaring infernos.

America is frightened today.

We know not where this will strike next. We know not which city will erupt into flames next. We know not what child will be killed or whose home will be burned in a senseless rampage of violence.

There are those who profit. The Communists, masters of godlessness and dictatorship, reap a grand reward.

The entire fabric of international communism leaps with joy as they view the fruits of their labors. There is no question but that they have been involved just as much as humanly possible in stirring up racial strife in this Nation.

Because of the activities of a very small percentage of the Negro community there is fear on the part of both races. Social progress stops in an era of terror and destruction.

We must first have law and order before this Nation can move forward.

The pleas and the statements of the real men of integrity in the Negro community go unheard in the storm of publicity of swine who scream, "burn, loot, and kill."

To make a point, I would like to quote you just a part of an editorial from the Washington Post of July 25:

The Detroit riot is the greatest tragedy of all the long succession of Negro ghetto outbursts. In other cities it has been possible to seek causes in the ineptitude of governments, the hostility of employers and unions, the destitution of the slum's people. But Detroit is different.

For years Detroit has been the American model of intelligence and political courage applied to the governance of a huge industrial city. Mayor Cavanagh has gone further, over a longer period of years, to respond to the people of the slums than any other big-city mayor; and now Mr. Cavanagh is doubtless destroyed as a political leader. Detroit's gifted young Congressman Conyers, one of six Negroes in the House, was booed and pelted by the crowd.

Detroit's poverty program has been repeatedly cited as the most effective in the United States. Its police force is considered a model of temperate restraint. Its inner city schools are one of the country's leading examples of forceful reform in education. The United Automobile Workers have done more for racial equality than any other union in the history

of American labor, and they have been met with the steady cooperation of the automobile manufacturers. Whatever the deprivations of Detroit, there is no shortage of well-paid industrial jobs free of racial discrimination. The city of Detroit was badly shocked by its fearful race riot in 1943. Over the past decade there has been no other large American city in which government, business and labor have devoted as much skill and effort to the cause of the Negro and the poor.

The paper went on to state that the sources of these riots lie beyond any easy explanation in the social and economic statistics.

Certainly there is much that needs to be done in the public and the private sector to relieve poverty, hunger, and disease. We have different views as to how this can be accomplished.

But being poor, of any religion, or any race, is no excuse for rioting.

When we have the right to engage in violence, to decide what laws we will abide by and those we will ignore, we no longer have a government, but we have anarchy.

We are facing a breakdown in law and order.

With it comes a disintegration of our moral fiber.

With this plague comes destruction and violence.

With this horror comes death and destruction.

Terror stalks our land.

Those who participate in these riots are virtually destroying our Nation and the freedoms that have been won by each succeeding generation with their blood, sweat, and tears.

There seems to be a hesitancy on the part of many officials to use their law-enforcement powers to meet these threats.

Riots are pure and simply uncontrolled force, and they must be met with greater force. As a fire burns more brilliantly as fuel is heaped upon its flames, so does a riot increase in violence as it is allowed to grow.

It is my opinion that we do not need new laws, rather we need to enforce the laws that are presently on the books. When rioting breaks out, we need to send in the police with such force as is necessary, and to immediately back them with the National Guard. We should not hesitate to use Federal troops.

We would not do so to wantonly kill and maim, but rather to protect American citizens in these areas—to protect their homes and businesses. Those who instigate riots should be ferreted out, and our laws would provide just punishment for their crimes against humanity.

An investigation without a determination that we are going to meet this challenge with all the power necessary is a farce. I think we need to take a long and hard look at these riots and their cause, but we need to bring law and order to this land, whether these investigations are held or not.

There are doubtlessly new laws that we need to enact to preserve law and order, but if we are not going to enforce those laws on the books now, then we make a mockery of the lawmaking process.

I would add my condemnation to the

unthinking and perverted views of those in the judiciary who live in an ivory tower with great and noble thought, while the world burns at their feet. Rapists, murderers, looters, and other criminals must be called on to account for their crimes.

Loosing them on society through technicalities only increases the growing problem of law officials—and leads to disrespect for the law.

America today is a nation in crisis.

No platitudes will suffice.

We must meet this crisis with determination. We must meet force with force.

We must not be deluded by those who would tell us that 20 million Negroes are in agreement with what is really a small minority that has no respect for law and for human dignity. This is no racial question, and this Nation needs to realize that it is our Negro citizens who are suffering the most.

They want action taken. They deserve it.

Every American has the right to feel free and secure in his home.

The horror of snipers firing, firemen shot down as they attempt to put out flames, policemen stomped to death and gunned down, buildings burning, stores looted—this cannot be allowed to continue.

No, Rap Brown, you are not going to see this country burned down. No, Stokely Carmichael, there is not going to be a fight to the death between the races in America. What we are going to do is establish law and order and to place those who think they can violate the law under arrest and see that they pay the penalty for their crimes.

I call on the President to match his words with action. I call on every Governor in the land to take whatever action is necessary to preserve law and order.

Let those of us in Congress determine that law and order is going to be preserved, and let us take whatever action is necessary to see that this is done.

THE HOUSE SHOULD ESTABLISH COMMITTEE OUTLAWING POLITICAL SINECURES

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, somewhere along the line Congress has been delinquent in failing to note that the decreased workload of the Subversive Activities Control Board does not justify \$26,000 salaries for its five members. While I do not challenge the importance of that or any other particular office at this time, I nonetheless believe that the situation calls for a review of the necessity, workload, and pay scale of every Federal board and commission to determine whether full-time employees are actually necessary.

In every case, compensation should be limited to time on the job. Many positions of importance may be found to require so

little attention that responsible officials could serve at per diem rates; there is no question but that we can obtain enough dedicated citizens to volunteer, if necessary, and qualify for these positions.

An investigation is likely to disclose groups other than the SACB where some cost cutting can be accomplished. There may be more than a few instances of exaggerated salaries among the 50 boards, 59 commissions, and 13 councils listed in the Congressional Directory.

Put your finger on these lists and you are likely to hit upon an organization like the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, or other recognized office which is constantly under the public spotlight. Or you may come up with a commission whose officials are Members of Congress and other Government officials serving in dual capacities without additional cost to the taxpayer.

Yet is anyone certain that there are not others with sinecures that should either be eliminated or which can be reduced in operating expenses? What, for instance, are the functions and payrolls of such lesser known offices as the International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada? It attracted my eye because I am not at all familiar with its operations. In all probability, the Commissioner has a full-time job on his hands; if he does not, Congress should know about it and act accordingly.

We need not establish another agency to police the agencies. Congress can do the job itself and, if it is the pleasure of Members, may set up in the House a Committee Outlawing Political Sinecures—COPS.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS ON CIVIL DISORDERS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include the address of the President on civil disorders.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the President in his address to the Nation on July 27 on civil disorders was a major statement of policy on this important and pressing matter. More than that, it expressed the resolve of this Nation that law and order should prevail, and it called upon Americans of all races and color to obey the law. It properly asked for respect for those charged with the enforcement of law. It called for the implementation of programs needed to root out the underlying causes of civil disorder.

Mr. Speaker, the President's speech follows:

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO THE NATION ON CIVIL DISORDERS

My fellow Americans:

We have endured a week such as no Nation should live through: a time of violence and tragedy.

For a few minutes tonight, I want to talk about that tragedy—and I want to talk about the deeper questions it raises for us all.

I am tonight appointing a special Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

Governor Otto Kerner, of Illinois, has agreed to serve as Chairman. Mayor John Lindsay, of New York, will serve as Vice Chairman. Its other members will include Fred R. Harris, Senator from Oklahoma; Edward W. Brooke, United States Senator from Massachusetts; James C. Corman, U.S. Representative from California, 22nd District, Los Angeles; William M. McCulloch, the U.S. Representative from the State of Ohio, the 4th District; I. W. Abel, the President of the United Steel Workers; Charles B. Thornton, the President, Director and Chairman of the Board of Litton Industries, Inc.; Roy Wilkins, the Executive Director of the NAACP; Katherine Graham Peden, the Commissioner of Commerce of the State of Kentucky; Herbert Jenkins, the Chief of Police, Atlanta, Georgia.

The Commission will investigate the origins of the recent disorders in our cities. It will make recommendations—to me, to the Congress, to the State Governors, and to the Mayors—for measures to prevent or contain such disasters in the future.

In their work, the Commission members will have access to the facts that are gathered by Director Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The FBI will continue to exercise its full authority to investigate these riots, in accordance with my standing instructions, and continue to search for evidence of conspiracy.

But even before the Commission begins its work; and even before all the evidence is in, there are some things that we can tell about the outbreaks of this summer.

First—let there be no mistake about it—the looting, arson, plunder and pillage which have occurred are not part of a civil rights protest. There is no American right to loot stores, or to burn buildings, or to fire rifles from the rooftops. That is crime—and crime must be dealt with forcefully, and swiftly, and certainly—under law.

Innocent people, Negro and white, have been killed. Damage to property—owned by Negroes and whites—is calamitous. Worst of all, fear and bitterness which have been loosed will take long months to erase.

The criminals who committed these acts of violence against the people deserve to be punished—and they must be punished. Explanations may be offered, but nothing can excuse what they have done.

There will be attempts to interpret the events of the past few days. But when violence strikes, then those in public responsibility have an immediate and a very different job: not to analyze, but to end disorder.

That they must seek to do with every means at their command: through local police, state officials, and—in extraordinary circumstances where local authorities have stated that they cannot maintain order with their own resources—then through Federal power that we have limited authority to use.

I have directed the Secretary of Defense to issue new training standards for riot control procedures immediately to National Guard units across the country. Through the Continental Army Command, this expanded training will begin immediately. The National Guard must have the ability to respond effectively, quickly, and appropriately, in conditions of disorder and violence.

Those charged with the responsibility of law enforcement should, and must, be respected by all of our people. The violence must be stopped: quickly, finally, and permanently.

It would compound the tragedy, however, if we should settle for order that is imposed by the muzzle of a gun.

In America, we seek more than the uneasy calm of martial law. We seek peace based on one man's respect for another man—and

upon mutual respect for law. We seek a public order that is built on steady progress in meeting the needs of all of our people.

Not even the sternest police action, nor the most effective Federal Troops, can ever create lasting peace in our cities.

The only genuine, long-range solution for what has happened lies in an attack—mounted at every level—upon the conditions that breed despair and violence. All of us know what those conditions are: ignorance, discrimination, slums, poverty, disease, not enough jobs. We should attack these conditions—not because we are frightened by conflict, but because we are fired by conscience. We should attack them because there is simply no other way to achieve a decent and orderly society in America.

In the past three and a half years, we have directed the greatest Governmental effort in all of our American history at these ancient enemies. The roll call of those laws reveals the depth of our concern: The Model Cities Act. The Voters Rights Act. The Civil Rights Act. The Rent Supplement Act. Medicare and Medicaid. The 24 educational bills. Head Start. The Job Corps. The Neighborhood Youth Corps. Teacher Corps. Manpower Development and Training. And many, many more acts too numerous to mention on television tonight.

We will continue to press for laws which would protect our citizens from violence: like the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act now under consideration in the Congress and the Gun Control Act.

Our work has just begun. Yet there are those who feel that even this beginning is too much. There are those who would have us turn back even now, at the beginning of this journey.

Last week in Congress, a small but important plan for action in the cities was voted down in the House of Representatives. The members of that body rejected my request for \$20 million to fight the pestilence of rats—rats which prowl in dark alleys and tenements, and attack thousands of city children. The passage of this legislation would have meant much to the children of the slums. A strong government that has spent millions to protect baby calves from worms could surely afford to show as much concern for baby boys and girls.

There are some tonight who feel that we cannot afford a Model Cities program. They reduced my request for funds this year by two-thirds.

There are some who feel that we cannot afford additional good teachers for the children of poverty in urban areas. Or new efforts to house those who are most in need of housing. Or to aid in education to those who need to read and write.

There is a strange system of bookkeeping. I believe we should be counting the assets that these measures can bring to America: cities richer in opportunity; cities more full of promise; cities of order, progress, and happiness. Instead, some are counting the seeds of bitterness.

This is not a time for angry reaction. It is a time for action: starting with legislative action to improve the life in our cities. The strength and promise of the law are the surest remedies for tragedy in the streets.

But laws are only one answer. Another answer lies in the way our people will respond to these disturbances.

There is a danger that the worst toll of this tragedy will be counted in the hearts of Americans: in hatred, in insecurity, in heated words which will not end the conflict, but prolong it.

So let us acknowledge the tragedy; but let us not exaggerate it.

Let us look about tonight. Let us look at ourselves. We will see these things.

Most Americans, Negro and white, are leading decent, responsible and productive lives.

Most Americans, Negro and white, seek safety in their neighborhoods and harmony with their neighbors.

Nothing can destroy good will more than a period of needless strife and suspicion between the races.

Let us condemn the violent few. But let us remember that it is law-abiding Negro families who have really suffered most at the hands of the rioters. It is responsible Negro citizens who hope most fervently—and need most urgently—to share in America's growth and prosperity.

This is not the time to turn away from that goal.

To reach it will require more than laws; more than dollars. It will take renewed dedication and understanding in the heart of every citizen.

I know there are millions of men and women tonight who are eager to heal the wounds that we have suffered; who want to get on with the job of teaching and working and building America.

In that spirit, at the conclusion of this address, I will sign a proclamation calling for a day of prayer in our Nation throughout all of our States. On this Sunday, July 30, I urge the citizens in every town, every city, and every home in this Land to go into their churches—to pray for order and reconciliation among men.

I appeal to every Governor, every Mayor, every preacher and every teacher and parent to join and give leadership in this National observance.

This spirit of dedication cannot be limited to our public leaders. It must extend to every citizen in this land. And the man who speaks to break the peace must feel the powerful disapproval of all of his neighbors.

Tonight, I call upon every American to search his own heart.

To those who are tempted by violence, I would say this: Think again. Who is really the loser when violence comes? Whose neighborhood is made a shambles? Whose life is threatened most?

If you choose to tear down what other hands have built,

You will not succeed;

You will suffer most from your own crimes;

You will learn that there are no victors in the aftermath of violence.

The apostles of violence, with their ugly drumbeat of hatred, must know that they are now heading for disaster. And every man who really wants progress or justice or equality must stand against them and their miserable virus of hate.

For other Americans, especially those in positions of public trust, I have this message:

Yours is the duty to bring about a peaceful change in America. If your response to these tragic events is only "business as usual"—you invite not only disaster, but dishonor.

My fellow citizens, let us go about our work. Let us clear the streets of rubble and quench the fires that hatred set. Let us feed and care for those who have suffered at the rioter's hands—but let there be no bonus or reward or salutes for those who have inflicted that suffering.

Let us resolve that this violence is going to stop and there will be no bonus to flow from it. We can stop it. We must stop it. We will stop it.

And let us build something much more lasting: faith between man and man, faith between race and race. Faith in each other—and faith in the promise of beautiful America.

Let us pray for the day when "mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other." Let us pray—and let us work for better jobs and better housing and better education that so many millions of our own fellow Americans need so much tonight.

Let us then act in the Congress, in the

city halls, and in every community, so that this great land of ours may truly be "one Nation under God—with liberty and justice for all."

Goodnight and thank you.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BLANTON, for Monday, July 31, 1967, on account of business within the Seventh District of Tennessee.

Mr. MORTON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, and remainder of the week, on account of official business as a member of the House Committee on Interior.

Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for July 31, and for the balance of the week, on account of official business as a member of the House Subcommittee on Irrigation.

Mr. WYATT (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, 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. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. BUSH), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FUQUA (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOW.

Mr. WOLFF.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1003. An act to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to increase the protection afforded consumers against injurious flammable fabrics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1648. An act to extend the authority for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist

in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 1, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

961. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report of the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of June 1967, pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1967, and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

962. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings in financing operations of Government-owned vessels supporting military activities in Southeast Asia, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

963. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

964. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the report on "Guidelines for Minimizing Possible Soil Erosion From Highway Construction," pursuant to the provisions of 80 Stat. 766; to the Committee on Public Works.

965. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report covering grants made during calendar year 1966 to nonprofit institutions and organizations for support of scientific research programs, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-934; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9761. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes (Rept. No. 519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 10347. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography; with amendments (Rept. No. 519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DADDARIO: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 11284. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept.

No. 522). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3727. A bill for the relief of Elpidio and Natividad Damazo; with amendment (Rept. No. 520). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 11909. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the non-recognition of gain on certain transfers of property pursuant to a decree of divorce or of separate maintenance of a written separation agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 11910. A bill to remove the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to prohibit, curtail, or regulate the melting or treating of coins of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11911. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to permit the importation of upholstery regulators, upholsterer's regulating needles, and upholsterer's pins free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 11912. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ERLBORN:

H.R. 11913. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 11914. A bill to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 11915. A bill to amend the college work-study program with respect to institutional matching and permissible hours of work; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GETTYS:

H.R. 11916. A bill to cut off Federal benefits for conviction of rioting and prohibiting entitlement to such benefits thereafter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 11917. A bill to establish the Government Program Evaluation Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 11918. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.R. 11919. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 11920. A bill to provide for the training and equipping of the National Guard in riot control; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 11921. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit looting during a riot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 11922. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11923. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11924. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 11925. A bill for the establishment of a commission to study and appraise the organization and operation of the executive and legislative branches of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 11926. A bill to designate lock and dam No. 8 on the Arkansas River and the lake created thereby as Toad Suck Bridge and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11927. A bill to provide that certain income required to be accumulated shall be disregarded in determining whether a charitable organization is exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 11928. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 11929. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 11930. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 11931. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide for the payment of benefits under such act to certain citizens and permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 11932. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 11933. A bill to create a public works program for the purpose of reducing unemployment; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11934. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 11935. A bill to provide for the training and equipping of the National Guard in riot control; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11936. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program under which tickets to professional, semiprofessional, and amateur baseball, football, basketball, hockey, and soccer games will be furnished at no cost by local police officers and firemen to individuals under the age of 19, particularly such individuals who are economically underprivileged; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11937. A bill to provide that the

nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.R. 11938. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to make grants to local law enforcement agencies to assist them in the prevention and control of riots; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 11939. A bill to provide a program for an "Operation Bootstrap" for the American Indian in order to improve conditions among Indians on reservations and in other communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 11940. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the admissibility in evidence of confessions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11941. A bill to prohibit electronic surveillance by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 11942. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11943. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 11944. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (for herself, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. QUE, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. ESCH, and Mr. GARDNER):

H.R. 11945. A bill to amend the college work-study program with respect to institutional matching and permissible hours of work; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11946. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program under which tickets to professional, semiprofessional, and amateur baseball, football, basketball, hockey, and soccer games will be furnished at no cost by local police officers and firemen to individuals under the age of 19, particularly such individuals who are economically underprivileged; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 11947. A bill to provide for the training and equipping of the National Guard in riot control; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 11948. A bill to amend Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress to create within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Overseas Education Board having responsibility for the elementary and secondary education of certain overseas dependents; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 11949. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit travel under a U.S. passport in violation of certain passport restrictions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 11950. A bill to provide for the inclusion of Panola and Shelby Counties, Tex., within the Marshall division of the eastern district for the U.S. district courts in Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 11951. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 11952. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize, in the national interest, restrictions on travel by nationals of the United States in certain designated areas of the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.J. Res. 754. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as National UNICEF Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 755. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Select Committee on Civil Disorder; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 756. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ERLBORN:

H. Con. Res. 440. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to investigate riots and violent civil disorder; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 441. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in re the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H. Res. 835. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 836. Resolution concerning the U.S.S. *Forrestal* tragedy; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

265. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to the transport, shipment, or receipt of sporting arms and ammunition in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

266. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, relative to the repeal or modification of 18th and 19th century congressional laws affecting administration of school and ministerial lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 11953. A bill for the relief of Keith Raymond Christiansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 11954. A bill for the relief of Vito Mannino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 11955. A bill for the relief of Francisco Thomas Cells, M.D., M.S.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 11956. A bill for the relief of Juan Campillo Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11957. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Herrera Velasquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 11958. A bill for the relief of Franziska Seck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLURE:

H.R. 11959. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Nesbitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11960. A bill for the relief of Shwen-Sing Tai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 11961. A bill for the relief of S. Leon Levy to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

134. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to the new U.S. 5-cent postage stamp, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 31, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. J. Bruce Weaver, pastor, Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, creator and preserver of all things, without whose support we cannot exist; we come before Thee this day to give thanks for the innumerable benefits which Thou dost so plentifully bestow upon us.

We thank Thee for the mercies and gifts that continue to come to us in Thy good providence, and for all the satisfactions and comforts which sustain and gladden us day by day.

We thank Thee for the country in which Thou has made it our privilege to live, and for good laws and equitable government under which we may live and prosper.

We thank Thee that even in our afflictions and in our times of blindness and sin, the hand of Thy goodness hath continued with us; that even the strokes of deserved judgment have been directed and tempered with mercy. We beseech Thee to continue Thy favor to us and to our children from generation to generation.

Continue also, we beg of Thee, Thy special favor upon these United States. Let them truly become and ever remain the home of the free and an asylum for the persecuted and oppressed. Enable our President, and all others in authority, to discharge their duties with wisdom and fidelity as men responsible to Thee. Counsel our counselors, and teach our Senators wisdom. Let not prudence be hid from the eyes of those who lead and govern. Help them to follow Thy example in tempering justice with compassion, law with love, and power with humility.

Especially, in this day when our hearts are sorely troubled and our minds uncertain under the burden of riots and war, of tensions and terror, help us to find our way with certain steps to that unity of purpose, and that courage of conviction necessary to restore peace, invite tranquillity and to establish the conditions which make it possible for us to serve Thee in honor and integrity, and to be the blessing to all the nations of the

earth which, we are persuaded, Thou dost both intend for us and expect of us.

Help us to find the means to be worthy of the mission upon which Thou hast sent us, through Jesus Christ, Thy Son and our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on the following dates the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On July 27, 1967:

S. 280. An act for the relief of Rosa Agostino;

S. 324. An act for the relief of Jesse C. Johnson; and

S. 322. An act for the relief of Hye Suk Paeng and Mi Kung Paeng (Patricia Ann).

On July 29, 1967:

S. 39. An act for the relief of Athanasia Argere;

S. 256. An act for the relief of Rosa Anna Genovese; and

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution authorizing the operation of an amateur radio station by participants in the XII World Boy Scout Jamboree at Farragut State Park, Idaho, August 1 through August 9, 1967.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 27, 1967, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CIVIL DISORDERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], and myself, I send to the desk a joint resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 98) as follows:

S.J. RES. 98

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) for the purposes of this joint resolution, the term "Commission" means the Commission appointed by the President by Executive Order 11365, dated July 29, 1967.

(b) The Commission, or any member of the Commission when so authorized by the Commission, shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence