mesh with the rebuilding of the slums where so much crime is spawned?

Fourth, strikes. Labor-management disputes have reached a point of no return. The giants of industry and labor test each other while the public suffers. Work stoppages have spilled over into the area of government employes, from teachers to garbage men. There is, of course, an answer. Newsday and former State Supreme Court Justice Samuel I Rosenman have pointed the way by recommending the creation of labor courts to hand down binding solutions in cases involving the public interest. Now it is up to the candidates to discuss this problem and take a stand on the problem of strikes.

Fifth, youth's desire and drive to participate in public affairs. Today's young people are the best educated and most knowledgeable youngsters in American history, but they require guidance and preparation to help them share fully in the great challenges of the day. How to give them this special type of guidance and how to give them a meaningful role in our society represents a challenge to all candidates.

Sixth, the preservation of our environment—the protection of air, water and open space; the creation of adequate sewage and waste disposal facilities; the improvement of rapid transit and highway transit; the enhancement of the quality of education. To what degree can we meet these rising expectations? How will we be able to pay for these demands?

Seventh, the maintenance of the nation's financial integrity. The gold stampede has given the dollar a rude shock. Our spending by far exceeds our income. The fiscal stability of America must be preserved. But how? By tax increases? By spending cuts? By the creation of priorities?

These are the issues for which answers are needed. The candidates for President must provide the answers.

Freedom's Challenge

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of Members of the House the following speech entitled "Freedom's Challenge." This speech, prepared and delivered by William Joseph Nadeau, "A" Company, 1st Special Forces, Group, Abn, APO San Francisco 96331, son of M. Sgt. Conrad Joseph Nadeau, U.S. Army, presently stationed at Fort Bunkner, Okinawa, and a resident of my congressional district, was the winning entry from Connecticut in the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary.

I have had the pleasure of working with this young man relative to his interest in being appointed to a service academy. It is heartening to see a young man with such deep insight into the problems confronting our Nation desire to serve his country. I am pleased that he has received a nomination to the U.S. Naval Academy through Senator DODD and has also been authorized to take the examination to qualify for a presidential appointment to the U.S. Military Academy.

Let me take this opportunity to commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary for its outstanding service to our Nation through its sponsorship of the Voice of Democracy contest. This program encourages young Americans to learn about their Government and inspires them to exercise their rights and responsibilities within its framework. The speech follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

As a citizen of a democratic nation, I have inherited the liberty to determine the course of my own actions, which are subject to restrictions that are the same for all and are as few and liberal as the public safety permits. Thus I have the obligation to ensure the survival of this system as the major factor in this world. I owe allegiance to this form of government and am entitled to protection by this same government. In this modern democratic state, personal liberty exists as a recognition of the right of each individual, within limits, to do what he pleases without the constraint of his fellows, to go where he pleases, to work at whatever trade he pleases, and to own whatever property he can purchase. Restrictions on the individual by the state should not be more oppressive than necessity demands.

It is being realized that the modern nation demands citizens who understand peoples and cultures in every part of the world. It is my duty as a citizen of the United States to appreciate better the role of the American system in the international scene, and in order to gain such knowledge, I need to study other governments and varying economic systems, other societies, past and present, and the relationship between man and his environment.

It is my responsibility to add to the liberty, prestige, prosperity, and power of my nation. I have a deep sense of belonging to my nation and a desire to contribute to its welfare. My loyalty to the nation is exceeded only by my loyalty to God and my parents. I have a pride in its achievements, a belief in its excellence, and a respect for its superiority over all other nations. I am to understand the ties which hold our great nation together: political, racial, religious, cultural (including language), and historical. I must have the determination to work with my fellow citizens toward the betterment of my country.

My involvement in the affairs of the Union is needed to form a more useful federal government. My participation can be realized by different acts such as voting and presenting my ideas on matters that pertain to the country as well as to myself to the proper government officials. These men always welcome constructive criticism.

I strongly feel that one of my major duties as a citizen is to attempt to find out all that is possible about our federal government: how it functions, its benefits to me, and what I can do to make it a more effective body. Its effectiveness depends upon the political intelligence of its citizens. If I am ignorant about the affairs of the nation, I am not contributing anything towards the welfare of my nation, thus I am a useless and weak point in the proper functioning of the nation.

Voting for or against any measure, law, or the election of a person to office is not only a right and a privilege but also a duty. As a citizen, I must never let my emotions interfere with my selection. I must consider all candidates and issues carefully and deliberately before making my decision. And most important, I must believe that my decision is correct.

In conclusion, the freedoms that I have inherited through citizenship are too valuable to be neglected, so it is my duty to participate to the fullest of my capabilities whenever possible.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, March 20, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

In the day when I cried to Thee, Thou didst answer me and didst increase the strength of my soul.—Psalm 138: 3.

Eternal God, our Father, who art the God and Father of us all, grant that by the tides of Thy spirit we may be lifted into the blessed assurance that Thou art with us, that Thy grace is sufficient for every need and that by Thy living presence in our hearts we may meet our responsibilities with patience, manage our moods with creative faith, and master our temptations with confident strength.

Make us ever sensitive to the needs of our people and ready to dedicate ourselves to worthy endeavors that minister to the welfare of our Nation.

Bless those who struggle for freedom across our world. Crown their efforts with resounding success that all men everywhere may ultimately be free.

In the spirit of Him who sets men free we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 18, 1968, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14743. An act to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works may sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

VIETNAM WAR POLICIES

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Washington newspapers carried stories of the sponsorship of a resolution seeking an inquiry and review of Vietnam war policies, stating that this resolution now has 140 House sponsors, and the comments of some on the radio and television have indicated it appeared to be an expression of no confidence insofar as the Chief Executive is concerned.

It appears to me even more reasonable, as an interpretation, that this is an expression of no confidence in the existing committees of the House of Representatives which have a continuing responsibility to review our policies with regard to Vietnam.

It seems to me much more an expression of no confidence in our Appropriations Committee, and in our Armed Services Committee, and Foreign Affairs Committee—all of whom are charged with the responsibility of continual review.

It seems to me that if folks really want to bring this matter out in the House, they could introduce a resolution for the repeal of the Tonkin Bay resolution and in that way put themselves on record as to just where they stand with regard to our policies in Vietnam. That would certainly give us a direct issue and a position with regard to the war that would be debatable. As it is, this list of Members, most of whom are members of the other party, appears to me to contain just about as many hawks as it contains doves and certainly does not reflect a clear line of thinking with regard to what our policy should be.

Finally, it seems even more noteworthy that a much greater number of House Members refused to sponsor the resolution—by more than 2 to 1—than we find identified as sponsors.

APPOINTMENT OF DR. PHILIP R. LEE TO COORDINATE HEALTH AGENCIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. JARMAN. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, with the health needs of our society becoming a major national concern, the announced appointment of Dr. Philip R. Lee to coordinate the health agencies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is most welcome.

Acting Secretary Cohen has picked a man who is equal to the job. As a former medical practitioner, he is sensitive to the needs of individual patients. As a member of a group practice clinic, he has had experience in this promising approach to the delivery of health care. His personal interest in both preventive and curative medicine gives him a broad outlook on health. Appointments as Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Director of Health Services in the Agency for International Development have been a testing ground for his competence to deal with his new assignment.

The task that Dr. Lee has before him is of national significance. The health needs of our society should be one of our prime concerns. The proposed reorganization and appointment of Dr. Lee is an important step in meeting those needs.

THE PRESIDENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HAYS. 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. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, with all the announcements flying around, people announcing and announcing that they are going to announce, it is hard to get a day to announce. I am a delegate to the Democratic convention, and I expect to support the President. However, if something unforeseen should arise that he would not be a candidate, I want hereby to announce that I am a candidate.

I do this, Mr. Speaker, so the Democratic Party and the people will have a choice instead of a double echo. I have a great deal of modesty about this, but with all due modesty I think I can safely say I would make a better candidate than either McCARTHY or KENNEDY—BOBBY, that is—and certainly would make a better President than either one of them.

I just want to announce now that there is about 5 percent of the vote that some people seem to be seeking that I do not seek. They are the hippies, the dropouts copouts, bums, crumbs, beatniks, draft-dodgers, and card burners.

AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED UNDER PUBLIC ASSISTANCE SHOULD RECEIVE FULL SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. FEIGHAN. 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. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join ranks with the gentleman from California, Congressman PHILLIP BURTON, and 24 cosponsors of the bill to provide benefits for those recipients of public assistance who were short-changed when the social security legislation was passed last year. Under the bill which I will introduce tomorrow, provision is made for recipients of public assistance—the aged, blind, and disabled—who also receive some social security benefits. The law presently gives the States the option of letting the recipients keep the social security increase or deducting a dollar-for-dollar amount from their public assistance checks. It so happens that most States are taking the benefit of this option and making the deduction. As a consequence, these aged, blind, and disabled individuals who need an increased benefit are being denied under the present law.

Also, the legislation passed last year did not provide any increase for public assistance recipients having no other income. They number approximately 1,195,000.

Under my bill, these persons will receive an additional $7.50 per month, a mere $90 a year, but even that would be a help.

Throughout my years in Congress I have been a consistent supporter of legislation to provide adequate benefits for our senior citizens and those disabled, and it is my hope that early consideration will be given to this most needed and just legislation.

FRANCE SHOULD PAY ITS WORLD WAR I DEBT OF $6,800,000,000

Mr. WOLFF. 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 York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current gold crisis and De Gaulle's relentless attacks upon our gold position it is of great urgency that this body and the Ways and Means Committee implement the requests of more than 170 Members who have cosponsored resolutions to have France pay its World War I debt of $6,800,000,000. These resolutions comprise 40 percent of the House membership. Certainly this should give the House Ways and Means Committee a clear indication of strong feelings of this body and the American people. As each day passes we read more and more of the rantings of the modern Midas, De Gaulle, as he continues to spearhead attacks on the economic system of this Nation and the world. I call upon those of my colleagues who have not yet indicated their support of this measure to look at the avalanche of thousands of pieces of mail received daily from every corner of our fair land. Surely as Americans are asked daily to reach down deeper and deeper to pay their due a way can be found to make others respond to that which is due to us.

ACTION ON THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. RUMSFELD. 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. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, within the last 24 hours the House of Representatives and the country have received

the news that the House Committee on Rules has decided to defer action on the civil rights bill until April 9. I have not as yet seen it communicated or reported that in the event anyone feels that it would be advisable to have this bill go to a conference and be acted on prior to that date, the Democratic leadership of the House, the distinguished Speaker and the majority leader, and certainly the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee could this very afternoon request permission to have the civil rights bill sent to conference so that the issues between the House and the Senate could be considered.

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

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I add that also a majority of the members of the Committee on Rules could get together and immediately report the resolution out, which is already before the committee. Then we could vote it up or down within a matter of days.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is, of course, also correct. However, the alternative course I mentioned is easily accomplished.

Also, it seems to me that, in view of all this outpouring of support for President Johnson, which we have heard during the last 2 days, as Member after Member came into the well and said he stood behind the President—we should remember that President Johnson has asked for legislation dealing with civil rights. The Senate has passed a bill and requested a conference. I would urge those Members, who have been in the well day after day expressing their support of the President, to communicate with the Democratic leadership and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and see if the House and the Senate cannot move ahead with a conference on civil rights. We need not wait until April 9, unless that is the Speaker's wish. If a compromise cannot be worked out in conference, then since the chairman of the Judiciary Committee controls the situation, he could come back to the House, and the House could still vote the Senate bill up or down before the April 9 date.

It seems to me this is an important point, and I would hope the Democratic leadership would reconsider their decision. They are in the driver's seat. If they would act now a conference could be called tomorrow and we could get on with the work of the Congress. Clearly it is the majority's decision.

ACTION ON THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. ANDERSON 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. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will mark exactly 1 week since the civil rights bill passed the other body. I remind the House that the bill could be in conference right now, at this very minute. I do not consider this beyond the realm of possibility—that the conference might have been concluded and we might today be voting on the civil rights bill for 1968 if the move had been promptly made, as the gentleman from Illinois suggested, to send it to conference.

I, for one, want to say to this House I think time is of the essence, and I am prepared to vote today to send that bill to conference, if action is truly desired, before April 9, because I believe we should have a civil rights bill in 1968, and I think we can and will have a better bill than passed the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I think if we have only a decent respect for the legislative process and if we are not trying to abort that process, but if we have a decent respect for it and do not play politics, but try to get the best civil rights bill out on this floor as soon as we can, I think we can then pass the civil rights bill, and I would support it.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in the first place, talking about what we might do or what we might have done, we might have had a couple of votes on the Rules Committee on the Republican side to have sent this resolution to the House so the House could work its will.

No procedure, I might advise my good friend and my able friend, has been recommended; no procedure has been undertaken that aborts the legislative process. All that has been done is in line and strictly in accordance with the rules of the House.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader, I do not think there is anything wrong with letting a committee of this House hold a few days of hearings on what is and rightfully should be considered one of the important pieces of legislation this Congress will pass upon.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I believe it was understood we had hoped the Committee on Rules would hold hearings.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. It is my understanding that the committee will proceed promptly to hold those hearings.

I repeat, if there is this overwhelming desire to get this bill out of the way before the 10th of April, when I believe it would normally come before the House under the procedure decided upon yesterday, I for one am willing to support a motion today to send it to conference in the hope that the conferees would agree on a bill and bring it back here before this Congress recesses for the Easter holiday.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION A NATIONAL IMPERATIVE

Mr. REID of New York. 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 York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe that H.R. 2516, the civil rights bill as passed by the Senate, should be strongly supported on the merits. Open housing legislation is a national imperative which has been deferred too long.

Twenty-one States have fair housing legislation. New York, for one, has much broader language than is in the Senate bill.

It seems to me that we should not forget that this Nation has before it the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. The need, as pointed out in the report, is dramatic, and has not been met in an adequate fashion. Parliamentary maneuvers which could send the bill to conference could represent serious delay, a possible filibuster—imperiling if not defeating the bill. Let us be clear that reporting the bill to conference could result in its not seeing the light of day in this session.

I would urgently hope that the Rules Committee would in its wisdom report a resolution at an early date and that the full membership of the House would have an opportunity to vote on a bill, one of the most important before this Congress in a generation.

RESPONSIBILITY OF RULES COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. LATTA. 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. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I should just like to concur in the statements made by the two gentlemen from Illinois. Certainly this is a matter of great importance and of real interest to the Nation.

I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Rules Committee has been requested by the leadership of this House to act in a very unusual way on this bill. Members of this House have not had an opportunity to work their will on the amendments placed in this bill by the Senate. We are a deliberative body, and certainly members of the Rules Committee are supposed to act responsibly. It was acknowledged on the floor the other day by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee that he himself did not know all of the intricacies contained in the civil rights bills considered by his committee. Certainly, as a member of the Rules Committee, I do not at this time know all of the intricacies contained in this legislation.

I know the Members of this House would not want me, as a member of the Rules Committee, to vote to report out a rule asking them to vote up or down a piece of legislation with which they are not familiar.

It is important that this House act responsibly on all legislation. Under the

regular procedure this bill would go to conference. It should not now be in the Rules Committee with the Democratic leadership seeking a special rule, it should be in a conference committee where the differences can be solved.

Certainly I agree with the statements made by the gentleman from Illinois that it is incumbent upon the Democratic leadership of this House, not the Republican minority, to send this bill to conference.

I notice the very able gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, on the floor and he would be the one under normal procedures to request that this bill be sent to conference. I would be pleased to yield to him at this time if he would like to make such a motion to send this bill to conference.

Apparently, he does not want to use this time and this opportunity to do this, Mr. Speaker, so I yield back the remainder of my time.

STRONG ACTION NEEDED ON THE "PUEBLO" INCIDENT

Mr. ADAIR. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it is now some time since a naval vessel of the United States was seized on the high seas by Communist North Korea. There were many calls from Members of both bodies of the Congress for prompt and effective action. The United States has been patient. We have asked the Soviet Union to intercede and received a diplomatic slap in the face for a reply. We have been to the United Nations and many fine speeches have resulted. Certain air reservists have been called to active duty in dramatic fashion. But I still ask, Mr. President, what has been done for the safety and the lives of the men on the *Pueblo*? Our ship still sits in Wonsan Harbor.

There is further the larger question of "freedom of the seas." A 1965 State Department publication says this on that subject:

> All water beyond the outer limit of the territorial sea qualifies as high seas. Here stretch the vast ocean areas of the world, void of sovereignty and subject to the doctrine known as Freedom of the Seas.

Now in the last year we have seen a growing number of incidents on the high seas, all concocted by the Communists to restrict our right to use that freedom. Soviet ships have harassed our naval maneuvers, and even had a collision with one of our ships off Japan. We cannot let this trend continue.

Historically, this *Pueblo* incident is more serious than those that occurred in 1812. There the British only stopped our ships and seized presumed deserters. Again, even in the Mason and Slidell incident of the Civil War, only individuals were seized, not the entire ship and certainly not a ship flying a naval ensign. America has listened and waited, Mr. President. Effective action is overdue.

REVIEW OF BASIC POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. FINDLEY. 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. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] very kindly called attention to the resolution which 139—and it is now 140—Members of this House have cosponsored calling for a review of basic policy in Vietnam. In his remarks he suggested that this implied criticism of the Congress and its committees.

Anytime a proposal is made for action I suppose there is some implied criticism that inaction is therefore occurring. Such is certainly the case here; but I would like to point out that if there is a measure of criticism in this proposal it is more directed against the Congress for inaction than against the President for what he has proceeded with. I feel that under article I of the Constitution Congress does indeed have grave responsibilities. The warmaking clause and the requirement that the Congress alone can provide for the establishment of the Army and Navy and the requirement that the Congress alone can provide for the regulation of the military services places upon this body as well as the other body a grave responsibility.

In view of the fact that there is such wide discord and dissatisfaction with the progress of the present policy, I feel it is high time that the Congress because of its constitutional responsibilities finally do what it should have done a long time ago.

OPEN HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the Hosue for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I think this is my second 1-minute speech. The last one was on an appeal that we try not to be partisan about the question of riots. This one is only to set the record straight as to what happened in the Committee on Rules yesterday. And, Mr. Speaker, I have no criticism of anyone who voted to delay action on the civil rights bill.

However, the fact of the matter is that the motion which I made but which was defeated by a substitute—had it passed, and come to the floor of the House, would have provided an opportunity to the Members of the House to do exactly what they pleased in this matter.

I say this because if the majority of the Members of the House did not approve of that resolution which provided for accepting the Senate amendments and thereby sending the civil rights bill to the President of the United States, all they had to do was to vote down the previous question, and having voted down the previous question, substitute their will. And, further, Mr. Speaker, if it were the will of the House to send the bill to conference, it would have been sent to conference. If it were the will of the House to send it back to the Committee on the Judiciary, then it would have been sent back to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, the delay is clear. I criticize no one for the delay. However, I cannot sit here and listen to these pious speeches about the ease with which it could be sent to conference. Of course it could have been sent to conference the day after the bill came over here. However, the fact of the matter is that the vote in the Rules Committee was a vote to delay action on the civil rights bill. If the proposal as originally made in the Committee on Rules had passed, the House of Representatives could have worked its will on March 27.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has always been perfectly frank and honest with the Members of the House of Representatives in recounting what happened yesterday. I believe, however, in all fairness he ought to add, as many who were present would agree, that the question revolved principally around the date, and that it was the chairman of the Committee on Rules who requested some consideration of a change in schedule and who pointed out that certain Members on the other side of the aisle had requested such consideration, and we were happy to accede to the wishes of the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the statement which has been made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] in a very specific manner. I changed my proposed time for action to April 2 and thus took care of all the requests of the chairman, and of a Member on our side. Inadvertently, the motion that was finally made failed to take into account a third request that was made by a gentleman who happened to vote for my motion—that he had to be away on the 5th of the month. I feel it is a very interesting point that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois raises because the opinion of everyone else was taken into consideration, except one who happened to be a proponent of the position I took. But, that was inadvertent. However, what the gentleman has to say has no pertinence and bearing upon what I said, and let us not kid the American public about that.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] said that he did not want the American public to be fooled on this

issue. In order to make it absolutely clear to all, the gentleman from Missouri is not denying that this very afternoon the Speaker could——

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman said that.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Could recognize the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to move to send the bill to conference immediately? We need not wait until April 9. That is the only point I was making. This decision is with the Democratic leadership.

Mr. BOLLING. That is exactly right, and the gentleman will reply to the point, and the point is that a group in the House is insisting upon there being only one choice—they are insisting upon having their way entirely in saying that we ought to go to conference or not act at all. The point that I was trying to make is the proposition I offered in the Committee on Rules if adopted would have allowed the House to make its choice. It could have taken the Senate bill as it was, it could have sent it to conference, it could have sent it to the committee or it could have accepted the Senate amendments with an amendment. I am merely stating the facts.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS MATTER

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in replying to the two gentlemen from Illinois who have just spoken with reference to the civil rights bill, let me say that they are building up a sham argument, because they know the Republican Members on their side are going to do everything they possibly can to scuttle this bill.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts knows that he is totally inaccurate. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that on every civil rights bill that has come to the floor of the House since 1957—and I believe we have had four or five of them—a greater percentage of the Republicans in this body on each occasion have voted for that legislation than have the Members on that side of the aisle.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. The proof of the matter is we need 65 to 70 Republican votes. Now, the gentleman is the minority leader, the leader of the Republicans—so I say deliver them, give us the 65 or 70 votes that are needed to accept the Senate bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts knows that there are 258 Members on that side of the aisle, and it only requires 218 votes for the House to work its will. The gentleman really admits that his political party is deeply split on this issue.

When the facts are on the record in 1968 the gentleman will find more Republicans percentagewise voting for good civil rights legislation than is the case on that side of the aisle. This was true in the Senate in 1967 where Republicans overwhelmingly supported this civil rights legislation. In the House Republicans will do their full share in helping to enact good legislation.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. SLACK. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, back to the matter that has been under discussion, the fact is that the civil rights bills that have been passed by the House of Representatives and by this Congress have been passed when this Congress was a Democrat Congress, and to my knowledge there has been no civil rights bill passed during a Republican Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 61]

Ashley	Foley	Matsunaga
Brown, Calif.	Fountain	May
Collier	Gardner	Miller, Calif.
Conyers	Green, Oreg.	Moorhead
Corman	Gurney	Resnick
Cowger	Hagan	Roth
Davis, Ga.	Holland	St. Onge
Dawson	Karsten	Selden
Diggs	King, Calif.	Stubblefield
Dingell	Landrum	Watts
Edwards, Calif.	Madden	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 401 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 285)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1968.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In this letter I ask the Congress to take further steps to improve America's balance of payments position. That position is the hinge of the dollar's strength abroad and the soundness of the Free World monetary system.

Both actions I recommend today will help to increase America's exports—a vital element in the balance of payments equation.

I urge the Congress to:

—Allocate $500 million of the Export-Import Bank's existing authority as a special fund to finance a broadened program to sell American goods in foreign markets.

—Approve promptly the $2.4 million supplemental appropriation which I submitted on March 11. This will enable the Commerce Department to launch a 5-year program to promote American exports.

Last year, the United States exported some $30 billion worth of products—the highest in our history. The trade surplus resulting from that commerce was about $3.5 billion—large but far from large enough.

Our concern now must be to improve that record as part of a long-term program to keep the dollar strong and to remove the temporary restraints on the flow of capital abroad.

For more than three decades, the Export-Import Bank has effectively encouraged the sale of American goods abroad. Through loans, guarantees and insurance, it has financed billions of dollars in U.S. exports—the products of our farms and factories. But new competitive conditions in world trade demand added scope and flexibility in the Bank's operations.

The $500 million allocation I am requesting will finance export transactions not covered under the Bank's present program. It will:

—Support the determined efforts of the entire business community to expand exports.

—Assist American firms who now sell only within the United States to expand their markets and send their goods abroad.

—Make available to American firms export financing more competitive with that provided by other major trading nations and especially suited to developing new markets.

To achieve the greatest benefit from this new export financing plan, I will establish an Export Expansion Advisory Committee, chaired by the Secretary of Commerce, to provide guidance to the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank.

The Kennedy Round has added a new and exciting dimension to the expansion of trade opportunities for American busi-

ness. We must be prepared to take full advantage of these and other opportunities now unfolding in foreign commerce. I believe that a long-range and sustained promotional program can go far to stimulate the flow of American exports.

In my Fiscal 1969 Budget, I requested a $25.7 million appropriation to launch such a program. In order to get an immediate start, I asked the Congress last week for a $2.4 million supplemental appropriation for Fiscal 1968. With these funds, we can participate in more trade fairs, establish Joint Export Associations for various industries, conduct marketing studies, and take other steps to stimulate the growth of sales abroad.

The new authority for the Export-Import Bank and the supplemental appropriation for export promotion will reinforce our trade position. These measures will help business firms penetrate and secure new foreign markets and provide the follow-on services to expand their position in these markets.

I urge the Congress to take prompt action on these requests.

The threat posed by our balance of payments deficit is immediate and serious and requires concerted action.

We have been moving in a number of ways to counter that threat and to carry out the program I announced on January 1, 1968.

The proposals in this letter to increase our exports are part of a national balance of payments strategy.

We have already acted to:

—Restrain the flow of direct investment funds abroad, and foreign lending by banks and other financial institutions.

—Reduce the number of government personnel in overseas posts, curtail government travel abroad, and negotiate new arrangements to lessen the impact of military expenditures overseas.

—Initiate discussions with other countries on actions to improve our trade position.

—Launch a new program, in cooperation with private industry, to attract more foreign visitors to these shores. As part of this program, I have asked for a supplemental appropriation of $1.7 million to strengthen the U.S. Travel Service.

—Remove the outmoded and unnecessary gold cover, in legislation which I signed yesterday.

—Reach an agreement with our six active gold pool partners to halt speculative attacks on gold reserves.

Further measures await Congressional action.

One is the elimination of obsolete and burdensome visa requirements which now discourage foreign travelers from visiting our land.

Another is legislation to reduce the expenditures of Americans traveling abroad.

Finally, there is the anti-inflation tax—the most critical measure of all. This tax—one penny on every dollar earned—is the best investment Americans can make for fiscal responsibility at home and for a strong economic position abroad.

The nations of the world look to us now for economic leadership. The fabric of international cooperation upon which the world's postwar prosperity has been built is now threatened. If that fabric is torn apart, the consequences will not be confined to foreign countries—but will touch every American. We must not let this happen. Prompt enactment of the tax bill will be clear and convincing proof of our leadership and an exercise of our responsibility.

The hour is late. The need is urgent. I call upon the Congress to act—now.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 284)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to submit to the Congress the Seventeenth Annual Report of the National Science Foundation, for fiscal year 1967.

This Report highlights a year of advance in exploring the frontiers of science and in educating the scientists of tomorrow. During fiscal year 1967, the Foundation has:

—Provided $220 million to support scientific research projects in every State of the Union. Some 5,500 scientists carried out this work in colleges and universities.

—Invested $123 million to improve science education at every level from elementary school through the university. These funds provided training for about 38,000 high school teachers, 5,000 elementary school teachers, and 5,000 college instructors.

The Foundation's programs have helped to unearth new information of both scientific and practical importance. For example, we have now:

—Learned more about how genes pass on hereditary characteristics. This knowledge may some day lead to control of diseases and the prevention of inherited defects.

—Neared completion at Cornell University of the world's most powerful circular electron accelerator, an atom smasher that will enable us to advance our understanding of the atom.

—Begun sea grant programs to develop knowledge and to train manpower for developing our marine resources.

—Increased support for the national weather modification program to speed the day when we can reduce losses caused by drought, hail, and violent storms.

—Supported research on a new plastic for possible use as heat shields for re-entry of space vehicles.

The National Science Foundation also continues to increase its support of social science research. A Special Commission on the Social Sciences was established by the National Science Board to provide guidance in this important area.

In my 1967 message to Congress on Health and Education, I directed the National Science Foundation, working with the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to establish an experimental program for developing the educational potential of computers. This has been done through a newly established Office of Computing Activities. The day is not far when these exciting new machines will be contributing to the education of our people.

The Annual Report of the National Science Foundation deserves the attention of the Congress and the American people. It is proof that we are penetrating the unknown, educating new generations of scientists, and making our scientific research yield maximum value.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 20, 1968.*

RADIATION CONTROL OF HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1968

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1105 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1105

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10790) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public health from radiation emissions from electronic products. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1105 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 10790, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public health from radiation emissions from electronic products. The resolution further provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

Numerous electronic products have the capability of emitting radiation at levels which may be dangerous. The public health and safety require that radiation hazards be controlled, and that authority be granted to protect the public from present and future hazards.

To effect this purpose, H.R. 10790 provides for the establishment by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of an electronic product radiation control program. This program will include the development and administration of performance standards to control electronic product radiation emissions. Also, to achieve the basic purpose of the legislation, provisions are included for planning, conducting, coordinating, and supporting research, development, and training to minimize undesirable and unnecessary exposure of people to radiation from electronic products.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1105 in order that H.R. 10790 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] has stated, House Resolution 1105 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 10790, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The purpose of the legislation is to insure that electronic products having the capability of emitting radiation at levels which may be dangerous to the public are safely controlled under a program operated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Secretary is empowered to establish and carry out programs to protect the public from electronic radiation. It will include the establishment, administration, and enforcement of performance standards for electronic products, research projects concerning such radiation, and constant reevaluation of known hazards to insure the public safety.

The Secretary is authorized to make grants and to enter into contracts for research work in this field with public and private organizations. He is also to collect and disseminate information resulting from such research and study concerning the nature and extent of the hazards created by various types of equipment.

Section 357 contains the authority for the establishment of standards to control electronic radiation whenever the Secretary determines that a standard is necessary with respect to a certain product.

Administrative procedures to ensure fair hearings for all interested parties are provided for.

The advisory committee created by the bill is to consist of nine members, appointed by the Secretary and representative of the public, scientific groups, and the electronics industry.

Section 385 provides for notification of any discovered defects causing radiation. Such notice must identify the defect and state what repairs are necessary.

The current funds for radiation control will cover this program. No authorization is contained in the bill. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates the cost of this program for fiscal year 1969 at $1,000,000, for 1970 at $2,500,000, and for 1971 at $5,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolution be adopted, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HUMPHREY'S TUXEDO SPECIAL

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] may speak out of the regular order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there has been quite a bit of preaching lately by the President on the subject of "austerity."

I was somewhat puzzled, therefore, to learn that Vice President HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY's personal Air Force jet plane was flown back to Washington from Scranton, Pa., Sunday afternoon to fetch his tuxedo.

The flight of the Tuxedo Special was quite a hush-hush affair yesterday morning when I initiated some questions about it. The Air Force at first would not give out the time of the flight, let alone admit that it took place at all.

Finally, after 4 hours, an outfit described as the Air Operations Office of the Vice President blamed the pilots for Operation Monkey Suit.

It is interesting to note that the newspapers were first told that the flight was necessary because someone connected with the Scranton dinner, at which the Vice President was to speak, had not told him to bring his tuxedo.

The Air Force explanation is different. Here is its statement:

> Departure (from Washington) to Scranton took place in a rain storm and in our haste to avoid bad weather and guarantee a safe flight the Vice President's briefcase, including speech materials and other important documents needed for work over the weekend were left at the airport along with part of his luggage.
>
> Without informing the Vice President we flew back to Washington to pick up all the material.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you could drive a herd of goats through the holes in this so-called explanation.

If anyone bothered to check the records of the Weather Bureau station at National Airport for Sunday afternoon, it would be found that the ceiling between 3 and 5 p.m. varied from 2,000 to 2,500 feet; that the visibility was more than 15 miles, and that the only rain that fell was in the form of what the Weather Bureau calls "very light rain," and for all of 5 minutes—from 4:25 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.

The Humphrey jet—which you will remember was in "haste to avoid bad weather" connected with this "rainstorm"—took off at 4:29 p.m.—1 minute before this "very light rain" ended.

HUMPHREY apparently joins in blaming the Air Force for leaving his luggage behind, and he claims the pilots took off without his knowledge on their fast and expensive flight from Scranton to Washington and back to Scranton to rescue the tuxedo that had strayed from the Vice-Presidential fold.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Vice President always has enough people in his personal entourage to look after his belongings on these junkets without making bell hops and porters out of Air Force personnel.

It will be recalled that it was only about 3 weeks ago that a Member of the other body was flown back to Washington from Indiana to vote. He arrived too late to vote and one of the big Presidential jets was promptly wheeled out to rush him back to Indiana where he got a degree of one kind or another. Thereafter, he was again presidentially jetted from Indiana to Washington, arriving in the city of make believe in time to attend a cocktail party at the White House.

As I said in the beginning, Mr. Speaker, we are hearing some high-flown talk from the administration these days about austerity. It costs a substantial piece of change to run aerial commuter services for the political royalty, and if the operation of the "Tuxedo Special" comes within the definition of austerity I suggest we have another addition to the ever-widening credibility gap.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield,

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Has the distinguished gentleman from Iowa determined the cost to the taxpayer of the "Tuxedo Special" roundtrip from Scranton, Pa., to Washington National Airport?

Mr. GROSS. No, I have not. I will say to the gentleman that costs of these operations are pretty hard to get at. That is one of the most difficult things to find out around here—how much some of these things cost.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I can certainly appreciate the gentleman's questioning the cost of the USAF "Tuxedo Special," and maybe other errand devices used to haul the political elite back and forth. But is the gentleman in anywise objecting to the Vice President wearing a tuxedo?

Mr. GROSS. Oh, no, not at all; not at all. He could wear overalls and it would be all right with me. I do not care what he wears.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr.

Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I merely wish to add that I am sure the gentleman from Iowa would not want the Vice President to wear overalls at an Irish affair.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10790) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public health from radiation emissions from electronic products.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I just do not want the record to rest in its present state. My distinguished colleague is still on the floor. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], this question: Mr. GROSS, I hope you did not imply, knowing that the Vice President was going to Scranton to speak to the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, one of the oldest patriotic societies in the history of our country, that it would be all right for him in all dignity to address the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in overalls?

Mr. GROSS. Why not?

Mr. CAREY. Because they have long since moved out of the overall category. We reserve those for the farmers of Iowa. Many years ago we doffed our overalls and put them in Mrs. Murphy's chowder.

Mr. GROSS. I have seen a lot of Irish wearing overalls in my time, and, incidentally, they were good people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10790, with Mr. WRIGHT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, public hearings were held on this legislation commencing on August 14, 1967. In addition to that session, public hearings were conducted September 28, October 5, 11, and 17, 1967, and on February 1, 1968. The Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare held executive sessions on February 7, 28, 29, and March 4, 1968. The committee has reported H.R. 10790 favorably with amendments.

The major purpose of this legislation is to protect the public from the dangers of unnecessary and undesirable electronic product radiation. To achieve this, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would establish an electronic product radiation control program which would include the development and administration of performance standards to control the emission of radiation from electronic products and the undertaking by public and private organizations of research and investigation into the effects and control of such radiation emissions.

The general provisions of the bill include a definition section—section 355—which sets forth the meaning of "electronic product radiation," "electronic product," "manufacturer," and "commerce."

Section 356 sets forth the necessary details for the establishment of an electronic product radiation control program. It includes requirements for the development and administration of performance standards, the planning and coordinating of research, developing, training, and operational activities to minimize emissions, the maintenance of liaison with industry, the study and evaluation of emissions of and exposure to electronic product radiation, the development, testing, and evaluation of procedures and techniques for minimizing exposure, and consultation and liaison with the Secretary of Commerce on programs for testing and evaluating electronic product radiation, and the development of performance standards.

Section 357 requires the Secretary by regulation to prescribe performance standards upon a determination that they are necessary for the protection of public health and safety, and sets forth certain criteria for such standards. In this section, administrative procedures and the right to participate in such procedures are spelled out as are provisions for judicial review.

Section 357(f) establishes a National Advisory Committee on Electronic Product Radiation Standards which is to be made up of at least nine members. The membership must be fairly representative of industries manufacturing electronic products, independent testing laboratory personnel, public and private nonprofit scientific and professional organizations concerned, and the general public. The Secretary is required to consult this committee before prescribing any performance standards.

Section 358 provides for notification of defects by manufacturers of electronic products after discovery that a defect which relates to safety of use of any electronic product for which standards are set exists.

Section 359 requires the Secretary of the Treasury to deliver to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare upon request samples of electronic products which are being imported into the United States.

Section 360(a) requires manufacturers of electronic products for which standards have been prescribed to establish and maintain testing records and make reports to provide such information as the Secretary of HEW may by regulation reasonably require.

Section 360(b) authorizes the Secretary of HEW by regulation to require retailers of color television receivers, for which there are standards, to furnish manufacturers of the receivers such information as may be necessary to identify and locate the first purchasers.

Section 360(A) describes prohibited acts to foreclose the introduction into commerce of electronic products which do not comply with standards.

Section 360(B) sets forth provisions to restrain violations under section 360(A) and provides civil penalties of not more than $1,000 for each violation of section 360(A) and a maximum of $200,000 for any related series of violations.

Section 360(C) provides for Federal preemption. Under it, no State will have authority to establish or continue any standard which is applicable to the same aspect of performance of an electronic product as an existing Federal standard unless such State standard is identical to the Federal standard.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the American public has been carefully taught to fear X-radiation and to avoid it. Scientists and medical men have gone to great lengths to appraise the public of this danger because it was discovered the hard way. People working year in and year out with very small sources of radiation sickened and died. Even the scientists and members of the medical profession working with radiation to diagnose and to heal were themselves attacked by this insidious force.

Until a very short time ago it was the opinion of the experts that any ionizing radiation absorbed by the tissues of the human body did damage which was irreversible, and that anybody absorbing enough radiation during his lifetime would suffer the awful consequences. It has been learned that the body does, in fact, have some recuperative power from the effects of radiation, but not enough to noticeably alleviate the dangers.

Because of all this, X-ray is used sparingly even to diagnose illness or treat it. The use of this force for the treatment of cancer, for instance, is strictly one of relative dangers. It is hoped that in killing the cancer cells the body will receive less damage than that inflicted by the treatment.

It is small wonder then that the discovery of excessive radiation by some color television sets caused so much concern. It should be understood that the levels of radiation involved in color television sets is very low compared with the things we have been discussing heretofore. We are told that remaining at least 6 feet away from the color television set should eliminate any danger. Testimony before our committee revealed that in the case of the General Electric television sets involved, a small square of relatively light metal would effectively shield against the radiation being emitted. Nonetheless, some danger did exist, and it was considered better by the industry and by the Government that it be treated seriously.

The bill before us today is not a punitive measure based upon a conclusion of bad performance by the electronics industry. On the contrary, we found that

the industry has been very conscientious in its handling of this problem. The allowable levels of radiation recommended for television sets, for example, is very, very low. We did find, however, that a color television set can be adjusted as it grows older to make up for a gradually dimming picture. This involves raising the voltage by some minor adjustments in the set. The higher the voltage the more radiation is created, so here was an additional problem which needed attention in order to protect the purchasing public and also those working with used equipment.

Certainly color television sets are not the only sources of radiation by electronic products. There are many. Several of them are pointed out in the committee report, and I must admit that most of them I would not recognize if I met them face to face. The report speaks of X-ray spectrographs, klystron tubes, and cathode ray tubes, for example. I am told that the problem, however, can reach to the more common products such as fluorescent bulbs and ultraviolet lamps. It seemed very clear to the committee that here was an area where standards, worked out and established by the Government, would serve as a protection to the public and to industry as well.

The bill, first of all, defines electronic products and electronic radiation. The definition is broad enough to include such new devices as those employing the laser principle and also those described as ultrasonic.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is given authority to establish standards to control product radiation in those cases where it appears necessary for the protection of the public health and safety. Obviously, different standards may be required for different classes of products. The Secretary is expected to work with the scientific community in and out of Government to develop procedures and techniques for minimizing the danger. This will require research, evaluation, and exchange of information. When, after consultation with all appropriate people and agencies the Secretary does determine that a standard is necessary, he will proceed to establish that standard with all of the protections of the Administrative Procedures Act, including rights to judicial review by those who will be required to apply the standard. A newer, amended standard can be made effective between 1 and 2 years after it is issued unless there is some urgent reason for an earlier date.

If another situation were to arise similar to the color television situation of last year, it would obviously be desirable to notify the owners of the sets involved. This posed a problem for the committee because we have already been made aware of the situation with color television sets. Since it is expected in the future that standards may be set for electronic products which are much smaller, it would pose insurmountable problems of recordkeeping if we were to require information at all times as to all purchasers. Because of this, the bill calls for a dual system. In the case of color television sets the retailer must provide a record which will identify the first purchaser and maintain that record so that the manufacturer can, if need be, track him down. In all other products, at least for the time being, it is only required that the manufacturer give notice to the first purchaser when he can find him. He will also, however, give notice of defects to the Secretary who will then make a public announcement if this seems desirable. This may seem like a somewhat less than satisfactory system, but we feel that the Government and industry will need far more experience in this area before anything more definite could be made to work.

The bill also provides for civil penalties of $1,000 for each violation, with a maximum accumulated penalty of $200,000 for any related series. This is based upon the system used in the traffic safety legislation of last year.

This is a good and timely piece of legislation, and I recommend it to the House.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10790, the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act, which I have cosponsored with my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable PAUL ROGERS. Let me at this point pay special commendation to Mr. ROGERS, who has been a key factor in congressional recognition of this problem. He has made a real contribution and deserves much credit.

Mr. Chairman, since August 14 of last year, our subcommittee has conducted a series of hearings on the potential hazards presented by some of our most common electronic products. Those hearings have demonstrated the need for Federal standards in this area, as well as continued research and investigation into the problems of radiation from such products.

Persons exposed to excessive radiation may suffer lasting injuries to their health and even death. Responsible authorities have concluded that the reception of radiation by an individual is retained, thus making its effect cumulative. Furthermore, these adverse results from excessive radiation may be injurious not only to an individual, but may also be transmitted by him to his descendents.

There are numerous electronic products which have this potential radiation hazard. Color television sets, because of their increasing popularity and widespread availability, received the greatest amount of publicity in the course of the hearings on H.R. 10790. The record has shown that approximately 2,700,000 receivers were sold for domestic use in 1965; that this number increased to 4,900,000 in 1966, and that in 1967, some 5½ million receivers were sold on the domestic market. No one knows for sure just how many color television sets emit radiation at levels which may be dangerous. However, recent surveys conducted in Pinellas County, Fla., and in our own Washington metropolitan area measuring the amount of X-radiation from color television sets, have confirmed the existence of the very real dangers that this bill will attempt to control.

This bill will provide specific responsibility and authority for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish and carry out a program to protect the public from electronic product radiation. A part of the program shall be the constant evaluation of hazards from known sources of electronic product radiation. To assist the Department and its Secretary, authority is given to make grants to and negotiate contracts with public and private organizations and individuals to carry out the necessary research, evaluation, and testing aspects of the program.

Mr. Chairman, the committee feels that the industries engaged in the manufacture of electronic products have shown a responsible attitude toward meeting the challenge of assuring the public of the highest degree of health protection. However, improvements can be effected, and such improvements will be facilitated under the bill with continued industry effort and through the work of the Secretary. This legislation, Mr. Chairman, is another major step toward the protection of the American consumer, and deserves the support of the entire Congress. I most sincerely urge this body's favorable action on the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will speak very briefly about this bill. I should like to call attention to the review before the subcommittee and the atmosphere which existed in the committee and also between industry and HEW, which I believe deserves great compliment.

We found that there was no authority in the hands of HEW to do anything about standards dealing with electrical equipment which might have radiation dangers by emissions, and under the present law no authority was in the hands of HEW to set up these standards.

It also must be said that when industry found some of the color television sets were defective, industry called them back in for reexamination and restructuring in the public interest. I believe they should be complimented for that.

In the hearings we learned that industry and HEW were perfectly willing to sit down together to work out these standards so that the public would be protected.

In the bill we provide provisions for registration, so that we can keep track of equipment which may be in the hands of the public, up until such time as adequate standards are established, and then they may drop the provision if they find the public is adequately protected.

I feel this is a very sensible piece of legislation. It serves a public need. It protects the public as it ought to do. I highly recommend consideration and adoption of the bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chair-

man, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding to me. I, too, want to join with the subcommittee chairman in saying that there was fine work done by the subcommittee in a spirit of cooperation with the department as well as the industry.

The bill now before us, H.R. 10790, has as its basic purpose, the protection of the people of this Nation from radiation emissions from electronic products.

There is no doubt that a number of electronic products are capable of emitting radiation.

There is no doubt that many now are emitting such radiation, and there is no doubt that, in many instances, the radiation being emitted is above the acceptable tolerance level for humans.

Standards for the control of the emission of hazardous radiation from electronic products is needed.

This legislation would permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set such standards for electronic products when they are found to present radiation hazards which in most cases is an unwanted byproduct in the operation of the products.

Testimony from industry during the hearings on this legislation acknowledged the emission of radiation, often excessive emission, in not only color television receivers, but also microwave ovens, radar, lasers, computing systems, and other ionizing—electromagnetic—as well as nonionizing products.

The committee commended the industry for its interest and cooperation, and I am sure the industry feels that this problem needs to be met, and that they will work with the Secretary to meet the problem through effective standards.

As research into the causes of this radiation continues, not only into existing products, but into products that are not yet on the market, new standards may be set, and the hazardous radiation will be readily identified and controlled.

I first became aware of this problem of radiation being emitted from electronic products through studies made by a Dr. John Ott in Sarasota, Fla., who experimented with mice placed in front of television screens.

In May of last year, the problem became more real, insofar as humans are concerned, when the General Electric Co. announced that some 100,000 of its color television receivers were found defective and could emit radiation above the generally accepted level of 0.5 milliroentgen per hour at a distance of 5 centimeters from the face of the screen. That is about 2 inches.

The cause of the excessive radiation in the GE sets was found in a defective shunt regulator tube.

Subsequent investigation has shown that the radiation in color receivers from GE, as well as other manufacturers, can be caused not only by a defective shunt regulator tube but also by the rectifier tube as well as by the face of the picture tube itself, and, of course, by a service repairman either coming into the home or taking a set in his shop and increasing the voltage of the set.

I must emphasize that by this legislation, which I introduced along with my colleague the Honorable JOHN JARMAN of Oklahoma, we do not seek to condemn, but rather to protect. To protect the public health from such excessive radiation in the future.

During the extensive hearings, and in writing this bill, the committee made it clear that research is to be encouraged to identify potential sources of, and the consequences of exposure to, electronic product radiation.

The committee, in unanimously reporting this bill and recommending that it do pass, is of the opinion that this is a workable, effective piece of legislation which can protect the public health.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I shall be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida yielding to me at this point and I want to make it clear at the outset that I am strongly in favor of this type of legislation, legislation which is designed to protect the public. I think it is important and timely that it be presented and debated in the House of Representatives today.

However, Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] have any idea as to how many people have been injured or have indeed been brought into a fatal illness, as a result of any of this type of radiation which we are seeking to protect against?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Well, of course we have the very recent case, with which I am sure the gentleman from Missouri is familiar and has read, that appeared in Newsweek of last week involving certain individuals who were exposed to this X-radiation beam in the State of Pennsylvania. This is probably the most recently celebrated case. Very severe damage was suffered by these men.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. However, if the gentleman will yield further, those are the dramatic cases, the obvious cases which always come to the attention of the public, and that leads to my next question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Would the gentleman's proposed legislation seek to protect against all different types of radiation and all different hazards involved, whether by reason of environment involving a radiation atmosphere in which we seek to protect ourselves, or whether it is a situation involved as "perchance" such as the example which was cited by the distinguished gentleman from Florida which involved increasing the voltage, the adjustment of the rectifier, and other mechanical and electrical as well as electronic and radioactive operations are concerned in existing television sets?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. This is correct. That is what we are trying to do. As I am sure the gentleman from Missouri realizes, we do not fully know nor do we undertake to set out all of the effects of radiation, all the different types of radiation. We are still conducting research with reference to this problem.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would submit to the gentleman that I am probably one of the few people in this body who has been upon innumerable occasions overexposed to radiation as the result of the operation of the fluoroscope in the days before there was adequate protection. However, be that as it may, that again leads to another question.

Under this bill for example, will the Secretary coordinate his authority with the Atomic Energy Commission and other agencies of the Government such as the Army food irradiation laboratories at Natick, Mass., which deal with isotopes and electronic radiation of many types?

Also, has there been sufficient planning against the excessive use of isotopes or the——

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Missouri will permit, on that question we have made it clear in the report at page 12 thereof, which I am sure the gentleman from Missouri has read, that this does not encompass an overlapping of authority at all or a limitation or encroachment upon the authority of the agencies involved in this field such as the Atomic Energy Commission. So, that is all set up. We do not feel that we ought to get into that field. This is definitely confined to electronic products.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further for one final question?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes.

Mr. HALL. Also, on page 12 of the report—which I have read—is the estimated cost of the legislation. I notice that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in its wisdom, and those who appeared before the committee in support of this legislation, feel that this cost will go from $1 million in fiscal year 1969 to over $5 million for the three different sections of the bill in fiscal year 1971.

Now, does this come out of the present authorization or the present budget? In other words, is it included in the budget for 1969?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes, it is included in the budget for 1969. Now, let me say this——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman may realize, these are simple projections. We hope that the job can be done for less than this. However, we also are trying to accede to the recommendation of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in setting forth very clearly for the benefit of the membership of the House, as the gentleman from Missouri has inquired about, exactly what is anticipated that this bill, if enacted, will do. We feel we have set forth very clearly the fact that we are undertaking to hold down the cost of the program.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the

gentleman will yield further, I appreciate the fact that this does comply with the current law, but my last question is this: There are no additional authorizations contained in the bill and, therefore, for fiscal year 1969, the cost thereof will come out of the existing authorizations to the Secretary; is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is correct.

Before I conclude, may I say it is the intention of the committee, in reference to section 360(b), where the term "manufacturer" is used, the term "manufacturer" in this section may also be interpreted as meaning a company such as Sears or J. C. Penney Co., who sells electronic products such as TV sets under its own trade name. In such cases such trade name companies would be considered as manufacturers in effect, so that the information as to the purchasers of TV sets would go back to them rather than the orignial manufacturer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968.

Not one of us here wishes to have history judge us as being a body which lacked the foresight to protect our people. The medical professions, as well as industry, has long taken advantage of the beneficial uses of radiation. However, Herman Muller in his 1964 Nobel laureate presentation in Stockholm, sounded an alarm which still echoes, that the genetic damage which can be produced by radiation places a burden upon society in judging its proper use.

Unlike most physical insults to the body the effects of radiation may be passed from one generation to another. A genetic mutation in an individual in the population will be expressed, or leave that population only by genetic death which in the terms of the geneticist is defined as the failure or inability of a person to reproduce. Thus, we are faced with the dilemma of optimizing the beneficial uses of radiation, yet controlling all sources of radiation which produce no benefit.

A high-voltage tube which is designed for one purpose, and only incidental to that purpose produces X-rays which can expose our families in our homes, clearly must be controlled. The effects of radiation are cumulative and a small exposure received from one source adds up with exposures from other sources. By not controlling the unnecessary radiation from electronic products, we impose an unwarranted burden upon the medical professions in their use of radiation for beneficial results.

This act authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish standards for the control of radiation from electronic products. By providing funds for research and training, we will increase our capability to understand the effects of radiation and thereby receive optimum benefits with minimum risk.

I hope that every Member of this body will join me in voting for this important legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10790, the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968.

As one who introduced identical legislation in this field last year, since this problem first came to public attention, and as one who strongly believes that every possible step must be taken to protect the American consumer, I am in wholehearted accord with the purposes of this bill.

In this era of accelerating technology it almost requires an engineering degree just to operate some of the devices being presented to the public today. How many of us are even aware of the potential dangers those same devices may hold.

It is precisely to a segment of this problem that the bill now before us addresses itself.

When people bought about 4.7 million color television sets in 1966, and about 2.7 million the year before, not one realized that he might be subjecting himself to potentially dangerous radiations every time he sat before his set. Apparently, not even the manufacturers were cognizant of having opened a Pandora's box. But open it they did.

In 1967, it was discovered that approximately 150,000 color television sets had been manufactured that emitted particularly high levels of X-radiation. The manufacturer corrected those sets when the hazard was disclosed. The point is, however, that the public suddenly came face to face with the realization that electronic products posed a definite health problem about which nothing had been done.

Had a suitable system of testing and control been in force, those 150,000 color television sets could have been prevented. I do not wish to be an alarmist, but the truth is that no one knows how many other electronic products at this very moment are leaking hazardous radiation.

The proposed Radiation and Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968 will, in my opinion, provide the research, investigation, and control tools necessary to protect the American consumer from at least this one aspect of our technological genius.

It is not my intention to take the time of this distinguished body with an item by item detailed analysis of this bill. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with its fine chairman, my good friends and outstanding ranking minority members, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], and [Mr. SPRINGER] have already taken care of that.

I would, however, ask for clarification of one aspect of the bill. Section 359 dealing with imports of electronic products into the United States does set forth certain controls placed in the hands of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Furthermore, section 360A would make it unlawful for any manufacturer to import an electronic device which does not comply with applicable standards. Yet it seems to me the bill is vague on the point of what responsibility is actually placed on foreign manufacturers who would ship their products to the United States.

Would they, for example, be required to furnish to the Secretary the same information required of American manufacturers?

Mr. STAGGERS. Under the bill, as the gentleman was saying, in section 359 definitely the Secretary of the Treasury has to submit samples of anything that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare wishes to be sampled. The Secretary sets up the standards. These must meet the same standards of every device that is being used in this country or that is manufactured in this country. They would have to meet these standards the same way as they would in this country—that is right.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment to clarify this point but the answer of the gentleman establishes the legislative intent and should leave no question as to the bill's application to foreign manufacturers who sell their wares here.

I think it is necessary to emphasize that this legislation is not designed as a punitive measure against the television industry, or any other industry for that matter. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, in its report, expressed the sense that industries engaged in the manufacture of electronic products have shown a responsible attitude toward meeting the challenge of assuring the public of the highest degree of health protection.

Yet the fact does remain that improvements and guarantees are essential, and this bill will help achieve those objectives. I urge my colleagues to support it and the American consumer.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. KYROS], a member of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10790, the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968.

It is extremely important that such legislation be speedily passed so that the Government will have the necessary tools to minimize the exposure of people to electronic product radiation.

The frequent reports and news coverage over the past 6 months concerning X-radiation from color television receivers pointed to the need for this legislation. Studies made by the Public Health Service shows that the problem of hazardous radiation is not limited to color television. The studies confirm the need for immediate action.

I am deeply concerned about such effects upon the home, but I am equally concerned that we do not overlook the fact that there are other extremely important potential sources of hazardous radiation. One especially important example comes to mind—the particle accelerator accident in a research and development laboratory in October 1967, at Harmarville, Pa.

Barely 2 weeks ago a report was issued on the condition of the three men seriously injured in this radiation accident. More than 5 months after the accident, one of the injured men who received ex-

tremely high dosage of X-radiation, remains in the hospital and the date of his release still has not been determined. Two other victims of the accident have returned to work, but only after lengthy hospitalization.

I am very pleased to hear reports of the extremely effective and well planned medical services which probably saved the lives of these men; but I would be less than frank if I did not note my own concern that as the number of these extremely potentially hazardous accelerators come into use, there is no Federal agency provided with the authority to develop and enforce regulations to cover the existence and operation of these electronic products.

H.R. 10790 would give the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the necessary tools—authority to establish and enforce performance standards. The bill would also authorize the Secretary to support research, development, training, and operational activities to reduce to the lowest possible minimum the exposure of workmen to such products.

This legislation will also call upon the electronics industry to assist in the development of standards for electronic products to control any harmful radiation. Representatives of the electronics industry have been cooperative throughout the hearings on this legislation and indicated their own concern for sound development of safeguards for the public.

I feel that such legislation is long overdue and I wish to place myself on record as being wholeheartedly in support of H.R. 10790 and the objectives it seeks to achieve.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I would like to point out, since my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], raised the question as to the possibility of overlapping jurisdiction, section 4 of this bill has been carefully analyzed by the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. We are absolutely convinced that this eliminates the possibility of overlap. We also have noted in the report that the Atomic Energy Commission is one of the areas of jurisdiction that is mentioned, with the thought of being absolutely certain there would be no provision that would provide for overlapping of jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, I have followed the legislative history of H.R. 10790 intently and with considerable interest Although the bill as introduced appeared to conflict in certain respects with the Atomic Energy Act, as reported these conflicts appear to have been eliminated. I support the bill. As I read the bill it appears to be consistent with and complementary to the Atomic Energy Act, which provides for the regulation of source, byproduct, and special nuclear material. The intent of H.R. 10790 seems to be to bring under Federal regulation sources of radiation not already covered by the Atomic Energy Act. Any remaining doubts about the possibility of overlapping jurisdiction between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Atomic Energy Commission should be removed by section 4 of H.R. 10790, where it is specifically provided:

> This Act shall not be construed as superseding or limiting the functions, under any other provision of law, of any officer or agency of the United States.

I believe the proposed legislation is generally well conceived, necessary, and deserving of enactment. My only regret is that with respect to the formulation of performance standards to control the emission of radiation from the electronic products covered by the bill, H.R. 10790 does not recognize explicitly the role of the Federal Radiation Council.

Under the Atomic Energy Act the Federal Radiation Council is established as the official representative of the President in development of policy and guidance with respect to radiation hazards. Section 274(h) of the act provides:

> The Council shall advise the President with respect to radiation matters, directly or indirectly affecting health, including guidance for all Federal agencies in the formulation of radiation standards and in the establishment and execution of programs of cooperation with the States.

Thus, the FRC's advice extends to all Federal agencies, not just the AEC, and to radiation from whatever source, not just materials covered by the Atomic Energy Act. The Council consists of the Secretaries of Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce, the special assistant to the President for Science and Technology, and the Chairman of the AEC, or their designees.

In view of the fact that this organization is already in being, represents a wide area of expertise, and was established to provide policy guidance to all Federal agencies on the very subject covered by this bill, it seems highly regrettable that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who himself is a member of the Council, is not required to consult with it before adopting regulations in implementation of this legislation.

Another oversight, in my opinion, is the failure of this bill to require consultation by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements. The NCRP, a federally chartered organization, has since the late 1920's made notable contributions to the development of basic radiation protection criteria. Over the years NCRP has gained considerable stature, and its standards now have national acceptance. Indeed, its recommendations are felt on the international level, where NCRP works closely with its international counterpart, the ICRP.

It is my hope that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in addition to consulting with the National Advisory Committee on Electronic Product Radiation Standards which would be established by this bill, will consult closely with and give appropriate weight to relevant standards published by these expert groups in prescribing any performance standards under this legislation.

I note that the Secretary is authorized by this bill to support research by public and private organizations into the effects and control of radiation emissions from covered electronic products. In order to avoid wasteful duplication of Federal facilities and technical personnel and unnecessary costs, it would also be my hope that the Secretary will utilize the resources of the AEC's national laboratories wherever he thinks they can be of particular assistance in carrying out the research contemplated by the bill. An amendment to the Atomic Energy Act approved last session now permits the Commission under appropriate circumstances to perform research and development for others in its laboratories when the Commission determines that its facilities or scientific resources have the potential of lending significant assistance in the fields of protection of public health and safety. In view of the AEC's wide experience with radiation protection and knowledge of the effects of radiation on man, I would think the Commission could make a valuable contribution to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in this area.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE], a member of the committee.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of my committee for yielding. I rise in support of H.R. 10790.

Mr. Chairman, ever since the spring of 1967 when the potential hazard of excessive X-radiation from color television receivers was made known to the public, increased attention has been focused both on the benefits to be derived from the proper use of radiation as well as the associated risks.

Last fall, a serious radiation accident during the operation of a particle accelerator in a laboratory in Pennsylvania threatened the lives of three men. Only the most alert and effective use of medical skills and techniques saved them from serious injury.

In the case of color television receivers, we have heard of hazardous X-radiation considerably in excess of the 0.05 milliroentgens limit recommended by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements. Recent surveys show that it is an industrywide problem.

The extended application of such devices as microwave ovens for domestic use focuses attention on another potential source of hazard—in this case, nonionizing radiation—but nonetheless a potential hazard to the individual which needs careful evaluation.

We cannot but conclude that the continual development of complex electronic products for use in the home will increase the threat to the public health unless suitable controls are established. The passage of H.R. 10790 and the authority which will be granted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under this legislation for developing performance standards, research, training and coordination with all interested groups and agencies, will be an important forward step in making certain we preserve the benefits of modern technology while we eliminate harmful side effects.

Mr. Chairman, I would have favored a less or smaller fine or penalty in case of any violation as provided under section 360(B)(b). I offered an amendment in the committee to lower the individual penalty from $1,000 to $500. However, I know that the intent of the committee is in no way a punitive approach, and that the measure is not intended as an indictment of the television industry, but rather a sound approach for safety and health. With that I am sure all will agree.

I call on every Member of this House to study this legislation carefully and join me in its support.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE].

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, and congratulate my colleague from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a positive step to prevent further degradation of our environment with invisible and unsensed but potentially harmful radiation from electronic products. These radiations include X-rays, microwaves, and the energetic, coherent light waves from lasers. The commonplace experience and knowledge of most of us simply is not sufficient to protect ourselves against these radiations.

In many ways we should be thankful for the almost accidental discovery last year that some color television sets of a well-known and reputable manufacturer were emitting X-rays well above recognized limits. Since then, on March 14, the Public Health Services reported the results of a survey of 1,124 color television receivers in the Washington, D.C., area and found that 268, about 20 percent, were emitting detectable X-radiation, with 65 of them emitting more than the 0.5 milliroentgens per hour recommended by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurement. Sets of more than one manufacturer were involved.

This episode is a dramatic warning that we cannot blithely assume that a manufacturer of an electronic product indeed has had someone looking after the safety of his product. So many individual designers, engineers, market specialists, cost accountants, and others have a hand in development of a new product that safely can be lost in the shuffle, especially if it adds to costs, unless the Government sets performance standards. H.R. 10790 does precisely that. It authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish and carry out an electronic product radiation control program to protect the public health and safety.

For example, improvements in electronic components brings us to the time when microwave ovens may become commonplace in kitchens of the home, restaurants, and food-service industries. Microwave ovens are already on the market. Presumably they are safe, but so were the color television sets. Can we take for granted that microwave ovens have the proper safeguards to prevent their users from accidental exposure to the powerful heating action of this radiation? Microwaves from such an oven can cook a heavy roast in one-eighth to one-half the usual time. Think what that could do to a person who might be exposed if a safety device of the oven were to fail because of poor design or cheap manufacture. And safety devices do fail, even in leading scientific laboratories. It was only last fall that three workers at a laboratory near Pittsburgh were seriously exposed to X-rays from a Van de Graaff machine—another electronic product—when a safety device apparently failed.

Mr. Chairman, I emphasize the setting of performance standards is a practicable way to assure the radiation safety that the public requires. In many ways this situation brings to mind that of the manufacture of medical and dental devices, surgical and therapeutic instruments, artificial organs and limbs. This is why in February 1967 I introduced H.R. 6165 to create a National Medical Devices Standards Commission. This Commission would review the quality controls and manufacturing procedures for medical devices. I believe such a review is necessary to reveal and determine the requirements for possible Federal regulation of the manufacture and sale of such items in interstate commerce. The ongoing advancements in medical science, the heavy emphasis upon quick and direct applications of that science, the sophistication and strangeness of the technologies that are now evolving out of that medical science all are urgent reasons to act now to control the manufacture of medical devices before tragic errors and mistakes generate public reactions that lead to hasty, ill-considered response.

Just about a week ago, on March 12, the House passed H.R. 14910 to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to prescribe regulations for the manufacture or use of electronic devices which emit radiations that cause harmful interference with radio reception. The act was necessary to maintain the quality of our communications in a time whenever more products are being made that can cause interference. But does not our sense of values seem out of balance when we act faster to assure the quality of communications reception than to protect the public health and safety?

Mr. Chairman, we in Congress have a special responsibility to look to the future and anticipate and provide for control of the unwanted, unexpected, undesirable side effects of new applications of our vigorous science and technology. Congress set a great example in 1946 and again in 1954 when it built into the Nation's laws for atomic energy thoroughgoing provisions for the control of nuclear reactors, of artificial radioactive materials, before their use became commonplace.

Enactment of H.R. 10790 will further show that this legislative body and the rest of our Government is able to deal intelligently and effectively with new technologies without waiting for and paying the cruel human price of needless accident and injury. I urge your immediate support for H.R. 10790 and your attention to my bill, H.R. 6165.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY], a member of the committee.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

As is so often the case with our highly advanced technology, we rush to take advantage of its convenience and pleasure before fully understanding its ultimate affects. As a result, many products of this technology contain harmful elements which may endanger the public health. Because our society is geared to mass production and wide distribution, there is a strong national concern for the protection of the general public from the adverse effects of this technology.

One of the most dramatic advances in our scientific development has been in the field of electronics, and there are few homes today which do not have electrical products of some kind. Recent studies have found that numerous electronic products have the capability of emitting radiation at levels which may be dangerous.

Because the average citizen has no way of protecting against such dangers, or even knowing that they exist, I cosponsored legislation to establish an electronic product radiation control program within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The danger here is that the reception of radiation by an individual is retained, thus making its effect cumulative, and adverse effects of excessive radiation may be injurious, not only to the individual, but to his descendants as well.

The problem today is that no one knows how many electronic products are emitting hazardous radiation. During the hearings before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, color television sets were cited as one source of radiation emissions, but no one knows how many color television sets are emitting hazardous radiation. But it is clear from this one product alone that we must act now; in 1965 2.7 million color television sets were sold in this country; in 1966 4.9 million were sold, and in 1967 5.5 million. Thus today millions of people own an electrical product which may be causing serious and permanent damage to their health, and no one knows how much damage is being done, or which sets may be doing it.

The industry is very concerned with this hazard, and is moving to meet their responsibility to protect the public health. But the magnitude of the problem calls for national action. The bill now before this body would provide the tools necessary to protect the public health in this field, and should be approved.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I note with great interest and appreciation that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has indicated, in its report accompanying the bill now before the House, compliance with Public Law 801, 84th Congress, by indicating the personnel costs involved in H.R. 10790.

In November of last year I indicated to the Members that it was not only good budgeting but good lawmaking, and certainly good government, to determine the total cost of bills including the number of additional personnel before creating new programs or expanding old ones.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget was urged to require the heads of each department and agency to develop complete cost information on all proposed programs.

In turn, I indicated to the chairman of each standing committee of the House on November 16, 1967, the necessity for showing total labor costs and also called attention to Public Law 801 of the 84th Congress.

Again, I am happy to state that Chairman STAGGERS has complied with Public Law 801, and you will find that information well specified on page 12 of the subject report on this bill.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10790, the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968. The purpose of the bill is to protect the public against devices in the electronics field, the radiation emissions of which may be hazardous. This bill provides for a program whose function it is to develop performance standards and it calls for research to minimize exposure to such radiation.

To effect the health protection purpose of the legislation, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would establish an electronic product radiation control program which would include the development and administration of performance standards to control the emission of electronic product radiation from electronic products. Under this program, research and investigation into the effects and control of radiation emissions will be conducted by public and private organizations.

As the number of new electronic devices begins to become more prominent on the market, there arises a more pressing need to protect the public. Such things as microwave ovens are not far from the commercial market and the laser beam is finding greater use. Medical and dental X-ray equipment has long been with us and fluoroscopes, once a common item, are now being used only in conservative ways.

Not so long ago I used to go to the shoestore and the method of fitting a person was by the use of the fluoroscope. The radiation from these instruments was ultimately found to be hazardous to health. In the early days of the fluoroscope, doctors used it with no thought of personal danger. Many suffered the loss of fingers or hands through the inroads of radiation.

Radiation is something which accumulates in the human body. It does not come and go. It is thought to even accumulate and be transmitted to a person's descendants.

We are not absolutely certain as to all the byproducts of X-ray exposure but we do know that a sufficiency thereof will cause cancer, leukemia, and death. Where the exposure is not sufficient for these extremes, damage to the regenerative powers may result.

Public notice of this radiation problem arose out of the hearings on this legislation when it was pointed out that a number of color television sets were found to be emanating a higher degree of radiation than was safe. The number of color sets on the market more than doubled since 1965 when there were 2.7 million. At last report there were over 5.5 million in the United States. Of this number, no one knows how many are emitting hazardous radiations. At the hearings it was pointed out that 150,000 color television sets had been manufactured which incorporated a type of shunt regulating tube, and that a majority of those tested emitted excessively high levels of X-radiation. The color sets tested were of the large screen variety which required a kilovolt capacity high enough to create X-radiation.

This X-radiation can and must be effectively shielded. This bill provides the necessary authority for inspecting these devices and for providing safe levels of radiation. I want to make it clear that I am not singling out television because in checking on the dangers of radiation, medical X-ray units were found defective in over 50 percent of the machines tested.

When I speak of the need for correction, I want to take this opportunity to say that the electronic industry has always been scrupulous and eager in their desire to produce a safe and efficient product. I have every confidence that with the type of bill that we are voting on today, this propensity will not be stifled. This bill will give the industry the necessary leeway while guaranteeing requisite safety for our people. It will make certain that the harmful exposure will be cut down as much as possible.

It think this legislation is fair in that it takes into consideration not only the welfare of the public but also the problems of industry.

I accordingly urge passage of this necessary legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I take such time as I may consume, to commend and compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], and all of the members of the subcommittee for the hearings which they conducted on the bill, I congratulate all members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. We have had the best relationship on our committee that I know of anywhere in the Congress. I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] and all the members of the minority side for their cooperation. And I might say that today's cooperation by majority and minority Members is by no means an exception. It has been continuing right along in all types of complex legislation before our committee. I value this relationship very, very highly.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an important bill. It was recommended by the committee unanimously. I urge passage of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the bill as an original bill for purposes of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968".

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 2. Part F of title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended—

(1) by striking out the heading for such part and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"PART F—LICENSING OF BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS AND CLINICAL LABORATORIES AND CONTROL OF RADIATION

"SUBPART 1—BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS"

(2) by inserting immediately above the section heading of section 353 the following:

"SUBPART 2—CLINICAL LABORATORIES"

and

(3) by adding at the end of such part F the following new subpart:

"SUBPART 3—ELECTRONIC PRODUCT RADIATION CONTROL

"Declaration of purpose

"SEC. 354. The Congress hereby declares that the public health and safety must be protected from the dangers of electronic product radiation. Thus, it is the purpose of this subpart to provide for the establishment by the Secretary of an electronic product radiation control program which shall include the development and administration of performance standards to control the emission of electronic product radiation from electronic products and the undertaking by public and private organizations of research and investigation into the effects and control of such radiation emissions.

"Definitions

"SEC. 355. As used in this subpart—

"(1) the term 'electronic product radiation' means—

"(A) any ionizing or non-ionizing electromagnetic or particulate radiation, or

"(B) any sonic or ultrasonic wave,

which is emitted from an electronic product as the result of the operation of an electronic circuit in such product;

"(2) the term 'electronic product' means any manufactured or assembled product which contains an electronic circuit and which emits electronic product radiation;

"(3) the term 'manufacturer' means any person engaged in the business of manufacturing, assembling, or importing of electronic products;

"(4) the term 'commerce' means (A) commerce between any place in any State and any place outside thereof; and (B) commerce wholly within the District of Columbia; and

"(5) the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"Electronic product radiation control program

"SEC. 356. (a) The Secretary shall establish and carry out an electronic product radiation control program designed to protect the public health and safety from electronic product radiation. As a part of such programs, he shall—

"(1) pursuant to section 357, develop and administer performance standards for electronic products;

"(2) plan, conduct, coordinate, and support research, development, training, and operational activities to minimize the emis-

sions of, and the exposure of people to, electronic product radiation;

"(3) maintain liaison with and receive information from industry, industry associations, and other organizations on present and future potential electronic product radiation;

"(4) study and evaluate emissions of, and conditions of exposure to, electronic product radiation;

"(5) develop, test, and evaluate the effectiveness of procedures and techniques for minimizing exposure to electronic product radiation; and

"(6) consult and maintain liaison with the Secretary of Commerce on (A) techniques, equipment, and programs for testing and evaluating electronic product radiation, and (B) the development of performance standards pursuant to section 357 to control such radiation emissions.

"(b) In carrying out the purposes of subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to—

"(1)(A) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of, and other information concerning, research and studies relating to the nature and extent of the hazards and control of electronic product radiation; and (B) make such recommendations relating to such hazards and control as he considers appropriate;

"(2) make grants to public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions, and to individuals for the purposes stated in paragraphs (2), (4), and (5) of subsection (a) of this section;

"(3) contract with public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with individuals, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U.S.C. 529, 41 U.S.C. 5); and

"(4) procure (by negotiation or otherwise) electronic products for research and testing purposes, and sell or otherwise dispose of such products.

"Performance standards for electronic products

"SEC. 357. (a)(1) The Secretary shall by regulation prescribe performance standards for electronic products to control the emission of electronic product radiation from such products if he determines that such standards are necessary for the protection of the public health and safety. In the development of such standards, the Secretary shall consult with appropriate interested persons, including representatives of industries which would be affected by such standards, and shall give consideration to—

"(A) the latest available scientific and medical data in the field of electronic product radiation;

"(B) the standards currently recommended by (i) other Federal agencies having responsibilities relating to the control and measurement of electronic product radiation, and (ii) public or private groups having an expertise in the field of electronic product radiation;

"(C) the technical and economic feasibility of such standards as applied to a particular electronic product; and

"(D) the adaptability of such standards to the need for uniformity and reliability of testing and measuring procedures and equipment.

"(2) The Secretary may prescribe different and individual performance standards, to the extent appropriate and feasible, for different electronic products so as to recognize their different operating characteristics and uses.

"(3) The performance standards prescribed under this section shall not apply to any electronic product which is intended solely for export if (A) such product and the outside of any shipping container used in the export of such product are labeled or tagged to show that such product is intended for export, and (B) such product meets all the applicable requirements of the country to which such product is intended for export.

"(4) The Secretary may by regulation amend or revoke any performance standard prescribed under this section.

"(b) The provisions of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5 of the United States Code (relating to the administrative procedure for rulemaking), and of chapter 7 of such title (relating to judicial review), shall apply with respect to any regulation prescribing, amending, or revoking any standard prescribed under this section.

"(c) Each regulation prescribing, amending, or revoking a standard shall specify the date on which it shall take effect which, in the case of any regulation prescribing, or amending any standard, may not be sooner than one year or not later than two years after the date on which such regulation is issued, unless the Secretary finds, for good cause shown, that an earlier or later effective date is in the public interest and publishes in the Federal Register his reason for such finding, in which case such earlier or later date shall apply.

"(d)(1) In a case of actual controversy as to the validity of any regulation issued under this section prescribing, amending, or revoking a performance standard, any person who will be adversely affected by such regulation when it is effective may at any time prior to the sixtieth day after such regulation is issued file a petition with the United States court of appeals for the circuit wherein such person resides or has his principal place of business, for a judicial review of such regulation. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary or other officer designated by him for that purpose. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which the Secretary based the regulation, as provided in section 2112 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"(2) If the petitioner applies to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shows to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the proceeding before the Secretary, the court may order such additional evidence (and evidence in rebuttal thereof) to be taken before the Secretary, and to be adduced upon the hearing, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Secretary may modify his findings, or make new findings, by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and he shall file such modified or new findings, and his recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of his original regulation, with the return of such additional evidence.

"(3) Upon the filing of the petition referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the court shall have jurisdiction to review the regulation in accordance with chapter 7 of title 5 of the United States Code and to grant appropriate relief as provided in such chapter.

"(4) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any such regulation of the Secretary shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"(5) Any action instituted under this subsection shall survive, notwithstanding any change in the person occupying the office of Secretary or any vacancy in such office.

"(6) The remedies provided for in this subsection shall be in addition to and not in substitution for any other remedies provided by law.

"(e) A certified copy of the transcript of the record and administrative proceedings under this section shall be furnished by the Secretary to any interested party at his request, and payment of the costs thereof, and shall be admissible in any criminal, exclusion of imports, or other proceeding arising under or in respect of this subpart, irrespective of whether proceedings with respect to the regulation have previously been initiated or become final under this section.

"(f)(1) The Secretary shall appoint a National Advisory Committee on Electronic Product Radiation Standards (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Committee') which he shall consult before prescribing any performance standard under this section. The Committee shall be composed of not less than 9 members who shall be fairly representative of (A) industries manufacturing electronic products to which such standards may apply, (B) independent testing laboratory personnel, (C) public and private nonprofit scientific and professional organizations expert on electronic product radiation safety, and (D) the general public. Each member appointed by the Secretary shall hold office for not more than two years, except that any member may be reappointed.

"(2) Members of the Committee who are not officers or employees of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of the Committee or otherwise engaged in the business of the Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem (including traveltime), and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized in section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. Payments under this subsection shall not render members of the Committee officers or employees of the United States for any purpose.

"(g) The Secretary shall review and evaluate on a continuing basis testing programs carried out by industry which are intended to assure that electronic products comply with standards prescribed under this section.

"Notification of defects in electronic products

"SEC. 358. (a) Every manufacturer of electronic products shall, within a reasonable time after discovering that an electronic product produced, assembled, or imported by him has a defect which relates to the safety of use of such product by reason of the emission of electronic product radiation, or that an electronic product produced, assembled, or imported by him on or after the effective date of an applicable standard prescribed pursuant to section 357 fails to comply with such standard, furnish notification of such defect or failure to comply to the persons (where known to the manufacturer) specified in subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The notification required by subsection (a) of this section shall be accomplished—

"(1) by certified mail to the first purchaser of such product for purposes other than resale, and to any subsequent transferee of such product who is the holder of any manufacturer's warranty on such product; and

"(2) by certified mail or other more expeditious means to the dealers or distributors of such manufacturer to whom such product was delivered.

"(c) The notification required by subsection (a) of this section shall contain a clear description of such defect or failure to comply with an applicable standard, an evaluation of the hazard reasonably related to such defect or failure to comply, and a statement of the measures to be taken to repair such defect.

"(d) Every manufacturer of electronic products shall furnish to the Secretary a true or representative copy of all notices, bulletins, and other communications to the dealers or distributors of such manufacturer or to purchasers (or subsequent transferees) of electronic products of such manufacturer re-

garding any such defect in such product or any such failure to comply with a standard applicable to such product. The Secretary shall disclose to the public so much of the information contained in such notice or other information obtained under section 360(a) as he deems will assist in carrying out the purposes of this subpart, but he shall not disclose any information which contains or relates to a trade secret or other matter referred to in section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code unless he determines that it is necessary to carry out the purposes of this subpart.

"(e) If through testing, inspection, investigation, or research carried out pursuant to this subpart, or examination of reports submitted pursuant to section 360(a), or otherwise, the Secretary determines that any electronic product—

"(1) does not comply with an applicable standard prescribed pursuant to section 357; or

"(2) contains a defect which relates to the safety of use of such product by reason of the emission of electronic product radiation; he shall immediately notify the manufacturer or such product of such defect or failure to comply. The notice shall contain the findings of the Secretary and shall include all information upon which the findings are based. The Secretary shall afford such manufacturer an opportunity to present his views and evidence in support thereof, to establish that there is no failure of compliance or that the alleged defect does not exist or does not relate to safety of use of the product by reason of the emission of such radiation hazard. If after such presentation by the manufacturer the Secretary determines that such product does not comply with an applicable standard prescribed pursuant to section 357, or that it contains a defect which relates to the safety of use of such product by reason of the emission of electronic product radiation, the Secretary shall direct the manufacturer to furnish the notification specified in subsection (c) of this section to the persons specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) of this section.

"(f) The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Advisory Committee established pursuant to section 357, work with the industries concerned to establish appropriate programs for bringing nonconforming or defective products, that are in the hands of distributors, dealers, first purchasers for purposes other than resale, or subsequent transferees holding a manufacturer's warranty, into conformity with applicable standards prescribed pursuant to such section or remedying the defect, and shall include, in his annual report to Congress, a summary of the results of such program.

"Imports

"SEC. 359. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall deliver to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare upon the latter's request, samples of electronic products which are being imported or offered for import into the United States, giving notice thereof to the owner or consignee, who may have a hearing before the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. If it appears from an examination of such samples or otherwise that any electronic product fails to comply with applicable standards prescribed pursuant to section 357, then, unless subsection (b) of this section applies and is complied with, (1) such electronic product shall be refused admission, and (2) the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause the destruction of such electronic product unless such article is exported, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, within 90 days after the date of notice of refusal of admission or within such additional time as may be permitted by such regulations.

"(b) If it appears to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that any electronic product refused admission pursuant to subsection (a) of this section can be brought into compliance with applicable standards prescribed pursuant to section 357, final determination as to admission of such electronic product may be deferred upon filing of timely written application by the owner or consigneee and the execution by him of a good and sufficient bond providing for the payment of such liquidated damages in the event of default as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may by regulation prescribe. If such application is filed and such bond is executed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, permit the applicant to perform such operations with respect to such electronic product as may be specified in the notice of permission.

"(c) All expenses (including travel, per diem or subsistence, and salaries of officers or employees of the United States) in connection with the destruction provided for in subsection (a) of this section and the supervision of operations provided for in subsection (b) of this section, and all expenses in connection with the storage, cartage, or labor with respect to any electronic product refused admission pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, shall be paid by the owner or consignee, and, in event of default, shall constitute a lien against any future importations made by such owner or consignee.

"Records and reports

"SEC. 360. (a) Every manufacturer of any electronic product which is subject to standards prescribed pursuant to section 357 shall establish and maintain such testing records, make such reports, and provide such information, as the Secretary may by regulation reasonably require to enable him to determine whether such manufacturer has acted or is acting in compliance with this subpart.

"(b) The Secretary may by regulation (1) require retailers of color-television receivers, to which there is applicable a standard prescribed pursuant to section 357, to furnish manufacturers of such receivers such information as may be necessary to identify and locate the first purchasers of such receivers for purposes other than resale, and (2) require manufacturers to preserve such information.

"Prohibited acts

"SEC. 360A. It shall be unlawful—

"(1) for any manufacturer to introduce or to deliver for introduction, into commerce, or to import into the United States, any electronic product which does not comply with an applicable standard prescribed pursuant to section 357;

"(2) for any person to fail to furnish any notification or other material or information required by section 358;

"(3) for any person to fail or to refuse to permit access by the Secretary or any of his duly authorized representatives to testing records required pursuant to section 360; or

"(4) for any person to fail or to refuse to make any report required pursuant to section 360(a) or to furnish or preserve any information required pursuant to section 360(b).

"Enforcement

"SEC. 360B. (a) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, to restrain violations of section 360A and to restrain dealers and distributors of electronic products from selling or otherwise disposing of electronic products which do not conform to an applicable standard prescribed pursuant to section 357 except when such products are disposed of by returning them to the distributor or manufacturer from whom they were obtained. The district courts of the United States shall also have jurisdiction in accordance with section 1355 of title 28 of the United States Code to enforce the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) Any person who violates section 360A shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $1,000. For purposes of this subsection, each violation of section 360A(1) shall with respect to each electronic product involved constitute a separate violation, except that the maximum civil penalty imposed on any person under this subsection for any related series of violations shall not exceed $200,000.

"Effect on State standards

"SEC. 360C. Whenever any standard prescribed pursuant to section 357 with respect to an aspect of performance of an electronic product is in effect, no State or political subdivision of a State shall have any authority either to establish, or to continue in effect, any standard which is applicable to the same aspect of performance of such product and which is not identical to such standard."

Definition

SEC. 3. As used in the amendments made by section 2 of this Act, except when otherwise specified, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Noninterference with other Federal agencies

SEC. 4. The amendments made by section 2 of this Act shall not be construed as superseding or limiting the functions, under any other provision of law, of any officer or agency of the United States.

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask someone on the committee why $5 million in the third year? I think legislation on this subject is necessary, and I am pleased to see the penalties that are provided in the bill, but I am not satisfied that the expenditure in the third year should be permitted to go to $5 million. I would like to hear a little more about the justification for going from $1 million in the first fiscal year to $5 million in the third fiscal year.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, there is no money authorized in this bill at all. The only part is what the gentleman has read on page 12 of the report, which indicates what the Department believes this will cost. That is purely their estimate. They have not asked for any money at this point at all. We have not authorized any money under this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I could not find it in the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. There is no authorization of any money, but there is an estimate of what they think it will cost. I presume at some future time they will come in, I do not know. This is a little unusual, but there has not been a request made for an authorization, and we do not authorize any money in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. It is most unusual to create an advisory committee and in the bill agree to pay the members $100 a day each when they are meeting or involved in any work, yet there is no provision in

the bill for money to pay them. I thought it was couched in language I could not understand.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think it is purely this, that the department itself does not know what it will cost. I will admit that $100 a day sounds like a lot of money. However, this is a very technical field, radiation emission, and whoever is hired or serves will have to be of some technical quality, or otherwise I would not think the Secretary would want to employ him.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend from Illinois that I was not necessarily being critical of the $100 per diem figure, because it seems to have become fashionable in the bureaucracy in Washington to pay $100 a day regardless of who they are or what they do. But the point was that here we fix this per diem, and yet there is nothing in the bill authorizing any money for the purpose. We create an advisory committee—and neither is there any statement as to the number of persons who may be employed nor any indication of the staffing of the advisory committee in the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say, if they come to this committee for authorization, I assure the gentleman from Iowa it will receive the most careful scrutiny. We did ask for an estimate, and I believe they gave as honest an estimate as they could. The gentleman may find fault with the estimate, but that was the best this committee could get from the Department.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, my only point in taking the floor was to get some clarification on the provisions of this bill. I did not understand how it was possible to set up in the report an estimate of $1 million in the first year, $2 million in the second year, and then go to $5 million in the third year without reference to it in the bill in any way, shape, form, or manner.

Mr. SPRINGER. I say to the gentleman, I would be hopeful that the Department could absorb this cost. That sounds a little unusual. Perhaps it cannot be done, but perhaps the Department has that in mind.

Mr. GROSS. In view of the troubles we have financially in this country, I certainly join the gentleman in expressing the fervent hope that the costs, whatever they are, will be absorbed without additional appropriations.

I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute committee amendment.

The substitute committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. WRIGHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10790) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public health from radiation emissions from electronic products, pursuant to House Resolution 1105, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 382, nays 0, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—382

Abbitt	Cederberg	Galifianakis
Abernethy	Celler	Garmatz
Adair	Chamberlain	Gathings
Adams	Clancy	Gettys
Addabbo	Clark	Gibbons
Albert	Clawson, Del	Gilbert
Anderson, Ill.	Cleveland	Gonzalez
Anderson, Tenn.	Cohelan	Goodell
	Colmer	Goodling
Andrews, Ala.	Conable	Green, Pa.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Conte	Griffin
	Corbett	Griffiths
Annunzio	Cramer	Gross
Arends	Culver	Grover
Ashmore	Curtis	Gubser
Aspinall	Daddario	Gude
Ayres	Daniels	Gurney
Baring	Davis, Wis.	Haley
Barrett	de la Garza	Hall
Bates	Delaney	Halleck
Battin	Dellenback	Halpern
Belcher	Denney	Hamilton
Bell	Derwinski	Hammer-schmidt
Bennett	Devine	
Berry	Dickinson	Hanley
Betts	Dole	Hanna
Bevill	Donohue	Hansen, Idaho
Biester	Dorn	Hansen, Wash.
Bingham	Dow	Hardy
Blackburn	Dowdy	Harrison
Blanton	Downing	Harsha
Blatnik	Duncan	Harvey
Boggs	Dwyer	Hathaway
Boland	Eckhardt	Hawkins
Bolling	Edmondson	Hays
Bolton	Edwards, Ala.	Hébert
Bow	Edwards, Calif.	Hechler, W. Va.
Brademas	Edwards, La.	Heckler, Mass.
Brasco	Eilberg	Helstoski
Bray	Erlenborn	Henderson
Brinkley	Esch	Herlong
Brock	Eshleman	Hicks
Broomfield	Evans, Colo.	Holifield
Brotzman	Everett	Horton
Brown, Mich.	Evins, Tenn.	Hosmer
Brown, Ohio	Fallon	Howard
Broyhill, N.C.	Farbstein	Hull
Buchanan	Fascell	Hungate
Burke, Fla.	Feighan	Hunt
Burke, Mass.	Findley	Hutchinson
Burleson	Fino	Ichord
Burton, Calif.	Flood	Irwin
Burton, Utah	Flynt	Jacobs
Bush	Ford, Gerald R.	Jarman
Button	Ford, William D.	Joelson
Byrne, Pa.		Johnson, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.	Fraser	Johnson, Pa.
Cabell	Frelinghuysen	Jonas
Cahill	Friedel	Jones, Mo.
Carey	Fulton, Pa.	Jones, N.C.
Carter	Fulton, Tenn.	Karsten
Casey	Fuqua	Karth
Kastenmeier	O'Konski	Shipley
Kazen	Olsen	Shriver
Kee	O'Neal, Ga.	Sikes
Keith	O'Neill, Mass.	Sisk
Kelly	Ottinger	Skubitz
King, N.Y.	Passman	Smith, Calif.
Kirwan	Patman	Smith, Iowa
Kleppe	Patten	Smith, N.Y.
Kluczynski	Pelly	Smith, Okla.
Kornegay	Pepper	Snyder
Kupferman	Perkins	Springer
Kuykendall	Pettis	Stafford
Kyl	Philbin	Staggers
Kyros	Pickle	Stanton
Laird	Pike	Steed
Langen	Pirnie	Steiger, Ariz.
Latta	Poage	Steiger, Wis.
Leggett	Podell	Stephens
Lennon	Poff	Stratton
Lipscomb	Pollock	Stuckey
Lloyd	Price, Ill.	Sullivan
Long, La.	Price, Tex.	Taft
Long, Md.	Pryor	Talcott
Lukens	Pucinski	Taylor
McCarthy	Purcell	Teague, Calif.
McClory	Quie	Teague, Tex.
McCloskey	Quillen	Tenzer
McClure	Railsback	Thompson, Ga.
McCulloch	Randall	Thompson, N.J.
McDade	Rarick	Thomson, Wis.
McDonald, Mich.	Rees	Tiernan
	Reid, Ill.	Tuck
McFall	Reid, N.Y.	Tunney
McMillan	Reifel	Udall
MacGregor	Reinecke	Ullman
Machen	Reuss	Utt
Mahon	Rhodes, Ariz.	Van Deerlin
Marsh	Rhodes, Pa.	Vander Jagt
Martin	Riegle	Vanik
Mathias, Calif.	Rivers	Vigorito
Mathias, Md.	Roberts	Waggonner
Mayne	Robison	Waldie
Meeds	Rodino	Walker
Meskill	Rogers, Colo.	Wampler
Michel	Rogers, Fla.	Watkins
Miller, Ohio	Ronan	Watson
Mills	Rooney, N.Y.	Whalen
Minish	Rooney, Pa.	Whalley
Mink	Rosenthal	White
Minshall	Rostenkowski	Whitener
Mize	Roudebush	Widnall
Monagan	Roush	Wiggins
Montgomery	Roybal	Williams, Pa.
Moore	Rumsfeld	Willis
Morris, N. Mex.	Ruppe	Wilson, Bob
Morton	Ryan	Winn
Mosher	St Germain	Wolff
Moss	Sandman	Wright
Murphy, Ill.	Satterfield	Wyatt
Murphy, N.Y.	Saylor	Wydler
Myers	Schadeberg	Wylie
Natcher	Scherle	Wyman
Nedzi	Scheuer	Yates
Nichols	Schneebeli	Young
Nix	Schweiker	Zablocki
O'Hara, Ill.	Schwengel	Zion
O'Hara, Mich.	Scott	Zwach

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—51

Ashbrook	Fisher	Matsunaga
Ashley	Foley	May
Brooks	Fountain	Miller, Calif.
Brown, Calif.	Gallagher	Moorhead
Broyhill, Va.	Gardner	Morgan
Clausen, Don H.	Giaimo	Morse, Mass.
	Gray	Nelsen
Collier	Green, Oreg.	Pool
Conyers	Hagan	Resnick
Corman	Holland	Roth
Cowger	Jones, Ala.	St. Onge
Cunningham	King, Calif.	Selden
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Slack
Dawson	McEwen	Stubblefield
Dent	Macdonald, Mass.	Watts
Diggs		Whitten
Dingell	Madden	Wilson, Charles H.
Dulski	Mailliard	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. King of California with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Selden with Mr. Cowger.

Mr. Hagan with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Morgan with Mrs. May.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Roth.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Landrum.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Pool.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Watts.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Slack.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. CELLER. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, without equivocation and without reservation, I rise to declare my support for President Johnson.

I have served under eight Presidents, in periods of calm and periods of strife, so it is not without reason when I say that President Johnson will be accorded by history a place among the greatest of our Presidents. He has set our country on a proud course, opening door after door to equality of opportunity. He has turned our country's attention to urban blights as no other has done.

We need only look at what has happened in the areas of education, health, social security, civil rights, consumer interests, model cities, water and air pollution, the poverty program, flight into space, transportation, highway safety, crime curbs, narcotic addict rehabilitation, immigration reform, judicial reform. Of course, for those who want millennium in 24 hours, let me remind them of the tortuous course of thousands of years of history behind us.

It took courage, it took vision, it took leadership of the first order to prod, to cajole, to convince the Nation to move forward, not to a hesitant start but to a giant stride. This President Johnson has done.

It takes courage and insurpassable strength to maintain the security of the United States in a country divided, to call upon the country to make sacrifices of the highest order, to keep the tide of isolationism from engulfing us. It takes vision to foresee the tragic consequences of the United States not facing up to its responsibility to itself and to the free world in the commitments it has made.

President Johnson has never chosen to take the easy political path, to veer with each shifting wind. His strength is our strength, his courage is our courage. Of this I am convinced and I welcome this opportunity on the floor of the House to voice that conviction.

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I proudly associate myself with the remarks which have just been made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, of New York.

This fall, Mr. Speaker, America will go through one of the most important exercises in the democratic process: the election of a President to provide national leadership.

In these challenging times it is proper that the Nation should evaluate all contenders for leadership, all positions and policies, all proposals and all alternatives. I, for one, have no hesitancy in making my choice today. I stand alongside the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], in proud support of Lyndon B. Johnson.

Indeed, the times are perilous. But where others are running hither and yon promising easy and painless solutions, I stand with the President of the United States on the hard but certain path which he has charted.

The President of the United States has never failed to bring us face to face with the difficult realities and challenges with which our Nation is confronted. He has promised no quick, slick solutions. He has promised no easy way out. He has been responsible. This is the mark of true leadership, and it is the kind of leadership I want to follow.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is the kind of leadership that the American citizenry desires to follow.

SUPPORT FOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON: A GREAT DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENT

Mr. FASCELL. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Johnson's accomplishments are unprecedented in the history of this country. Under his leadership, and through the efforts and partnership with the Democrats in Congress, this administration has provided more landmark social welfare legislation than any other administration in history.

I believe too that the American people will continue to support the President in Vietnam. They will do so knowing that while no American wants this war to continue, there simply is no choice if Hanoi refuses to negotiate.

There is no question but that President Johnson is ahead of everyone else in desiring a peaceful conclusion to this costly and frustrating conflict. But, as he and Secretary Rusk have said many times, America cannot negotiate with itself. And until the Communists demonstrate a sincere desire to settle differences at the negotiating table, the only other alternative is to continue the war.

We have heard a lot of talk about this war from the President's critics. But the fact is we have heard few, if any, reasonable alternatives presented that would challenge the administration's policies.

The time has come for all Americans to rally around President Johnson's policy in Southeast Asia. It is a policy of wisdom and courage; wisdom, because it is based on the lessons of half a century of violence without equal in human history—the lesson that peaceful means alone can never halt totalitarian aggression—the lesson that genuine peace can only be obtained with adequate security.

Moreover it is a policy of courage because it would be ever so much easier to ignore the pledge President Kennedy made in his inaugural address that—

> We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and success of liberty.

For more than 25 years the American people have borne immense burdens and shown utmost courage in living up to our basic conviction, which is the foundation of our foreign policy, that peace and liberty are indivisible and that neither liberty nor peace can ever be protected by surrendering to those who would destroy both.

Mr. Speaker, I am a loyal Democrat. But I do not put my party above the interests of my country. I support Lyndon Johnson and do so proudly as an American and as a Democrat.

And so I say to my fellow Democrats: We have a great record. We have an excellent program. And we have a splendid President. Let us go to the people, in unity, and work for the victory we have earned.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the President of the United States for the words that he expressed on Monday and on yesterday with re-

spect to our commitment in Vietnam, and the leadership that he is exercising in that regard.

I wish, as one Member of this body and one member of the Committee on Armed Services, to extend to him my full support in his leadership on our commitment in Vietnam.

I think it would be of interest to Members of the House, in view of some of the events of the past few days, if I also mentioned the fact that a group of some 16 Democratic county chairmen in New York State assembled in Rochester last night and pledged their support to Lyndon Johnson. Incidentally, the cities of Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, and Albany, major cities in our State, were all represented.

I would not want to criticize anyone's motives or assail anyone's patriotism, but the simple fact of the matter is that one of the major purposes of the Vietcong Tet offensive was to destroy the confidence and the will of the American people. I must say that Hanoi must be encouraged by the events of the past few days.

The distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] mentioned just a moment ago that it was 7 years ago that John F. Kennedy stood outside the front of this building and pledged this country to "bear any burden, support any friend and oppose any foe to insure the survival of liberty." He also called on the American people to "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country." It is surprising that in just 7 years we have a campaign for the Presidency in our party today based upon the idea that nobody has any obligations to the country, but just get all you can.

THE LATE JOHN E. FOGARTY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, a little more than a year ago, on the opening day of the 90th Congress, we were overcome with sadness by the sudden death of our beloved friend and colleague, John Fogarty of Harmony, R.I.

This coming Sunday, March 23, will be the 55th anniversary of the birth of John Fogarty. It will be an occasion on which it will be appropriate for us to reflect on what has been done in commemoration of him during the 14 months since his death by the people for whom he did so much during his 26 years in the House of Representatives.

John Fogarty received countless honors during his lifetime and he deserved every one of them. But he had done so much for so many that the tributes had not fully caught up with the achievements when his life ended on the 10th of January 1967.

In the Congress the Honorable MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, has moved to name the international center under construction at Bethesda, Md., the John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences. And as the gentleman from Wisconsin has said:

> Not only will such an institution be a living embodiment of the spirit and aspirations of John Fogarty, but it will serve a needed and valuable role in securing the progress of science in the cause of the well being of all mankind.

In his home State of Rhode Island, at Davisville, the Seabees of the U.S. Navy have named Camp Fogarty in his memory. In North Smithfield, the John E. Fogarty Memorial Hospital has been named for him. In Newport the Tonomy Hill Center for Retarded has been given his name. At Providence College the John E. Fogarty Memorial Room in the library has been set aside to hold his papers. In downtown Providence the city council has designated the John E. Fogarty Plaza and plans have been made by the Eire Society of Rhode Island for the establishment of a John E. Fogarty Irish Center in the State.

Other tributes have been paid to him which have taken other forms and substance. The Rhode Island State Dental Society has established a fund to memorialize him. The student body of Gallaudet College has set up a similar memorial fund. The John E. Fogarty Memorial Golf Tournament was inaugurated at the Glocester Country Club with the proceeds going to the Fogarty Foundation. The Shriners of Palestine Temple named John to their "Ladder of Smiles." The Misrachi Women have announced the planting of trees in the memory of John Fogarty in the Kennedy Forest in Israel. The Providence Exchange Club has made him a member of the Heritage Hall of Fame.

Posthumous awards have been made by Antoni Milewski Post 65, American Legion; the Rhode Island Heart Association; the American Legion in Washington; New York State Association of Sheltered Work Shops; the Shrine Hospital for Crippled Children, Imperial Council AAONMS; the George Everett Partridge Foundation; the American Association for Cancer Research; the National Rehabilitation Association, northeast region; the American College of Dentists; the Rhode Island State Nursing Home Association; the 23d Eastern Seaboard Apprenticeship Conference; the National Association of American Nursing Homes and the Bricklayers Labor Union 1, local.

In addition to these marks of recognition of the good that was done by John Fogarty there have been hundreds of publications which have carried words of praise for him. Newspapers and magazines, trade papers, and house organs, special editions and bound memorials have produced volumes of testimony to the love and respect in which he was held by every segment in every level of the community.

The list of newspapers consists of the Boston Globe, the Warwick Beacon, the Cranston Herald, the Providence Visitor, the Woonsocket Call, the Observer, the Providence Journal, and the Rochester Advocate.

Other publications include the National Library of Medicine News, the Journal of the American Dental Association, the Pilot—Our Lady of Providence Seminary High School, the Bricklayer Mason & Plasterer, the Rhode Island Dental Activities Special Memorial Edition, Exceptional Children, the Memorandum of the Bureau of Handicapped Children, the Medical Tribune, the Rehabilitation Record, Medical World News, the NRTA News Bulletin, the Intercom of the Rhode Island Heart Association, the Laborer, the Journal of the American Medical Association, the VRA Bulletin Board, the American Journal of Public Health and the Nation's Health, and the RICA Journal.

Resolutions were adopted and promulgated by the American Heart Association, the National Association for Retarded Children, National Association of College and University Business Officers, the University of Michigan School of Public Health, the United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., the U.S. Jaycees, the Lions International, the National Advisory Dental Research Council, the National Advisory Neurological Diseases and Blindness Council, the Gallaudet College Alumni Association, the County of Los Angeles, the New England Association of School Superintendents, the Rhode Island Tuberculosis and Health Association, the National Association for the Help of Retarded Children, Daughters of Israel Occupation Day Center, the Providence Lodge No. 14, BPOE, the Massachusetts Dental Society, the New England Council of Optometrics, the Association for Children with Learning Disability, the Rhode Island Post Masters Convention, and the National Library Association.

Perhaps the finest tributes of all were those that came from Ireland, for Ireland indeed had a warm spot in the heart of John Fogarty. He loved it as the land from which his forebears came, the land from which he therefore came himself and which he went to visit often. He did for it all he could as an individual and as a public figure.

The Irish press was generous in its praise of him. The President of Ireland, Eamon de Valera, said:

> Ireland has lost a close personal friend and the United States a great statesman.

It was the bulletin of the External Affairs Department of Eire that summed it up best when it said:

> John Fogarty's life and work adorned and dignified the profession of politics to which he had dedicated himself. His integrity, his frank and direct manner together with his warmth, humour and humility were qualities which earned him recognition and esteem from a host of friends. Well could he say with Yeats:
>
> "Think where man's glory most begins and ends,
> And say my glory was I had such friends."

John Fogarty had those friends in Ireland, he had them throughout America, he had them in the House of Representatives. There is not a day goes by that I do not think of him. He is in my heart and mind as I know he is in yours. It will make you happy as it has made me happy to see that others think of him, too, and that they put their thoughts and feelings into forms that we

can see and share. We shall keep his memory fresh as long as we with whom he served so long and well are in this House and those who follow us will keep it alive long after we have gone.

THE LATE JOHN FOGARTY

Mr. TIERNAN. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, without doubt, every Member of the House recalls that this body convened in sadness over the death of our longtime colleague and trusted friend, John Edward Fogarty, of Rhode Island, just 2 hours before the opening bell sounded on January 10, 1967. John Fogarty's 26 years as a Member of the House of Representatives were an immense contribution to his fellow man and to his country, and his complete devotion to them was the single guide to his service. Throughout this Nation's trade union movement, of which he was part all of his adult life, John Fogarty will always be remembered. With unanimous consent, I now offer the resolution honoring him, which was adopted by the delegates to the recent AFL–CIO convention, to be reprinted at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

JOHN E. FOGARTY

Resolution No. 196—By Delegates of the Bricklayers, Masons and Plasterers International Union of America

Whereas, The late Congressman John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island was for all his adult life a member of the Bricklayer's Union, who went on to serve the people of his district, and all the people of the United States, in the House of Representatives, and

Whereas, In the Congress his outstanding legislative accomplishments in behalf of health and medical research earned him the title of "Father of the National Institutes of Health," therefore, be it

Resolved: That the AFL–CIO Convention honor the accomplishments and the great legacy of Congressman Fogarty and mourn the passing of this fine trade unionist and public official.

COCHON DE LAIT FESTIVAL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is again my pleasure to extend an invitation to you and the Members of the House, and to the general public to attend the annual Mansura Cochon de Lait Festival in my district in Louisiana. This year the festival will open on April 19 for a 3-day run, and it will again feature delicious roast suckling pig, as in past years.

Festival events include a living rosary staged in the evening of April 19, a pategeau, the tournoi, and a boudin-eating contest the following day, and high mass at St. Paul's Church on Sunday morning, followed by the Cochon de Lait in the afternoon.

Good food, street dancing, and a general joie de vivre characterize the celebration. Visitors are welcomed and encouraged to participate.

The festival, as I have informed the House in past years, is based upon a singular talent by the people of Mansura, La., for preparing the Louisiana French delicacy, cochon de lait. The town is located in Avoyelles Parish in the French-speaking section of the State and about the geographical center of my district.

An interesting and heartwarming gesture by the festival is its dedication this year to the Nation's Vietnam war veterans, of whom there are a considerable number from Louisiana and Avoyelles Parish.

The people of Mansura insist that in this area of their heritage at least, the past shall not give way to the modern, and I think anyone who has taken part in the Cochon de Lait will agree that there is scant possibility of improving upon this unique custom.

[From the Alexandria (La.) Daily Town Talk, Mar. 10, 1968]

OF VIETNAM WAR—MANSURA FESTIVAL DEDICATED TO VETS

MANSURA, LA.—The 1968 Cochon de Lait festival will be dedicated to area Vietnam veterans, Mayor Kirby Roy has announced. It is not a political move, he said. The festival is simply being dedicated to the men who have been there.

The crowning of the queen of Cochon de Lait March 29 will kick off a series of events to be held prior to the official opening of the festival April 19.

The three-day festival will be held in "La Capitale de Cochon de Lait" here, and events include a grand ball, tour of homes, pategeau, boudin eating contest, beer drinking contest, street dance, and a grand meal. The highlight of the celebration is the serving of the meal on Main Street Saturday and Sunday.

Melvin J. Harris is president of the festival this year.

The queen's contest will be held at 7:30 p.m. March 29 in the Gaston Porterie Auditorium in Mansura High School.

On April 10, festival officials will tour South Louisiana and invite its citizens to attend the celebration. The grand ball will be held April 13 at 8 p.m. in the school auditorium.

The first official event of the festival will be a living rosary to be staged at 7 p.m. April 19.

Saturday's entertainment will include a tour of homes at 9 a.m.; pategeau, 10 a.m.; Tournoi exhibition from Ville Platte at 1 p.m.; the boudin eating contest at 2:30 p.m. and the beer drinking contest at 3:30 p.m. A street dance wil be staged at 7 p.m. on Main Street. Music will be by Happy Fats and his Bayou Buckaroos. A rock and roll band will also be entertaining.

Sunday's activities will begin at 9 a.m. with high mass in St. Paul's Catholic church. A grand parade with floats and area school bands will begin at 10:30 a.m.

Sunday's feast will begin at noon on Main Street.

Sky divers and other types of entertainment will begin at 12:30 p.m.

Eight years ago, Mansura celebrated its centennial and renewed the tradition of cooking pig.

The exclusive title of "La Capitale de Cochon de Lait" was made into law in 1960 by the wishes of Roy and the town council. An official document, signed by the governor, hangs in City Hall.

The 20 to 30 pound pigs, are lined in rows over very hot, mostly hickory fires in the open and are kept turning constantly for six to eight hours until they have turned honey brown and the excess fat is drained.

Past presidents of the festivals are Signey Neck, 1960; Roy, 1961; Lawrence L. Laborde, 1962; Edmond St. Romain, 1963; W. W. Sanders, 1964; Sylvan Tassin, 1965; Shepherd Roy, 1966, and James T. Lanningan, 1967.

SHIPMENT OF LIQUID RADIOACTIVE PHARMACEUTICALS

Mr. ROBERTS. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I received the following letter from Dr. Stanley E. Hodges, Jr., director of the department of nuclear medicine, and Mr. J. P. Huey, administrator, at the Collin Memorial Hospital in my hometown of McKinney, Tex., pointing out some proposed changes in the shipment of liquid radioactive pharmaceuticals.

If these pharmaceuticals are banned from shipment on commercial passenger-carrying aircraft, it will not only be disastrous from an emergency need standpoint, but it will also drastically increase the cost to the patient.

It is an alarming situation when an agency of our Government invokes regulations that will make pharmaceuticals more difficult to obtain rather than more accessible.

I hope all of my colleagues will study the points brought out in the following letter and join me in protesting the enactment of the proposed regulation by the Federal Aviation Administration.

The letter follows:

COLLIN MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,
McKinney, Tex., March 14, 1968.

Hon. RAY ROBERTS,
U.S. Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RAY: It has come to our attention that in the Federal Registry C.F.R., in Volume 33, Number 14, on Saturday, January 20, 1968, the F.A.A. has proposed in Resolution No. 2, some drastic changes concerning the shipment of liquid radioactive pharmaceuticals, by commercial passenger-carrying aircraft. This proposed change affects 10 CFR 71, 49, CFR 170–190 and 14 CFR 100.

The use of radioactive pharmaceuticals by the Nuclear Medicine Department in this hospital, as well as in other hospitals throughout the entire country, has been established for a long period of time and provides diagnostic tests used in evaluating the sick, as well as in treatment of various diseases, such as cancer.

The radioactive isotope is secured by the radiopharmaceutical manufacturers, from an atomic energy licensed supplier and is chemically attached to an appropriate compound for use by the Nuclear Medicine Departments in hospitals throughout this country. The physical half-life of these radioactive compounds vary from six hours up to twenty-eight days, with the shorter half-life isotope compounds being more frequently used and

the most important ones. Their delivery from the radiopharmaceutical manufacturers, to the Nuclear Medicine Department, at a specific time is very critical, in that any delay in delivery will not only reduce the effectiveness of the radiopharmaceutical dose, but will also produce extreme hardship in the diagnostic evaluation of ill patients and in their subsequent treatment. As of this time, all of our radiopharmaceuticals are delivered by commercial passenger aircraft carriers. Because of their frequent flights and the ready availability of this means of conveyance from the radiopharmaceutical manufacturers we have been able to provide prompt diagnosis of a patient's disease to the attending physician.

Because of the short radioactive half-life of most of these radiopharmaceuticals, it is impossible to stock them on a day-to-day basis in a Hospital Nuclear Medicine Department. Most of the isotopes are thus ordered as the need arises, with receipt of the shipments in most instances occurring within three to twelve hours after the order has been placed. Curtailment of shipments by commercial passenger aircraft would relegate the deliveries to cargo carriers, whose frequency of flights are markedly less and who do not keep regularly scheduled flights. The resultant use of such conveyances as a sole means of transporting the liquid radiopharmaceuticals would result in a severe delay and impediment in the diagnosis and treatment of the sick.

In those cities in which there are no air-cargo flights available, this would totally remove the use of these valuable radiopharmaceutical products from hospitals in those locales.

There has never been demonstrated, by the FAA or any other governmental agency, that a need exists to change the current delivery system. It has never been a hazard to passengers on such flights, nor to the airline employees handling the packages. The Atomic Energy Commission, many years ago, established radiopharmaceutical packaging and handling requirements for all radioactive materials, thus insuring the protection of all carrier employees and airline passengers. These regulations are still in effect and their use has prevented any demonstrable hazard from ever occurring to the general air-traveling public or to the airline employees.

It is our opinion that enaction of changes proposed in CFR, Volume 33, Number 14, would cause undue delay in the diagnosis and treatment of the sick and may result in the loss of life, in some instances, from the delay encountered in obtaining the proper diagnosis. This serious curtailment in a critical hospital service, by the proposed change should heavily out-weigh any theoretical danger thought to exist by the FAA.

In behalf of the people of the Fourth Congressional District, and in the desire to continue to provide the best possible care of the sick, we respectfully request that you investigate this proposed change in shipping procedures and inform the appropriate bodies and officials of the serious curtailment in the management of the ill, that such an enactment would produce.

Sincerely,

J. P. HUEY, FACHA,
Administrator.

STANLEY E. HODGES, Jr., M.D.,
Director, Department of Nuclear Medicine.

PLACING OF ENGINE ORDERS BY U.S. AIRFRAME MANUFACTURERS WITH ROLLS ROYCE CO., IN GREAT BRITAIN.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, along with my colleague, DON CLANCY, and a number of Senators and other Congressmen concerned, I wrote to the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Transportation Secretary, asking for confirmation or denial of published reports that the Government had encouraged placing of $7 billion and 20,000 jobs for engine orders by U.S. airframe manufacturers with the Rolls Royce Co. in Great Britain. On March 13, not having had a reply to the first letter, and having received additional information that an American airplane manufacturer had been advised by a representative of the Government, that the Government would "look with some favor" on a program with the British engine manufacturer, I repeated my demand for a statement of position by the Federal Government on the matter.

I am delighted that I have now received from the Secretary of Transportation, a communication indicating that in dealing with the airbus matter, it is the official view that it would be inappropriate for the administration "to sanction or disapprove a decision by a U.S. manufacturer to purchase foreign-built engines." While it apparently is true that some earlier departmental communication responded to a manufacturer's inquiry with an indication that the Government would "look with some favor" on a cooperative program with British industry, I now have the positive written assurance of the Secretary of Transportation of complete official neutrality as to the placing of orders by American airplane manufacturers for jet engines.

While this is reassuring, it does not, of course, in any way make certain that the orders placed by American airplane manufacturers would actually be placed with American engine manufacturers.

Presumably, a decision will be made by competitive bidding. American engine makers will still have to overcome large-scale subsidies anticipated from the British Government to the British engine manufacturers. It is also true, of course, that labor rates in Great Britain are considerably lower than labor rates in this country.

But, it is my hope, that the technical skills, know-how, and efficiency of American industry will prevail in a free, competitive market. This is all that American labor and manufacturers ask.

TWO PROBLEMS REALLY ONE

Mr. DENNEY. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join with my good friend and colleague from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] in cosponsoring H.R. 16098.

In my opinion, the so-called present urban crisis is directly related to the rural crisis that has existed for many years. Unfortunately, the attempts to solve these two problems have failed to take into account their inextricable relationship. They are, in fact, only one problem.

Therefore, that is one of the major reasons why the Department of Agriculture policies over the last few years have been largely ineffective. In fact, I have even heard some of my colleagues who represent urban areas talk about the "farm boondoggle." This, in my opinion, is extremely shortsighted. For in 1967 because of a reduction of net real income and increase in net indebtedness, the average return to the American farmer fell almost $2,000 in 1966. However, the fact remains that consumers have never paid such a small percentage of their income for food. All Americans should realize that their greatest consumer protection is through adequate income to the agriculture sector. To do otherwise would be to destroy our ability to protect an abundant supply of food and fiber at reasonable prices and weaken the very foundation of our national strength. It is my belief that these facts will be forcefully developed as a result of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will create a Countryside Development Study Commission to study, analyze, and report their recommendations to Congress on how best to correct the population disparity and allocation of total rural resources. Inadequate income to the farm sector has rapidly increased migration of rural young people into metropolitan areas to seek better financial opportunity. Hopefully, as a result of the study, positive plans could be developed which would allow relief to overcrowded cities and utilize unused countryside resources.

Another fact that I feel that will be developed is that through the procurement policies of the Federal Government, we are actually contributing to the overcrowding of our cities. Even a cursory examination of these policies shows that the vast majority of contracts are awarded to companies located in large cities. People go where the jobs are. This naturally contributes to the urban crush. The volume of Federal Government procurement is rapidly rising. In 1957, it was $49.5 billion, by 1966 it had risen to $77 billion and estimates are that it exceeded $85 billion in 1967. If procurement policies could be changed so that arrangements could be made to divert contracts to less populous areas, it would make considerable difference in our future population distribution pattern.

Mr. Speaker, last year I carried on correspondence with the University of Nebraska with respect to this very same problem of rural to urban migration. As a result of the discussion with people from that institution, I am convinced that positive steps have to be taken now or we will compound our problems in the future. I urge speedy passage of H.R. 16098.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON H.R. 14314, TO AMEND SECTION 302 OF LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee on Labor has scheduled hearings on March 27 on H.R. 14314, a bill to amend section 302 of the Labor Management Relations Act to permit employer contributions to trust funds to provide employees and their dependents with scholarships or to establish child care centers for preschool or school age children. The hearings will be held in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR MORE FLEXIBLE INVESTMENT POLICY BY STATE LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITIES OF MORRILL ACT ENDOWMENT FUNDS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the first Morrill Act, approved July 2, 1862, in order to permit sums received thereunder to be invested in equity securities as the State legislatures may prescribe. The law as it now stands, narrowly restricts land-grant universities in their investment policies. In its provisions, the Morrill Act presently requires that moneys derived from the sale of land or land scrip by the States under that act be invested in U.S. bonds, State bonds, or other safe bonds, except that States having no State bonds may invest such moneys "in any manner after the legislatures of such States shall have assented thereto and engaged that such funds shall yield a fair and reasonable rate of return, to be fixed by the State legislatures."

The present prohibition of investment in equity securities—in the case of States that have State bonds—conforms to the general practice of governmental institutions. However, colleges and universities, both private and State supported, already include equity securities in addition to bonds in their investment portfolios, and the trend, which I believe to be a prudent one, continues in this direction.

Thus, while a relaxation of the first Morrill Act's restriction on investment would be a departure from the custom and usage of governmental institutions in general, it would nonetheless be in keeping with the usual practice among colleges and universities investing private endowment funds.

It should be noted that this amendment, while giving the States more flexibility in investing land-grant funds, would not permit them to expend any amount derived from appreciation in the value of the assets of these funds, since general principles of the law of trust provide that any such increase is to be attributed to the principal amount of the fund rather than to income. This is in keeping with the trust-fund concept of the act.

Both the Department of Treasury and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have considered the possibility of this legislation and have indicated that they have no objection.

I therefore urge early favorable consideration of this bill for liberalization of the existing investment restrictions in the Morrill Act so that land-grant universities having the approval of their respective State legislatures, may invest their Morrill Act endowments in stocks, bonds, and other securities, including mutual funds.

LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. MACGREGOR. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on August 8, 1967, the House of Representatives passed the comprehensive Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act. To date this bill remains stalled in the Senate Judiciary Committee. Time is growing short. We must provide our law enforcement officials with the tools to adequately and effectively meet the growing and alarming increase in crime.

The House-passed bill properly emphasizes the role of the individual States in coping with the crime problem. There is no question in my mind but that the States can effectively take on this responsibility. My own State of Minnesota, under the able leadership of Gov. Harold LeVander and Attorney General Douglas Head, has ably prepared and equipped itself for the task.

Earlier this month our Governor was presented by the attorney general with a comprehensive report on the law enforcement task force of the Governor's commission on law enforcement, administration of justice, and corrections. In the introduction to that report it is stated:

> We welcome the emphasis on planning contained in the proposed law enforcement assistance legislation (H.R. 5037) which passed the House of Representatives in August 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the "Introduction," "Task Force Procedures and Scope of Activities," "Need for a Coordinated Information System," and "Task Force Recommendations" sections of that report in the RECORD following my remarks. All Members of Congress should be informed of the growing capability of the States to assume a full partnership responsibility. The Minnesota story is an outstanding example of the States' willingness and desire to get the job done. The Congress must now act with dispatch to assist in providing them with the needed tools.

The material referred to follows:

PLANNING FOR THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IN MINNESOTA

SECTION A—INTRODUCTION

This report represents part of an eight months' effort to begin to plan for the criminal justice system in Minnesota. In our attempt at the State level to move ahead in this field, we owe much to the spade work done at the Federal level through the two million dollar, 18 months' study of the President's Commission. Its report, "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society," and the Task Force and other working documents have provided valuable background and guidance to our work to date.

We have attempted to review each of the Federal recommendations with a view towards their applicability to the situation in Minnesota. We would hope in turn that, as our State efforts proceed, they might help stimulate study and planning at regional and local levels in Minnesota. "State planning," in our view, does not connote only planning by the State. A State plan should involve regional and local plans developed largely by persons knowledgeable with criminal justice needs in local areas—persons both within and without the agencies of criminal justice.

Undoubtedly, the President's Commission has provided needed stimulus to State efforts in this area. Similarly, we welcome the emphasis on planning contained in the proposed law enforcement assistance legislation (H.R. 5037) which passed the House of Representatives in August, 1967. But even without federal action as a stimulus, we believe the time is overdue for a concerted state planning effort.

There is clearly a crisis in our system—in our agencies and methods of attempting of dealing with crime and the criminal. This is as true in Minnesota as elsewhere in the nation.

We do not wish to dwell unduly on statistics noting the rate of increase in reported crime, but they are there—up 16.3% for 1967 over 1966 statewide for all reported crime, up 37.1% for robbery, 21.3% for burglary, 25.9% for aggravated assault, etc.

Our courts, both trial and appellate, are jammed with criminal matters. Police are overworked, and law enforcement agencies are undermanned, partly because it is difficult to recruit new officers. There are not enough prosecutors, public defense counsel, crime bureau personnel, parole and probation officers. Some elements of our communities are deeply alienated from the police. There has been unrest in our major cities.

The question arises—why plan if things are this bad, do something—and this is a good question. To answer it, we must respond that a great deal is being done by our local and state agencies, but it is not enough and it will not be enough under our traditional modes of operation. There should be more police. More police will help, but they will not solve our problems any more than more judges, prosecutors, defense counsel, jailers or probation officers alone will solve our problems. So, while we move ahead where we can—in trying to recruit and hire more personnel, in training police, in beginning to computerize crime information and in other ways—we must also plan. We must look at ourselves, at the system within which we all operate, at our laws, at what statistics and information we have, at the few burglars we are able to catch and convict, at our juvenile offenders, embezzlers, price fixers, dope ped-

dlers, and at whatever we can do to devise better means to prevent and control crime.

The report of the President's Crime Commission demonstrated how much we have to learn about crime. And it demonstrated even more clearly how little attention has been devoted to the whole system through which we try to control crime—the police, prosecution, courts, corrections, parole and probation.

This report and the report of the other Task Forces comprise the first attempt in Minnesota at a comprehensive look at our state criminal justice system. As the report indicates, the view is a clouded one, for to look is to realize how little we can see. But, it is a start.

SECTION B—TASK FORCE PROCEDURES; SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES TO DATE

Following the appointment of the Task Force in July, 1967, work commenced in six subcommittees as follows:

1. Science and Technology—Chief Clarence M. Coster, Chairman.

2. Criminal Law Reform—Judge Neil A. Riley, Chairman.

3. Prosecution—George E. MacKinnon, Chairman.

4. Law Enforcement Coordination—Judge O. Russell Olson, Chairman.

5. Police Problems—Carroll E. Crawford, Chairman.

6. Crime Assessment—Frank S. Farrell, Chairman.

Five or six Task Force members comprised each subcommittee, with some members serving on more than one subcommittee.

Each subcommittee had been assigned topics and issues. As their study progressed, related problems came to their attention—all reflected in the recommendations for action or further study contained in this report.

Most subcommittees have gathered at least monthly at meetings which often last for five to seven hours each. Most of the subcommittees are relying heavily on advisors who attend subcommittee meetings or meet periodically with the chairman of the subcommittee. Advisors, as well as the staff members assigned to each subcommittee, have been responsible for developing much of the material contained in this preliminary report. Two technical consultants assisted the Task Force in several of the areas related to science, technology and research.

Each Task Force member, and most advisors, received and studied the President's Commission report and the nine related Task Force reports, especially as they applied to the study in the particular subcommittees to which a member or advisor was assigned. It has been our attempt to relate each of the national recommendations in the law enforcement area to the needs of the system as we see them in Minnesota. As indicated in the report, further study in the Task Force will proceed in certain important areas not yet considered in depth.

Our original assignment was to report in June, 1968. The urgency of many of the matters under Task Force consideration led us to "scramble" so that we could issue a preliminary report at this time.

All subcommittee reports were distributed to the full Task Force, which then met in February to consider the Task Force report. Following this meeting, attended by almost all Task Force members, the approved subcommittee reports and recommendations were integrated into this Task Force report.

In this integration process, the Task Force-approved material has been grouped into five chapters so that the results of an individual subcommittee's work, as approved by the Task Force, may appear in more than one chapter of this report. Much of the supplemental or appendix material contained in subcommittee reports has had to be left out of the Task Force report to keep it a manageable size. This background material and data, however, is on file in the Attorney General's office.

SECTION C—NEED FOR A COORDINATED INFORMATION SYSTEM

A word should be said about the major finding of our study to date—the lack of and urgent need for information—and of the major recommendations that result from that finding—that a basis and means to collect and analyze information must be devised and an in-depth system analysis of criminal justice be undertaken at the earliest possible date.

Among the immediate problems facing the administration of criminal justice in Minnesota is the non-existent or cumbersome interagency sharing and exchange of information essential to the performance of each agency's functions. The current and projected upward trends in crime, violence, property loss and number of offenders all lend dramatic emphasis to concern for improvement in the total interrelated criminal justice system.

The present information process developed without deliberate design and served a much smaller population than exists today. The collective capability lacks the precision and speed to handle the large volume and nature of cases currently imposed on our system. Present procedures lack a mechanism to coordinate control or provide adequate verification for a meaningful audit of our operations.

While operating economies have often attracted initial attention to systems analysis, there has been a growing trend toward the assessment of new programs in terms of functional requirements, social necessity, public convenience, and necessary consideration for the integrity of the individual who becomes involved with the processes of criminal justice. Law enforcement and related justice agencies in Minnesota are seeking solutions to information management problems which currently confound the system of criminal justice.

Thus, while it does not constitute the easiest reading in this report, and while it may not have the "grab" of our discussions on narcotics, gun laws, police standards, computers, burglary rings and the like, we urge you to review the results of the preliminary systems information study and the recommendations contained in Chapter II.

SECTION D—TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Science, technology, and research

Governor's Crime Commission

1. The Governor's Crime Commission should be structured in such a fashion as to establish policy for various research, development, planning and operational activities to be placed under its jurisdiction.

2. The Governor's Crime Commission should undertake a detailed system analysis of the criminal justice system in the State of Minnesota.

Detailed Systems Analysis of Criminal Justice System in Minnesota

3. Study should be undertaken to determine the nature of the economic and statistical data on a criminal justice system that is required for planning purposes.

A meaningful systems analysis of the criminal justice system in Minnesota must be accomplished generally in two stages. The "near term" action (Recommendations 4 through 15) involves establishment of programs and procedures for the compilation of statistical and economic data on the activities of law enforcement agencies, prosecution, public defense, courts, and correctional programs. The "medium term," or second stage action, (Recommendations 16 through 21) involves a program of studying the data compiled in the initial stage with a view towards determining the specific characteristics of data that would be of value in an on-going criminal justice information system for on-going planning.

(1) Near term action law enforcement

4. The Bureau of Criminal Apprehension should collect and tabulate law enforcement statistics including data on arrests, type of offense, and type of offender based on a standardized reporting period. This program should include special and periodic audits of selected agencies to assure the accuracy and uniformity of the data collected.

5. The Bureau of Criminal Apprehension should initiate investigations as to the nature, cost and benefit of criminal victim surveys.

6. The Bureau of Criminal Apprehension should identify appropriate sources of data which describe the demography of the Minnesota population.

7. The Bureau of Criminal Apprehension should establish a program for the periodic collection of limited economic data on local law enforcement operations, and that a special analysis of unit and functional costs of local law enforcement should be conducted by using a large metropolitan police department as a pilot project.

Prosecution

8. The Attorney General's office should establish a program for collecting data from district, county and municipal prosecutors as to the costs and types of prosecution. This program should include the collection of data as to the disposition of charges wherein no prosecution follows and this data should be collected at least on a one time and thereafter perhaps a periodic basis.

Public defense

9. A program should be instituted for the collection of statistical data as to the types of crimes and the costs of providing counsel for indigents.

Courts

10. A program should be established for the collection of data as to the costs and the types of offenses heard by the district, municipal, probate and juvenile courts. Initially this data should be collected through a single survey, but consideration should be given to periodic collection of this data.

11. A program should be established for the collection of data on the fees, number and types of cases handled by the justice of the peace courts.

12. A single and accurate reporting system of district court dispositions should be established.

Corrections

13. The Department of Corrections should establish a program to collect and tabulate comprehensive economic and statistical information from all agencies in the state connected with correctional functions.

14. The Department of Corrections should establish and maintain a dictionary of terms and definitions that can be used by all Minnesota correctional agencies.

15. The Department of Corrections should pursue the development of a program budget and unit cost connected with various programs and activities.

(2) Medium Term Actions

16. Based upon the accomplishment of the above recommendations there should be a detailed systems analysis of the criminal justice system and the design of an information system for planning purposes.

Law enforcement

17. All Minnesota law enforcement agencies should participate in the design of a criminal justice information system for planning.

Prosecution

18. The results of the one time analysis under near term actions should be taken into account in determining the specific characteristics of prosecution data in an on-going criminal justice information system for planning.

Public defense

19. The data provided by the study currently being conducted by Dr. Roger Benjamin of the University of Minnesota, and

other data available on public defense should be carefully considered for inclusion in the criminal justice information system for planning.

Courts

20. The data collected through near term actions should be assessed as to its benefit to a criminal justice information system for planning.

Corrections

21. Data collected through near term action should be assessed as to its benefit to a criminal justice information system for planning; specifically with a view to combining economic and statistical data on a meaningful basis.

Minnesota Crime Information System

22. Speedy implementation of the MINCIS, Phase I project as announced by the Governor and 1969 legislative appropriations to carry forward the project.

23. All major law enforcement agencies in the state not now connected by teletype to the BCA should arrange to make such connections as soon as possible in order to benefit fully from MINCIS.

24. All major law enforcement agencies should explore integration of their department files on wanted persons, etc. with the BCA files as soon as feasible.

25. The Attorney General's office, Department of Administration Computer Division and BCA should undertake a feasibility study in cooperation with other interested agencies on extension of MINCIS to cover information beyond that envisioned in Phase I, particularly misdemeanor and traffic warrant information.

26. In the longer term consolidation or coordination of juvenile offender, courts and corrections data should be studied. These studies should be part of the Systems Analysis Study recommended in Section A.

Research and Development

Local law enforcement agencies need more money and personnel for research and development functions. An improved mechanism is also needed to coordinate research and development functions among the over 500 law enforcement agencies in the state. There is a need to provide certain central state staff, available to all law enforcement agencies in the state that can beneficially utilize their services. This staff could carry out some research and development functions and provide personnel when requested to assist local agencies in their own research and development efforts or implementation of the results of such activities by others. Thus:

27. and 28. The Governor's Crime Commission should sponsor a program of "operations research" intended to strengthen the operations of law enforcement agencies and a program of "equipment research" directed at the following goals:

(1) the development of concepts of new equipment and the stimulation of the manufacture and widespread adoption of such equipment;

(2) provide information to firms conducting market and product research related to law enforcement functions;

(3) the evaluation of new products and the dissemination of information to appropriate parties; and

(4) the establishment of statewide equipment standards, where appropriate.

29. There should be established a program of state funding for local law enforcement agency research and development projects.

30. A central staff and state funding should be employed in assisting local agencies to conduct in-house and contracted research and development.

31. An "Upper Midwest Criminal Justice Research and Development Institute" should be established by the University in the Twin Cities area utilizing either federal funds or funds from several states.

The institute should establish close ties with neighboring criminal justice agencies. It should develop its own program with the guidance of an advisory committee comprised of senior representatives from major segments of the criminal justice system and outstanding research scientists in a wide variety of academic disciplines.

Computer Command and Control Systems

32. through 35. A metropolitan-wide (7 county) study should be undertaken to determine the technical and economic feasibility of employing a computer assisted command and control system for law enforcement agencies in the area.

An extensive examination of the communication system should be undertaken to insure proper channels available and to assess the utility of car locators, mobile teletype and automatic address location from the telephone.

The study should lead to a detailed plan setting forth all the necessary and evolutionary steps that are preconditions to a successful operation. The feasibility study should be conducted by an organization experienced in large computer based systems. It should be assisted by a staff of full time personnel from the local law enforcement agencies participating in the study. Such local personnel would form the staff nucleus for an on-going operational system.

For the purposes of conducting the study referred to above an advisory committee should be formed consisting of representatives of the law enforcement agencies in the metropolitan area and elected officials of the metropolitan area units. This committee should establish an executive committee which would have the responsibility for obtaining funds to undertake the study, formulating the objectives of the study, conducting discussions and negotiations for any necessary consulting services, and providing the necessary staff to conduct the study.

Police Radio Communications Coordination

36. A detailed study should be undertaken for the State of Minnesota to cover the entire law enforcement communications system in detail and to develop a plan to solve the shortcomings of the system. This study should be directed towards:

(1) unification of all two-way radio systems operated by the State of Minnesota;

(2) improved interdepartmental radio communications throughout the state, especially in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, and

(3) better liaison between mobile units of all law enforcement agencies and tie into units of related agencies such as fire, ambulance, National Guard, etc.

Uniform Public Safety Telephone Number

37. That an advisory committee representing the metropolitan public safety agencies but also containing other governmental and public representatives be established immediately for purposes of determining with the Northwestern Bell organization the feasibility of implementing the new "911" universal emergency number.

38. In the event that the availability of a universal emergency phone number in the Twin City metropolitan area, we would recommend that study should be undertaken relative to the possible public use of public safety call boxes.

Motor Vehicle Registration and Photo Identification of Drivers License

39. Continued study by the Task Force leading to possible recommendations for legislative action to change Minnesota to a "title" state for motor vehicle registration purposes and to require photographic identification on drivers licenses is being conducted.

Fingerprint Identification

40. No major independent research or study project should be undertaken by Minnesota law enforcement agencies on fingerprint identification, but they should keep abreast to research in this area.

Identification by Physical Features—Voice Print Recognition

41. The state and the principal metropolitan agencies should initiate or continue study in this area.

Law Enforcement Coordination

Crime Investigation

42. The Bureau of Criminal Apprehension should reduce the size of the present field areas throughout the state and divide the state into ten field office districts with an assignment of investigators to the districts based on population, area, and crime rate.

43. Twenty-three additional investigators should be added to the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension's staff in order to provide the investigative capability suggested in the ten field district plan.

44. Four additional stenographers should be added to the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension's staff.

CRIME BUREAU—NEED FOR INTELLIGENCE DIVISION

45. The Bureau of Criminal Apprehension should coordinate crime intelligence information and be responsible for the accuracy and swift dissemination of such information.

46. Funds and personnel for such intelligence activities within the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension should be provided at the earliest possible time.

47. The intelligence unit within the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension should, at a bare minimum, be made up of four investigators assigned to the central office for the purpose of over-all coordination of information and dissemination of this information throughout the state.

Crime Bureau—Division of Narcotics

48. There should be established a division within the State Bureau of Criminal Apprehension to direct and coordinate statewide activities in the control of illegal traffic in drugs and narcotics.

Crime Bureau—Physical Expansion

49. There should be immediate investigation by the Attorney General and appropriate state agencies of possible new arrangements to house the Crime Bureau headquarters. Pressing space needs now exist in all functions, especially laboratory, the message center, records center, and investigation.

Attorney General—Division of Organized Crime

50. There should be estabilshed in the Attorney General's office a special Unit on Organized Crime as suggested in the report of the President's Crime Commission. Such a unit should include at least two lawyers and several trained investigators.

51. State officials should make known to the proper federal authorities the interest in Minnesota for developing resources to deal with both types of organized crime considered in this report, and that the pending federal legislation be written so as to include states such as Minnesota for consideration for funds to develop the capability to cope with "organized crime" as more broadly defined than in S.F. 917.

Organization of Law Enforcement Agencies Emphasis on Coordination

52. Communities with a population of less than 1,000, should contract with the sheriff or with an adjacent larger community to provide full time police coverage. These small communities should not attempt to maintain their own separate police functions.

53. The Task Force should further consider methods to increase the coordination with law enforcement agencies, especially through contractural arrangements.

54. A special subcommittee in the Gov-

ernor's Crime Commission should be appointed to advise the planners with whom the state will contract for the conduct of the study under the H.U.D. grant. This subcommittee should be comprised primarily of persons from the seven-county metropolitan area.

55. The Task Force should explore ways to provide state financial assistance to local enforcement agencies related to possible standards for local law enforcement agencies evolved to encourage professionalization of law enforcement and adequate local financial support of the police function.

Law Enforcement—Civil Disorders

56. State, county and local authorities should proceed with both short term and long term coordinated planning for civil disturbance. Not only the agencies of the criminal justice system, but also public service agencies such as fire departments, private utilities, the bar and other groups must be actively involved in such planning which should also be related to crime prevention plans and programs. Local and state human relations agencies should also be involved.

57. Appropriate elected leaders of the state and all levels of government in the Twin City area should meet to develop and issue a joint statement recognizing the right of lawful protest and enunciating a joint, coordinated position and policy on the handling of civil disturbances and supporting firm, fair and deliberate enforcement of the law.

58. These leaders should continue to make strong efforts towards diagnosing, controlling and ameliorating conditions which cause civil disturbance.

Professionalization of the police

Community Relations Bureaus

59. Major law enforcement agencies should establish community relations bureaus within their departments.

Police Training

60. Immediate supplemental appropriations should be obtained from legislature interim funds to assure that the state can provide sufficient basic police training courses of at least four weeks in length, commencing in September, 1968.

61. Planning should proceed for the early funding and operation by the State, at least by September, 1969, of basic training courses of at least six weeks in duration, eight weeks by 1970, ten weeks by 1971 and twelve weeks by 1972. The 12-week course should be achieved earlier if sufficient funds and manpower are made available.

62. Short term training facilities and personnel needs of the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension should be determined by the police training board at an early date.

63. Steps should be taken immediately to plan for the establishment of a law enforcement training center which will serve as the center for the technical training of policemen throughout the state.

64. The provisions of the mandatory police training bill should be extended to include all new law enforcement officers in the state. The Task Force feels that the extension of the provisions of the mandatory police training bill to all new policemen is essential; no new policeman or sheriff's deputy should be without training.

65. The board should move swiftly to recommend requirements for in-service training for officers previously employed but who have never been trained.

66. Study should be undertaken immediately by state and local agencies with the cooperation of appropriate outside professional and other groups and educational institutions towards development of more effective training components and programs designed to give law enforcement officers in-depth understanding of human relations. Minority persons should participate in such study. Courses should be approved by responsible minority organizations and be taught predominately by minority persons.

Police Education

67. The University of Minnesota should develop as rapidly as possible a quality four year program leading to a degree relating to police work. Similarly the Junior College Board should quickly develop a quality two-year program to be offered at several of the Junior Colleges.

68. The Junior College Board and the University should cooperate in developing their separate educational programs so that credits earned in one program are transferable to the other.

69. The Legislature, State Planning Agency and the Higher Education Coordinating Council should immediately address the problem of coordinating the development of post-high school law enforcement education programs.

Recruit Standards

70. The standards developed by the Peace Officers Training Board should be widely distributed and public employing authorities should be encouraged to adopt them in hiring peace officers.

71. The Task Force should further explore the possibility of legislation for mandatory standards.

Attracting Minority Persons to Police Work

72. Immediate study should be undertaken under the auspice of the Urban Coalition or an equally appropriate group to determine ways in which greater numbers of minority persons can be attracted to law enforcement. Minority persons and law enforcement officers should participate actively in study planning and implementation of efforts in this regard.

Police Mobility

73. A study should be made to determine the factors which inhibit the development of lateral entry as a standard personnel practice in police jurisdictions throughout the state. As part of this study exploration should be made on the feasibility of establishing a single retirement system for all police throughout the state.

Police Compensation

74. As part of the Police Agencies Standards Study recommended in Chapter III the Task Force should explore ways to encourage adequate local support for law enforcement including better police salaries. A possible State aid program for law enforcement in this connection is part of the Study.

Legal Assistance to Local Law Enforcement

75. The Attorney General should undertake the function of informing law enforcement agencies of changes in the criminal law which affect the work and procedures of the police as soon as personnel and funds are available to his office.

76. The Task Force should further explore the feasibility of establishing a law enforcement legal advisor program in Minnesota.

Local Law Enforcement Facilities

77. All governments maintaining law enforcement functions, if they have not already done so, should take immediate steps to plan for, improve and expand physical facilities for law enforcement agencies where needed.

Prosecution

Prosecution—Manpower and Compensation

78. Legislation should be enacted making the position of county attorney full time in all counties with a population of 25,000 or more, according to the last official census. Further, the full time county attorneys should be provided with assistants where needed, either full time or part time, to carry out the function of the office.

79. Minimum salaries for county attorneys should be set by the legislature which would be more commensurate with the responsibilities of the office and the time required for official duties.

80. The 1969 legislature should implement the District Prosecutor Program.

81. There should be further study and recommendations involving a plan and legislation for implementation of the District Prosecutor Program in Minnesota.

Prosecutor Training

82. A proposed bill (Appendix D–1) to provide for training seminars for county attorneys to be called by the Attorney General for which county attorneys would be compensated should be enacted by the 1969 legislative session.

83. County Attorney's Newsletters should be continued on a monthly basis. Appropriations to cover this function should be made to the Attorney General.

84. Law student internship programs should be encouraged to give law students familiarity with the prosecution function and also to encourage their entering this vital field of law.

Council of Prosecutors

85. There should be further study leading towards a possible recommendation for a plan and proposed legislation for a State Council of Prosecutors.

Joinder and Severance

86. Standards generally consistent with those promulgated by the American Bar Association and Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure relating to joinder and severance should be adopted in Minnesota.

Plea Discussions

87. Standards relating to pleas of guilty as promulgated by the American Bar Association should be favorably considered for adoption as part of the New Rules of Criminal Procedure for Minnesota.

Discovery and Disclosure

88. The Task Force should give further study to the concept of expanding discovery and disclosure in criminal cases.

Criminal law reform

Compensation for Victims of Crime, and Good Samaritan Laws

89. The State should enact legislation establishing a program for the compensation for victims (or their surviving dependents) of violent crimes.

90. The State of Minnesota should enact legislation providing for compensation to persons injured when coming to the aid of a policeman or a citizen who is being victimized—the so-called "good samaritan" notion.

Wiretapping and Bugging

91. Legislation should be initiated in Minnesota making wiretapping and bugging by private sectors of the community unlawful. These procedures should also be made unlawful for law enforcement agencies except as provided below. Heavy criminal sanctions should be provided for unlawful wiretapping or bugging.

The legislation should provide that the only exception to the above would apply where, with prior written court approval, wiretapping or bugging would be allowed by law enforcement agencies where certain serious crimes as determined by a court have been or there is good cause to believe are about to be committed and the court sets out in its order, within limitations to be provided in the law, the allowable scope of the proposed bugs or taps.

Firearms Control

92. State law on the control of firearms should provide as a minimum the following:

(1) Sale of handguns to persons under the age of 21 and sale of rifles and shotguns to persons under the age of 18 should be prohibited.

(2) All persons engaged in the business of the sale of firearms should be licensed.

(3) Sellers of firearms should be required to keep adequate records concerning the transfer of ownership of weapons.

(4) Purchasers of firearms should be required to sufficiently identify themselves at the time of purchase.

(5) A penalty should be provided by statute for filing a false registration.

(6) On a regular reporting basis sellers should be required to forward to the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, information related to the sale of firearms. This information could then be indexed and verified on a spot-check basis to determine whether or not the information contained therein is true.

(7) Provisions for the revocation of licenses to sell in the event the state seller fails to comply with requirements concerning record keeping, forwarding of information, etc.

93. Minneapolis, Saint Paul and the metropolitan area should make an attempt to compromise between the cities to provide uniformity in local gun ordinances. In this connection a model local gun ordinance should be drafted.

Alcoholism and the Law

94. Drunkeness should not in itself be a criminal offense. Disorderly and other criminal conduct accompanied by drunkenness should remain punishable as separate crimes.

95. The legislature should repeal section 340.96 of the Minnesota Statute.

96. The Task Force should continue to study possibilities for the development of alternatives to the court handling of drunks by establishing adequate civil detoxification procedures.

Drug Abuse

97. Programs designed to educate the public as to the dangers of drug abuse, and the telltale signs of present or impending drug dependence should be established.

98. Legislation should be adopted covering non-narcotic drug abuse, i.e. Model State Drug Abuse Act.

99. Local centers for treatment of drug problems on out-patient basis should be established and there should be a study of possible need for expanded resident facilities in the state.

100. A central Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Division in the State Bureau of Criminal Apprehension as recommended in Chapter III should be established to direct state and coordinate local law enforcement activity in control of illegal drug and narcotics traffic and to facilitate coordination with federal authorities in this field.

Mentally Disordered Offenders

101. The Task Force should make further study of the possibility of recommendations relative to the handling of mentally disordered offenders.

102. The Task Force should give further study to the question of establishing statutory prcedures for raising, waiving or recording a determination of competency to stand trial.

103. The Task Force should give further study to the question of establishing a statutory procedure for determining competency to stand trial once it is raised.

104. Legislation should be considered to provide for a plea in the form of "not guilty by reason of insanity."

Sex Psychopath Laws

105. The Task Force should give further study to the possibility of recommending revisions of the law relating to sex psychopaths, which recommendations should be consistent with the rationale underlying the 1967 revision of the mental commitment laws.

THE U.N. AND CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, millions of enslaved human beings existing behind the Iron Curtain bear tragic testimony to the declaration of Karl Marx a century ago:

The Russian bear is certainly capable of anything, so long as he knows the other animals he has to deal with to be capable of nothing.

Between 1920 and 1960, 27 once-free nations fell prey to the Soviet Union. By sheer brute force and overwhelming power the Communists crushed these small nations, despite their heroic struggles to survive. Today self-determination and political independence are part of a fading dream as the years roll on and these countries remain imprisoned.

While the Russian bear has marauded through Eastern Europe, the United Nations, that organization created to peacefully resist and resolve colonization and tyranny, has stood by virtually mute, proving that the "Russian bear is certainly capable of anything" when he sees no impediment in his way.

It is time the United States, as a member of the United Nations, spoke out vigorously and clearly to demand that the Soviet Union abide by the U.N. Charter to which it has subscribed. It is a mockery of our own membership to do less.

Therefore I am today introducing a concurrent resolution which would authorize and instruct the President of the United States to direct our Ambassador to the United Nations to request at this year's session that the U.N. insist on fulfillment of its charter provisions calling for sovereign equality of states and condemning colonial rule.

My resolution also directs that the Soviet Union be asked to abide by its U.N. membership obligations by withdrawing all its troops and agents from other nations and through returning all Communist-held political prisoners to their homelands.

In conclusion my resolution authorizes and directs the President of the United States to use all diplomatic, treatymaking, and appointive powers vested in him by the Constitution to augment and support actions taken by the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. in the interest of self-determination and political independence of these captive nations.

America must not stand silently by in the United Nations while the Russian bear of Karl Marx' creation retains a stranglehold on 27 countries.

We must vigorously protest in this world forum against Communist tyranny. We must do all in our power by peaceful means to keep alive faith in the free world's determination that men everywhere will be free from domination by any military or political power not of their own choosing. My resolution is a step in that direction.

OUR ROLE IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, recent events in Vietnam, throughout the world, and in the United States, have made it imperative for every Member of Congress to put himself squarely on the record on the Vietnam war, the overriding issue in America and in the world today. Although the hour is already late, every manifestation of decision can help guide our Nation to a stronger, corrected course. It is never too late to try to do a right thing.

All Americans share the grief of those close to the 20,000 young men who perished in the fire of the war. All Americans share the misery of the 100,000 men who must go through life maimed with the marks of their heroism. All Americans share the concern of those close to the 515,000 American men who remain exposed to the costly terror of war.

At no other time in history have so many people witnessed the day-by-day destruction of the war through the irrepressible media of radio, television, and wirephoto reports. The daily horrors of war are in the diet of every home. The faces of the dead are flashed on our television screens in living color. The horrible sense of guilt swelling the conscience of every viewer makes every citizen an enemy of war and its horrors. Throughout America, a moral ground swell has developed against the conflict which brings so much suffering.

Today, mounting criticism is directed toward the President for leading the country into Vietnam as though it was solely his decision. However, ranking Republican congressional leaders in foreign affairs cannot and must not be allowed to shed responsibility for our Nation's dilemma in Vietnam. They "hawked" the President into a misjudgment of continued bipartisan support for both entering and expanding the war in Vietnam. This cannot now be erased from the record. Our involvement in Vietnam resulted from the decisions of a bipartisan coalition which had firsthand and almost exclusively secret information concerning the grave extension of the conflict and our growing involvement.

The coming Republican flight to "doveland" is not founded on either morality or principle. It does not come from the "rightness of a peace" or the "wrongness" of the war. It is founded on a shameful quest for votes and lust for the control of the Government.

I do not, I cannot absolve myself from a share of the responsibility for the frustrating problem of America's role in Southeast Asia. Faultfinding may explain how the problem developed—but that course does not lead to workable solutions.

Events in America call for solutions today. During the past many weeks, I have personally discussed national problems with thousands of my constituents. I want to report that there exists in my community very little support for the

Vietnam war, and practically no interest in its expansion or escalation.

If this is representative of the national reaction—and I believe that it is—I urge that we aggressively pursue an immediate termination of the conflict. There is no time to tarry for the seesaw of a more favorable military advantage. The question no longer centers on whether there will be peace. The issue now being resolved centers on who will make the peace.

If our President overlooks this opportunity for peacemaking, he may very likely miss his last chance. Circumstances next year may assign that role to a lesser man, an untested executive who may be more likely motivated by political passion than by reason. Our bargaining capacity for peace is not strengthened by a change of administration—it is critically weakened.

How can we move toward peace? We can start with a bombing halt in North Vietnam and announce a line of defense around the urban centers of South Vietnam to protect civilian innocents from the carnage of war. We can announce that we will fire when fired upon from these positions. These two decisions may well become the framework of a settlement which the enemy might well consider, or be urged to consider, by their military allies. The defensible enclave would protect civilian populations and reduce the exposure of our American troops.

The bombing pause and the enclave defense will save American lives and reduce our financial outlays in Vietnam to levels which will prevent further attack on our economy. In addition, it would deliver a plan of reasonableness to the world which fears our further drift into a conflict of worldwide dimensions. It is substantially these fears which threaten the financial collapse of the free world economies.

Recent events in London and Paris reveal that the free world is even more concerned with the collapse of the free-world economies than the military outcome in Southeast Asia. While they can isolate themselves from our military involvement, they cannot remain isolated from our financial collapse, which would bring them down with us. In the world of economics, the domino theory works with shocking accuracy and certainty.

I do not believe that we can immediately leave Vietnam. Our presence may save millions of human beings and leave the destiny of the country in the hands of its people. Our enclaved presence may deter military overthrows of Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand. More importantly, our presence may deter a Chinese aggression into India, which has the potential of developing into a hundred Vietnams.

As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, I cannot support a tax increase to expand or escalate the war in South Vietnam. Nor can I support the termination or further cutback of programs designed to meet the urban crisis and the problems of educating and training Americans to achieve self-support. Escalation of Vietnam spending without new taxes puts America on a collision course with financial collapse. Under these circumstances, the only possible course is a limitation on our Vietnam involvement directed toward settlement. Any other course leads toward the brutal commitment of additional thousands of American lives and the danger of financial collapse—not only for America—but for the free world.

STUDYING THE PROBLEMS OF RURAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to create a Countryside Development Commission to study the problems of rural America. I am joined by a number of colleagues.

A definition of countryside does not in itself limit this to farmers, but rather, includes the social, political, and economic problems of all those governments and inhabitants living outside the congested metropolitan areas.

We have had many references made to the fact that 70 percent of the people live on 1 percent of the land. This Commission then will primarily study and correlate information on the problems of 70 million of our population living on 99 percent of our acreage. Such a study should lead us to those positive recommendations necessary to bring about a balanced development of our economy.

The object of such a Development Commission is to investigate and make a thorough study of possibilities of maximizing the attributes and advantages of the countryside in order to stabilize the economic and geographic trends of our Nation, and to maintain a stronger balance of our Nation's economy.

Congress at this time does not have sufficient study in depth of the reasons for the overcrowding of our Nation's largest cities. It is widely assumed to be caused in large part by the unbroken inflow of economically disenfranchised and disadvantaged rural people. Consequently, we have improvised many new legislative proposals leading to the establishment of countless agencies, all funded with inflated tax dollars, to cope with the bulging city problems. However, very few of these quick money solutions have any hope of doing anything but treating the symptoms of the bigger problem—imbalance of our society's economy.

This Commission can well explore, in depth, the ratio of migration to the level of farm parity. We should find out why the farm programs of the past 35 years have been unable to answer the income needs of the smaller farmer. Certainly the fact that the farmers get only $1.30 more over the past 20 years out of the average consumer household grocery bill increase of about $240 must be part of the problem. We have already committed millions of dollars to farm programs, to retraining of underemployed rural residents; we have paid for the 2-year President's National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber; we have also received the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty; and still we do not have the facts needed to bring jobs and income to the countryside, or to use to the maximum those natural resources that our countryside contains so abundantly.

In the area known as the countryside there are over 16,000 cities and villages up to a population of 15,000; over 3 million farms, over 11 million people on farms, and the balance of the 70 million reside in our villages and rural communities.

The cost of providing public services for citizens already varies greatly between our metropolitan and countryside areas, and will certainly continue in this direction until utter collapse of such services may force a reverse flow of this migration such as we experienced nationally during the depression years of the 1930's.

For example, a city of 50,000—Fargo, N. Dak.—spends $487,000 for an entire year for its total street department, while in New York each additional resident using that city's streets adds $21,000 in capital requirement needs alone.

Congress has been concerned with the problems of depopulation and compaction, and many departments or agencies do have programs which are only on the periphery of this entire problem. Such a study Commission will be authorized to seek the advice, testimony, and experience of such agencies in making their study.

In St. Cloud, Minn., a Ford Foundation grant has been received to provide some study and analysis of a portion of the problem. This study, under the leadership of Dr. Edward Henry at St. John's University, is known as the microcity study project and will especially concentrate on the problems of larger cities in the countryside. It is hoped that following this study a continuing center will be founded there. St. Cloud and St. John's University are to be commended for receiving this grant and for the acknowledgement of the multitude of problems that are pressing for solutions. This special study can be of material value to a larger nationwide Countryside Development Commission, especially for those problems in cities of 10,000 to 50,000. Such a countryside development study might well pay for itself many times over—just on the one item of the model city proposal. We may learn that the present mode of packing people on top of each other, of living so tightly that the very environment of man becomes fouled, are problems which may be subject to solution through programs using the present countryside resources.

This Commission will be composed of 24 members, appointed by the President from a list of nominees submitted by the Governors of the States within the 12 farm credit districts. The life of the Commission is limited to 2 years and such a Commission must report its findings to Congress and the President within that time.

There are 12 Federal land banks in the farm credit system, each serving a separate district:

District 1: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

District 2: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Virginia, and West Virginia.

District 3: Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

District 4: Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, and Tennessee.

District 5: Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi.

District 6: Arkansas, Illinois, and Missouri.

District 7: Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Wisconsin.

District 8: Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

District 9: Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, and Oklahoma.

District 10: Texas.

District 11: Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, and Utah.

District 12: Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH], in cosponsoring the Countryside Development Commission Act to study the economic problems of rural America.

Our colleague has presented some very interesting statistics relating to our rural and urban populations, plus the current trends that see the continuing exodus from the countryside into the vast metropolitan areas. It is hoped that every Member of Congress studies those statistics carefully, including the inherent problems that have accompanied such movements of people.

It has long been my contention, so stated many times before the Congress, that the best investment we can make in solving the problems of rural America is to first of all make sure our farm population receives adequate income, so that the rural migration is halted or at least slowed. Our Government can expend vast sums of money in make-work programs that are merely temporary in nature, plus the pouring of billions into the cities to rescue those who have been forced into the megalopolises with scant preparation for the life they will lead there. These moneys are really wasted, when the wise expenditure and policy would be in preventing the mass movement of people from environments they understand to environments they do not understand and do not want.

As Mr. ZWACH points out, there is a real relationship between crowded cities and unused countryside resources. That relationship should be explored to the fullest by the blue-ribbon Commission called for in this bill.

For too long our smaller communities have struggled to keep alive amid the specter of falling farm income, upon which they depend for their existence. They have struggled diligently, spending way out of proportion to educate their children, only to see them leave their areas due to the lack of employment opportunities. These rural areas have contributed much, including their educated children, to the rest of the Nation, but very little has been done to preserve these traditional areas of national strength.

We must do everything we can to shed light on this worsening problem. A Countryside Development Commission would not only analyze and evaluate the economic growth of, and the impact of governmental programs upon, the countryside, but would recommend programs through which the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments and private corporations and organizations, might effectively encourage the economic growth and development of the countryside.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks with respect to the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK J. O'MALLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, March 30, several thousand men and women will gather at the Sheraton Cleveland Hotel in my home city of Cleveland to attend a testimonial dinner for a man named Patrick J. O'Malley.

I would like to join in honoring Pat O'Malley for his outstanding career as one of the Nation's most successful labor leaders.

Pat O'Malley will soon retire after serving 19 years as director of region 2 of the United Auto Workers of America, but will continue as president of the 200,000-member Cleveland AFL–CIO Federation of Labor.

He has not only helped tens of thousands of members of his union to achieve better wages and working conditions, but also has helped make a better community and a better Nation in many ways.

Pat O'Malley is living proof that a man can be a dedicated leader of organized labor and also a leader serving humanity in many other fields.

For example, Pat O'Malley can be as emphatic in telling a group of union members that they have an obligation to support the United Appeal as in telling employer representatives that they have an obligation to give their employees a larger share of the company's profits.

It was very fortunate for this country that Pat O'Malley, who was born in County Mayo, Ireland, on April 29, 1903, decided to come here. He was 21 years old when he arrived in New York on the liner *Scythia*.

He went on to Cleveland, where several of his relatives had already settled, and soon found himself working as an inventory checker for the White Motor Co. He was an original member of what has since become the White Motor Company Local of the United Auto Workers.

Pat O'Malley held every office in local 32 of the UAW, from shop steward to president. In each capacity, he fought hard to prevent what he considered a radical element from seizing control of the union. He insisted that the union could obtain the best results for its members by adhering to the principles of American democracy—and history has proven him completely correct.

He served with distinction as president of the CIO's Cleveland Industrial Council, and then became president of the combined Cleveland AFL–CIO Federation of Labor, which he has headed since 1958.

Pat O'Malley and his colleagues have long taken the position that organized labor should serve its members in many other arenas besides the picket line and the bargaining table. He was one of the early advocates of medicare, of which I am proud to be coauthor. Pat O'Malley realized that medicare would recognize the rights of senior citizens to decent medical services, and would also serve the interests of younger people by relieving them of a large part of the burden of hospital expenses and doctor bills of their elderly parents and grandparents.

Pat O'Malley long has been a leader in the battle for better unemployment compensation and workmen's compensation laws. He somehow found time to throw his support behind every effort to improve our educational system at every level. He has helped win passage of numerous school levies and school bond issues, and is partly responsible for the creation of such institutions as Cuyahoga Community College and Cleveland State University.

Pat O'Malley has always been a valiant fighter for fair treatment and equal opportunity for all people, regardless of color or creed, both inside and outside the labor movement.

He is respected and highly regarded by members of the Union Club, an organization of rather wealthy Clevelanders, as well as by members of all AFL–CIO unions.

Pat O'Malley is noted for his sense of humor, as well as for his dedication to the principles of organized labor. Who else would have taken advantage of an invitation to write an article for the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce magazine to gently needle the business community.

Pat wrote that he could not "resist the impulse to suggest that, someday, the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce may wish to affiliate with the Cleveland Federation of Labor—in essence, isn't the chamber of commerce really a union of businessmen banded together to promote their mutual interests—so, you see, by joining the chamber, you make a tangible expression of your recognition that by joining a union you can accomplish more than you can by working alone."

I share Pat O'Malley's conviction that organized labor has done as much as any other force to improve the standard of living of the average American family, and to make this country a happier home for all its people.

In honoring Pat O'Malley, the thousands of people who attend his testimonial dinner will also be honoring the finest traditions of American democracy.

THE DUAL-PRICE GOLD MARKET: A TEMPORARY REPRIEVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is widely recognized that the moves made by the U.S. monetary authorities this past weekend, restricting U.S. official gold sales to those central banks not trading on the private gold markets, represent a necessary but temporary reprieve from the disaster that threatened both the international financial position of the United States and the stability of the entire free world monetary structure.

By sealing off, in effect, official gold from private gold holdings, the central banks have allowed for the establishment of a two-price system for this metal. While the price in official trading will remain at $35 an ounce, the private market price will be allowed to fluctuate according to supply and demand. Although no one can estimate precisely where the private price will come to rest, it appears clear that it will be somewhere above the $35 official figure.

The inherent instability in such a system is obvious; the temptation presented to central banks to acquire gold from the U.S. Treasury at $35 an ounce, and to sell it for a higher price on the private market, cannot be ignored. Although we have stated our intention to refuse gold to those foreign monetary authorities engaging in this practice, our ability to police this restriction is limited. Perhaps our major European allies will comprehend the extent to which cooperation in this system is essential to the survival of our current international monetary structure; there are other countries, however, whose monetary authorities are not necessarily expected to exhibit similar restraint when faced with such opportunities for profit. Evidence of such defection, which will be needed before we can restrict our gold sales, will not be easy to come by. And such selectivity in our sale of gold automatically decreases the convertibility of the dollar which, until the present, was unlimited in official circles. Nonetheless, imperfect as this system may be, recent pressures left no satisfactory alternatives to its adoption.

The major lesson that we must garner from the decisions of this weekend and the events leading up to them, is that we are confronted with a profoundly difficult problem, one whose symptoms can be alleviated by short-term measures, but which will completely disappear only after major steps are taken. And these steps will be taken only if we, in the United States, recognize the extent of our financial maladies, and the necessity of applying the most stringent possible remedies; and only if the other major free world nations recognize that their economic health is significantly dependent on their cooperation in combating the financial ills plaguing the United States in particular, and the international monetary structure as a whole.

The directions in which constructive moves must be made are clear: the United States must make every effort, involving both domestic and international economic activities, to resolve its balance-of-payments disequilibrium; the free world economies must evolve their international monetary structure away from its current dependency on gold and toward a more stable system, better able to respond adequately to the needs of world trade.

Elimination of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit will call for stringent controls on our domestic fiscal policy; monetary policy cannot carry the entire burden, nor would it be advisable to allow it to do so.

It is also beyond question that our involvement in Vietnam has contributed heavily to our current financial difficulties. The critical monetary decisions of the past few days constitute but one more reason for a comprehensive reassessment of our policies in Southeast Asia.

Determination is required not only on our part, but on the part of all the free world nations to devise a far more resilient and permanent system of international finance. Reliance on gold has been shown inevitably to yield instability. We must move, and move more rapidly than we might initially have planned, toward adoption and expansion of the special drawing rights system proposed at the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund.

Mr. Speaker, we have moved, and properly so, to head off an imminent crisis in the international economic system. But we must not for a moment assume that these steps have afforded us anything more than a breathing space, time in which to set our domestic and international economic houses in order.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITY IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, last October I warned the Congress that Communist forces were preparing to launch a full-scale war in southeast Africa at a time when the United States was heavily committed in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, news reports from Africa in the past few days indicate that stepped-up guerrilla action by Communist-trained forces from Zambia into Rhodesian territory is reaching mammoth proportions. In fact, the situation is so critical that South African police and Rhodesian military forces with air support are moving to Rhodesia's northern border with Zambia.

This is only the beginning of widespread Communist guerrilla activity designed to plunge the whole of southern Africa into war. The objective of this Communist-supported drive is simple: The Soviet Union and Red China desperately want to dominate the important shipping lanes around the tip of South Africa. Of course, the closing of the Suez Canal has demonstrated beyond contradiction that the sea route around the cape is of immense strategic importance both militarily and economically. It goes without question that, if a Communist power can overrun South Africa, the United States will lose a vital refueling port. As long as the Suez remains closed, the cape is the main link between India and America, and Western Europe. Lose control of the cape, and American influence in Africa and Asia will terminate. In my judgment, loss of the cape would contribute mightily to a U.S. defeat in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation, if for no other reason than to protect its long-range self-interests in Africa, must move immediately to reexamine its official policy toward South Africa and especially Rhodesia. These two nations are firm allies. Where else on the African continent can we point to greater pro-Western governments?

Yet, our State Department continues on the futile and ridiculous course of supplying the supporting timbers for British foreign policy by taking part in the economic sanctions against Rhodesia. The ever-increasing abdication by Britain of her international responsibilities should make the U.S. Government all the more resolute not to sacrifice our major strategic interests simply because London is seeking the easy way out of her commitments by turning to the United Nations. The United States must now look for allies within the vacuum that British withdrawals have created. South Africa and Rhodesia are such allies, and we should invite their friendship. In the future the United States must look upon these nations as holding the true balance of power and as being the only pro-Western influence of any consequence in sub-Saharan Africa and on the western shores of the Indian Ocean.

This Nation has no quarrel with the Government of Rhodesia. Why should we pull British chestnuts out of the fire by taking part in these immoral and illegal sanctions? Without the support of Washington, the sanctions would collapse overnight. We destroy the credibility of our image as a champion of the smaller nations of the world by supporting the boycott. In the case of Rhodesia, we not only tarnish the image but we are running the risk of suffering a humiliating defeat by communism in Africa at a time when we are desperately trying to hold the line in Southeast Asia.

This Nation can prevent another Vietnam, at least in southern Africa. But, the administration must act now to withdraw its support of the British trade boycott against Rhodesia. Rhodesia has declared its independence, and it has no intention of knuckling under to the Wilson government. Rhodesians are fighting the same battle in Africa that we are fighting in Vietnam. The frontline is as clearly defined on the Zambezi as it is in Vietnam—the one arm of communism is being restrained in Vietnam while the other is being resisted in Africa.

Rhodesia at this moment is successfully resisting Communist aggression. But, its enemies are determined and ruthless in their design to destroy all remaining vestiges of Western influence in Africa. A military defeat would pave the way for Russian and Chinese domination of Africa.

We must not allow the tragic errors of British incompetence in Africa for over a century become an American albatross.

A critical review of our entire policy toward Rhodesia, indeed if such a policy exists, is in order. Communist subversion is not limited to Southeast Asia. So-called wars of liberation are just as dangerous to American interests in Rhodesia as they are in Cuba, South Vietnam, and other smaller nations. If the United States can commit over 500,000 men and billions of dollars to Vietnam to stem Communist aggression, the very least we can do is to support Rhodesia economically with trade agreements in order to assist that country in its fight against communism. To do less is to invite anoanother Vietnam, or even worse in the long run, Communist control over the wealthiest and most strategic portion of Africa.

ANTITRUST LAW REVIEW: NO TIME FOR SECRECY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in recent years many thoughtful commentators have remarked on the need for a review and revision of our antitrust laws to bring them into accord with the needs and trends of our modern economy. Last year, as in the 89th Congress, I introduced legislation (H.R. 9155) to establish a blue-ribbon Conference on the Antitrust Laws to review the entire tangled field and make responsible recommendations to the Congress and the President.

The administration has neither commented officially on this legislation nor submitted any specific suggestions for comprehensive changes in existing law.

I was rather surprised, therefore, to read in the New York Times of February 13 that the White House had reportedly created a secret task force of outside experts to study the antitrust laws and make suggestions for change.

While I applaud any signs of constructive activity in this area, I do feel that the Congress, the business community, the legal profession, and the public generally ought to know what type of review is being made, under what mandate, and by whom. I therefore wrote on February 15 to the Attorney General, requesting confirmation of this report and urging him to advise the Congress of the full membership and mandate of the task force.

Last Friday I received a reply from Mr. Donald F. Turner, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, which read as follows:

MARCH 14, 1968.

Hon. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MATHIAS: The Attorney General has asked me to reply to your letter of February 17, inquiring about the New York Times report of February 13 that a White House task force of outside experts had been appointed to advise the White House on antitrust policy questions. As you probably know, this report was subsequently confirmed, although there have been no comments or disclosure as to the membership of the group or as to the issues that it is considering.

We understand that the White House has from time to time utilized small groups of outside experts on a wholly informal basis to review particular national issues or problems and to provide ideas and suggestions on a confidential basis. While the President has also made extensive use of publicity designated commissions or committees to study particular problems, it seems quite reasonable that the solicitation of ideas not be limited to such formal devices. We would suppose that non-disclosure of the names of the persons involved often serves the useful purpose of enabling them to give a completely candid statement of their own personal views and suggestions. This is particularly true where one wishes to elicit the personal suggestions of those in the private bar or private business sector, where public disclosure of views deemed objectionable by clients or business associates might cause them considerable difficulty.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD F. TURNER,
Assistant Attorney General,
Antitrust Division.

Mr. Speaker, two aspects of Mr. Turner's response particularly concern me. First, it appears that the Justice Department, the agency charged with the administration and enforcement of our antitrust laws, either has not been fully advised about this task force and its work or else is not at liberty to advise the Congress. In either case, it is interesting that the White House, rather than the Justice Department, has taken this initiative, and will determine what use, if any, is made of the results.

Second, while I agree that consultation between public officials and citizens should not be limited to formally constituted advisory groups, I am troubled by the suggestion that candor can be secured best through secrecy. This approach is contradicted by the fact that many business and professional leaders have served with distinction—and candor—on many public advisory panels in the past, and have been willing to make public recommendations in many "sensitive" policy areas. Presidential advisers, both official and unofficial, are not immune to bias, and the best cure for bias is wide public exposure.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the tenor of Mr. Turner's reply, I am today asking the President to inform the Congress and the country of the membership and mandate of this "task force" on the antitrust laws. I am confident that the White House will agree with me that releasing this information at this time will be a constructive step which could increase congressional and public receptivity to any proposals which this panel might eventually make.

AFL–CIO DENOUNCES PROPOSALS TO RAISE FHA INTEREST RATES

Mr. PATMAN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern about proposals to raise interest rates on all types of Federal housing programs. These proposals would remove the congressional control over interest rates on federally insured mortgages and would leave the sole discretion with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and with the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

The 6-percent statutory ceiling now in effect would be wiped out on both the VA and FHA programs.

Mr. Speaker, the increases which would follow this action would be a tremendous blow to the low- and moderate-income families throughout this Nation. On a $20,000 loan over the life of a 30-year mortgage, a 1-percent increase would mean an additional charge of $4,674.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents of these interest rate increases claim that the increases would improve the flow of funds into these types of mortgages. To date, no economic evidence has been put forward to support this contention.

On the contrary, we have much evidence which shows that the flow of funds often decreases when interest rates are increased. That was true in 1966 when the FHA interest rate went up three times and mortgages insured by FHA went down 20 percent. This morning, Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, director, department of legislation, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, appeared before the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee with a forthright statement on these high interest rates. The AFL–CIO is to be commended for its stand against higher interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I call particular attention to this paragraph from Mr. Biemiller's statement:

But more than an upward spiraling of money costs, it is our belief that we are being asked to support a higher price for money without any resultant improvement in housing money. Painful history has taught us that earlier rises of this nature did not bring any appreciable flow of funds into the market, and housing starts, if spurred at all, improved only for a matter of a few months.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that those who are urging a quick rush to higher interest rates will carefully consider the statement by the AFL–CIO and by others who are attempting to protect the public interest in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD excerpts from Mr. Biemiller's remarks relating to the interest-rate proposals contained in the housing bill, as follows:

FHA INTEREST RATES

We have discussed to this point subsidies of the interest rate between one percent and the market rate. What that market rate will be is of vital concern in all of these programs because whatever amounts of money are appropriated by Congress, they will provide many more housing units at six percent interest rate than at seven percent or eight percent or even higher.

Furthermore, we are hopeful that many millions of Americans who will not be covered by these publicly-assisted programs will be able to buy their homes through the regular FHA mortgage routes. But if the rates on interest rise, tens of thousands of moderate income families will be squeezed out of the home buying market, thus making their housing plight another area of concern for us rather than having contributed to a solution.

We note with considerable concern the proposal that the statutory limit of six percent on all FHA mortgages be eliminated and that the interest rate be set by HUD Secretary. The argument is made that unless the limit is raised, there will not be any great flow of mortgage money and many of the programs within this bill will lie fallow, even if enacted. In effect, we are being told that the interest rate is being held hostage, and all of us who are inherently opposed to high interest rates are expected to surrender as the price of realizing any mass building programs.

If a higher interest rate were to produce more money and more dwellings we might at least understand why some non-bankers support the proposal, well-knowing the terrible price that will very shortly have to be paid throughout our economy. That terrible price, we are convinced, will be an across-the-board upward movement in all money costs, be they the cost of borrowing for a car or other consumer items or the cost of borrowing by the U.S. Treasury or the states and local governments. The added interest will hit us all many times over. Very soon a new higher plateau of interest rates will be established, cancelling out any temporary advantage enjoyed by the higher mortgage interest rate. Within a matter of months new pressures would generate for another rise in the mortgage interest rates and the movement would be underway again to move the whole interest rate structure to still a higher plateau.

Once the ceiling is removed, rates will go in one direction only. And with all due respect to the Secretary, the terrible burden and responsibility to withstand the pressures of the nation's entire money market should not be put on his shoulders, removed from the Congressional insulation FHA interest rates have always had.

But more than an upward spiraling of money costs, it is our belief that we are being asked to support a higher price for money without any resultant improvement in housing money. Painful history has taught us that earlier rises of this nature did not bring any appreciable flow of funds into the market, and housing starts, if spurred at all, improved only for a matter of a few months.

We are told that the FHA ceiling of six percent is unrealistic. However, if it is lifted, the entire economy will be rocked and buffeted on seas of higher and higher interest rates. We are well aware that discount points are a burden—a cash burden. But points are the leakage in the present system, and there has been no assurance from any source since this bill was introduced that a rise in the interest rate will eliminate points. Rather, we suspect they will recede temporarily only to return.

Higher interest rates, we declare, will add to the cost of the interest rate subsidy in rental and home ownership programs and reduce the total number of units that can be realized.

A rise in interest rates from six percent to seven percent on a $20,000 mortgage over a 30 year period will cost a home buyer $4,674 in additional interest, a 17 percent increase in the interest charges, as Chairman Patman has told the House of Representatives.

We are most painfully aware that history also has taught us that high interest rates are always the forerunner of economic recessions or depressions.

Before opening the floodgates of higher interest rates, we suggest that first the Federal Reserve Board, under Public Law 89–597, be directed to put up to $5 billion into the mortgage market. If the Board purchases up to $5 billion in government-guaranteed obligations that relate to housing, a considerable amount of funds would be made available at once. Here is an immediate source of funds, under law, that is available, and at no increased cost in interest to the entire economy.

U.S. VETERANS ASSISTANCE CENTER IN CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. FEIGHAN. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that Cleveland was selected as one of 10 cities to have a Veterans Assistance Center. This center consists of a one-stop office where veterans will receive personal counsel on all the benefits that the law provides for them. Some 28 Federal agencies, organizations, and veterans groups are participating in this program, and working toward the common goal of helping the veteran adjust to the rapidly changing conditions of our society.

By leave granted, I am including my remarks at the dedication of the U.S. Veterans Assistance Center in Cleveland on March 8:

REMARKS BY MR. FEIGHAN

President Johnson in his January 30 message on veterans' affairs to the Congress referred to the returning serviceman and the serious problem he is facing in attempting to find out about the many programs available to him—programs administered through facilities which are often scattered across widely separated areas.

The President said, "the answer, I believe, lies in an effort we have never tried before for our veterans—the one-stop center.

I believe we should locate in one place the offices where a veteran can receive personal attention and counsel on all the benefits the law provides him—from housing to health—from education to employment."

Nineteen days later, on February 19, in ten cities, we had just that.

We are proud that Cleveland was selected as one of those ten cities.

This is a unique program, one never attempted by the Federal Government before.

It is not the final answer.

To assume so would be less than realistic.

Although we have had rehabilitation programs for our veterans. This is a pilot program designed to help our veterans adjust to civilian life after military duty.

Many of these young men are sorely in need of counsel and guidance in adjusting to the ever-changing, complex society in which we are living today.

Of significance is the fact that this program has been inaugurated with the cooperation of numerous Federal agencies toward a common goal—some participating actively each day, such as the Department of Labor, the Civil Service Commission, and the Veterans' Administration—others standing by to assist as needed, like the Federal Housing Administration, Small Business Administration, United States Attorney, and others.

It is most encouraging to me to know that many outstanding civic, welfare, and veteran organizations in the State and city have pledged their support to this new program.

This means that while we have started off in a new field without all the answers, certainly we have a big league team on the field.

This task, obviously, has been turned over to the pros and this is as it should be.

We keenly feel an obligation to help our veterans, in addition to the pecuniary benefits to which they may be entitled.

Our objective is to be positive that every serviceman who returns to civilian life today and in the months ahead, no matter where he lives, what his background may have been, what his hopes and ambitions may be, will have the education he wants, the training he needs, and the opportunities for the job for which he is best suited.

As we dedicate this United States Veterans Assistance Center today, let each of us involved dedicate ourselves to accomplishing with our efforts the ultimate for those who have accomplished so much for us with so little concern for themselves.

THE GOVERNOR'S VETO OF POVERTY PROGRAMS

Mr. HARRISON. 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 Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, in the melange of bills creating the poverty program, it was the intent of Congress to affirm and reaffirm the right of the Governors of the States to exercise veto authority over certain programs proposed for their jurisdictions.

The veto provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are largely the result of congressional additions to the administration bill. As transmitted to Congress the administration bill required only that the Governor approve the assignment of VISTA volunteers to the States and that the OEO Director give the Governors an opportunity to comment on CAP applications. In both Houses additional veto provisions for the Job Corps, adult basic education, Neighborhood Youth Corps and the community action program were added by floor amendments.

In the 1965 amendments, the OEO Director could reverse a Governor's veto within 30 days if he felt it was not based on proper reasons and that the achievements of the purposes of the act required that the vetoed project be carried out.

In an informative publication by the Advisory Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations the point is made through a chart that groups asked if "the existence of the veto power had any effect on the conduct of your program?" responded in the negative in percentages ranging between 84.4 to 100 percent. Eighty-four and four-tenths percent of chief elected county officials responded in the negative, as did 89.8 of community action agency directors and 100 percent of the mayors of cities over 50,000.

One of the modifications to the 1965 amendments provided:

No contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall be made, with, or provided to, any State, local or public agency or any private institution or organization for the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other activity within the State unless the plan setting forth such proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan or other assistance has been submitted to the governor of the State, and such plan has not been disapproved by the governor within 30 days of such submission, or if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the directors and found by him to be fully consistent.

I believe the record supports the feeling of many Governors that this language

was intended to give them a veto over specific increments of multipart community action programs. This was the intent of the Congress. However, the Office of Economic Opportunity seized a literary opportunity and by clarifying the language of the law in a memorandum, succeeded in what for all practical purposes has been the redrafting of this key section of poverty law to force the Governors to swallow a big and bitter pill coated with but a taste of sugar.

Through a regulatory memorandum, the OEO clarified the Governors right out of their item veto by contending that they did not have it in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I cite a case in point. In February of this year, Wyoming Governor, Stanley K. Hathaway, called a press conference in Cheyenne to announce that he had been "blackjacked" by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity into acquiesing in a $78,000 neighborhood youth program for Laramie County. The chief executive said he had been notified that if he vetoed the program under the provisions of law, the OEO would cancel out two other OEO projects already in existence in Laramie County.

The Governor accepted the NYP program because he did not want to endanger the other two projects, legal services, and Project Headstart.

A study of the record establishes that Congress never intended OEO to have the power to suspend over the statehouses a sword of Damocles, the horsehair of which would be severed by the exercise by a Governor of the latitude of veto which legally is his.

Accordingly, I today introduce a brief bill which would restructure the language of section 242 of the 1967 amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 by striking out "within a State unless" and inserting in lieu thereof language which stipulates that the Governor has the power to veto "any component" of a CAP program.

The amendment would not peg one part of the CAP package to any other part insofar as the Governors' veto is concerned.

The Governors were given the veto to assure a State role in the OEO programs. The veto is a useful device to insure that the Governor will be kept informed of program developments within the State, thus permitting him to evaluate these programs and to cooperate with them through the agencies of the State government.

The veto assures the Governors' right to know. The Governor has the right to be informed of planned activities of the Federal Government within his State and he should have an opportunity to express disapproval of any which he feels are not in the interest of the State.

The veto assures State coordination; it assures actions of local public and private groups. Since local public agencies and, to some extent, private nonprofit groups are formed and regulated under State law, a Governor should be able to exercise a veto power over their activities in connection with the Federal Government as a way to assure that they continue to operate in accordance with such State legislation. In some States, little or no direct State enabling legislation is required—because of the act's flexibility concerning local applicants—and the veto may be the only opportunity for a State legal review.

The veto also is to prevent bypassing of the States by the Federal Government.

The bill I introduce today would help insure that the Federal leviathan does not continue its unimpeded journey over the rights of the States. It would return to our Governors the right to say, on behalf of their constituents, "No" to community action programs which are not in the best interest of the States.

Mr. Speaker, I place newspaper articles from the Cheyenne, Wyo., State Tribune and the language of my bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press, Feb. 12, 1968]

AN ANGRY MAN IN CHEYENNE

Gov. Stan Hathaway is angry.

He has a right to be. No one likes to be told in effect, "take it all or else."

The Governor made public last week the fact he had been blackjacked into approving a $78,000 federal program for a neighborhood youth center in Cheyenne, even though he didn't like the program.

Essentially the Governor felt the program lacked planning, and according to the figures he quotes, most of the money was going to go to administrators, rather than for helping needy youth.

Simply, the Governor felt the money for the program was a waste.

Why did he sign? He signed because it would have jeopardized legal aid and Head Start programs already going, and these he feels have considerable merit.

"I've been informed," the Governor revealed, "that we have to take everything or nothing. Unless I accept the neighborhood center I also must veto these other programs."

That the Governor should be angry is understandable, for freedom of choice has been denied.

And this is the whole point.

Not infrequently, government on all levels, and even private business comes up with package propositions such as this. The packages are just that, packages, and even though only part of them appear desirable, it is a matter of all or nothing at all.

It is on the government level, however, that this situation is particularly untenable because it involves public funds. It doesn't make sense that the Governor should have to approve a program, which he obviously considers a waste of money and effort, in order to save two others of which he approves.

Freedom of choice is not only denied, so is the proposition of spending public funds wisely.

But it is the loss of freedom of choice that is particularly offensive. Freedom of choice is something we boast about in this country, it is not something we reduce.

We join that angry man in Cheyenne feeling that all citizens ought to be angry when freedom of choice is denied.

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, Feb. 7, 1968]

STAN FORCED TO ACCEPT COUNTY YOUTH PROGRAM

Governor Hathaway charged today he had been "blackjacked" by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity into acquiescing to a $78,000 Neighborhood Youth Program for Laramie County even though he tried to veto it because only $3,000 of the total sum would be paid to youths who would be enrolled under the program's provisions.

The chief executive said his office had been notified that if he vetoed the program under provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act, the OEO would cancel out two other OEO projects already in existence in Laramie county.

Hathaway said he therefore would neither approve nor veto the Neighborhood Youth Program sought by the Laramie County Community Action Program, Inc., and approved by the OEO, because he did not wish to endanger the other two projects, the OEO's Legal Services and Headstart projects.

But he said he thought the people of Wyoming and of this country should know how their money was being spent by the OEO.

Of the $78,000 outlay, most will go for salaries of 10 employes of the program plus rent for a building, for one year's time, the governor told a news conference this morning.

The governor said among other things, the project would provide for a project director at $600 per month; a job developer, $530 per month; a job placement counselor at $371 per month; workshop supervisor and recreation aide, $392 per month; sewing room supervisor, $300; secretary, $300; a "problems in living" counselor, $300 a month; youth recreation supervisor, $320; public health nurse, $585 per month, and a medical secretary, $150 per month.

In addition to the salaries, the $78,000 OEO grant provides for a cash outlay for rental of a building on Cheyenne's South side at $10,500 per year, and another $2,650 for the health insurance of the project's 10 employes to which they will have to make no contribution.

The $3,000 of the entire project that would be spent on the youth whom it is designed to serve would be sufficient, the governor pointed out, to care for 60 enrollees for one month, or five persons for one year.

The 10 employes in the office would have an extensive outlay of supplies including nine desks, 100 folding chairs, 10 pencil sharpeners and 10 staplers.

The governor pointedly noted that his own office had only one pencil sharpener.

Hathaway said he particularly thought the 10 pencil sharpeners and 10 staplers for an office force of 10 persons was "symbolic" of a "lack of thought."

The governor said extensive correspondence was carried on by his office, principally by his coordinator of federal aid programs, Charles G. Newton, and the regional office of the OEO at Kansas City.

Hathaway said when he indicated he intended to veto the Neighborhood Youth Project as provided by law, the regional OEO officials in Kansas City retorted they would void the other two projects, legal aid services and Headstart.

The governor said he thought both of the latter were worthy projects and that he did not wish to endanger them, so he gave up the idea of exercising a veto but he made it plain he did so reluctantly.

"I want the people of Wyoming to know why I am not vetoing this project," he said today.

The governor said he did not object to the concept of the Neighborhood Youth Program and suggested it might be proven a worthy one, but he said he thought the OEO's approach to it with the heavy emphasis on spending for everybody except the intended recipients, was "grandiose."

"I think we had better start thinking about how we are spending our money," he added.

Hathaway said he intended to bring the matter directly to the attention of Sargent Shriver, director of the OEO.

Furthermore, he said he would seek an opportunity to bring it up when the executive committee of the National Governors Conference meets with President Johnson's cabinet in Washington later this month.

Hathaway intends to participate in the session, which is scheduled on Feb. 29–March 1.

"I am going to make my thoughts known on this," the governor said.

He said he hoped the nation's governors would join him in his criticism of such features of the OEO and "that they are tired of being patsies . . ."

Only eight gubernatorial vetoes across the nation have been exercised since the Economic Opportunity Act became law and Hathaway said today he now realized why so few governors had exercised that power.

He said the OEO based its approach to the states on an "all or nothing basis."

"I suppose that any governor looking at (an offer of) federal funds should say, 'let's take all we can get'," the governor observed. This could validly be said in Wyoming's behalf since this state has made hundreds of millions of dollars in federal mineral royalty contributions to the federal treasury, he said.

But Hathaway said he looked at the matter not just as a Wyoming citizen, but also as an American. And he left no doubt that what he saw of the workings of such programs disturbed him deeply.

H.R. 16088

A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to permit State Governors to disapprove component programs included in community action programs to be carried on in their States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 242 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "within a State unless" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", or any component thereof, within a State unless, with respect to each such program, project, or other activity, and with respect to each such component,".

IMPORTANCE OF THE STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA

Mr. HARRISON. 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 Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 I introduced a House resolution on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK] and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD] calling upon the Budget Bureau to establish in the only three States not now having one, at least one standard metropolitan statistical area.

The resolution was viewed with favor by the leading newspaper in the city which would most likely be the center of any SMSA which would be created in Wyoming.

The Wyoming State Tribune noted editorially March 15 that this resolution would help correct the disadvantage which Wyoming, Alaska, and Vermont suffer from not being listed in official publications which are reserved exclusively for information on SMSA's.

The editorial points out that SMSA designation will not "automatically guarantee instant industrial growth; but it should remove another of the adverse factors, or put another way, providing another of the steps needed, in securing that growth."

Mr. Speaker, I bring this editorial to the attention of the House and the Budget Bureau in the hope that it will in some way expedite action on the resolution that could mean so much to the three States which at present have no standard metropolitan statistical areas:

IMPORTANCE OF THE SMSA

House enactment of Congressman Harrison's resolution with respect to standard metropolitan statistical areas should serve to correct an oversight that now exists in such federal data and also help Cheyenne achieve its goal of securing such a designation.

Harrison's resolution introduced last week notes that of the 50 states, only Wyoming, Alaska and Vermont do not have at least one SMSA. The resolution would correct this by in effect requiring that any state which does not have an SMSA, receive at least one such area designation.

What is the value of a standard metropolitan statistical area designation? Why should this community, through its Chamber of Commerce, seek one? Current SMSA designations include 231 localities or metropolitan areas in the U.S. The Bureau of the Budget, which significantly is in charge of SMSAs rather than the Bureau of the Census, says: (SMSA) definitions are used in presenting data from the censuses of business, manufacturers and mineral industries; the census of population and housing; and the census of governments; in presenting current economic and social data; and in analyses of local area problems . . . (SMSAs) are not intended to be "market" areas, but are so used in much market analysis . . .

In a news story in this newspaper yesterday the president of the Chamber of Commerce, Wallace K. (Wally) Reed, noted the importance of this designation: "The Chamber was aware industrial prospects and firms considering expansion into new areas many times check areas under consideration in advance through the statistical data that is prepared by the Bureau of the Budget . . . Cheyenne in not being listed among these other cities is automatically placed in an unfavorable position."

Harrison's resolution hopefully should serve to help correct this unfavorable condition. Neither it nor the SMSA designation, if it is forthcoming, will automatically guarantee instant industrial growth; but it should remove another of the adverse factors, or put another way, provide another of the steps needed, in securing that growth.

SECRETARY RUSK WINS ACCLAIM OF OKLAHOMANS

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Dean Rusk made a lot of friends in Oklahoma last week during his appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The Tulsa World of Saturday, March 16, contains an editorial, entitled "Rusk Shows His Class," which calls the Secretary "the most able defender of the U.S. position in Vietnam." This editorial also cites Secretary Rusk as being a man with a "basic regard for the honor of the Nation and a keen understanding of Communist thinking." I would like to have this fine editorial tribute to a great American appear in the RECORD.

I would also like to point out that this editorial reflects the overwhelming sentiment of the people of my district in Oklahoma. I spent last weekend in Oklahoma and was heartened at the many, many expressions of support for Secretary Rusk and the administration's position in Vietnam.

The editorial follows:

RUSK SHOWS HIS CLASS

After his ordeal before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this week, we have to express a word of admiration for Secretary of State Dean Rusk. He showed his class every step of the way.

Rusk is a sensitive man who realizes as much as any Dove in Washington the horrible nature of war. But he also has a basic regard for the honor of a nation and a keen understanding of Communist thinking. He stands fast on his conviction that we are committed in Vietnam, no matter how unpopular the war may become.

Under heavy pounding by members of the Committee—led by their unrelenting Chairman, Sen. William J. Fulbright of Arkansas—the Secretary kept his cool and could not be shaken. In the end he had weathered the two days of grilling better than his questioners. He also managed to withstand the storm with dignity, as opposed to some of the Senators whose questioning tended to be querulous and sometimes nasty.

We believe the nation is fortunate to have this man in perhaps the most difficult job in the Cabinet. He has been our Secretary of State since leaving the Presidency of the Rockefeller Foundation at the beginning of the John F. Kennedy Administration. In the past seven years he has had to bear much more than the slings and arrows of a Senate committee—but he is still the most able defender of the U.S. position in Vietnam.

Rusk has the admirable ability to go to the heart of a matter. When the Doves swarm in, waving their olive branches for an end to the bombing of North Vietnam, it is he who always brings them to earth by recalling the futility of our previous bombstoppages and the fact that the Communists have made no genuine effort to meet us halfway.

If the Doves can hate, they have to dislike Dean Rusk, for he is the man who has exposed their fallacious wing-flapping.

GLASS IMPORTS CONTINUE AS DANGER TO AMERICAN INDUSTRY

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this floor many times to sound a warning on the fate of the American flat glass industry if imports are to continue to increase. I have pointed out that the glass industry in the United States is a small industry. I also have pointed out that it is an industry which employs highly skilled, highly paid workers. Glass workers are among the most productive citizens of my district in Oklahoma.

The concern for the fate of the glass industry in this country is a joint concern. I do not believe I have ever seen such a concentrated effort involving both management and labor as I have seen in the all-out effort to save the glass industry in this Nation.

The president of the Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., a major flat glass manufacturer in the United States, has written a concise, clear report on the glass industry today in the edition of NAM Reports published today. His report leaves no doubt that unless some relief is found, the big glass companies are going to be forced to go into business overseas, and send the product back to the United States. These firms do not want to do this. They do not want to abandon their trained labor forces in this Nation, and they do not want to contribute further to our balance-of-payments deficit, which events of recent weeks already have shown us is very much out of hand. Libbey-Owens-Ford is a company which has the resources to establish overseas operations. Some of the smaller firms are simply going to have to shut down if there is no relief. This could mean disaster for many American communities, including some in northeastern Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have Mr. Robert G. Wingerter's analysis of this situation appear in the RECORD, and I hope all my colleagues will study it, as follows:

WHY NOT FACTS ON FOREIGN TRADE?

(By Robert G. Wingerter)

Whenever American manufacturers engage in a dialogue on foreign trade policy, it is expected that each will speak according to his own company interest. If one company finds its domestic market seriously eroded by imports, and its products priced out of world markets because of wage and other production costs, it is a safe bet that its executives will protest the reduction of U.S. tariffs. Conversely, executives of another company which imports products or component parts for final assembly here, either from its own foreign subsidiaries or from independent foreign sources, will advocate lower U.S. tariffs because costs of its finished products are favorably affected.

Such a dialogue produces little but sound and fury. Both parties can fairly be charged with self-interest if their advocacy derives primarily from their own P & L statements. Neither can lay claim to being "industrial statemen" unless their rationale is truly based on the national interest.

My own bias in such a discussion is no secret. Libbey-Owens-Ford is being hurt by heavy importations of window glass. Since window glass is made on almost identical equipment throughout the world, worker efficiency is not very different, one country to another. Differences in wage rates, therefore, closely approximate differences in wage costs. Direct wage costs represent more than 40% of window glass selling prices because the materials from which glass is made—sand, limestone, salt cake and soda ash—are relatively inexpensive. Obviously, competitive wage rates one third to one seventh of ours place us at great disadvantage.

It goes without saying that we are examining all possible escape routes from this dilemma. One solution lies in the old saw, "If you can't lick 'em, join 'em." We can produce our window glass abroad, availing ourselves of prevailing low-wage rates, shipping the glass back to the United States, and paying the same low import duties that our foreign competitors pay.

If we do take that route, will I then be in the other camp, arguing that low tariffs are good for America? We would surely be able to offer stiff competition to the domestic manufacturers who remain here.

Perhaps I would join the other camp if I could persuade myself that only a few industries in the United States are unable to pay the high wages that are part and parcel of our standard of living and still compete with low-wage foreign manufacturers. In that case, the closing of one or two more plants would not have significant effect on the national well-being. Our window glass workers could find good jobs in less vulnerable industries. We could reestablish an adequate profit position in this segment of our business without seriously harming anyone.

This is not a hypothetical exercise as far as Libbey-Owens-Ford is concerned. If the competitive problems we face in window glass manufacture are not shared broadly by U.S. industry, well and good. We can pitch our tent in some economic climate more favorable to the production of window glass—or, to put it more bluntly, where there are lower wage standards.

If broad segments of U.S. industry are affected, however, corrective action by the Government is indicated. The United States is committed to its high wage structure. If those high wages are demonstrably causing domestic manufacturers *generally* to lose ground in their own home market, that market must be made less accessible to low-wage foreign competition. It is just that simple. The national interest is not compatible with the wholesale export of jobs.

The key to the question lies in the words "domestic manufacturers *generally*." If high wages disadvantage only a minority of U.S. producers, perhaps affected factories, should be sacrificed for the good of all, as officialdom has suggested. But if a *majority* of U.S. manufacturing industries are finding it impossible to overcome the high-wage handicap with achievable superiority in productivity, overall export-import statistics should show it. Statistics should show a trend toward exporting relatively more goods with low labor content and importing relatively more goods with high labor content.

Fortunately, the Department of Commerce* lists the dollar value of imports and exports in categories which reflect varying labor content: 1) Crude Materials. 2) Crude Foods. 3) Manufactured Foods. 4) Semi-manufactures. 5) Finished Manufactures.

Obviously, the first two categories include those products which have minimum value added by labor. The last three have more value added by labor. If U.S. wage rates are a generally significant handicap in international competition, U.S. imports should logically have grown faster than exports in the categories most affected by labor costs. U.S. military grants-in-aid were excluded in making the following calculations:

With 1957–59 as a base period, U.S. exports of Crude Materials and Crude Foods had increased, by the end of 1966, at an average rate of 9.9% per year. On the same basis, imports of Crude Materials and Crude Foods had increased 2.9% per year. During the base period, we imported more low-labor-content goods than we exported. By 1966, the balance was reversed—we exported more Crude Materials and Crude Foods than we imported. The trend was toward our assuming the role traditionally played by an underdeveloped country—supplying those better qualified to perform the manufacturing function with raw materials for their fabrication.

The trend line in exports and imports of low-labor-content goods indicates that U.S. high wage rates are changing the *character* of our overall foreign trade. The same thing is demonstrated by the trend of U.S. foreign trade in high-labor-content goods.

From the same 1957–59 base period, U.S. exports of Manufactured Foods, Semi-manufactures and Finished Manufactures had increased, by the end of 1966, at an average rate of 9.6% per year. But our imports of these high-labor-content items had increased at an average of 16.8% per year!

During the base period, the average value of our exports of Manufactured Foods, Semi-manufactures and Finished Manufactures was $13.5 billion. The average value of imports for these same categories was $9.0 billion. By 1966 those exports had increased to $22.6 billion and imports in the same categories were $19.6 billion. The U.S. favorable balance of trade in goods with high labor content had eroded from $4.5 billion to $3.0 billion.

Projecting the 9.6% annual growth of exports of Manufactured Goods, Semi-manufactures and Finished Manufactures, and projecting the 16.8% annual growth of imports, we will have an unfavorable balance of trade in goods with substantial labor content by 1969. That's next year! Worse still, while *official* figures show that an unfavorable U.S. balance of trade has yet to occur, actually it has already occurred. Our exports are being officially overvalued and our imports officially undervalued, as will soon be apparent.

From even a cursory examination of import-export statistics, however, it is apparent that Libbey-Owens-Ford is by no means alone in finding low foreign wages a formidable competitive factor. It is so important and so widespread a factor that the whole *character* of United States foreign trade has been affected.

Theoretically, there are three things the United States can do. American wage rates can somehow be brought into line until the wage cost differential becomes manageable. Or we can accept a worsening balance of trade as the price we must pay for diplomatic and military alliances. Or some kind of import controls can be applied which will permit U.S. industry to pay its higher wages and still retain at least its present share of the domestic market.

The first alternative is politically unthinkable. I have been told that some of our negotiators at Geneva felt that the tariff concessions they granted would force American labor to tailor wage demands to the pressures of foreign competition. It is hard to believe that anyone could have been so thoroughly insulated from reality for so many years. Since this publication is read by men with at least vicarious experience at the bargaining table, I am content to develop no rebuttal to that kind of thinking, if it can be called thinking.

To ignore a worsening balance of trade is too high a price to pay for international good will. When American products are being driven from world markets, they must likewise surrender their domestic markets unless production cost differentials are offset by import controls. Without a strong industrial base, the United States would cease to be a world power.

That leaves the more practical solution of judiciously applied import controls. It seems likely that such controls will be invoked simply because the inability to cope with so severe a wage handicap is demonstrably very widespread. In that case, of course, Libbey-Owens-Ford would blunder if it closed its U.S. window glass plants and imported window glass from foreign bases. Our imports would also be limited by controls.

But suppose these adverse import-export trends do signal trouble ahead for the American economy and our trade balance. Is there any evidence that there is awareness of them? Doesn't the Government continue to refer pridefully to this country's large export surplus? Isn't that surplus officially regarded as an offset to our balance of payments deficit? True, but let me quote from the January 29, 1968 issue of the Journal of Commerce—a staunch advocate of lower U.S. tariffs:

"The 1967 (trade) surplus was officially reported as $4.13 billion, *counting an estimated $3 billion in foreign aid and government financed commodity exports.*" (Emphasis added)

The significance of that quotation goes be-

*Bureau of International Commerce, "Overseas Business Reports" and "Historical Statistics of the United States."

yond its confirmation of the import-export trends we have been discussing. The Journal of Commerce has refused to use the "official" trade surplus figure without commenting that three-fourths of the surplus in 1967 was accounted for by goods we U.S. taxpayers bought and shipped abroad. My hat is off to the Journal of Commerce. Newspapers, news magazines and financial papers generally have not looked behind the "official" figure. As a consequence, the public is accustomed to thinking that our exports exceed our imports each year by a comfortable $4 to $5 billion.

This Administration, and others before it, has constantly referred to a favorable balance of trade of this magnitude as a plus factor in the nation's balance of payments struggle. In this context, if it is proper to include, as bona fide exports, the goods we taxpayers buy and give away abroad, then all that is necessary to correct our unfavorable balance of payments is to give away more than we now do. When the "official" balance of trade, swollen by these added gifts, equals our unfavorable balance of payments—presto!—our problem has disappeared.

Anyone who has even a nodding acquaintance with a balance sheet would hesitate to propound so idiotic a solution. But month after month, the Administration's top spokesmen have cited the "official" export surplus—including our give-aways—as an offset to our payments deficit.

The inflation of U.S. export values, however, is only half of what Senator Dirksen has called our "seduction by statistics." Again, *in the context of the U.S. balance of payments,* goods imported into this country are "officially" undervalued. *All* the dollars that leave this country in payment for imported goods are *not* counted. U.S. "official" imports are valued F.O.B. foreign port. But the dollars an importer must pay for the goods he buys include the cost of insurance and freight. At least 90% of imported goods cross the ocean in foreign bottoms. These freight and insurance dollars leave the country and contribute to our payments deficit. Yet they are ignored in our "official" evaluation of imports.

Restrictions on private American investment abroad and restrictive taxes on U.S. tourist travel in foreign countries are measures the President has suggested to correct our unfavorable balance of payments. Such stop-gap measures are not expected to be a complete answer. Few thoughtful citizens will deny that it is absolutely imperative to correct the payments deficit. Many of the proposals to be debated during this session of Congress—an income tax surcharge, a reduction of non-defense spending, a reduction of foreign aid—will have balance of payments overtones. The business and financial community, no less than the press and the political establishment, recognizes the seriousness of the situation.

Because of this awareness, and because of the overriding importance of the problem, the Government should *stop publishing "official" balance of trade figures which do not relate directly to the balance of payments.* As long as an "official" trade figure is published which requires alteration according to footnotes before it can be related to payments, only a few knowledgeable analysts—like Richard Lawrence of the Journal of Commerce—will get the message. The rest will continue to be persuaded that our "official" trade surplus is a reliable sheet anchor to windward which is helping us to ride out the balance of payments storm.

The new "official" balance of trade figures should state a) exports as the dollar value of negotiable currency we receive from the sale of goods we ship abroad. Goods we taxpayers pay for should *not* be included. Likewise the value of imports should be b) the number of dollars that leave this country in payment for the foreign goods we buy. The balance, a) compared to b), would then have a meaningful relationship to our balance of payments situation. If the true balance of trade is a net in-flow of dollars, we should know it. If the true balance of trade is a net loss of dollars, we should know that, too.

There is no reason to sugar-coat the facts. Our citizens do not require the sedation of false reports and twisted figures. I believe the American people will rise to any challenge that can be thrown at them, no matter how somber. I believe they can respond precisely as the British did when Winston Churchill grimly confessed that he had nothing to offer them but blood and sweat and tears.

If we are between a rock and a hard place—in Vietnam, in Korea, in the balance of payments where foreign trade surplus or deficit is a key factor—self delusion, on however grand a scale, is not an answer. Too much is at stake for the facts to be swept under the rug, even in an election year. Let's have done with the little pretendings that give rise to such very large credibility gaps.

In the areas of foreign trade there is wealth of information available to those who seek it. A great deal is known that was not known five years ago. For example, the Trade Relations Council commissioned Georgetown University to undertake a highly comprehensive, computerized study of foreign trade. Into the memory bank of the computer are fed the astonishing variety of data that are available from the Bureau of Census and other divisions of the Department of Commerce. Such data is meaningful even to individual companies because the data is classified at the four-digit level.

(Perhaps a word of explanation is in order in case some others may be as unfamiliar as I with Washington's statistical jargon. In the standard system of industrial classification, a two-digit grouping would list Libbey-Owens-Ford under "Stone, Clay and Glass Products." Under a three-digit grouping, LOF would be under "Glass Products", along with the bottle people, tableware, fiberglass, and so on. Under a four-digit grouping, LOF would be under "Flat Glass Products.")

For each industry at this revealing four-digit level, the following Census data, by year, is fed into the computer's memory bank: Total employment. Production workers. Total payroll. Production worker payroll. Man-hours of production labor. Value of shipments. Cost of materials. Value added by manufacture. Capital expenditures. Value added per production worker. Average annual earnings and average annual man-hours per production worker. Landed value of imports. Value of exports. Imports as a percent of apparent U.S. consumption. Employment equivalent of imports and exports.

The computer can now answer questions such as, "What was the net gain or loss in jobs due to foreign trade in Paper Mill Products in 1960?" At what average annual rate has worker efficiency improved in that industry since 1960?" Or, more broadly, "Is it true that job gains due to foreign trade in capital intensive industries more than offset job losses in labor intensive industries?"

The computer is not always cooperative. If you tell your Congressmen that your industry has lost 12,000 employees in the last three years because of import competition, the computer might contradict you. It might say, "Five thousand employees lost jobs because of import competition. Seven thousand jobs disappeared because of automation and increased worker efficiency."

To be thus dispassionately corrected may impress some as an unwanted intrusion in an area safely and more impressively left to propagandists. But the argument that will prevail is the one based on figures not susceptible of challenge. The economy of the next decade may well be decided by what Congress and the Administration do about foreign trade policy in the months immediately ahead. If we demand accuracy from our Government, those who write our laws have every reason to ask the same of all witnesses who testify.

In the coming debate on foreign trade policy, many voices will be heard. Let us hope that logic, fact and truth prevail.

CONSERVATION PROGRAMS IMPERILED

Mr. CLEVELAND. 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 New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, most thoughtful persons realize that in this time of financial crisis, modest budgetary cuts and deferments are necessary in most Federal agencies.

And, while I have joined with many of my colleagues in pointing to the necessity of such cutbacks and deferments, I strongly protest what seems to be the plan of the present administration to cut back and defer some of the more necessary programs, at the same time spending wildly on new, untested, and in some cases unwanted programs.

The proposed budgets of the agricultural conservation programs and the Soil Conservation Service are good examples of this budgetary gimmickry being foisted on the Congress and thus on the citizenry.

Despite the necessity, importance and proven worth of agricultural conservation programs, every year since 1953 its budget has been cut before being presented to the Congress. Every one of these years but one, the cuts have been restored. Apparently, the administration has felt that by cutting a proven and popular program—one for which it knew funds would be restored—it could masquerade as economy minded.

This year, the ACP budget has again been cut, by some $120 million. And there has been added a new target of this fiscal gimmickry, the Soil Conservation Service. Despite the proven worth and necessity of its watershed improvement and protection programs, budget allocations for these programs have been sliced by 40 percent from last year's appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I earlier spoke of the need for economy. I am sure that all thoughtful conservationists agree with the necessity for modest cuts and deferments. But a 40-percent cut in this small but important program, while proposed spending continues nearly unchecked in other areas, is certainly not justified.

I call to my colleagues' attention a most thoughtful and perceptive editorial on this subject, written by Kenneth Whipple, editor of the Claremont, N.H., Daily Eagle, which outlines what these cuts could mean to one area:

CONSERVATION PROGRAMS IMPERILED

Chief area sufferer from the recommended cutback in federal funds for support of conservation programs seems likely to be the

proposed multi-purpose watershed on the Sugar River.

This is the considered opinion of the Sullivan County Conservation District Board of Supervisors, which has reacted vigorously to the idea that reductions totaling better than $150 million be made in S.C.S. and A.C.P. (Agricultural Conservation Programs) in the 1969 federal budget.

In a recent newsletter the county organization cites earlier cutbacks which have curtailed various activities in this district and throughout the state and nation.

If the 1969 budget cut is approved, they point out, this move will push into the background the Sugar River project, originally scheduled to become operational this fall or early in 1969.

Local interest and community involvement in this upcoming project is widespread. Mounting requests for recreational lakes are still swelling the total; there may be as many as 10 out of 12 watershed sites. This could mean creation of 1,750 acres of new recreational waters in the county.

And, the S.C.S. adds, this project will provide a 100 year level of flood protection to all urban areas in Newport and Claremont.

This is but one of several in the state. There are watershed projects elsewhere—Souhegan, Baker River, Dead River—which have already ground to a near halt for lack of funds. And these, already started, rate priority over the upcoming local development.

Federal funds, admittedly, are scarce. But their use for new and unproved programs in favored areas at the expense of well-established, essential highly rated projects already approved, is difficult to explain or excuse.

K. D. W.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1967

Mr. CLEVELAND. 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 New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind the Members of this body that 1 year ago this month on March 7, the Senate passed the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967. On March 9 the bill was referred to the House Committee on Rules, and it is still in that committee today.

I was interested to read the resolution presented to Congress on February 29, by the Democratic steering committee of the House. The resolution was adopted by a unanimous vote of the committee and was presented to the House by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, who is chairman of the Democratic steering committee, as well as a ranking member of the Rules Committee and his party's ranking member from the House on the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. The resolution recommended, and I quote:

> That the legislative committees act to report their bills promptly in cooperation with the leadership so that the Congress may adjourn no later than August 1, 1968, prior to the national conventions.

I commend this idea. Indeed, if Congress would undertake to schedule its business in a proper way and demand that its Members work 5 days every week, I think we could adjourn every year by the legal adjournment date of July 31.

But back to the specific resolution of the Democratic steering committee, I was also interested in the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the House Rules Committee, following the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana:

> I wish to compliment the steering committee for taking this action . . . Last year, the Members may recall, the Committee on Rules adopted a somewhat similar resolution in an effort to get that session of the Congress adjourned. We think that action served well. We have repeated that procedure on several occasions this year. I have also discussed this with the leadership from time to time this year. Therefore the purpose of this statement is to advise the chairmen of the various legislative committees and the House that at a date not too far distant we propose to take action in the Rules Committee to advise the chairmen of these committees that by a certain date they must have their bills before the Rules Committee; otherwise, there will be no action except upon matters of the direct emergency or in procedural matters.

On February 27 this year, 2 days before these remarks were made by the gentlemen from Indiana and Mississippi, we were confronted with H.R. 11308 to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965. I recall the words of the gentleman from Iowa during debate on the rule:

> All I was trying to do was to find out how, in all conscience, the Rules Committee would bring out a rule on this bill if the amount involved exceeds the President's budget figure.

I do not want to rehash the arguments relating to either the rule of the bill, but I do wonder at the rationale which dictated that this particular bill could be scheduled for action ahead of the reorganization bill, which passed the Senate by a vote of 75 to 9 a year ago and has been bottled up in the House Rules Committee ever since.

I do wonder what standard the Rules Committee is using in saying that other committees must report their bills in a timely fashion so that we can adjourn in an election year by August 1, when it continues to sit on a year-old reorganization bill over which it has jurisdiction.

And while I commend the spirit of the Democratic steering committee's adjournment resolution, I do wonder why this distinguished committee has not seen fit to give us the benefit of its enthusiasm for congressional reform.

Mr. Speaker, when the reorganization bill embodying the recommendations reported to the Congress unanimously by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress was first introduced in the 89th Congress, the House Republican policy committee urged that action be taken on the legislation before adjournment "so that the next Congress may utilize the new institutions and procedures." No action was forthcoming in the 89th Congress.

Following passage of the bill by the Senate in the 90th Congress, the House Republican policy committee again urged the House to take action on this critical piece of legislation. I would remind my colleagues that since the House Rules Committee took charge of this bill more than a year ago, it has held only 1 partial day of hearings on congressional reform legislation.

On October 11 last year, the House Republican conference, by a unanimous vote, called upon the leadership to get the Senate-passed bill to the floor. The first session of the 90th Congress adjourned without so much as a whisper of a stirring of interest by the Democratic leadership in the reorganization bill.

Mr. Speaker, one of my Republican colleagues or I have remarked nearly every day since the convening of the second session of the 90th Congress about the critical necessity to begin taking steps to modernize our work patterns and procedures in the House of Representatives. We will continue to press for action until we get some.

The Republican position on this issue has been clear and consistent. We have asked for passage of a meaningful package of reforms, and we have asked that the bill be reported to the floor of the House under terms which will assure open and free debate for all of the Members of the House, each of whom is an expert in his own right on congressional operations and procedures.

QUEMOY AND MATSU

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to read in the Washington Post of today a column by Jack Anderson in which he reports that the United States is preparing to ask the Republic of China to withdraw its military forces from the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. It is my hope that the report by Mr. Anderson is in error.

Quemoy and Matsu are very vital links in the chain of defense of freedom in Southeast Asia. It would be tragic if our commitment to support Nationalist China in Quemoy and Matsu were abandoned. Those of us who have had the privilege of witnessing firsthand the magnificent performance of the military men of free China in these strategic places have a great appreciation for their splendid performance. Their role has been an important one, and they have executed their assignments with real distinction.

The small financial cost of our support of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek has paid great dividends for free people throughout the world. It would be penny wise and pound foolish for us to abandon our commitment to his government in any way, but particularly insofar as the continuance of the support of his program on Quemoy and Matsu.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the executive branch of our Government abandon immediately any discussion of lessening our cooperation with the free people of China as they so valiantly meet their responsibilities in Southeast Asia. We are fortunate to have the friendship and cooperation of the Government of the Republic of China, and I hope that nothing will be done to in any way indicate that we are unwilling to meet our share of the responsibility.

America's interest, and the future of

all free people, is directly involved in the maintenance of a strong military posture on Quemoy and Matsu. We should never voluntarily abandon the opportunity that we have to serve the cause of freedom there.

APPOINTMENT OF DR. PHILIP R. LEE AS ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. GUBSER. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents, Dr. Philip R. Lee, of Palo Alto, Calif., is to be our new Assistant Secretary of Health and Scientific Affairs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Health is a $50 billion a year business. But it is far more than "business" in any limited sense of the term. Protecting and promoting the health of the American people represents one of the finest commitments of the federal system, and one of the most challenging.

The selection of Dr. Lee to this high post to take full charge of the massive health programs of the Department is both timely and wise.

As a physician and health administrator of outstanding qualities, Dr. Lee has earned considerable distinction. As director of health services for the AID program and later as a key member of the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Lee has served with great skill in developing policy during an unprecedented period of growth in the size and scope of Federal health programs.

Now Dr. Lee will have direct charge of two of the Department's major health programs, the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration, as well as of the health activities of the other agencies within the Department.

We can confidently expect that these programs will enjoy an added measure of effectiveness under Dr. Lee's supervision and, what is more important, that they will be forged into a strong and effective unit to deal with the pressing health problems that now confront this Nation.

Dr. Lee is to be congratulated. But it is the Nation that has gained.

USE OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES OF THE SCHOOLS DURING THE HOT SUMMER MONTHS

Mr. McCULLOCH. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, when the members of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders were visiting the riot-torn cities of America, we were surprised that so many of the big city schools failed to use the recreational facilities of the schools during the hot summer months.

It was the conclusions of most, if not all, of the members of the Commission that all recreational facilities of the public schools should be used to capacity for such proper purposes.

In the western part of Montgomery County, Ohio, a number of boys were breaking into the Madison High School gym to play basketball.

Mr. James H. Wooldridge, able superintendent of schools solved the problem swiftly and wisely. He found a way to keep the gym open for 4 hours on Sundays to accommodate the youngsters.

School superintendents, wherever there be such need, should go and do likewise.

The Dayton, Ohio, Daily News carried an editorial on the problem and its solution on Sunday, March 17, 1968.

The editorial follows:

GOOD SOLUTION

Trotwood School Supt. James H. Wooldridge took the right track when he learned that dozens of boys were breaking into the Madison high school gym to play basketball.

He didn't go into a tirade against youthful vandals. He didn't threaten police or school disciplinary action. Instead, he recognized a need. He went to work to find a way to keep the gym open for four hours on Sundays to accommodate the youngsters.

What Trotwood is trying to do for youngsters ought to be considered by communities throughout the Miami Valley. The cost of keeping a gym open a few hours on the week ends—providing supervisory and maintenance service—isn't going to break any school district or government. Better use of school facilities, for recreation or classes, is a goal that should gain in priority.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to incorporate as a part of my remarks the statement by the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Congressman McCULLOCH, my very able colleague on the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, for bringing to the attention of the House the need for better use of school recreational facilities.

It is shameful that such enormous plants as schools, maintained at taxpayers' expense, should remain unused during the summer months, when they could be used to provide young people with wholesome recreation throughout the year at very little cost.

For years, parents and educators have pleaded for year-round use of schools to relieve overcrowded classes. A plea might well be added for year-round use of both indoor and outdoor recreation facilities of schools—particularly during the hot summer months—to help fill the long summer days of the thousands of young city dwellers who have time on their hands.

Better use of school recreation facilities will not, in itself, eliminate the possibility of future riots, but it will help. A teenager playing basketball in a school gym may get more caught up in the game at hand than in the delirium of a riot.

THE OTTO F. OTEPKA CASE

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Otto F. Otepka case, so badly handled by our Department of State through the years, continues to intrigue all of our peoples. Even the excellent and typical Springfield, Mo., Leader-Press continues to portray this story of planned perfidy, malfeasance, and cupidity in mismanagement of our No. 1 appointive Cabinet branch of the bureaucracy. I enclose the article so that all Members may be updated in this "boo-boo" of the Department of State, at all levels:

OTTO F. OTEPKA WON'T GIVE UP

(By Stan Benjamin)

WASHINGTON.—The breaking of a rule, the firing of an employee . . . in other circumstances, the incident might have caused no more than a ripple in the sea of government bureaucracy.

But the case of Otto F. Otepka made waves.

Two years of hearings by a Senate subcommittee, 1,700 pages of testimony, half a dozen battered careers and a flotsam of angry editorials bob in its wake. And it isn't over yet.

Why such turmoil?

In 1948, President Harry S. Truman decreed that loyalty files of government employees "shall not be transmitted or disclosed except as required in the efficient conduct of business" without presidential authorization.

In 1963 the State Department suspended, then fired Otepka, its top security evaluator, for giving classified loyalty documents to Julien G. Sourwine, chief counsel of the Senate internal security subcommittee.

The department charged that his action violated the Truman rule. Otepka claimed it didn't and appealed for reinstatement.

But more was involved than an impersonal legalism.

The subcommittee staged hearings for almost two years, then released 20 volumes of testimony, one at a time.

At last in June, 1967, the department held a closed two-week hearing. In December Secretary of State Dean Rusk reached his decision: Otepka, still on the payroll, would not be fired; but he would be demoted, reprimanded and reassigned.

Seeking full reinstatement, Otepka has appealed to the Civil Service Commission. If that fails, the next step would be to take the appeal to court.

In his own defense, Otepka has said the subcommittee's right to obtain classified information "truly cannot be questioned."

It was more than coincidental that the subcommittee had been investigating State Department security, leaning heavily on testimony from department officers, including Otepka.

The subcommittee reacted quickly and angrily when Otepka was fired.

Called to testify, Rusk said the charges were not in retaliation for Otepka's testimony.

But he added, "I do not believe the subcommittee wishes to permit unauthorized underground relations about which neither you nor I are informed. I am sure you would also agree that your staff should work for you and the department's staff should work for the secretary of state."

Otepka also claimed he submitted the documents in self-defense, saying his boss, John F. Reilly, deputy assistant secretary of state for security, had disparaged his work and integrity in subcommittee testimony.

Again, there was more to it than that.

"Things began to happen to Otto Otepka long before he found himself in a jam because he had crossed swords with his boss," the subcommittee later concluded.

A Civil Service investigator, Otepka, then 38, had joined the State Department as chief of its Division of Evaluations in 1953 and was promoted in 1957 to deputy director of the Office of Security.

In January, 1962, Otepka's job was erased in a staff reduction and he returned to his *old position* as chief of evaluations.

He later wrote that in 1960 and 1961 he reviewed the records of persons "with known character weaknesses, instability, inclinations to appeasement, or leanings toward utopian internationalism instead of solid Americanism . . . my findings laid the foundation for future actions against me because I have trod in hallowed places where no other security officer in the department had dared enter."

Reilly became deputy assistant the following April.

He later testified that he found Otepka obsessed with the setback to his career "to a point where, with respect to that topic, he does not strike me as being a balanced individual."

Otepka had reviewed appointees to an advisory committee and recommended further investigation in one case, Reilly said in April, 1963.

But in May, Reilly expressed doubts "whether I am getting complete and frank advice from him on all matters." Otepka, he said, had suggested a procedural change, then objected to its use.

That's when Otepka handed the subcommittee the three documents—to prove Reilly wrong, he said, about the procedural change and the advisory committee appointments.

It later emerged that Reilly and his aides had tapped Otepka's telephone, searched his desk and rifled his wastebasket. Charges were made that he prepared questions for the subcommittee and cut the classification from some documents, but these were later dropped.

Rusk indicated the "unauthorized underground relations" were harming morale in the security office; Otepka offered another explanation.

Cliques had formed among the evaluators, Otepka wrote; there were "liberals" who thought government employment was "more of a right than a privilege," and they labeled "fairminded evaluators" as "conservatives."

Otepka had "personally recruited" six of his evaluators, he said, and he had irked the "liberals" by giving "more authority to those on whose independent judgments I could rely."

The wiretapping incident turned a harsh spotlight on Reilly and his technical services chief, Elmer D. Hill. At first they denied in testimony that they tapped Otepka's phone; then they said they tapped it but couldn't hear anything; finally, Hill admitted recording conversations.

Thirteen days after Otepka was fired, they resigned.

Of the key security figures in the case, only Otepka is left, doggedly trying to regain desk space in the office which decides who is to be trusted in the making of American foreign policy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of death in the family.

Mr. CORMAN for March 20 and 21, on account of official business.

Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for Wednesday, March 20, and balance of this week, on account of official business.

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. LEGGETT), for Wednesday, March 20, and Thursday, March 21, 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. FEIGHAN, today, for 10 minutes; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUKENS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. WATSON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DORN (at the request of Mr. VANIK) for 60 minutes, Wednesday, March 27, 1968; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances.

Mr. PHILBIN in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUKENS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MESKILL.
Mr. WYDLER.
Mr. WHALEN.
Mr. Bow in five instances.
Mr. HARRISON in two instances.
Mr. BRAY in two instances.
Mr. SCHERLE.
Mr. KLEPPE.
Mr. SCOTT.
Mr. BERRY.
Mr. SHRIVER.
Mr. UTT.
Mr. HALPERN.
Mr. GURNEY.
Mr. KUYKENDALL.
Mr. ESHLEMAN.
Mr. MCCLURE in two instances.
Mr. ROBISON in three instances.
Mr. ASHBROOK.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VANIK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RESNICK.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in two instances.
Mr. PEPPER in three instances.
Mr. CASEY in two instances.
Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico in two instances.
Mrs. MINK in two instances.
Mr. TENZER in five instances.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.
Mr. BOLLING.
Mr. PICKLE in two instances.
Mr. KASTENMEIER.
Mr. BINGHAM.
Mr. DANIELS.
Mrs. KELLY in two instances.
Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.
Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.
Mr. VANIK.
Mr. PATTEN.
Mr. ADDABBO in two instances.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana.
Mr. ROSENTHAL in two instances.
Mr. DORN in two instances.
Mr. GALLAGHER.
Mr. HANLEY.
Mr. FEIGHAN in four instances.
Mr. MCCORMACK.
Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2318. An Act for the relief of Kelley Michele Auerbach.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 21, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1967 TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following report for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85–804:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1968.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is a report to the Congress pursuant to Section 4 of the Act of August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 972), submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives pursuant to Rule XL of that House.

During Calendar Year 1967, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration utilized the authority of the above-cited statute as follows:

1. Extraordinary contractual adjustments authorized by the NASA Contract Adjustment Board:

(a) Under date of April 3, 1967, the Board authorized the adjustment of a contract for technical services with Tec Productions, Inc., Houston, Texas, in the amount of $27,163.57. Relief was granted on the ground that the parties to the contract made a mutual mistake in relying upon an erroneous interpretation of a contract provision regarding holidays and administrative leave.

(b) Under date of June 20, 1967, the Board authorized the adjustment of a contract for the production and delivery of a hydraulic duplicating milling machine with Machinery Sales, Inc., Los Angeles, California, in the

amount of $1,676.00. Relief was granted on the ground that the Contractor made an inadvertent clerical error in adding up a column of figures when computing its fixed price proposal.

(c) Under date of June 28, 1967, the Board authorized the adjustment of a contract for installation of electrical cable and wiring and installation of computer equipment with Chambers and McGregor, Inc., Houston, Texas, in the amount of $1,090.00. Relief was granted on the ground that the parties to the contract made a mutual mistake in failing to include, in the contract price, the correct figures actually negotiated as the fixed fee to be paid to a subcontractor.

(d) Under dates of October 20, 1967, and November 27, 1967, the Board, in two decisions, authorized the adjustment of a contract for the design, fabrication, installation and check-out of a Man-Carrying Motion Generator with Genisco Technology Corporation, Compton, California. The adjustment authorized consisted of an increase in the contract price in the amount of $270,000.00, a reduction in the work required to be performed, and an increase in the allowable progress payments to 95% of the Contractor's total costs incurred under the modified statement of work. Relief was granted on the ground that the parties to the contract were mutually mistaken in relying upon invalid technical assumptions on which the contract specifications were based. As of the date of this report, however, a supplemental agreement implementing the adjustment authorized has not been executed.

2. Actions under Project Stabilization Agreement applicable to construction work at Cape Kennedy, Florida.

Under date of May 20, 1964, the Administrator of NASA made a determination pursuant to the Act of August 28, 1958 (Public Law 85–804), that from and after April 1, 1964, all contracts, or amendments or modifications thereof, for the performance of construction work at the Patrick Air Force Base, Cape Kennedy, and the John F. Kennedy Space Center, should include a clause requiring contractors and all subcontractors thereunder to abide by money provisions of a Project Stabilization Agreement, to the extent such money provisions are determined by the Government to be reasonable. The Project Stabilization Agreement referred to is an agreement negotiated by and between the Patrick Air Force Base Contractor's Association and other local and national associations of contractors, and the Brevard Building and Construction Trades Council of the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO. The purpose of this agreement is to promote stability, efficiency, and economy of performance of contracts involving construction work at Patrick Air Force Base and the Cape Kennedy complex. The agreement was originally negotiated in 1962, and re-negotiated for the period beginning April 1, 1964.

On February 5, 1964, the President's Missile Sites Labor Commission found the money provisions of the revised Project Stabilization Agreement to be reasonable for cost reimbursement purposes and recommended that they be authorized for payment on all Government contracts. The determination under P.L. 85–804 made by the Administrator on May 20, 1964, was in implementation of the foregoing recommendation of the President's Commission. Pursuant to this determination, ten NASA contracts for construction work in the Cape Kennedy area, of a total value of $13,420,830, which were awarded during 1967, included the clause making the money provisions of the above Project Stabilization Agreement applicable. While it is possible that inclusion of the clause resulted in some increase in costs under the contracts involved in an amount not readily determinable, the purpose of the Project Stabilization Agreement is to promote the overall stability, efficiency, and economy in performance of the contracts brought under it.

3. Action under Project Stabilization Agreement applicable to construction work at the Mississippi Test Facility.

Under date of June 22, 1967, the Deputy Administrator of NASA made a determination similar to that described in Paragraph 2 above with respect to contracts and subcontracts for construction work at the Mississippi Test Facility, in implementation of a revised Project Stabilization Agreement dated July 1, 1966, which had been negotiated for that area. (The original Agreement expired on June 30, 1966.) Pursuant to this determination, one amendment to an existing contract for construction work at the Mississippi Test Facility, of a value of $754,979, which was executed in 1967, included the clause making the money provisions of the revised Project Stabilization Agreement applicable. While it is possible that inclusion of the clause resulted in some increase in costs under the contract involved in an amount not readily determinable, it is noted again that the purpose of negotiating a Project Stabilization Agreement is to promote the overall stability, efficiency, and economy in performance of the contracts brought under it.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1673. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting information relative to the dollar's strength abroad and the soundness of the free world monetary system (H. Doc. No. 285); to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers.

1674. A letter from the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, Washington, D.C., transmitting the annual audit of the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 83–662; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1675. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of actions taken by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during calendar year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of 72 Stat. 972; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 16085. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increased rates of disability compensation, improve service-connected benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON (by request):

H.R. 16086. A bill to amend the act of August 25, 1959 (73 Stat. 420), pertaining to the affairs of the Choctaw Tribe of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 16087. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increased rates of disability compensation, improve service-connected benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 16088. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to permit State Governors to disapprove component programs included in community action programs to be carried on in their States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 16089. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 16090. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to provide additional dental care for dependents of active duty members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 16091. A bill to amend section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 16092. A bill to extend for 1 year the authority for more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends, higher reserve requirements, and open market operations in agency issues; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16093. A bill to extend the authority of domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 16094. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to defer law enforcement officers from training and service under such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 16095. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to include, among the health insurance benefits covered under part B thereof, coverage of certain drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 16096. 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 Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 16097. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH (for himself, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. MAYNE, and Mr. GOODLING):

H.R. 16098. A bill to establish the Countryside Development Commission to study the economic problems of rural America; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 16099. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 16100. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to provide for a fair and random system of selecting persons for induction into military service, to provide for the equal application of deferment policies, to authorize an investigation of the feasibility of establishing a volunteer army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 16101. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 16102. A bill to grant taxpayers an optional procedure for the disposition of small claims in the Tax Court, and to increase the compensation of Tax Court commissioners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 16103. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to pay to members of the Armed Forces serving in South Korea special pay for duty subject to hostile fire; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 16104. A bill to amend section 2412(a) of title 28, United States Code, to make the United States liable for court costs and attorney's fees to persons who prevail over the United States in actions arising out of administrative actions of agencies of the executive branch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 16105. A bill to amend the First Morrill Act to permit sums received thereunder to be invested as the State legislatures may prescribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 16106. A bill to define the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and the inferior courts ordained and established by the Congress under article III of the Constitution of the United States in criminal prosecutions involving admissions or confessions of the accused; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 1188. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as Family Reunion Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.J. Res. 1189. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the right to vote of citizens who have attained the age of 18 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.J. Res. 1190. Joint resolution to provide for the exclusion from gross income, under section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, of interest on industrial development bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.J. Res. 1191. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as Family Reunion Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.J. Res. 1192. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the voluntary admission or confession of the accused in a criminal prosecution shall be admissible against him in any court sitting anywhere in the United States, and that the ruling of a trial judge admitting an admission or confession as voluntarily made shall not be reversed or otherwise disturbed by the Supreme Court or any inferior court established by Congress or under its authority if such ruling is supported by competent evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. Con. Res. 724. Concurrent resolution to instruct the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to insist on fulfillment of charter provisions based on self-determination of all peoples, and that the Soviet Union be asked to abide by its U.N. membership obligations concerning colonialism and interference with the sovereignty of other nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 16107. A bill for the relief of Alda Vergano Fracchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 16108. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Basile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16109. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Orlando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 16110. A bill for the relief of Castello Striano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 16111. A bill for the relief of Stephen B. Ema; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 16112. A bill for the relief of James Joseph McCulloch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 16113. A bill for the relief of Bernardine Earlene McSweaney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 16114. A bill for the relief of Tahir Ahmad Rashedi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 16115. A bill for the relief of Angelo Cavallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 16116. A bill for the relief of Diego Zanfei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 16117. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Robert S. Mattox, Jr., U.S. Army Reserve (retired); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 16118. A bill for the relief of Genia Lazari and his wife, Irene Mouradtian Lazari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 16119. A bill for the relief of Antonio J. Ballagas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 16120. A bill for the relief of Erna Maria Deml; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 16121. A bill for the relief of A. C. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Wednesday, March 20, 1968*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Merrill W. Drennan, minister, Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we stand to praise Thee as did the psalmist when he wrote, "O Lord, our Lord, how majestic is Thy name in all the earth."

We invoke Thy divine presence in this Chamber this day, and ask that Thou wilt be gracious unto the Senators who shall here deliberate, unto those who shall sit in committees, and unto the members of the several staffs who assist in the daily procedures of government. Our thoughts reach beyond these hallowed Halls, O God, to pray for the constituents who have placed their trust in these elected officials, and for Thy blessing upon them.

May each of us be faithful to all the high principles we have pledged to uphold, and may Thy spirit guide those who have difficult decisions to make. Help all of us to overcome the temptation to rely on expediency in the solutions to knotty problems, and to be willing to stand for the right because it is right.

Strengthen the weary, our Father; sustain the frustrated; and undergird the despondent. As we move from the bleakness of winter into the freshness of spring, may we remember that as the earth is restored with new life, so we can be revitalized for the days of decision that lie ahead. "O Lord, our Lord, how majestic is Thy name in all the earth."

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 19, 1968, be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 284)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to submit to the Congress the Seventeenth Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1967.

This Report highlights a year of advance in exploring the frontiers of science and in educating the scientists of tomorrow. During fiscal year 1967, the Foundation has:

—Provided $220 million to support scientific research projects in every State of the Union. Some 5,500 scien-

tists carried out this work in colleges and universities.

—Invested $123 million to improve science education at every level from elementary school through the university. These funds provided training for about 38,000 high school teachers, 5,000 elementary school teachers, and 5,000 college instructors.

The Foundation's programs have helped to unearth new information of both scientific and practical importance. For example, we have now:

—Learned more about how genes pass on hereditary characteristics. This knowledge may some day lead to control of diseases and the prevention of inherited defects.

—Neared completion at Cornell University of the world's most powerful circular electron accelerator, an atom smasher that will enable us to advance our understanding of the atom.

—Begun sea grant programs to develop knowledge and to train manpower for developing our marine resources.

—Increased support for the national weather modification program to speed the day when we can reduce losses caused by drought, hail, and violent storms.

—Supported research on a new plastic for possible use as heat shields for re-entry of space vehicles.

The National Science Foundation also continues to increase its support of social science research. A Special Commission on the Social Sciences was established by the National Science Board to provide guidance in this important area.

In my 1967 message to Congress on Health and Education, I directed the National Science Foundation, working with the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to establish an experimental program for developing the educational potential of computers. This has been done through a newly established Office of Computing Activities. The day is not far when these exciting new machines will be contributing to the education of our people.

The Annual Report of the National Science Foundation deserves the attention of the Congress and the American people. It is proof that we are penetrating the unknown, educating new generations of scientists, and making our scientific research yield maximum value.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 20, 1968.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 12073. An act for the relief of John Allunario;

H.R. 15224. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; and

H.R. 15364. An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2318) for the relief of Kelley Michele Auerbach.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries had appointed Mr. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; Mr. LENNON, of North Carolina; and Mr. GROVER, of New York, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, on the part of the House, and that Mr. GARMATZ, of Maryland, is authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries had appointed Mr. DOWNING, of Virginia; Mr. MURPHY, of New York; and Mr. MOSHER, of Ohio, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, and that Mr. GARMATZ, of Maryland, is authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 12073. An act for the relief of John Allunario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15224. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 15364. An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enable the Export-Import Bank of the United States to approve extension of certain loans, guarantees, and insurance in connection with exports from the United States in order to improve the balance of payments and foster the long-term commercial interests of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL CENTER IN WASHINGTON

A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer, conveyance, lease, and improvement of, and construction on, certain property in the District of Columbia, for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States, as sites for governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, March 20, 1968, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 793. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Alabama Space Science Exhibit Commission;

S. 876. An act relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education;

S. 989. An act to provide improved judicial machinery for the selection of Federal juries, and for other purposes;

S. 2318. An act for the relief of Kelley Michele Auerbach;

S. 2336. An act to determine the respective rights and interests of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation and the Yakima Tribes of Indians of the Yakima Reservation and their constituted tribal groups in and to a judgment fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 536. An act to convey certain Chilocco Indian School lands at Chilocco, Okla., to the Cherokee Nation;

H.R. 12555. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of pension, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution calling on the Boy Scouts of America to serve the youth of this Nation as required by their congressional charter.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 3135. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the authorization of appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (Rept. No. 1017).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 3193. A bill for the relief of Vesna Kesic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 3194. A bill for the relief of Maria Dina Giurlani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 3195. A bill to provide for the disposition of unclaimed property in the District of Columbia;

S. 3196. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia," approved February 24, 1914;

S. 3197. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors in the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928;

S. 3198. A bill to authorize the Commis-

sioner of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty;

S. 3199. A bill to prohibit landlords from retaliating against tenants for good-faith complaints of housing violations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 3200. A bill to establish a revolving fund for the development of housing for low- and moderate-income persons and families in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BOGGS):

S. 3201. A bill to protect the public health by extending for 1 year the provisions on research and assistance for State and interstate planning for solid waste disposal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 3202. A bill to prohibit the redemption in gold of dollars for the Government of France while such Government is in arrears in the payment of its obligations to the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 156. Joint resolution authorizing the posthumous promotion of the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to the grade of General of the Armies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3201—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO EXTENSION OF SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, today I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend for another year the provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965. This legislation was an important segment in the President's recent message "To Renew a Nation."

As you know, this message offers proposals to preserve and renew this country's basic resources of land, air, and water. These three resources are indispensable to preserving the most important resource of all—our human resources—since the strength and productivity of the American people are dependent upon water and air which are safe to drink and to breathe, and a safe and healthy environment.

In his message the President pointed out that the millions of tons of rubbish, garbage, and trash this country discards every year "mars the landscape in cities, suburbia, and countryside alike. It breeds disease-carrying insects and rodents, and much of it finds its way into the air and water."

The solid waste disposal program was authorized by the Congress in 1965. Under that authorization the Public Health Service has made grants to 38 States to conduct thorough surveys of municipal solid waste disposal practices and problems and to develop comprehensive State plans. Demonstration projects have been started in 61 communities throughout the Nation to test new methods of disposing of solid wastes in a manner which would avoid polluting air and water, and the landscape. In some instances, these projects are also exploring how metals and other materials can be salvaged for further use. In others, the objective has been to attain these goals and also to reduce the very high costs which are characteristic of the outmoded and unsanitary methods which are now in wide use.

This year the President has asked for a simple, 1-year extension of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, coupled with "a comprehensive review of current solid waste disposal technology." The review would be directed toward a reduction in the "present high costs of solid waste disposal" and strengthened "government-wide research and development in this field."

One of the President's objectives is "to convert waste economically into useful materials."

I share the President's objectives on this program. Up to this point, most of our attention has been directed at improving the techniques of getting rid of solid wastes—that is, to remove them from places where they are offensive and dangerous to the health of communities by incineration and by burial.

Neither technique is particularly satisfactory in the long run. Both contribute to pollution, and neither takes advantage of the resources contained in the solid waste.

A number of proposals have been made for recovery of organic materials, metals and other ingredients of solid waste which can be reused. There have been promising breakthroughs in technology which could make it possible to turn waste recovery into a profitmaking enterprise rather than a continuation of environmental damage.

For these reasons, I think it is time for us to take stock of our solid waste program and to determine how best to encourage a program of waste management rather than waste "disposal."

Mr. President, I am convinced we must find better ways of coping with the garbage, junk, and trash that deface our streets, our roadsides, and the countryside wherever we look. I believe we should give expeditious consideration to this requested 1-year extension.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3201) to protect the public health by extending for 1 year the provisions on research and assistance for State and interstate planning for solid waste disposal, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. BOGGS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXCISE TAX RATES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 637

Mr. JAVITS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 15414) to continue the existing excise tax rates on communication services and on automobiles, and to apply more generally the provisions relating to payments of estimated tax by corporations, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendments when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 638

Mr. ANDERSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the resolution (S. Res. 266) to provide standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. ANDERSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 639

Mr. PELL submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate Resolution 266, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 640

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate Resolution 266, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 20, 1968, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 793. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Alabama Space Science Exhibit Commission;

S. 876. An act relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education;

S. 989. An act to provide improved judicial machinery for the selection of Federal juries, and for other purposes;

S. 2318. An act for the relief of Kelley Michele Auerbach;

S. 2336. An act to determine the respective rights and interests of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation and the Yakima Tribes of Indians of the Yakima Reservation and their constituted tribal groups in and to a judgment fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution calling on the Boy Scouts of America to serve the youth of this Nation as required by their congressional charter.

RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF OTTO KERNER, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the public hearing scheduled on the nomination of Otto Kerner, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge, seventh circuit, vice Win G. Knoch, retired, for Tuesday, March 26, 1968, has been rescheduled for Thursday, March 28, 1968, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and myself, as chairman.

HEARINGS TO RESUME ON HEALTH SCIENCE COMMISSION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would like to call attention to the resumption of hearings tomorrow on Senate Joint Resolution 145, for the creation of a Commission on Health Science and Society.

Mr. President, the 2 days of hearings held so far have uncovered a tremendous information gap concerning the needs of biomedical researchers who are working to bring about technological advances that can save lives and improve the physical and mental health of Americans.

That fact alone justifies the hearings, and makes an overpowering case for the establishment of the Commission.

I am shocked by the absence of public understanding of the work now being done in such areas as organ transplants, genetic intervention, and behavior control. Many Americans do not know what is going on in these fields. We do not know how many lives could be saved with existing technology if more money became available. We do not know how much faster progress could be if there were adequate support for this research and its application.

The witnesses of the first 2 days represented a chorus of agreement on the need for greater public awareness. They told us clearly and directly that there is much to be gained, much to be done, and too little committed in the research battle to improve the physical and mental health of Americans.

In testimony before the subcommittee the first day of the hearings, I made two points that bear restatement.

The first is my conviction about the necessity for the Commission. The development of health science is much like the history of atomic energy. Its implications for society are just as problematic. The line between good and evil is fine. Society as well as science is determining the balance.

Social institutions and attitudes seem always to be running to catch up with technology. It was true with atomic energy. It is true now of health. The questions for this Nation are real. Must we stumble into the future of health science the way we blundered into the bomb? Or can we begin to close the gap between ethics, institutions, and research findings?

The Commission I propose might not answer these questions. There may not be any final answers. But it would inaugurate the public debate it will take to move us toward consensus.

The second point I wish to restate has to do with the excitement and importance of hearings themselves. The hearings are history in the making; each day gives new evidence of the complex social and ethical implications of biomedical advance that demand the creation of a Commission. The statements and discussion will become a basic text not only for Congressmen called upon to decide on the legislation at hand, but for every American interested in the current and prospective state of science and society.

The intent of the hearings is to explore alternatives for the Commission in terms of structure, function, and membership. The primary task is the development of a meaningful agenda.

It is a tribute to the participants and to the Congress that so many of the finest minds in the country have been willing and eager to participate in this discussion.

I think it is fair to say that seldom, if ever, has a more distinguished group of witnesses been gathered to testify.

Already we have heard from two of the recent headline-makers in heart transplantation, Dr. Barnard and Dr. Kantrowitz. We also have heard from Dr. Arthur Kornberg, whose DNA discoveries are well known. In addition, others in the field of medicine and genetics have brought important perspective to our discussions.

My concerns in calling for the Commission have been the social, ethical, and institutional implications of health science research. Thus, in coming days, we shall hear not only from representatives of the medical and scientific community, but also from the theologians, lawyers, scientists, industry representatives, and public officials, who can bring different insights to the issues at hand.

Our hearings so far have enriched the subcommittee's knowledge of the issues and difficulties involved. But they have also created some doubts about the Commission which are unfounded.

In the interest of correctly informing the Senate and the public on two matters of concern, I would like to clarify the nature of my proposal and the response we have had so far.

Senate Joint Resolution 145 proposes the creation of a Commission on Health Science and Society to study and evaluate scientific research in medicine. The Commission would be instructed to analyze and evaluate the public and private national effort and public attitudes about health research; to make an assessment and evaluation of the legal, social, and political implications of such research; and to report to the President and Congress its findings and recommendations.

In the explanatory remarks made so far, I have emphasized that my goal is not to restrict the province of research, but to expand it. The Commission would be concerned not with private decisions, but with public policy issues. This is not a Commission to regulate surgeons and make medical decisions. It is a Commission to analyze the national effort in biomedicine and technology; to examine priorities; to explore the moral, ethical, and social questions that arise when this powerful technology becomes available.

Most who have read the proposal have seen it as I have; a crucial piece of preventive medicine for a society that need not wait for a medical Manhattanville. Over 150 deans of medicine, law, theology, social science, and public figures have stated their support for the idea. This support was echoed directly in the testimony of Drs. Najarian, Kantrowitz, and Beecher, following strong statements in letters they had sent earlier.

Dr. Najarian said:

> Today, the medical profession stands on firmer, scientific grounds . . . [It] should remove the "mystique" that surrounds the practice of medicine, and participate vigorously in methods of obtaining better public information so that an aroused and informed public can have the best health care available.

He sees the Commission as a "vital moving force in communication between the various Government agencies, and the legislative and executive branches of government so that priorities can be assessed, and that specific application of such reports as the Gottschalk report can be accomplished."

Dr. Kantrowitz supported the Commission idea as he had in a previous letter. Concerned about the instant reporting of the heart transplant operation, he suggested particularly that the Commission explore "the possibility of balancing the interests of scientific workers and of the communications media, so that the ultimate interests of the public may best be served."

Dr. Beecher concluded a brilliant statement with the following comment:

> The establishment of such a Presidential Commission is of great importance. It would go far to reassure the public and be a source of stimulation to the scientific community.

Other witnesses have responded in terms of their own conceptions of what the Commission would do.

Some have made suggestions. Dr. Lederberg, for example, thought that the charge to the Commission should be made more specific, and that it should not include the making of substantive prescriptions after 1 year's study. My approach, as I stated in my introductory remarks at the hearing, would be to use the hearings to assess the possible issues, and to include a suggested specific agenda as part of the report of the subcommittee.

I would like to pay a special tribute to Dr. Lederberg. As evidence of his concern for the issues at hand, Dr. Lederberg, whose testimony was cut short because of time, has asked to return to testify March 28. I look forward to his testimony and to that of the other geneticists and psychologists.

Two of the witnesses apparently had some misunderstandings of the proposal. Dr. Barnard, for example, came here with the misconception that this Commission would regulate surgeons and make medical decisions. That is not the purpose of the resolution, and I agree that it should not be a function of this Commission.

Nowhere in the language of the resolution, in the statements I have made, or in the letters I have sent out is the word "control" mentioned.

There is an obvious distinction, between recommendation on the one hand, and regulation on the other. The Commission on Health Science and Society would discuss and propose. It would not duplicate the work of Government agencies and professional societies in controlling abuse.

A number of articles have been written, and I have received a number of letters since the first set of hearings commenting on the Commission and on Dr. Barnard's testimony. Just as I requested that earlier opinions be included in the RECORD, so, too, I ask unanimous consent for the inclusion of this later commentary in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1).

Mr. MONDALE. I wish to stress now what will be clear to all those who read the record of Dr. Barnard's testimony later.

When I asked Dr. Barnard about public policy issues, he agreed that perhaps a Commission might handle very well such topics as conditions under which hearts should be made available, rights of donors, possible expansion of governmental research expenditures, and general availability of lifesaving operations.

He went on to make the distinction between public discussion, and regulation of individuals I too would make:

> I think we must distinguish between what this commission is going to do . . . Is this commission going to decide on . . . how the various transplant teams should handle a medical problem? . . . If you ask me whether I think a commission should be necessary for that, I would disagree. But if you think that one should have a commission to decide whether money should be poured into research because we now have these new techniques and this may need more money, and aspects like that, I would agree that there you need a commission.

Furthermore, although not mentioned in any of the letters, I think it important to make one further clarification about Dr. Barnard's testimony. Dr. Barnard did state:

> Commissions set up to *decide* on various medical advances . . . have hampered the progress of medicine.

He did not say in every case, but in "nearly" every case. Further, he explained why:

> Because they were not qualified to deal with the various aspects.

He did not condemn the kind of commission proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 145, which, like the President's Advisory Commission on Riots and Civil Disorders and that on Health Manpower, would be composed of the most qualified individuals in the Nation, and would discuss and recommend, not regulate.

Mr. President, organ transplants are only one of the advances the Commission should study. The crucial questions of genetic intervention and behavior control should be major concerns of the Commission because they involve shaping the human being of the future in our society.

The public interest and discussion, and mutual education which I foresaw as being the outcome of the Commission report have already begun. It is a tribute to the participants and the Congress that so many of the finest minds in the country have been willing and eager to participate. We have had to schedule 8 days of hearings to accommodate those specialists in medicine, science, law, social science, theology, and public policy who could make contributions to our deliberations and wanted to do so.

The hearings are a fascinating miniature of the future debates of the Commission. I am convinced they will lead to the formation of the Commission, and to a furtherance of biomedical and social advance.

I would commend the hearings to the press and to the public, as well as to Congressmen and Senators with interests in this area.

(EXHIBIT 1)

NAIVE HOWLS ON MEDICAL RESEARCH

(By Judith Randal)

Judging by the way the coffers of the American Heart Association have swelled since the first human heart transplants, nothing but good flows from the public understanding of medical research. Yet when it was suggested the other day that the rapid pace of medical progress calls for a public study of the long-range implications, howls of protest went up from the scientific world.

The occasion was a two-day hearing before a Senate subcommittee considering the advisability of a national commission to study the ethical, moral, legal and social problems posed not only by organ transplants and other medical advances, but also by the findings of scientists who are learning to control the life processes of the cell.

As envisioned by Sen. Walter F. Mondale, D-Minn., who originated the idea, the commission would consist of sophisticated people—some, if not all of them, scientists—who by getting the issues out into the open would actually broaden the public mandate for research support.

Many of the scientist witnesses at the hearing, however, seemed unable to see it that way. In their view, the only good commission would be one whose sole function would be to agitate for more money for research. Dr. Christian Barnard, the South African who performed the first heart transplant and whose second patient is now the only survivor of the six who have undergone the surgery, said so in so many words.

Barnard saw no reason either why, despite the fact that taxpayers now foot the bill for medical research to the tune of $800 million a year, anyone but doctors should have a voice in deciding how the benefits will be applied. "Operate on the patient who needs it most," he told senators, seeming to forget that with at least 80,000 Americans annually potential candidates for heart transplants, there would not be enough surgeons to go around—even assuming the procedure was perfected and replacement organs abundantly available. What about the cost, which the National Institutes of Health now pegs at about $75,000 per operation? In time, said Barnard, this will surely drop.

Barnard is probably correct in this prediction; the key question is by how much. In any case, his other assumptions are, to put it charitably, naive.

On the battlefield or in disaster areas when there are more casualties than doctors can deal with, they concentrate not on the sickest, but on those they can help the most. This is called "triage," and it is a perfectly respectable practice under certain conditions not usually encountered in peacetime. But when the demand for medical services exceeds the supply, similarly practical criteria can operate in routine civilian life.

With some notable exceptions, the deciding factor in the United States has been ability to pay. As long as most medical advances were privately financed, within reach of most people's budgets and within the competence of most physicians, the system was acceptable, if not ideal. But this situation no longer obtains.

Already it is estimated, for instance, that of the 7,000 or more Americans each year who could be rehabilitated by a transplanted or artificial kidney, 90 percent are allowed to die because of lack of personnel, facilities or funds. This is just one example. There are others and, as the heart transplants so vividly illustrate, more are coming along. Almost all these developments are occurring with government support.

Surgery and organ-assist devices, moreover, are only the beginning. Molecular biology and genetics may seem esoteric, but hidden in them is virtually certain mastery of aging, cancer and chronic diseases. These developments will raise problems of a magnitude no society has faced before.

Traditionally, science has always functioned in a social vacuum. But how long it can afford this luxury is anybody's guess.

For the moment, health research and its support are the darling of the public and shine with a luster that few would dare try to dim. It seems safe to say, however, that if scientists insist on being a law unto themselves and explaining themselves only to one another, eventual retaliation will be both swift and sure. And the scientist will not suffer alone.

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF RELIGION,

Waco, Tex., March 12, 1968.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I have followed with interest the proceedings of the Senate Government Research subcommittee. The social and moral problems created by the rapid advances in our technology (medical and otherwise) have been an area of special interest for me for several years. I have appreciated the interest which you have demonstrated in this area.

My immediate purpose for writing is to comment on the reports of the committee proceedings of last Thursday, March 8. The opinions expressed in the testimonies of Drs. Barnard, Kornberg and Lederberg are understandable but in my opinion mistaken. It is natural for any persons seriously dedicated to a specialized task to view the participation of any "outsiders" to be at best an inconvenience and at worst an insult. This bashfulness has been demonstrated by almost every specialized group in society—ministers, educators, realtors, physicians, etc.

There are several considerations which indictate that this all too natural reaction is inappropriate in the context of the rapid technical and social advances our society is making today. First, there is the long-recognized fact that all of us need to be checked by the opinions and actions of others. The political structures of our land are based on the "balance of powers" doctrine which acknowledges that no political group can safely go unchecked by other political powers and the powers of the public at large. This insight into human nature must be applied to groups other than political. Therefore, as a society we cannot allow any group, however competent or sincere, to create a closed community impervious to the opinions and wisdom of the rest of society. This is especially true when the matters being decided are of vital concern to the society as a whole, such as is the case with matters of health.

Second, the growing specialization of our society makes it imperative that there be a sharing of ideas across the lines of specialization. Otherwise our decisions become more and more provincial because we assume that the insights of our own speciality are the only ones worth considering. In the matter of medical treatment the physician must acknowledge that there are legal and moral issues involved which can be clarified by the insights of those who are specialists in these areas.

The growing specialization which is a part of our modern life demands that we become more interdependent and thereby get a full view of every issue. The alternative is to let our specialization drive us apart and fragment society with each segment growing increasingly provincial.

Third, the rapid advances being made in medical as well as other forms of technology require that we handle the social consequences of these advances in a more formal way than in the past. Formerly when technical advances were relatively slow, there was time for society to informally adjust to mores and value judgments to meet the social problems created by technological changes. Today one of the major changes which we must make in our social thinking is to acknowledge that we no longer have

the time for such leisurely and informal social adjustments. There must be deliberate planning if our social and political behavior is to keep pace with technical change. The kind of commission which you have proposed would provide such planning. When we understand the role of such a commission to be that of aiding society in its social adjustments then it becomes self-evident that members of the commission should represent the opinions of those other than just the technical specialists (who in this case are physicians).

A final consideration is the function of this commission assumed by physicians. Apparently they see the commission as serving only to restrict them in their research and practice. I feel that in the long run the opposite would be the case. To be sure, such a commission might advise caution regarding some procedures. Any limitation at this point would be very small when compared with the limitations which can be imposed on the physician's work by public fear and misunderstanding. We have already seen evidence of such restrictive fear in the reports of persons who have been unwilling to accept transplants and those who have been unwilling to donate or allow their relatives to donate an organ for transportation. Much of this reluctance would be alleviated by the public's knowing that all procedures would be done according to the findings of a broadly based public commission. In the long run, public confidence and support will be crucial for these kinds of medical advances. Such a commission would contribute to this confidence and thus to medical progress.

I might add in closing that I have heard of committees which have been set up in medical centers to deal with the kinds of social and moral issues under discussion here and they have in no way hindered progress. I am most familiar with the work of a committee at Duke University medical center which advises the staff on matters having to do with human experimentation at the center.

I wish you well in your efforts regarding this crucial issue and hope that success will mark your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL B. MCGEE,
Associate Professor of Christian Ethics.

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE TWIN CITIES,
New Brighton, Minn., March 9, 1968.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The morning Tribune today prompts a long-overdue letter of thanks to you on two counts.

First, we thank you for your creative and needed call for a national commission on health science and society. In my day-by-day work in the ethics field, I become increasingly convinced of the need for careful, cross-disciplinary, social reflection upon these issues of technological advance so that guide lines may be evolved that benefit the whole of society. Dr. Barnard's testimony, as reported in the morning paper, seems quite specious to me. His reasoning that such a commission involving "unqualified outsiders" and being "an insult to doctors" appears to be based upon a serious misunderstanding of the nature of the ethical reflection that is sorely needed in this area. In short, I am delighted by your proposal, and I deeply hope that it may become a reality in the near future.

Cordially,

JAMES B. NELSON.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
Old Senate Office Bulding,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: In our local newspaper, March 9, 1968, there was an article regarding the possibility of creating a Commission to investigate ethical and moral implications of heart transplants, etc.

In the article, Dr. Christiaan Barnard stated that the proposed federal study of the moral implications would be "an insult to your doctors." He also said that *doctors have always decided such questions as who should live or die.* Horrors!

Senator Mondale, I worked in a hospital surgical unit for several years and I saw some things that were immoral and unethical although these doctors were never taken to task.

I saw one patient, for example, who had died on the operating table during heart surgery. She was wheeled from the operating suite and parked in front of my office. Her mouth and eyes were gaping wide open *expressing terror* or *horror.* She lay there for 20 min. dead, but the last minutes of her life were clearly outlined in her face.

These men that we tend to place on a pedestal and whom we respect are, in many ways, obscuring from exposure, *compulsive, impulsive, unlawful,* as well as in cost cases very, very immoral acts. Their high degree of education does not seem to have made much difference in a few things I observed.

I can only say that I hope God or an unseen power will help naive people who wind up in the hand of Dr. Christiaan Barnard and men like him.

There are moral and ethical questions and those ghosts that Dr. Barnard denied *are* real.

Very Sincerely,

Mrs. BOCHARD.

P.S. I am sure there are other people in the medical field who feel as I do. I think there are dedicated men in this field, but they are very human.

I wanted also to say that in a couple of instances I have seen doctors want to go ahead with an operation without proper papers signed, and it was only the head nurse who stopped this action with an argument. I saw this happen in two different hospitals thousands of miles apart, different doctors, but all seemingly respected and trusted.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
March 9, 1968.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I am writing to voice my support for your proposal for a national commission to study the,—"legal, social and ethical issues that accompany Transplant operations,"—etc.

If the story as reported in The Minneapolis Tribune is in essence true, Dr. Barnard's remarks that such a commission would be,—"an insult to doctors", and would bring in,—"unqualified outsiders," are deplorable.

In my opinion, such remarks constitute further evidence that such a commission is needed.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. WEIGENT, M.D.,
Pathologist, VA Hospital.

PATIENTS' AID SOCIETY, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 12, 1968.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: May I commend you on your proposed bill to establish a group of legal, medical and theological authorities to decide who would get heart and other transplants. Had I known of these public hearings on your bill, I certainly would have appeared before your committee to deliver a statement.

I certainly don't think the decisions of human transplants should be left entirely to the doctors to decide anymore than a declaration of war should be left entirely to the generals.

I am enclosing one of our pamphlets to tell you more about the aims and purposes of our organization together with some additional material that I believe will be of interest.

Kindly send me a copy of your proposed bill and let me know if you'd like some additional material on the subject of human transplants and experimentation.

Very truly yours,

JAMES F. DONNELLY,
President.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
New York, N.Y., March 11, 1968.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I have followed with great interest your proposal for the establishment of a Commission on Health Science and Society and has noted the reactions to your plan in the March 6 edition of the Congressional Record.

You may be glad to know that the Episcopal Church has officially concerned itself with the matters relating to your proposal, both in its resolution on scientific and medical technology at the 1967 General Convention of the Church, and at the February 1968 meeting of the Executive Council at which the enclosed resolution was passed unanimously. I shall undoubtedly be deeply involved with these questions in the light of our Church's action.

Please accept my very best wishes to you in your continued efforts in this field.

Sincerely yours,

The Rev. KENNETH W. MANN, Ph. D.,
Executive Secretary, Division of Pastoral Services.

RESOLUTION

At the meeting of the Executive Council held February 20–22, 1968, at Seabury House, Greenwich, Conn., the following Resolution was adopted:

Whereas, New developments in medical technology, high-lighted by heart-transplants, and certain other "radical" surgical procedures, have given greater urgency to ethical questions relating to the rights and welfare of persons and the well-being of society, involving such possibilities as

Premature public anticipation of imminent cures,

Unrealistic hopes in the minds of affected individuals,

Undefined criteria for choosing patient-recipients of costly and rare operations,

Inadequate safeguards against undue influence upon the perspectives and decisions of recipients, donors, and their families, and

The problem of ascertaining beyond all reasonable possibility of error the appropriately defined death of a potential donor, and of taking every appropriate measure to sustain life; And

Whereas, Many members of the medical and scientific professions are deeply concerned with the gravity of these questions and are attempting to develop appropriate professional and public standards and policies in dealing with them; Therefore be it

Resolved, That, impressed with the urgency of prompt response to these issues, the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church call upon the members of this Church, other religious bodies, and other men of goodwill to join in urging that the medical and scientific professions exercise concerted leadership and the greatest caution in human experimentation and the application of such new techniques; And be it further

Resolved, That the appropriate staff persons of the Executive Council be, and they are hereby instructed to enter into consultations with respresentative standard- and policy-setting bodies of the medical and scientific professions in surgical procedures, and during the course of such consultations,

to stress the necessity of making use of advice on the related moral and ethical principles involved in reaching their conclusions upon all such policies and standards; And be it further

Resolved, That the Executive Council requests its staff to bring to the Council, as early as possible, recommendations for implementing the Resolution of the 1967 General Convention, which instructed the Executive Council "to carry out a study, with the aid of physicians, scientists, and clergymen, of the moral issues raised, and likely to be raised, by present and prospective advances in scientific and medical technology, and report the results thereof to the 63rd General Convention, through the Joint Commission of The Church in Human Affairs."

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
Palo Alto, Calif. March 11, 1968.

Senator WALTER MONDALE
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONDALE: I was pleased to have the opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee and am grateful for the benefit to me of exchanging views with you and Senator Ribicoff. As you recall from the testimony that I gave, my objections to S. J. Res. 145 focused on its broad application to basic scientific and health-science-related research. I was not asked and failed to volunteer my opinions about applied human research such as that involving organ transplans. From this, unfortunately, the local press and some others have gained the impression that I oppose all objectives of the resolution. It was made clearer in the exchange of views on the Issues and Answers program filmed Friday afternoon that Dr. Lederberg and I, in contrast to Dr. Barnard, do not oppose the formulation of guidelines to cope with the legal, social and ethical implications involved in research with patients. I imagine that my colleagues who are doing research with patients and are beset by these problems in their work might be helped by guidelines formulated by groups of medical experts. We would hope that such groups organized and sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences or the major professional organizations would do this work promptly.

We know that research with patients inevitably entails some risks. But research is the lifeline of medicine! Although I have a great deal of confidence in the wisdom and concern of the great majority of our medical researchers I believe they would still welcome guidelines that would protect us all from the indiscretions of a few. Such guidance would facilitate medical research and patient care and avoid damaging and unjustified criticism.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR KORNBERG.

AN AFRICAN REPORT

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, Mr. George J. Volger, who is president and general manager of Station KWPC in Muscatine, Iowa, believes in on-the-ground inspection of the areas about which he reports over his radio station; and he has made, and no doubt will continue to make, repeated and extensive trips to various parts of the world.

Last fall, he completed a visit of approximately 4 months to the southern part of Africa in order to examine the conditions there, so that he might report over his station the findings he made.

Mr. Volger is an objective reporter. I do not believe he has a preconceived point of view. He undertakes to find out the truth about the areas which he visits and to report factually.

He has compiled a so-called African report as of December 1967, from which he has used excerpts from time to time in his radio programs. He sent me a copy of this report some time ago, and I was so impressed with his findings, especially about South Africa, Rhodesia, Southwest Africa, Zambia, and some of the other countries along the Atlantic side of Africa, in the southern portion, that I asked his consent to place this compilation of notes—that is what it amounts to—in the RECORD.

I urge every Senator to read this report, not from an emotional standpoint but from a factual standpoint; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AN AFRICAN REPORT, DECEMBER 1967

(By George J. Volger, Radio Station KWPC, Muscatine, Iowa)

On Saturday, February 4th, 1967, at 0800, the *USS Franklin D. Roosevelt* was scheduled to fire a national salute one mile north of the breakwater of Cape Town Harbor, Republic of South Africa. At 0810 the great US aircraft carrier was to enter the harbor, with the Landstem Drum Majorettes of Cape Town to welcome the ship as it came to quay side at 0840.

In a detailed 18-page program, the U.S. Embassy had set out, in cooperation with the South African government officials, a four day visit by officers and men of the ship. The U.S. Ambassador, William M. Rountree, foresaw the visit as an important step in working more closely with the South African government and people. He had received good cooperation from the new Prime Minister of South Africa, B. J. Vorster, who had taken over those reins following the assassination of Dr. H. F. Verwoerd. South Africans of all racial backgrounds had worked on the preparations. At the U.S. Embassy I saw stacks of letters from South Africans who had offered their homes to these Navy men from the United States.

To aid in greeting the U.S. servicemen, South Africans had driven and flown from as far away as Johannesburg, a thousand miles to the east.—But the landing never took place. . . . At the last moment, even while thousands crowded the docking area, frantic instructions from Washington cancelled the visit—due to the Republic's racial policy. A U.S. Senator, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, described our country's action as the "height of what amounts to stupidity". It appeared to me that our handling succeeded in offending practically everyone.

In Cape Town, a few weeks after this episode, I learned at the U.S. Embassy that over a half-dozen U.S. Navy ships in the previous year, with their white and negro crew members, had visited Cape Town, with no difficulties whatsoever resulting.

And now, a few months later, while I am writing this report, I learn (from a South African Rotary Club Bulletin) that once again U.S. Navy ships are docking at Cape Town. Have the White House and State Department once again shifted policy?

The cancellation of the aircraft carrier visit—planned basically for needed ship repairs, not a social stop—was due to last minute political pressures being applied at the White House and Navy offices in Washington. However, to wait until the final moments, made the U.S.A. appear weak and undecided. To make the situation even worse, the U.S. Ambassador in Cape Town, after weeks of preparation, was not advised of the cancellation until the last moment. It placed him in more than an embarrassing situation. It was quite obvious that U.S. policy could be based on last-minute localized pressures from Congressmen and others seeking political "merit badges", rather than the knowledgeable judgment of a well-trained diplomat such as Ambassador Rountree.—And now, with the news that the ground rules regarding South African visits by the U.S. Navy have been revised once again, any interested observer can't help but ask, "Just who is writing the rule book—and how many policy variations can be expected?" Inconsistency certainly doesn't breed confidence.

In the many changing hues of the international political scene, the story of the *USS Franklin D. Roosevelt* may not carry much weight for future historians. Unfortunately, it is indicative of U.S. actions to too great a degree. In almost four months of travel in Africa, visiting widely with hundreds of people in countries of the southern part of the continent, I return with much concern about the stand of the U.S.—in policy statement issued from Washington, and on the floors of the United Nations. Not only do I have the feeling of inconsistency, but a lack of realism and objectivity, and a true facing of the facts.

After a stay of some ten days in Cape Town, I rented a car, travelling widely in the Republic of South Africa, visiting towns of all sizes, living on sheep ranches, cattle and tobacco farms, speaking with the so-called "Europeans", Coloured, Bantu or Africans, and Asiatics. Considerable time was spent in Southwest Africa, Zambia, and Rhodesia. And, after boarding a freighter at Luanda, Angola, we had stops at Congo Brazzaville, Gabon, Liberia, and my final stop, Dakar, Senegal.

The purpose of my trip, tape-recorded interviews of wide subject range for radio and educational programs, made it possible for me to meet people who might not be too accessible for the average visitor, or a U.S. government representative. My trip was self-financed—and, although I utilized various African government offices, and such associations as the South African Foundation, I chose my own subject material and contacts.

It is almost impossible for the U.S. citizen to make any considered judgment on the many-sided African situation. Any statement referring in general to "Africa" is questionable, as each country must be discussed in the light of its own specific background and history. The news media have not done commendable work—there is much prejudiced, incomplete, and "loaded" reporting. Such four-hour productions as the recent *Africa* of the ABC television network are guilty of unbalanced and unfair reportorial work. While Gregory Peck intones the extensive educational and health problems of the northern African countries, he proceeds south of the Zambezi River, and completely neglects to relate the marked advancements in schooling, sanitation, agriculture, health, housing, and the superior economic picture of *all* races in the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia.

In *Newsweek* of September 11th, 1967, in a story on the terrorists out of Zambia, the author refers to Rhodesia's "unschooled African villagers". What a descriptive phrase to use when Rhodesia, along with the Republic of South Africa, far outdistances the balance of African countries in educating its millions of non-white residents.

A recent Associated Press story told of the U.S.A. finally paying members of the Chehalis Indian tribe for 832,000 acres of land which had been taken over in 1855. The sale price—less than $1.00 an acre! If a similar story had come out of South Africa, with the "Europeans" paying that amount to the Bantu. I can well imagine the unbalanced treatment the account would receive. (And while our State Department

criticizes the Rhodesians and South Africans for their racial policies, can we really offer our treatment of the American Indian as the proper example for other nations to follow?)

Strongly prejudiced reporting seeps into our school textbooks. In *Getting to Know South Africa*, written by a former New York Times correspondent, Leonard Ingalls, (publisher, Coward-McCann), the opening paragraph reads:

"This is the story of a beautiful land—and a troubled one. The threat of civil war hangs over its city streets and haunts the rolling farmlands."

Not too many months ago, G. Mennen Williams, then Assistant Secretary of State, in charge of African Affairs, voiced his fear of rioting and violence breaking out in Rhodesia and the Republic of South Africa. Following the riotous outbreaks, looting, and murders in Detroit—his home State—plus civic disorders in some one hundred other U. S. cities, Mr. Williams and Mr. Ingalls must now consider their African prognostications in a new light.

As a professional broadcaster, I have over the years admired various news productions of the BBC. When I learned of terrorist-baiting broadcasts from Zambian transmitters, which were controlled by the British, my estimations descended.—And when I learned in Bullawayo, Rhodesia that the BBC had committed the cardinal sin of utilizing film clips of a fire some years ago at the Meikle's Department Store, and editing this into current "terror and riot" coverage, I lost all respect.

When South African sources complained of a Canadian Broadcasting Corporation telecast on South Africa, the photographer, Leon Lamprecht, stated that despite assurances the CBC had altered his original script.

What is it in the Rhodesian-South African situation that motivates normally objective news media to adopt policies and methods which they accuse others of using?

In spite of the widely used terms "terror, oppression, civil war, police state" used in reference to Rhodesia and the Republic of South Africa, the description is simply not true. I travelled hundreds of miles in both countries, talking extensively with whites, Asiatics, Bantu (of African in Rhodesia), many times in very remote areas and experienced no such climate. In contrast, the large majority of the police force in Rhodesia are Africans. But, one has to look rather long and hard to find even these men—the internal Rhodesian situation has simply not demanded such protective approach. (The terrorists crossing the Zambezi, from Zambia, in many cases have been apprehended by black, not white Rhodesians.)

After an extensive study trip in Rhodesia, Rene Wormser, member of the New York bar—Walter Darnell Jacobs, Professor of Political Science at the University of Maryland, and James J. Kilpatrick, editor of the *Richmond News-Leader*—state in the May 1967 issue of the National Review, that . . . ". . . the first of astonishments in Rhodesia is its tranquillity. . . . The present situation is one of utter calm". My observations are in agreement. For us to brand Rhodesia "a threat to world peace" and at the same time apologize to Russia for damaging a ship at Haiphong is ludicrous.

It is not necessary that we agree with all aspects of government policy in South Africa and Rhodesia. I, too, rebelled at some of the aspects of apartheid in South Africa—the separate elevators, post office windows, telephone booths, separate theatrical performances for white and non-white. Some of the most controversial regulations are found in the Group Areas Act, setting up residential segregation of Whites, Indians, Coloureds (mixed racial background), and Bantus, and also a policy of job reservation in some industries, limiting certain responsibilities to whites only.

But, we must, in all honesty, and if we really wish to know the *full* story, investigate and objectively judge what advancements have been and are being made. I believe that our government must level with itself, the American public, and the United Nations. If we do not re-analyze and vary our present course, the United States could find itself in the position of taking up even more aggressive action against possibly the only two African countries which can offer continued growth and solidarity for some years into the future.

As a result of the U.S. sanctions against Rhodesia, our country is in the questionable position of having to secure such material as chrome from Communist Russia rather than Rhodesia—at the same time that the USSR is supplying planes, armament, and other war supplies to North Viet Nam. While the U.S. joins with England in attempting to beat down Rhodesia with sanctions, British ships nonchalantly trade openly with Cuba and the Communists of North Viet Nam. The Rhodesian sanctions have forced more than one U.S. industrialist to deal "under the table" to secure vital ores and materials. One Rhodesian mining executive told me that he had been contacted by U.S. business representatives seeking to purchase certain strategic minerals, but he refused to talk business with them—until U.S. policy was revised.

In Rhodesia, it was quite obvious that the sanctions were certainly not bringing about the financial crisis being described by Britain. Firms sending merchandise to Rhodesia simply route orders via the Republic of South Africa or Mozambique. Rhodesians may pay a little more commission but the "mail comes through." The challenge has motivated Rhodesians to establish over 200 new industries. Housewives told me that in the early days of sanctions such items as safety pins, breakfast cereals, stationery, cosmetics, and paper clips were extremely scarce. These and many other items are now produced in the country. And the Unilateral Declaration of Independence has resulted in Ian Smith's popularity jumping from a 55–60% to almost complete backing. UDI and the resulting sanctions have united Rhodesians as nothing else could have.

And, with all the news concerning Rhodesia, the amount of misinformation is amazing. Contrary to almost general belief, the country has no racial restrictions whatsoever controlling a citizen's voting franchise. The right to vote is based on a scale of education, property ownership, and income, with the scale applying equally to all races. In Rhodesia's 1961 constitution 15 of the 65 seats in Parliament are guaranteed to Africans. (It also sets conditions by which Africans may compete for the other fifty seats.) True, in numbers, this present representation is not in balance racially, but if comparisons are to be made on this basis, how many years will it be in the United States before ten per cent of the Congressional seats are held by Negroes? It took some one hundred years following the Civil War before Negroes secured the post of Mayor in cities with heavy non-white populations.

If the United States plans to initiate a program of criticism against all countries with political-social-racial policies, we have a rather gigantic job. On his next trip to Johannesburg, Senator Robert Kennedy should include Zurich as a stop-over, as the women of Switzerland have yet to secure their right to vote. Australia, highly lauded for its participation in the Viet Nam conflict, has rather effectively controlled racial unrest, for, in its immigration policy, Asiatics and negroes are not allowed "down under". And Liberia, never colonized, founded some 150 years ago by slave families of the U.S.A., a favorite of United States AID programs, and the site for our Voice of America African studios, has a strictly racial policy. In a strong stand for segregation, the Liberian Constitution allows no person without negroid blood to become a citizen—and only a citizen may own land.

We have allowed the racial bickering to place a cloud over the important and basic issues. With the northern African countries (aided by the United States) making an obsession out of South Africa and Rhodesia, the stark and realistic issues of the economic ABC's are put into the background. A hundred resolutions in the United Nations or the OAU against Rhodesia and the Republic of South Africa are not going to aid the agricultural and industrial output, or the pessimistic health and educational picture in Ethiopia, Nigeria, or Liberia.

Not until the northern African countries grow stronger, and show substantial progress of their own, will their criticisms of the "White Africa" have much weight. This is rather dramatically shown by the fact that over a million African workers from other countries have crowded into the Republic of South Africa to work in the expanding industries and mines.

A major factor for workers is the income picture. Excluding South Africa, per capita income averages 95 dollars yearly in African countries, and in some it is down to the 40 dollar area. Bantu earnings in the Republic of South Africa are far higher, and compare not too badly with incomes in some European countries: Monthly figures for Bantu income in South Africa average out at $55.00—Spain, all workers $69.00—Greece, $57.00—and Yugoslavia, $40.00. Annual income per head of population is three times that of Ghana, five times that of Nigeria, and six times that of India. The non-white citizens of South Africa run more motor cars per capita than people in countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Over the past few years, charges of "slave labor" have been levelled at South Africa, especially in connection with the pressures for the United Nations to set a special committee to take over the supervision of South West Africa, the area mandated to South Africa. I visited the main offices of SWANLA (South West Africa Native Labor Association) at Grootfontein, SWA. I am certain that in the past there have been many cases of injustices involved in the Bantu labor procurement. Visiting administration officials, and also speaking with Ovambo workers living in the compound area, I also know that changes have taken place. Contacting of workers, and the setting up of agreements and contracts in relation to period of work and income, is basically similar to the manner in which migrant workers are brought into Iowa to work in the tomato, pickle and sugar beet fields.

I feel that many critics of South Africa and Rhodesia are neglecting to recognize basic difficulties these countries have needed to surmount in building their expanding industry and agriculture—too many critics have explained this success with "cheap labor, plus gold and diamonds." Some industries, such as Buffelsfontein Gold Mine, which I visited outside of Johannesburg, have workers representing over 80 different languages—necessitating the learning of a new language, Fanagulo, for basic communications. And there is the land itself. In the tobacco growing area of Karoi in Rhodesia, land development was not possible until the late 1940's because of the number of lions, along with the tsetse fly. In South West Africa, a farmer, a former British Colonel, and his wife while raising cattle and maize, have had to take time out to shoot forty-one leopards on their arid farm land. A major problem in South Africa is the lack of water, and inconsistent rainfall—the Orange River Project, a 30-year construction plan of dams, weirs and tunnels is now well underway. The 630-million dollar cost, entirely financed in the Republic, will not only give agriculture a great boost but also add 229 megawatts of hydroelectric power.

No matter what varied viewpoints are aired on the African picture, all seem to agree that increased educational levels are a basic necessity for future growth. In spite of strong criticism from other African countries and from the United States, educational figures and results in South Africa and Rhodesia point out that these two countries (without the assistance of U.S. Aid) have done quite well. In South Africa over 70% of the Bantu children in the 7–14 age group are in school. Some 2,000 Bantu are in Universities or Medical School, with some 200 graduating yearly. In Rhodesia, 80% of the children receive a minimum of five years schooling, and members of all races are enrolled at the University College in Salisbury. While the literacy rate among the Bantu in South Africa is approximately 50%, what has happened in Liberia, where over $230 million in U.S. AID have been aimed at raising the whole educational level? An officer of the U.S. Embassy in Monrovia advised me that the literacy rate in Liberia was less than five per cent.

While in Liberia I spent some time with AID personnel, primarily members of the Cornell University and San Francisco State College teams working in the University and grade-high school administration levels. After some 90-man years of work, these U.S.A. educators were not at all enthused in their ability to train Liberians to take over administration and department heads responsibilities. Valuable educational grants, it was rumored, are handled on a patronage basis rather than individual student ability. And evidently many young men who do receive higher educational experience return not to enter that field but become engaged in politically appointed posts. I wondered just how much our "helping hand and heavy purse" had undermined initiative in the Liberians.

In Zambia, another object of AID from this country, a discouraged official at one of the copper mines told me that the Zambian government has issued an order to school officials that all students must be given matriculation degrees, no matter what the calibre of work produced. With school standards sagging, industry has had to take up more and more educational responsibilities.

Propaganda motivated media have been quick to picture and tell of poor living conditions for the non-white. And I saw some of these areas, such as certain sections of Soweto, a Bantu housing sector outside of Johannesburg. But I saw throughout the country thousands of fine middle income apartments and homes also. In some 15 years, South Africa has accomplished the largest housing program in the Southern Hemisphere, with a budget of 438 million dollars. Of this amount, 75% was spent on 164,000 homes for Black Africans. In Rhodesia over the past ten years, just under 90 millions of dollars has been allocated to housing for Africans.

A few weeks ago the world thrilled to the news that a successful heart transplant had been completed in Cape Town. (This was one of the few news stories out of South Africa in recent years that was free, at least initially, of racial overtones when written for U.S. listeners and readers). What a pity that the valuable knowledge and medical experience of these South African physicians will not be more readily accepted by other African countries. Unfortunately, due to the racial bickering, a wealth of experience in South Africa and Rhodesia will not be accepted by the under-developed units. In contrast, a new John F. Kennedy Hospital is now being constructed in Monrovia, Liberia with funds from the U.S.A.—and a Liberian government spokesman has stated unofficially that he shudders to think of the day the hospital will be turned over to his government, as the number of Liberian doctors can be counted on the fingers of one hand, or less.

In South Africa there are over 8,200 doctors and specialists, or one for every 1,800 inhabitants—in Rhodesia, one for every 4,300 persons. In Liberia, there is one for every 40,000 persons, and Ethiopia, one for every 96,000. South Africa has over 40,000 trained and probationer nurses, and of these over 10,000 are non-white. While visiting the Livingston Hospital for the Bantu in Port Elizabeth, S.A., and Mpilo Hospital in Bulawayo, Rhodesia, I was much impressed by training equipment and procedures, and the sense of pride with which the Africans approached their responsibilities.

One rather interesting point, in Bulawayo, Rhodesia, the sophisticated and extremely expensive X-ray and cobalt treatment equipment is located in Mpilo Hospital for Africans, not the hospital for whites. The reason is quite simple; there is much higher frequency of use due to greater number of Africans. Whites requiring treatment go to the African hospital. It is also at Mpilo Hospital where white nurses serve under the direction of African supervisory personnel.

Tribalism, its customs, and the Africans reliance on witchcraft are almost incomprehensible to Westerners. A hospital administrator at Mpilo Hospital, Bulawayo, Rhodesia, stated that African nurses, with training in biology, physics, chemistry would still seek the witch doctor in case of serious accident or illness in their families. In Zambia a higher government official pleads with members of the legislative assembly to cease relying on witchcraft to further their legislative aims. In Bulawayo, Rhodesia, a healthy African worker in a modern tire-recapping plant dies as the result of the "witch doctor" placing a curse on him. Near Windhoek, in South West Africa, a mother, on the command of the tribal chief, took out the eyes of her son, accused of stealing (the court trial of this case was in session in Windhoek when I visited there).

One tribal custom which affects the initiative and accomplishments of a worker is found in most African countries. If a man secured a raise in income, he may find a horde of relatives on his doorstep, and he must take care of them. A U.S. consulting engineer in Monrovia told me of a Liberian worker who pleaded that his employer not divulge the amount of his salary to his parents—he could foresee many unemployed relatives moving under his roof which would pretty well cripple his own personal plans.

Over the centuries Africans have never "voted" as we know of it. Ways of Western democracy (as we have also found in Viet Nam) are foreign to them. Tribal decisions begin with discussions of family heads and kraals chiefs, then a lengthy palaver of councillors before the Tribal Chief makes a decision. This tribal approach has been incorporated, along with a Western method of voting, in the Bantu government of the Transkei, in South Africa.

That the machinery of Western democracy is difficult for the African nationalist to fathom is seen in this analysis which appeared in the *Malawi News*, official organ of the Malawi Nationalist Party on November 26th, 1960:

"For in a typical two-party system, you have two parliamentary factions—one dedicated to 'doing' and another dedicated to 'undoing'. . . . So from its very birth every law proposed and passed by a Government has bitter foes to see to its immediate or ultimate annihilation. It is a system of government with a built-in subversive mechanism. Under it a State works with, and finances, forces of its own destruction . . . (but) Africa must evolve systems that suit her people's attitudes and temperament."

The number of African countries with one-party "democracies" bears out this belief quite strongly.

There are undoubtedly many changes that Americans would like to see in Africa—not only in South Africa and Rhodesia, but in all African countries. But in attempting to motivate these changes, let's not ignore advancements made in Rhodesia and South Africa. At the same time, we need to analyze the situations in other African countries in a more realistic light.

Obsession with racial matters of Rhodesia and South Africa has kept northern African countries from concentrating on their own vast needs for advancement. The United States has not helped by adding more sanity and balance to the problem. Add to that the fact that we need to give the world a better answer in racial problems than what we have displayed up to the present.

Some elements of light can be seen. At an OAU summit meeting at Addis Ababa, President Tubman of Liberia stated the organization would be better employed in putting its own house in order. Recently, Phillip Richardson, the first chargé d'affaires from Malawi to the Republic of South Africa arrived in Pretoria—his aim, "to further the good relations now existing between Malawi and South Africa". And, the *New York Times* has shown that it too can be more realistic in its approach, when C. L. Sulzberger writes (Dec. 15th, 1967), "It is time for the United States to pipe down on South Africa. This country has a race policy which I personally find both abhorrent and absurd. It is also exceedingly arbitrary in applying justice to white opponents, but that is South Africa's affair, not ours. . . . It seems to me we go too far in interpreting the United Nations embargo on South Africa. . . . We would do better to encourage this trend (toward tolerance) and foster South African association with the outer world instead of driving it back into the laager of isolation from which it is just starting to escape."

Even with our vastly more advanced educational system, and our civil rights legislation, the U.S.A. remains highly concerned about approaching another "summer of discontent". If our problems take time, is it not logical to grant the same concession to countries whose racial spectrum is so much more intricate and involved than our own? Rather than a policy of continuing irritation, can't we acknowledge the advancements that have been made in the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia, and find ways to work together on solutions to complex problems which demand a united effort from the best minds of both continents?

RICHARD K. JONES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 454) for the relief of Richard K. Jones. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of March 18, 1968, page 6738, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

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

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The motion was agreed to.

A TIME FOR FISCAL RESTRAINT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in today's Wall Street Journal appears an editorial calling attention to the lack of leadership by the Johnson administration in having exercised the proper fiscal restraint in the face of our continuously mounting deficits.

The editorial cites this lack of fiscal restraint as being responsible for the lack of confidence in the American dollar and places emphasis upon the need for an expenditure reduction and the enactment of a tax increase.

The article very properly compliments Representative MILLS upon the firm stand he has taken in insisting that a realistic expenditure reduction must accompany any increase in taxes.

Pending on the Senate Calendar is a bill the purpose of which is to extend the automobile and telephone excise taxes, which otherwise will expire April 1.

Notice has been served that when this bill is considered by the Senate a determined effort will be made to attach to it an amendment which will:

First. Write into law a mandatory reduction in expenditures for 1969 of at least $8 billion, and

Second. Enact a 10-percent tax increase on both individuals and corporations, the effective date of the corporation tax to be January 1 and the effective date of the individual tax to be April 1.

In the light of the recent run on our gold supply as well as the continuing pressure on the American dollar neither Congress nor the administration has a choice other than to enact such a proposal of fiscal restraint.

Since this bill has a deadline of April first, I strongly recommend that the leadership of the Senate temporarily lay aside the pending business and proceed to the immediate consideration of the tax bill.

The pending business could be laid aside with the clear understanding that as soon as the tax bill has been disposed of, the Senate would automatically revert to the consideration of the measure now before us.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Wall Street Journal, entitled "Provided by Disaster," an editorial that appeared in yesterday's Washington Daily News be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 20, 1968]

PRODDED BY DISASTER

The gold crisis provides another telling example of the type of leadership the nation has come to expect from the Johnson Administration. It proved incapable of seriously attacking the problem until things got so bad an American businessman in Europe found he couldn't cash dollars to buy dinner.

The gold drain, after all, didn't start last week. It has been going on some time now. The actual importance of the problem, now so clear to nearly everyone, contrasts sharply with the low priority assigned to it for many years. Only when total collapse threatened did the Administration accept—if indeed it really has now—the need for painful domestic and international measures to protect the dollar.

To be specific, take the Administration's attitude toward the budget cuts Congress has quite sensibly set as a price for the President's tax increase bill. The week before last, the Administration was stoutly insisting that reductions of any magnitude were impossible. By the end of last week's run on gold, it started talking of appropriations cuts of $8 billion to $9 billion, which would translate into considerably smaller spending cuts in the coming fiscal year. President Johnson proclaimed that "some desirable programs of lesser priority and urgency are going to have to be deferred."

That, though the President naturally didn't say so, is what Representative Wilbur Mills and other key Congressmen have been telling him all along. They have observed that since spending demands on Government are roughly infinite, few things are so permanent as a temporary tax. Thus the leader who says a tax increase is necessary must also present an austere budget.

The Administration's response had consisted of denying the obvious by pleading a bare-bones budget. Subsidies for the supersonic transport, for instance, were increased only to $350 million in fiscal 1969 from $100 million in the current year. If that represents the Administration's notion of austerity in subsidizing business, imagine its standards of austerity concerning the social experiments of which it is so proud.

That particular foolishness may or may not be over, but the Administration's leadership problems are not. The legacy of its past talk even now saps its power to shape events. Despite the crisis, Congressional approval of a budget cut and tax increase package will not come easily. Mr. Mills, for one, is doubtful the newly proposed cuts are enough. Congress has already heard enough talk about austerity; this time it will want to see the color of the money involved.

The most serious mark against the Administration's leadership in the gold crisis, finally, is that everything was so utterly predictable. Ever since the British were forced to devalue the pound, certainly, there have been recurring threats and warnings about a speculative attack on the dollar-gold relationship.

The remedy has been equally clear: Getting the Federal budget closer to balance and clamping down on the wildly inflationary policies of the Federal Reserve Board. If the Administration had at the turn of the year proposed the spending cuts it now endorses, perhaps the crisis would never even have developed. Now that it is in full bloom, though, those same steps may not prove enough.

A single instance of such temporizing leadership is deplorable enough, but with this Administration it seems to have become a habit. Thus the whole record of its Vietnamese war is that of policy being shaped only by response to one crisis after another. In its general economic management, it rebuffed warnings of serious inflation even from the "new economists" until after the warnings had proved all too accurate.

In light of that record, it came as little surprise Monday that our Mr. Janssen reported that many within the Administration saw a "silver lining" in the gold crisis. They are thankful the crisis has arrived, because now it finally may be possible to do what should have been done all along.

That may be a silver lining, but it is also a sickening indictment of their own collective leadership. This Administration, it once again seems, can take the initiative only when prodded by impending disaster.

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 19, 1968]

ENCOURAGING WORD FROM L. B. J.

From President Johnson the word now is—more or less—that he finally is willing to face up to meaningful cuts in Government spending as a means of persuading Congress to pass a tax increase.

In Minneapolis yesterday he said:

"I ask you to join in a program of national austerity to ensure that our economy will prosper and our fiscal position will be sound."

He also said "We will do whatever is required" to meet the needs of our forces in Vietnam.

We have heard these encouraging words before. This time, Mr. Johnson had better mean it. Because by now there is no other choice.

It is not a question of what we want to do. It is a question of what we have to do.

The top Government bankers of the world have moved to curb the speculation in gold. But the bankers' steps, decided on at an emergency session here last week-end, will merely buy time—time in which to stave off real trouble.

Congress has refused to raise taxes because the key men were convinced Mr. Johnson would simply spend more with the extra money. So they have demanded deep cuts in spending. Now, it appears, the President is in the process of agreeing.

A good many people and a good many things will suffer from this.

The people will pay more in taxes. Mr. Johnson's "Great Society" programs will have to be postponed, or reduced, or abandoned. It won't be a happy time for anybody—save LBJ's election-year opponents who will have this much more to talk about.

But if prudence had been prevailing in the Government the last 10 years, the problem would not have arisen. If Mr. Johnson had held down spending and had taken real steps to prevent the excess flow of dollars out of the country when he first came to office, the problem would have gone away.

But it now is too late for any easy way out. More political pussyfooting simply will aggravate the crisis.

The country can survive more taxes and it can survive a severe cutback in "Great Society" schemes. The suffering which would follow a collapse—or even a near collapse—of the international monetary system would be far more widespread and far more painful.

If we do not shore up the dollar, in any case, it will not be possible to do all the things Mr. Johnson has in mind. We can't fight a war with the dollar going to pot. We can't remodel cities, or war on crime, or purify streams or do much of anything else if inflation becomes rampant.

The Senate has before it an excise tax bill. Sen. John J. Williams has an amendment which also would raise the income tax and at the same time whack $8 billion out of the spending. If the Senate and House would adopt this plan promptly, it would go a long way toward alleviating the world trouble in which the dollar now finds itself.

The House and Senate will fail this only at the national peril. LBJ should be up there demanding action on the whole package.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ILLINOIS—TRANSPORTATION HUB

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the greatness of Illinois as a producer of both agricultural and manufactured products is enhanced by its network of highway, rail, air, pipeline, and waterway transportation facilities.

Chicago is the transportation hub of the Nation. Through Chicago, more than through any other gateway, flows a steady movement of goods of all kinds, east and west, north and south. Here are joined the eastern and western railway systems, the Great Lakes and the Mississippi waterway traffic, our vast system of pipelines, the greatest accumulation of motor carriers in the world, and the world's busiest airport.

All communities in Illinois, from metropolitan areas to the smallest farm centers, share equally in the good things of life because of the unparalleled transportation system serving people everywhere.

The Nation's greatness comes in large measure from the fluid movement of goods and people. The State of Illinois has a proud record in the development of transportation of all modes, and will expand its transport leadership as the economy of the State and of the Nation continues to grow.

It is, therefore, most fitting that we salute the dedicated men and women making up our vast transportation systems on the occasion of National Transportation Week, May 12 to 18, 1968.

I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation by the President, designating National Defense Transportation Day and National Transportation Week, 1968, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PROCLAMATION 3834: NATIONAL DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION DAY AND NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK, 1968

(By the President of the United States of America)

One hundred years ago, an American travelling from San Francisco to New York went by ship to Central America, crossed the Isthmus by mule and wagon, and four weeks later arrived at this destination.

One year later, with the completion of our first transcontinental railroad, he could travel in relative comfort from California to New York in ten days.

This revolution in transportation was one of the principal causes and opportunities for the rapid progress of our Nation—the taming of a vast continent with a rapidity which astounded the countries of Europe and continues to amaze historians.

The history of our country cannot be separated from the story of our transportation—nor can its future. We look today to the leaders of our transportation industry for the imagination and enterprise which, in the past, did so much to make our Nation great.

While the Government of the United States must continue to play a key partnership role in the improvement and expansion of our transportation system, basic decisions on investment and operation are made by private industry. This partnership between Government and industry forms one of the most critical elements of our economic system.

This partnership will be called upon in the future to meet even greater challenges than ever before.

To call public attention to the contributions of this great industry—and to the challenges it faces—the Congress, by a joint resolution approved May 16, 1957 (71 Stat. 30), has requested the President to proclaim annually the third Friday of May of each year as National Defense Transportation Day, and by a joint resolution approved May 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 69), has requested the President to proclaim annually the week of May in which that Friday falls as National Transportation Week, as a tribute to the men and women who, night and day, move our goods and our people throughout the land and around the world.

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Friday, May 17, 1968, as National Defense Transportation Day, and the week beginning May 12, 1968, as National Transportation Week.

I urge our people to participate with representatives of the transportation industry, our armed services, and other governmental agencies in the observance of these occasions through appropriate ceremonies.

I also invite the Governors of the States to provide for the observance of National Defense Transportation Day and National Transportation Week in a way that will give the citizens of each community the opportunity to recognize and appreciate fully the vital role our great and modern transportation system plays in their lives and in the defense of the Nation.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this seventh day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-eight, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-second.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

HOW DANGEROUS IS MARIHUANA?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the recent statement by Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, that the use of marihuana among our young people is on a sustained upswing, while that of LSD is decreasing, points up once again the importance of knowing far more than we know now about marihuana and its effects.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, Dr. Yolles reported that surveys made under National Institute of Mental Health grants showed that perhaps 2 million high school and college students have had experience with marihuana, some of them using it only a few times, but others having deeper and more regular experience.

He furthermore revealed the challenging fact that fully 50 percent of the students contacted in the surveys said they had felt no effects whatsoever from the marihuana they had used.

This brings into focus again some of the questions which have been raised about marihuana, and about which I have spoken on this floor before, to wit:

How dangerous is marihuana?

Does it, like alcohol, pose primarily a problem in its use rather than constitute an abuse?

Or is it a drug whose use should be discouraged at all costs—a drug which under certain circumstances and dosages can lead to hallucinations, to a faulty sense of time, to a loss of judgment, to a lack of muscular coordination, and to many other undesirable physical and mental manifestations?

Again, what are the long-term effects of smoking marihuana? Could it induce lung cancer, as we know the smoking of cigarettes made of tobacco can, or can its continued use cause chromosomal changes, as we know can be the case in the use of LSD?

We can only get the hard data to make a full judgment through intensified research, and I was very pleased to note, therefore, that the budget request for drug research for the National Institute of Mental Health—the principal Federal agency sponsoring research in this field—has been increased from $4 million in fiscal 1968 to $4.6 million in fiscal 1969. I would personally favor stepping up the research rate even faster, but I am informed the funds requested are all that can be used to good advantage at this time.

The President's Commission on Crime and the Administration of Justice has heartily recommended that the Government support, stimulate, and if necessary do the research on marihuana that is long overdue.

We should be launching now, today, every type of study which will bring us any of the answers we want on marihuana, since it is usually 2 or 3 years after a project is begun before definitive results are available, and in any study of the effects of long-term use, it will take even longer, of course. We need hard, irrefutable facts immediately because it is all too clear that many of our young people are literally "going to pot."

We have been able to stem to some degree the use of LSD because we can prove it produces both psychological and biological effects which are dangerous. Factual scientific information based on research findings shows that LSD can not only cause severe psychotic reactions, but may also cause chromosomal changes in the cells of the user, and for a woman, in her children. Most of our young people are too hardheaded and practical to take such chances, and as the full effects of the use of LSD have become more widely known, its use has declined.

But we have no such conclusions on marihuana—in fact we have a welter of inconclusive information which does not impress most of our youth in the least. And now the fact that the National Institutes of Mental Health has just told us that about a million young people interviewed in surveys conducted under National Institutes of Mental Health grants say they felt no effects whatsoever from marihuana is certainly not going to discourage its use.

One reason we do not know more about marihuana than we do is that there have not been satisfactory supplies of the product for research. The cannabis plant, from which marihuana is made, grows wild in many places in this country, but it is generally considered as inferior and unwanted. Supplies of a standard product must come from Mexico or overseas. Recently, however, the National Institute of Mental Health has developed a synthetic, called THC, and since it provides a satisfactory product for research, this will ease the supply problem.

A number of programs are now being inaugurated, including investigations of long-range toxicity in animals through biochemical research, and carefully con-

trolled human studies. In addition, the National Institute of Mental Health will expand current programs of social and psychological investigations of marihuana users and has other plans. It is estimated that all these studies will cost approximately $5.25 million over the next 3 years.

The National Institute of Mental Health tells us that it has developed a survey method which it is believed will more accurately assess the prevalence of the use of marihuana in high schools and colleges and a grant proposal for a 5-year study is pending. The "no-effect" findings in the instance of 1 million young marihuana users is suspect for several reasons.

For one, there is serious question about the potency of some of the material used. Alfalfa is sometimes sold for marihuana in cigarettes, as are other similar products. A young person may think he has smoked marihuana, and insist he felt no effects, when actually he may have smoked something else, or have smoked marihuana in a very mild form. The term "marihuana" includes nearly all parts of the cannabis plant, and can range from a relatively mild mixture of leaves and flowers to the more potent pure extract which is known as hashish and which for many years has been used in India and other countries.

Again, the circumstances under which the drug is used may affect the results, as may also the fact that the user may not know what to look for insofar as the effects are concerned. He may not realize that all effects of the so-called happy weed are not happy. It may make him depressed, or physically ill, or it may heighten his perception, and loosen his inhibitions, and do many other things.

What do we know about the effects of marihuana at this time?

We know it can cause a mild euphoria, heightened suggestibility, faulty perception, distortion of time and space, rapid heartbeat, unsteadiness and drowsiness, and can prevent muscular coordination. Think how hazardous some of these could be to a person behind the wheel of a car.

In acute intoxication, especially when marihuana is ingested, we know it can produce hallucinations, pronounced anxiety, paranoid reactions and transient psychosis lasting from 4 to 6 hours.

We also know that a large enough dose can cause a temporary psychosis in almost anybody, and that for some persons a much smaller amount will have the same effect.

Studies of 2,000 addicts at the Public Health Service Clinical Research Center in Lexington, Ky., showed that marihuana was the first step in the progression to heroin for about 60 percent of the addicts, although we have no indication that marihuana is addictive. Instead, we believe it creates a psychological dependence. Its use is high among young people who have psychological problems—people who seek out marihuana as a way of coping with them. It also appeals to people who are seeking a thrill, or something different, or who want to thumb their nose at life.

It leads to use of stronger drugs only in the sense that the taking of one drug leads to an interest in experimenting with another. Studies now underway on drug patterns should help clarify the extent to which the milder drug marihuana does lead to use of more potent and definitely addictive ones.

We must also find out more about the long-term effects of marihuana—can it for example, produce lung cancer, or can it produce any change in the chromosomes, a change which can be passed on from generation to generation, or any other abnormalities.

We need to know these things as soon as possible because all too many of our young people are smoking "reefers" or "sticks" or "weeds" or "pot" or whatever the current name is for marihuana in their locality. Its use is second only to alcohol in escaping reality.

If continued use of marihuana even approaches the harm and heartbreak which comes from the continued use of alcohol to an alcoholic, or if it induces physical ills even half as serious as the lung cancer and emphysema and heart disorders which result from cigarette smoking, then we should be in a position to at least forewarn our young people now, and let them make a decision as to whether they really want to "go to pot" in the light of all of the facts.

HIGH-PRESSURE CREDIT MERCHANTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently the Washington Post concluded its excellent series of articles on high-pressure credit merchants in Washington, D.C. The articles were based upon a study conducted by the Federal Trade Commission.

The articles and the FTC study show that poor families pay substantially more for merchandise and for credit. It is claimed as justification for these high charges, that those who extend credit to the poor incur greater expenses and that the higher charges will compensate for this greater risk. It is also true, however, that many poor families are high pressured into buying merchandise they do not need and cannot afford. The easy credit merchants simply do not wait for the poor to come to them. On the contrary, they employ door-to-door salesmen to persuade the poor and unsuspecting to buy merchandise on credit. This is an extremely wasteful and inefficient system which in effect is subsidized by those families who are able to meet the exorbitant terms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the articles from the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POOR TAX—III: MERCHANT'S VIEW: LET BUYERS BEWARE

(By Robert C. Maynard)

A store, Allen Baverman said, has the right to charge what the traffic will bear so long as the customer knows the full price.

Price, Baverman said, is not important. "People are mainly interested in getting the item."

Baverman is out of the high-credit merchandising business, and he talked to a reporter. Attempts to interview those now in the business were rebuffed.

Baverman operated the Empire Furniture Co., but closed it in 1966 after signing a Federal Trade Commission consent decree to halt deceptive practices.

Now he owns Atlantic Finance Company, 530 7th st. se., which buys conditional sales contracts from high-credit retailers. His interest rate of 16 per cent a year works out, in actuality, to 30 per cent effective annual interest.

He agrees that the poor pay more, that because of their ignorance of the ways of the market they often pay prices that far exceed those paid by middle-class consumers.

But he places the blame for these malpractices on the customer. "The answer is education," he says.

"It's only exploitation if the customer doesn't know what she is being charged." Otherwise, he says, any price that the customer is willing to pay is all right.

"While higher prices are not necessarily exploitative in themselves," says the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, "many merchants in ghetto neighborhoods take advantage of their superior knowledge of credit buying by engaging in various exploitative tactics."

Federal Trade Commission records indicate these are some of the more common methods:

Inducing customers to sign blank contracts.

Obtaining signatures on contracts by telling reluctant customers that they are signing receipts for merchandise left only for "free home trial."

Refusing to disclose the full price of merchandise, telling the customer only how much he must pay each week.

Selling used merchandise, saying it is new.

"It's true," Baverman said. "Those things happened."

They happened at Empire Furniture Co., which he owned.

Baverman says he didn't know they were going on.

"When I found out," he says now, "I stopped them." He did more than that. He closed Empire because he said it wasn't making very much money anyway.

With what was left from Empire, he bought Atlantic, Baverman said.

Because Baverman knows both the credit-merchant side and the finance-company side, he was asked what criticism of the high-credit business he would think legitimate.

Concealing total prices, Baverman said. He would favor a law, just about the only regulation he supports, that would place price tags on all items.

Then he added:

"But they (merchants) would find a way around that by adding on something like insurance or 'repair fee' or something like that."

Short, slightly on the husky side, Baverman is friendly, engaging, intense, and indignant.

Crime in the streets, deadbeats on the Government payroll, the press, legal aid lawyers and people who call credit merchants "exploiters" are among the irritations in the life of Baverman.

And as he becomes indignant, his intensity becomes evident in the nervous working of a panatella cigar; he treats it almost as though it were chewing gum, and he can go through two or three an hour.

"Listen," he says, "as long as the customer knows that the television set is $250, and that more than likely she can get it at another store for less, that's not exploitation. Absolutely not. It's not even exploitation if she can't get it at another store. The other facts are not important; it's her choice to either buy it or leave it alone."

(Baverman always refers to the customer

in the female gender. The FTC study helps explain why: "Whenever possible the salesman endeavored to have both the wife and husband sign the contracts. In many cases, however, only the signature of the wife was obtained. Most of the remaining (unmarried) customers were women.")

The fact that the customer may not have credit available elsewhere is not crucial to Baverman. A price is a price.

"It's only exploitation" to Baverman "when the customer doesn't realize at the time of the sale what she is going to pay.

"Listen. Just listen. Eight or nine years ago in this town, where could a Negro get credit for things like clothing and furniture?"

He named a large department store and added, "If you went there in those days, they would say, 'Sure, we'll give you credit. Our maximum is $30 worth.' "

At another leading department store, the answer to a Negro was "no credit." In fact, he said, "they didn't want Negroes in the place. Period."

Discrimination, he admits softly, gave his business its birth and caused it to flourish. It helped Negroes have things they needed on credit when they could not obtain those things in any other way.

But it was not exploitive, he maintains—it helped people. The high price of that help is incidental.

Do all of these things create resentment of the ghetto businessman? Baverman was asked. Is there much anti-Semitism?

Baverman acknowledged that there was.

"If the Negroes start this racial stuff, they'll be sorry," he said. "I never heard anything like this anti-Semitism stuff until recently.

"Look, 7th Street happened to be the center of the downtown business area. When the Negroes started to come down there, where should the Jews go?"

So, the Jewish merchant, Baverman was saying, stayed on and traded with Negroes, and now? Now, the Negroes—"not all, certainly, not all, but some"—were showing signs of anti-Semitism.

He did not mention the studies done on anti-Semitism among Negroes, studies that have shown that while there is some hostility, it is paralleled by a certain trust.

But Baverman thinks that the high-credit merchant can sleep well at night, that he does perform a service.

But it's getting harder and harder to perform that service, he says.

"There's a Legal Aid lawyer on every corner," he says. "And when you go to court, the customer is always right."

The whole business of selling to low-income people on credit, Baverman said, may be a dying business.

With an odd mixture of regret and pride in his voice, he said, "You may be looking at its last days."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1968]

THE POOR TAX—IV: SLUM MERCHANTS SELL DEBT ON EASY TERMS

(By Robert C. Maynard)

"Despite their substantially higher prices, net profit on sales for low-income market retailers was only slightly higher and net profit return on net worth was considerably lower when compared to general-market retailers."

So said the Federal Trade Commission's recently published report on Washington's high-credit merchants.

From the FTC's study, it can be seen that somewhere, somehow, somebody is paying a lot of money for items—more than they cost normally.

In effect, those persons who keep paying on their purchases from high-credit merchants "finance" bad debts by other purchasers. And they help pay hefty commissions for the door-to-door and other salesmen employed by the merchants.

The FTC study said that the salesmen earn commissions of about 15 per cent, many times those given salesmen in the general market.

But the study placed more emphasis on bad debts, and the costs such debts create.

From its own study of the FTC report, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders noted that "the cost to the merchant is significantly above that of serving middle-income consumers."

PAY SAME PRICE

The FTC points out that the good credit risk and the bad credit risk pay the same prices in the high-credit store.

It must be pointed out, of course, that not all stores near poor neighborhoods are high-credit stores. Many stores on 7th Street, for instance, are general-marketing retailers, mostly selling for cash or on conventional charge accounts.

The true test of the high-credit merchant is whether his sales are made primarily on credit, whether the credit financing charges are high and whether it is difficult to establish the cash price of an item without the financing automatically added into the price.

Those prices, the FTC study found, are marked up two and a half times cost, on an average. If the store paid $10 for an item, it would normally sell it for $25. If a department store pays $10 for an item, it prices the item at about $16.50, says the FTC. Possibly because the risk of selling to the poor on credit is presumed to be greater than selling to the middle class, the cost of financing purchases is higher for the poor, even after they have paid more for the actual product.

Except for firms that finance their own credit operations, the FTC has found that the average credit contract sold to a finance company costs the customer 25 per cent a year, at least 4 per cent higher than in the nonghetto market.

Thus, the poor pay what amounts to a tax on a tax. If the item purchased costs more than it would a middle-class customer, and the interest is calculated on the price, you get a picture like this:

"POOR TAX" OF $100

A merchant can buy a washing machine for $100 whether he is a high-credit merchant or selling to the middle class. The high-credit merchant in the ghetto, using the FTC mark-up figures, will sell the item for $250. The finance company on a contract to be repaid in a year will charge interest of $33.85 for a total, without sales tax, of $283.85.

The middle-class customer, meanwhile, will pay a basic price of $165 for the identical washing machine, plus a finance charge of $18.77, for a total of $183.77.

The "poor tax" on the sale amounts to just over $100.

There is a further difference that points up the gap between the experiences and costs of the two classes in the marketplace. What if the washing machine breaks down? If repairs are not made promptly by the dealer, either customer would halt payment.

Here the "holder in due course" doctrine comes into play.

According to this doctrine, the finance company collecting the payments has the right to go on collecting payments, regardless of what happened to the goods the money bought. The doctrine says that the payment collector—the "holder in due course"—has paid for the note in good faith and is legally entitled to have his investment repaid.

Finance companies can normally claim this special legal status that immunizes them from the complaints of buyers. As holders in due course, the finance companies are guaranteed one thing—payments.

If a person buys a faulty washing machine from a dealer who caters to the middle class, the chances are quite good that the problem will be worked out regardless of whether the dealer has sold the note to a finance company.

This frequently is not the case with the ghetto resident. In many cases, if he stops payment, he will wind up defending himself in court.

The fact that the dealer sold him a bad washing machine is no defense for not paying the finance company. Without a lawyer, the ghetto resident will probably lose his legal battle.

The result could be the loss of the washing machine and liability for the unpaid balance as well.

The FTC found that in 1966, 11 credit retailers who cater to the poor obtained a total of 2690 judgments, 1568 garnishments and 300 repossessions in General Sessions court.

Put another way, the merchants of credit to the poor sought one judgment for every $2200 of merchandise they sold. Stores outside of the ghetto, meanwhile, sought one judgment for every $232,000 of merchandise sold.

A TYPICAL EXPERIENCE

The poor were sued 100 times more often than the middle class: Maggie B. Jamison's experience is typical. In testimony before the Senate District Subcommittee concerning Consumer Credit Legislation, she described her experience as follows:

She saw an advertisement in a newspaper for color television sets, with a trade-in allowance for an old set. Mrs. Jamison called the number for Giant TV Co. (not to be confused with the Giant Appliance Division of Giant Foods) at 4019 South Capitol st., and said she wanted a Philco color set. She was given a price, she says, of $599. The payments were to be $5 a week.

Then came delivery. "Before I knew what they were delivering, they asked me to sign a piece of paper telling me it was just a delivery receipt. They also told me to sign my husband's name for insurance—in case the television was stolen."

She protested that she had no authority to sign her husband's name, but the company representative, she remembers, said the signature obligated her husband to nothing financially.

She signed James Jamison Jr. on the piece of paper—the "receipt"—which was, in fact, a contract obligating the Jamisons to pay $800, of which $150 was to be financing charges, in 40 payments (once every two weeks) of $20 each.

James and Maggie Jamison, who live at 1317 South Capitol st., are poor. They have eight children. Maggie Jamison works nights as a short-order cook for $55 a week. Her husband works in a boiler room. He brings home $89 a week. That's $144 a week for ten people.

And Maggie Jamison thought she was buying a Philco, a brand she had heard of, the name they mentioned in the ad. It was "a brand we never heard of," Mrs. Jamison says.

Maggie Jamison thought the payments were $5 a week. So that's what she sent to the finance company, even though the payment book she received carried no amount, she says.

The store representative called and told Mrs. Jamison she would have to double her payments and "he threatened that if I did not keep up the payments he was going to garnishee my husband's and my wages."

The Jamisons would not—and could not—make $40-a-month payments for a television set. They told the company to come and get it.

"I thought that would be the end of it," Mrs. Jamison says, but Bonded Adjustment Association, Inc., a finance company, sent a letter to her husband at the place of his employment, saying he owed $700 for a television set that had been repossessed. Mrs. Jamison also got several calls each evening at her place of employment.

Then came the suit for $725, plus interest and attorney fees.

Mrs. Jamison went to the finance company and pleaded that since she did not have the television set, she didn't see why she should pay for it. The company offered to settle with her for $125.

ATTORNEY'S ADVICE

"But I told them I did not have that much money and did not think I owed it anyway."

Garnishment came next.

Mrs. Jamison went to see a lawyer of the Neighborhood Legal Services Project. The wage assignment was lifted and a default judgment was set aside. Fraud was alleged against Giant and slander of credit against Bonded Adjustment in a counterclaim suit. The suit against the Jamisons was dropped. All litigation was then terminated.

Had the Jamisons not obtained legal help, the outcome might have been very different.

The commodity being offered to Mrs. Jamison was credit—debt.

It is the only way she could afford to have a color television set, but the fact of the matter is that she could not afford a color television, any more than most poor people can afford what is being offered on "easy credit" terms.

But the credit system to the poor survives because, as the Kerner Commission says, America is an affluent land and, to many of the poor, that affluence screams out at them constantly.

So Maggie Jamison learned, as so many others do, that the system is not so easy, that color television even at easy credit rates—or perhaps especially at easy-credit rates—is more than she can afford.

A NATION OF ACHIEVERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what "A Nation of Achievers" can do is eloquently and persuasively revealed in the state of the nation message of that title which the Honorable Ferdinand E. Marcos, President of the Republic of the Philippines, delivered before a joint session of the Philippine Congress last January 22.

As this message so strikingly documents, the Philippines Republic has, indeed, chalked up a most impressive record of economic progress and political growth under President Marcos.

A better life for our people is the best guarantee of their security—

Said President Marcos in his stirring address. It has been to that end that his efforts have been dedicated and directed. The concrete results speak for themselves. Here are some highlights.

During the 2 past years the foreign exchange reserves of the Philippines Republic have more than doubled, from almost $100 million in 1967 to $237 million as of January 1968. In that same period, moreover, remarkable advances in agricultural production were achieved. It is no small feat that the country is now self-sufficient in rice and corn. This goal which has been the will-o'-the-wisp of economic planning in the Philippines for decades has at last been attained and 1 year ahead of the schedule. Important steps have also been taken to revitalize the nation's industry. Looking toward the future, too, is the beneficial program which is now underway to conserve the nation's natural resources.

In his address, President Marcos called attention to the fact that the Government has been intensifying its efforts to end the insurgency in the rural areas. In this connection, he gave special recognition to the constructive role of the nation's armed forces in economic and social development. Under his direction, they now give significant assistance in the infrastructure program as, for example, by constructing new roads and bridges and building schools. A Philippines military engineering group, it should be noted, is working in a similar fashion in concert with us and others in Vietnam.

The state of the nation report indicates progress in the attainment of a number of basic needed reforms. Land reform has been carried out on a major scale. The tax system has become more efficient with a resultant rise in collections of revenue. And the Government has waged a determined campaign to stamp out smuggling and eliminate graft and corruption.

Inasmuch as this is an election year in the United States, it seems timely to refer to one Filipino law which was enacted, in part, as a result of President Marcos' initiative. That law requires political parties to limit the period of their activity to 3 months for elections at the local level and 5 at the national level. Perhaps it is not beyond the realm of speculation to submit that by the time the 1968 elections in the United States come to an end, the American people may well wish to take a page from the Filipino book and provide for similar limitations.

In his state of the nation address, there is frank admission by the President of the Philippines that the Filipino nation has, in reality, only begun to fulfill its destiny and must continue to strive to meet new goals. Among the 1968 targets listed for his administration are the following:

A sweeping reform in the nation's traditional and inadequate tax structure; fuller implementation of land reform; launching of a massive housing program for low-income groups; emphasis on manpower development and training; promotion of export products; further agriculture, education, and conservation measures; and strengthening peace and order.

After highlighting the recent achievements of the Filipino people, President Marcos made the following remarks which provide the key to the remarkable advance which is now in progress:

Subsuming all these achievements is a new spirit and a new outlook discernible in the Filipino people—the will to confront the tasks of development and of nation-building purposively and energetically.

These are achievements not of a particular government administration but of the Filipino people as a whole. All these results, realized with no increase in material resources, tell a story about us—a success story that exhilarates by its very novelty and rarity in our national experience. We are no longer what we always believed we were—a nation of incompetents and failures. We have become—perhaps imperceptibly—a nation of achievers. We have begun to undergo the experience of competence which forms the basis of genuine self-confidence for men or nations.

There is a new birth of confidence in ourselves as Filipinos. This is in itself a source of great creative power. It reminds us of our distinguished heritage as the nation that pioneered the libertarian movement in Asia and founded the first democratic republic in our part of the world.

I know that the people of the United States wish for a nation of achievers and its distinguished President every success in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the state of the nation message of President Ferdinand Marcos be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

A NATION OF ACHIEVERS

(By Ferdinand E. Marcos, President, Republic of the Philippines)

Two years ago I came before you for the first time to report on the state of the nation and I gave you a faithful picture of a nation bogged in crisis and a people gripped by fear of the future. Barely a year ago I came again before you to report that the crisis had been surmounted and that the people had a new lease of hope and faith. Today, as I pass the halfway mark of my term of office, I am glad to report that in the year just past we have sustained the momentum of our advance; we have moved forward at an accelerated and accelerating rate.

Many grave problems remain and most of our people's needs remain acute. But today we face them with the confidence of self-made success; we have lost our fear of the future; problems have become challenges and goads to action.

In terms of history two years is just a fleeting instant in the life of a nation. What could be done in two years, set against the centuries-old hard crust of problems—the mass poverty, ignorance and disease that make up the main heritage of a former subject people?

But we believed in our people. We believed that in two years a resolute people could do something meaningful for themselves—perhaps meaningful enough to alter their destiny. We set out two years ago to accomplish some basic tasks which popular belief held to be impossible. The results of our common labors hearten us. For they show that the impossible could be attained and that in some respects, it has in fact been attained.

Some of these achievements are in fact historic breakthroughs for our people in their march to a fuller life. Others are much less spectacular, but in the long run just as important. Consider the following:

We have succeeded in solving our chronic food shortage. The country has attained self-sufficiency in rice and corn one year ahead of the deadline set for it by our administration. This fulfills a historic dream of several generations of Filipinos who equated the solution of the rice problem with the nation's self-esteem.

We have built up the physical underpinnings of our economic development faster and more thoroughly than any other Administration before us. The government's output of roads, bridges, irrigation dams, airports, portworks and other infrastructure projects exceeded by several hundred per cent the total accomplishments of preceding Administrations.

We have attained the growth objectives set in our four-year development program. In agriculture, the rate of growth in the past two years averaged 6 per cent, which exceeds the target of 4 per cent in the program. In manufacturing, the target increase was 7.1 per cent; the actual increase has been placed at 8.7 per cent. We have in-

creased per capita income. In terms of real national income the preliminary estimates show an increase of 5.4 per cent against the goal of only 5 per cent.

Investments in 1967, according to preliminary figures of the NEC, amounted to P5.375 billion compared to P4.562 billion in 1966, showing a growth rate of 17.8 per cent. An independent, non-governmental source, the Economic Development Foundation, places the figure at P5.614 billion, or an increase of 23 percent.

Paid-in capital of newly registered corporations for the period January to November, 1967, totalled P385 million compared to P358 million in 1966 and P294 million in 1965. Increased capitalization of existing corporations amounted to P1,108 million in 1967 compared to P824 million in 1966.

We have boosted rural employment by about 10 per cent and community development self-projects by 68 per cent over the preceding years.

We have coped successfully with the runaway problem of housing for the nation's school children in the face of a population explosion. In less than two years time, the production of schoolbuildings dwarfed the combined total of three preceding Administrations during the past dozen years.

We have increased the collection of taxes by 21 per cent over the previous year and in the second semester of Fiscal Year 1966–1967 customs collection increased by about 50 per cent over the comparable period of the preceding year.

We have successfully carried out land reform for the first time on a meaningful scale, encompassing the second district of Pampanga. With our assistance, hundreds of leasehold agreements were initiated throughout Central Luzon. We have demonstrated that land reform is attainable under a sincere and determined government.

Confronted with the threat of a foreign-inspired mutiny in Central Luzon, we honestly seek to turn this grave danger into a great opportunity for the development of this pivotal region. We have spurned counsel to further fratricide; we welcome the reconciliation of brothers; we eschew civil strife unless forced upon us by lawless and unscrupulous elements.

The problem of smuggling which used to overshadow most other problems in our national life has been placed fully under control. Direct smuggling has been wiped out. Technical smuggling is still being combatted. But the dramatic rise in revenue collections and in textile production proves that this form of smuggling, which is more difficult to control, is being sharply curtailed.

The conservation of our natural resources, especially forestry and fisheries, is now a major program of our government. It requires strict compliance with the laws on reforestation and discourages marginal and therefore wasteful logging. This solicitude of the government will extend to the entire patrimony of the nation.

We have dutifully ploughed back our earnings as a nation to the tasks of development. We have become a more disciplined and far-sighted nation. We devote 60 per cent of our budget to social and economic development. A more dramatic index of our new orientation towards production rather than consumption is this fact: up to 84 per cent of our imports in the previous year consisted of capital goods, reversing the traditional proportion of non-essential to essential importations.

Between January 1966 and September, 1967, government financial institutions provided long-term financial assistance to private enterprise in the amount of P4.4 billion in loans, equity investments, and guarantees. Of this amount, about 40 per cent went into manufacturing and about P1 billion consisted of assistance to rehabilitate industries that became distressed during the previous Administration.

We have developed a more creative role for the armed forces of the nation in the task of economic and social development. Thus our defense effort now serves also our peaceful development goals which, in the long run, constitute the true rampart of our security as a democratic society.

We have introduced administrative innovations and reforms which have raised the level of public service significantly, especially in the fields of rice production, land reform, infrastructure, and manpower development—through systematic coordination of related programs. This has filled up a gigantic gap in public administration which made it impossible for government-wide programs to succeed in the past.

We have achieved the first stages of effective local self-government through decentralization. In the past year the local governments increased significantly their share in internal revenue taxes and were relieved of financial burdens in the upkeep of agricultural extension workers and rural health units.

We have laid the basis for industrial democracy through the creation of a private securities market and the increasing participation of the public in the financing of economic development. The goal of P200 million in DBP progress bonds has been oversubscribed.

The general peace and order has been maintained and criminality has been reduced in most areas, except in the metropolitan areas where the national agencies do not exercise jurisdiction.

The price of rice has been stabilized though the last two typhoons last year had disturbed the prices of other components such as vegetables. The problem now is how to keep the price of rice profitable for the farmers.

For the first time our people have witnessed the punishment of fiscals and the judges, up to the level of judges of the court of first instance, for purported abuse of their offices. Innovations have been introduced to facilitate justice, changes that expedite preliminary investigations, eliminate red tape, and deny bail to those who pose a grave danger to society and seek the immediate prosecution and punishment of feared and influential criminals.

The National Police Commission has been organized and strengthened. The rules and regulations for all police forces have been finalized. All major services of the Armed Forces have been utilized in the peace and order drive, resulting in the immediate breakup of pirate gangs in the Visayas and Mindanao. The government today is coping more effectively with the menace from roving Huk bands, smuggling syndicates, carnapping groups, kidnapping, rape and robbery hoodlums and teenage gangs.

Our foreign exchange reserves more than doubled in the past two years, from almost $100 million in 1965 to $237 million as of January 1968.

After twenty years of muddling and groping for a policy on investment, we have now an Investment Act. A Board of Investments is now preparing the rules and regulations and the priority areas for investment. This should clear up unnecessary blocks to foreign and domestic investments in our country.

Education has become more than ever a reality for the poor. About 8,100 new schoolbuildings have been produced and erected. Scholarship funds and student loan funds for the poor have been extended.

With the substantial increase in rural health units and free medicine for the needy, medical facilities have been extended to the indigent population all over the country.

We initiated the improved conduct of political campaigns by reducing the period for campaigning and by setting up a workable machinery for the curtailment of election expenditures.

We have maintained our military security, dealt a firm hand against subversion, and increased the atmosphere of friendship and security with our common neighbors.

More than P250 million has been channeled into the rural areas in 1967 as a result of the increase in rice production and the subsidy to rice and corn. This has promoted a new demand among farmers for the acquisition of modern farming equipment and household goods. Thus, the increased income of the farmers becomes mass purchasing power for the goods of industry and stimulates further economic growth.

Subsuming all these achievements is a new spirit and a new outlook discernible in the Filipino people—the will to confront the tasks of development and of nation-building purposively and energetically.

These are achievements not of a particular government administration but of the Filipino people as a whole. All these results, realized with no increase in material resources, tell a story about us—a success story that exhilarates by its very novelty and rarity in our national experience. We are no longer what we always believed we were—a nation of incompetents and fallures. We have become—perhaps imperceptibly—a nation of achievers. We have begun to undergo the experience of competence which forms the basis of genuine self-confidence for men or nations.

There is a new birth of confidence in ourselves as Filipinos. This is in itself a source of great creative power. It reminds us of our distinguished heritage as the nation that pioneered the libertarian movement in Asia and founded the first democratic republic in our part of the world.

SOME GOALS FOR 1968

This year we shall be called upon to initiate bold steps to support the pace of development that we have begun, to maintain the momentum of our social and economic advance, and to achieve within the next two years a meaningful degree of well-being among our people.

The experience of nations shows that the cost of development must be borne mainly by the people themselves. Increasingly, the burden of development will have to be shared by citizens in proportion to their economic means. It is in this spirit that the Administration plans to propose to the Congress this year a sweeping reform in our traditional and inadequate tax structure. To act on this will require an atmosphere of courage and civic spirit and the ability to face the unpleasant today in return for the just rewards of tomorrow.

It seems to me that this will put to a test the capacity for courage and statesmanship of the distinguished members of Congress.

We appeal to you for your support so that the means required to sustain the pace of our efforts for national development can be made available to the government.

I think we can now point to a well-defined consensus as to certain priorities that will demand our undivided attention and concern in the year just beginning.

A national consensus certainly stands behind the fuller implementation of the Land Reform, especially in Central Luzon.

A massive housing program for low-income groups will be launched under a coordinated leadership with various agencies of the government taking part. An energetic thrust in the field of manpower training will be carried out, to upgrade our labor skills and meet the growing needs of business and industry for technicians and skilled hands. We shall engage in a vigorous campaign for the promotion of Philippine export products to realize an increased amount of foreign exchange needed to provide the import requirements of our growing economy.

We shall concentrate great energies on the problem of peace and order. Local govern-

ments will be asked to play a more active role.

We shall press vigorously the existing efforts to assure our food self-sufficiency on a sustained basis, to meet the crisis posed by the lack of schoolhouses for our children, to conserve our natural resources, and to upgrade our human resources through adequate educational facilities.

SUCCESS OF THE ECONOMIC PROGRAM

As we look back over the last two years, we can say that, in general, we have good reason to be pleased; and our satisfaction is heightened by the fact that, on the most important occasion so far given them to make their opinions felt, the great majority of our countrymen have shown that they agree with our estimate. Halfway through the Administration, and almost halfway through its economic program, both the progress and the prospects of the country are encouraging. Many serious problems still confront us; but some of the most critical ones have been handled with a success that has surpassed even our early expectations. A good start has been made toward solving the others.

The Administration addressed itself upon taking office to the three most serious requirements:

1. Attaining self-sufficiency in food production;

2. Providing the necessary infrastructure to support our industrial program and serve the growing population; and

3. Assuring the country of large and steadily growing foreign exchange earnings, under the present particularly difficult conditions.

A necessary condition to securing these was the solution of the peace and order problem.

These problems had to be solved to attain the basic objective of the economic program, which was to increase real income per head by about 2.5 per cent annually. This meant that gross national product had to increase at the average of 6.1 per cent annually over the four years of the plan: the target growth rates to increase progressively from 5.8 per cent in the first year to 6.3 per cent in the fourth year.

In the attainment of these targets, large amounts of both investible resources and foreign exchange were expected to be needed; and foreign exchange was thought harder to obtain. Domestic savings were expected to fall short to investment requirements by a total of P2.4 billion over the four years of the program; but the shortage of foreign exchange earnings as compared to import requirements was projected at P3.3 billion. A high priority was therefore attached to the expansion and diversification of our exports.

PROGRESS

The end of last year was also the end of the first year and a half of the Four-Year Plan, and a partial comparison is now available of targets and accomplishments for fiscal year 1967. In most sectors, achievements have surpassed expectations. The target growth rates for the first year of the program were 5.0 per cent for real national income and 5.8 per cent for real gross national product. A rough comparison may be made with actual growth rates obtained during the last calendar year. According to preliminary estimates, these were 5.4 per cent for real national income and 5.6 per cent for real gross national product: the first figure well over the target, and the second just under it.

The target growth rate for agriculture was 4.0 per cent for the four years of the plan. Over the last two years, our agricultural production index has been growing at almost 6 per cent annually. The increase in real agricultural value added was 5.1 per cent during the last year. Target growth rates were also exceeded in the transportation and commerce sectors and just about matched in the service sector. The manufacturing sector has responded vigorously to massive government support. I shall continue later the extent of this response.

Especially encouraging was the extremely high growth rate in agriculture over these two years, almost one and a half against the target rate that had seemed ambitious by the standards of the past. It is an indication that, well ahead of schedule, we have made a major breakthrough in food production. The National Economic Council has certified that we will have a substantial oversupply of rice at the end of the current crop year.

INDUSTRY

When this Administration took office in 1966, our manufacturing sector was in a state of deterioration. Many of our factories had sputtered to a stop or had substantially reduced their operations, laying off thousands of workers and leaving idle a considerable portion of our industrial capacity.

Recognizing the importance of industrial development to our country's economic growth, we immediately instituted measures to relieve the manufacturing sector.

Thus, we harnessed all government agencies to an unrelenting drive against smuggling. Tariffs on imports were strictly administered to protect local products; antidumping measures were intensified. On the positive side, our domestic industries were encouraged to step up operations, to expand and to diversify according to the demands of the local and foreign markets. Infrastructure projects were implemented to aid industrial undertakings. Capital investments were stimulated in both domestic and foreign sectors through the issuance of an Administrative Order to guide investments, the approval of an amendment to the Corporation Law to allow broader investments in mining ventures, and the enactment of an Investment Incentives Act designed to induce the rapid growth of industries.

The most tangible results of government assistance to industry in the past year were in financing. To alleviate the crisis of manufacturing and mining enterprises, the Development Bank of the Philippines accelerated the industrial refinancing program which the Administration launched in its first year. By November 1967 a total of P1,073 million had been channeled to distressed industrial enterprises under the program.

In addition, the Administration geared the lending operations of DBP, NIDC, GSIS, SSS and PNB to the need to bolster the pace of industrialization. By the end of September last year, these financial institutions had extended accommodations totalling four and a half billion pesos. Nearly 40 per cent of this figure, more than P1.7 billion was coursed to mining and manufacturing enterprises.

The beneficial effects of this financial assistance and of these measures instituted to curb smuggling and protect the local products, can be readily seen in the upsurge of activity in our industrial sector. Production for the second quarter of last year the latest available figure exceeded the comparable 1966 level by 8.7 per cent. Formerly distressed industries have come up with definite signs of good health, particularly the textile industry which was floundering and hence required sizeable aid from the government. Other essential industries also showed significant improvement. The output of plywood rose by 14 per cent in 1967; veneer by 38 per cent; cement by 28 per cent; and tire manufacturing by 20 per cent.

In general, mining and manufacturing in 1967 made very favorable improvements over 1966, and even more from earlier years. Similarly, and significantly, electric power consumption rose by about 15 per cent from the level in 1966.

The gratifying trends in the operations of our existing industries have carried over to the business atmosphere. Our private sector—our entrepreneurs, investors and industrialists have shown a new faith in the future of Philippine industry. Some 2,112 new corporations were registered in 1967, an increase over the figure for 1966 and exceeding the registrations in 1965 by over 40 per cent. The subscribed capital stock of these corporations combined to over P400 million, representing a tremendous amount of fresh capital pumped into Philippine industry. Out of these registrations, some 483 new companies with over P150 million in subscribed capital, were in mining and manufacturing.

As to the actual implementation of industrial projects, we identified more than 40 major ventures in mining and manufacturing which started operations during the past two years of this Administration. The essential products which these projects are now adding to our industrial strength include great volumes of refractory chromite, magnetite, tiles, cement, plywood and veneer, resins, ammonium sulphate and liquid ammonia, carbon black, synthetic fabrics and petroleum products. A host of other large-sized plants are currently in the process of construction or expansion. Some will supplement existing production capacities, while others will introduce new product lines to the domestic market and for our export trade. The new capacities will include among others, steel products, copper ore and copper concentrates, pulp and paper, and plasticizers.

We have also reached the final stages of negotiations for the exploitation of our valuable nickel deposits in Mindanao, which offer the prospects of a huge new source of foreign exchange income for our economy from the export of nickel or ferro-nickel, mild steel billets and cobalt.

FINANCING FOR DEVELOPMENT

We have succeeded in securing substantial financing abroad for our economic development projects. The support we helped secure for shipping has already been mentioned. Also, during the calendar year 1967, foreign funds amounting to $12.5 million were secured from the World Bank for the construction of the Bataan Thermal Plant in Limay and the Maria Cristina Hydroelectric Plant Unit 4 in Iligan City. These power projects when completed, will generate 75,000 KW from the Bataan Thermal Plant and an additional 50,000 KW from the Maria Cristina Unit 4.

Loan agreements with the AID were similarly approved during the year. Irrigation received a $4.7 million loan to finance the acquisition of equipment needed for irrigation construction and rehabilitation work. Also, a $2.0 million loan for undertaking feasibility studies was granted.

Assistance has likewise been granted to our export crops, of which the case of abaca may be cited. The production of abaca dipped by 4.9 per cent from 135.3 thousand metric tons in crop year 1966 to 128.7 thousand metric tons in crop year 1967. To alleviate the plight of this industry, the government extended financial help by releasing P2.5 million to the Abaca Corporation of the Philippines.

Prices of abaca were also threatened when the U.S. announced its decision to dispose of its abaca stockpile. The Philippine government intervened in behalf of this industry and secured an agreement for a more orderly schedule of disposal.

THE INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM

The accomplishments of the first two years of the government capital program are impressive; particularly impressive when one considers that they were done within the framework of limited government financial resources. The expected new taxes failed to materialize; we relied instead on the more efficient and organized use of what was available. We cite the effective assistance of the

Armed Forces in implementing the road building and schoolhouse programs; we point to the proficient, productive performance of our dredging fleet. In infrastructure, here are our achievements over the last two years:

In highways, 515 kilometers were paved with concrete and 903 kilometers with asphalt; 3,167 kilometers of feeder roads were constructed and 7,685 lineal meters of temporary bridges were replaced by permanent steel and reinforced concrete structures. The complete projects include roads and bridges thousands travel every day: the Manila North and South Diversion Roads, E. de los Santos Avenue, the Sayre Highway in Mindanao, the Cagayan Valley Road, and the Nagtahan and Guadalupe Bridges.

In irrigation, a total of 22 national gravity, 109 communal and 813 pump projects were undertaken, designed to irrigate a total of 161,670 hectares of farm lands, out of which 75,092 hectares were placed under irrigation during the 2-year period. Rehabilitation of the 79 existing systems provided extended water coverage to an additional 25,500 hectares.

In airports and airways, runways, taxiways and aprons in 25 airports were either constructed or improved and a terminal building for the Mactan Airport was constructed. In our effort to provide the improved communications facilities which are essential to safe air travel, we are attempting to provide an integrated nation-wide airways system under a turn-key deferred payment arrangement.

In ports and harbors, 55 new berths, 9 of which are for international shipping, were completed, with attendant port service facilities. The principal port projects were the completion of Piers 3 and 15 at the Manila South Harbor. The first phase of marginal wharf for the proposed Manila International Port is nearing completion, while the contract portion of Pier 16 at the North Harbor is already complete. Other major port projects included those at the ports of Tacloban, Zamboanga, Iligan, Dumaguete, Pagadian, Batangas, Pulupandan and Makan.

On 1 August 1966, by Presidential directive half of the Bureau of Public Works fleet of 14 dredges were transferred to the operational control of the Philippine Navy. Before the transfer the fleet had been dredging at the rate of 317,000 cubic meters a month. This total was immediately improved to 616,000 cubic meters a month; by December the fleet was dredging 1,500,000 cubic meters a month, almost a five-fold improvement. At the same time, the cost of dredging was cut to one-sixth of what it had previously been, from P5.00 a cubic meter to P0.70 a cubic meter.

In power, 112,000 additional kilowatts capacity of electrical energy was added and work is continuing on projects to provide 225,000 kilowatts of new hydro and thermal power. Two major hydroelectric power projects were undertaken. One of these, the Angat project, was inaugurated last September 9; the other, Maria Cristina Unit 3 in Lanao, is almost complete. The Bataan Thermal Plant Unit I was started last August.

A total of 97 provincial waterworks projects were completed, of which 37 were improvements or extensions of existing systems; 365 artesian wells were drilled and 1,422 more rehabilitated, 35 springs were developed for water supply. The Manila and suburbs water supply project continues to receive special attention, and is expected to be completed by December 1968.

Twenty projects in major or regional flood control systems and 60 localized flood control projects were completed. The principal projects were to control rivers in Pampanga, Agno, Cotabato, Ilog-Hilabangan, Agusan, Bicol and Manila.

In school buildings, over 5,816 units of prefabricated 2- and 3-room steel and wooden types have been delivered to sites of which 1,765 units of the steel type and 1,247 units of the wooden type were erected and another 1,145 units of the steel type were under construction. In addition, 1,179 schoolrooms of other various types were erected with 135 rooms more underway. These have the capacity to house 660,000 school children over our many rural and urban areas, assuming single-session classes of 40 pupils per class.

Finally, in the related field of transportation, the government was instrumental in securing significant addition to our shipping capacity, both interisland and international. With the use of German capital aid and under loans and guarantees provided by the Development Bank of the Philippines, four passenger-cargo liners and two bulk carriers were ordered by five interisland shipping companies. Also during the year and likewise under DBP guarantee, two oil tankers with a total dead-weight tonnage of 173,000 were ordered for our international shipping fleet; this increases our capacity for overseas cargo carriage by fully one-third.

AGRICULTURE

The general success of our production program has already been mentioned; the success was most striking in the sector to which the government devoted most attention, namely agriculture. For the last crop year, agricultural employment was up 10 per cent; instead of the target increase in production of 4 per cent annually, the actual yearly increase over the last two years has been about 6 per cent. For the current crop year, our supply of rice including importations will be 63.6 million sacks of 56 kilos. Our consumption over the same period will be no more than 55.1 million sacks. We shall therefore exceed our requirements by about 8.5 million sacks, or over 15 per cent. This excess, moreover, is accompanied by a handsome increase in the efficiency of production. From 30.8 sacks per hectare in crop year 1967, we shall rise to 32.8 sacks per hectare in crop year 1968, an increase of 6.5 per cent. This welcome situation has occurred in spite of severe typhoon damage; and the prospects for the next crop year are even brighter.

INCREASE FISH PRODUCTION

At the same time we stepped up the development of our fishing industry by restocking inland waters with 1.6 million fish seeds, by intensifying the campaign against illegal fishing, and by promoting fishpond production through the opening up of new fishpond areas and the expansion of credit for the fishing industry. Last year alone the DPB pumped in P3,122,700 in long-term loans to the industry. As a result of these steps, we expect fish production to reach 705,300 metric tons this year, which would represent an increase of 10 per cent over the production last year.

FORESTRY AND CONSERVATION

We have achieved the full consolidation of timber licenses into viable units of not less than 20,000 hectares each with an annual allowable cut of not less than 25,000 cubic meters. We have also set 100,000 hectares as the maximum size of each logging concession. The result of these steps is the emergence of our forests as our second major foreign exchange earner.

We have also undertaken vigorous measures to conserve our forest areas, through the strict enforcement of the law against illegal cutting and through a sustained reforestation program which saw the planting last year of 139,273 hectares with 292 million trees using mainly such fast growing varieties as the Kaatoan Bangkal and the Albizzia Falcata. We have required logging concessionaires to conduct systematic tree-planting, which they religiously do now as failure to comply could mean cancellation of their permits.

In this way we have paced up the systematic replenishment of our denuded forests and reduced the dangers which the wanton destruction of our forest areas in the past had brought in its wake.

THE SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

The government continues to direct most of its expenditures toward the social infrastructure, and here again there are many bright spots to report. Under this heading we include the extension of government services to improve health, education and welfare, as well as the improvement of the efficiency with which these and other government services are provided.

Improved government organization

The improvement of government organization is apparent in its performance, especially in such matters as the improvement of tax and customs collections and the success of the rice program. The most conspicous of the improvements in organization are probably the various coordinating groups, such as those for rice and corn and infrastructure; but there have been many other innovations; and the morale of government employees has been raised as well as their salaries.

By improving our administrative machinery for collections of customs revenues, we have been able to increase net customs revenues accruing to the General Funds by 44.3 per cent from 1965 to 1967. On the other hand, imports had only increased by 30 per cent during the same period.

The improvement in the administrative machinery has also helped diminish smuggling. The textile industry increased its production of cotton fabrics and knitted fabrics by 30 per cent and 43 per cent, respectively in 1967. On the other hand, specific tax revenues on cigarettes increased by 11.9 per cent in the calendar year just ended. These outstanding increases, in the industries most sensitive to smuggling, indicate the extent to which this social and economic evil has been brought under control.

Some new administrative projects and practices may be mentioned. The Decentralization Act of 1967 has been approved granting further autonomous powers to local governments. The allotment share of provinces and cities has been increased from 10 to 13 per cent and the allotment share of municipalities, from two to four per cent. To enable provincial and city governments to undertake field agricultural extension work and rural health work, they have been empowered to retain the amounts theretofore contributed by provincial, city and municipal governments to the National Government for these purposes. Steps are now being undertaken for the establishment and operation of a security printing plant to safeguard the printing, issuance, distribution and curability of security printing jobs. Steps are also being taken for the early operation of the Board of Investments which has been created to encourage domestic and foreign investments in certain areas of economic activity to accelerate the sound development of our economy.

NEW EDUCATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

In education and manpower development, there have also been many achievements; but our needs are very great, and lack of funds has prevented us from going as far as we would have liked. Nearly half a million children were admitted to the first grade this year, as well as 150,000 out-of-school youths, making a total of 7 million students in school; this is one out of five Filipinos. Three million textbooks are being produced for the Public School Textbook Program; the vocational education curriculum has been revised to make it more responsive to economic needs; and training centers have been established for cottage industry workers and urban squatters. And while government relationship with private education will veer towards encouragement and assistance in place of regulation and control, we have reconstituted the Board of National Education to help our

schools become channels of change and development.

Our participation in Southeast Asian educational cooperation has attained for our country the establishment of two internationally-assisted centers for regional research and graduate study in agriculture and tropical medicine.

LAND REFORM: A MODERNIZING PROCESS

The Land Reform program continues to improve the livelihood of our farmers as well as their dignity; here again, however, more could profitably have been done, if the funds had been forthcoming. Among other accomplishments, about 8,000 leasehold contracts were negotiated and entered into; about 80,000 hectares of private and public lands were disposed of, with another 21,000 under expropriation, or investigation; and almost half a million hectares of disposable land were maintained or improved.

In land reform areas, credit assistance to farmers rose by 250 per cent over the previous year, with a total of P3,549,169 in loans released to 3,029 farmers working in an area of 13,762 hectares.

Also significant was the acquisition by the government of one private agricultural estate, thus finally inaugurating the land-buying activity of the Land Bank. With an area of 108.8433 hectares, the property was purchased at a cost of P380,900, of which 10 per cent was paid in cash and 90 per cent in Land Bank loans.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR LAND BANK BONDHOLDERS

In this connection, a consortium of Filipino consultants has been formed for the purpose of identifying specific projects in which Land Bank bond-holders may invest. The US-AID has made available to the National Economic Council the sum of P600,000 to finance this activity. Initially some Central Luzon land owners have expressed preference to invest in fishpond, beef and dairy projects. At present the consortium is studying the possible sites of these projects.

All this demonstrates the validity of our decision to proclaim the whole second district of Pampanga a land reform area, a bold decision which, for the first time, raised the implementation of land reform to a serious level. Our experience in the second district of Pampanga has proved, beyond doubt, that land reform is both necessary and feasible and that our people, both landowners and landless, are now prepared for land reform's liberating and modernizing impact.

CENTRAL LUZON DEVELOPMENT

The development of Central Luzon continued to be a prime concern of the government. During the current fiscal year, the Budget Commission has already released a total of P13,871,660 for various development activities in the area, hiking the total budgetary releases since the start of the Central Luzon operations to P60,269,734. This amount was used mainly to finance production loans, public works projects, rural health units, and community self-help activities.

In Central Luzon, the ACA extended loans amounting to P1,636,456.05 to 3,572 farmers, thus raising the total ACA fund releases in the area to P25,894,033.39 for 49,059 farmers; at the same time, a total of 153,327 bags of fertilizers valued at P2,685,713.40 had been issued to farmers, including 55,700 bags secured under the reparations program.

LAND SETTLEMENT PROGRAM

Side by side with land reform, we shall open new settlements in virgin lands, preferably drawing settlers from enclaves of tenancy. This will ease up the pressure of population in crowded areas and at the same time harness manpower to more challenging and productive activities. To this end, I have ordered the Land Authority to make an inventory of lands which may be transformed into settlements and to formulate a systematic resettlement program patterned in part after the Malaysia land settlement project.

This will consist of a large scale land development program for the settlement of landless rural people on economically viable farms in land schemes provided with all essential public utilities and social amenities, adequate management, training and extension facilities and suitable processing and marketing arrangement in order to raise very substantially their level of living. The aim is to develop them into progressive and knowledgeable farmers so that the rural people can take their rightful place in the community.

I have also directed the Land Authority to coordinate with the Land Bank in arranging with landowners the exchange of their present landholdings with government lands for conversion into agro-industrial estates. This will implement the land reform objective of converting land owners into entrepreneurs, of shifting capital and energy from idle lands to productive industry.

EXPANDED HEALTH SERVICES

The year 1967 witnessed the expansion of health services in the rural areas, with the deployment of more physicians, nurses, midwives and sanitary inspectors in our barrios, the establishment of more rural health units, and the procurement of P6 million worth of medicines and other supplies for our rural population.

Hospital services were increased and upgraded, as 17 government and private hospitals were opened and 76 hospital plans and designs approved for immediate construction. Supplies and medicines worth P1.5 million were channeled to government hospitals for the benefit of our less fortunate countrymen.

NUTRITION PROGRAM

A five-year national nutrition program, designed to combat malnutrition among children of pre-school age, was launched, together with the Cholera Eradication Program, the Poliomyelitis Eradication Program, and the Malaria Eradication Program with financial and technical assistance from WHO, AID, and UNICEF.

Last year, a cancer center was established with the cooperation of the private sector, the first of many cancer centers to be established in various parts of the country.

ACHIEVEMENTS IN LABOR

The year 1967 saw the launching of vigorous programs for the strict enforcement of labor laws, the upgrading of labor and social services, and the acceleration of manpower development and utilization.

UPGRADED LABOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

Due to effective labor law enforcement, 22,770 workers in the logging and mining industries were paid P2,166,564 last year. These special enforcement projects formed the basis for the establishment of a Metallic Mining Industry Wage Board and the contemplated establishment of two other wage-fixing machineries in the logging and coconut industries. These impact projects aside from achieving fruitful results paved the way to the resumption toward the end of 1967 of a general enforcement campaign aimed at affording protection to the greater mass of workers. Victims of industrial accidents were recipients of P8,864,295 in compensation benefits; 2,129 workers received awards totalling P336,010 arising from various labor cases.

To cope with the needs of a developing industrial sector, a Manpower Development Council, composed of agencies whose activities have to do with human resources development directly or indirectly, has emerged to undertake the planning and implementation of an integrated manpower development program.

EMPLOYMENT EXCHANGES

Two employment offices recently created are the first step towards the operation of a network of employment exchanges throughout the country. The need for such national network of exchanges is basic. Providing not only placement services, they collect labor market data upon which depends planning efforts for the development and utilization of manpower resources.

An improved industrial relations climate was brought about significantly through the intensification of preventive mediation by the department of labor. This included the holding of industry-wide dialogues between labor and management in the shipping and arrastre, wood and coconut industries.

SALARY INCREASE FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Through the rigorous exercise of fiscal discipline, we were able to effect last year the 5 per cent salary increase for all government employees, including public school teachers.

We shall always keep an open mind to further salary readjustments as changing conditions require and as we succeed, through economy, in making funds available.

THE CITIZEN AS INVESTOR

The opportunity to participate in the benefits of investment will be extended to the average citizen. The Government Service Insurance System will soon launch a special program to lend money to employees with which to buy stocks in private corporations. In this way, we accelerate the process of economic growth and further broaden the social base.

BROADENING SOCIAL SECURITY

During the last two years, the total benefits paid by the SSS added up to P46.6 million, representing 48.4 per cent of all benefits paid by the SSS since its establishment in 1957. These benefits included payments for premature death, permanent disability, sickness and retirement. At the same time, the SSS released in 1967 a total of P10.4 million under its educational loan program, the purpose being to enable poor but deserving students to go to school through SSS assistance. A total of P16.2 million has been loaned out to qualified SSS members since the inception of the educational loan program under the present Administration in 1966.

The SSS also channeled last year a total of P10 million to the government rice self-sufficiency program, in order to help increase rural credit capacity and enable the farmers to avail of new and improved techniques of rice production.

A SHIFT TO LOW-COST HOUSING

During the last two years, the Social Security System has released a total of P130.1 million for housing—P50 million in 1966 and P80.1 million in 1967. This amount represents 45.7 per cent of the total housing loans released since the inception of the SSS housing program in 1958. This year the SSS expects to grant housing loans worth P120 million under its low-cost housing program for its low-income members. Under the low-cost housing program, the ceiling for housing loans has been brought down to P15,000 payable in 25 years. The SSS also aims to launch its own housing projects by purchasing and developing raw lands and constructing on a massive scale housing units costing not more than P15,000 each. The SSS has an on-going scheme to grant loans to employer-members for the purpose of developing housing projects for their employees at a maximum of P15,000 per unit.

ACQUISITION OF LANDED ESTATES

On the other hand, the GSIS is now making feasibility studies for the acquisition of landed estates where the GSIS plans to build 500 units of low-cost houses a month to be

sold to low-salaried employees on easy terms. The GSIS looks forward to increasing this monthly production targets so as to enable the Administration to close the huge gap in its overall low-cost housing program. Also contributing to the housing program of the Administration is the Development Bank of the Philippines and the PHHC. Last year, the PHHC sold 934 dwelling units worth P5,151,471.27 and 173 lots with an area of 66,083.30 square meters at P1,031,671.85.

INTEGRATED SOCIAL WELFARE PROGRAM

An integrated and coordinated social welfare program is now taking shape, to put an end to the sporadic and disorganized effort of the past. This program gives priority to services designed for social change and the development of productive skills. Special focus, however, will be placed on services that will advance the welfare of children, the youth and their families. We are determined that the problem of delinquency, of the school drop-out and the beggar shall not persist in our society.

CONCERN FOR NATIONAL MINORITIES

Through the Commission on National Integration, we have accelerated the integration of our cultural minorities into the mainstream of our national life. Five farm settlements are being maintained and operated, and 3.075 hectares of land have been surveyed as possible new reservation for our minorities. The Commission has also allocated for settlers 282 lots, titles to which are ready for issuance. In 1967, the Commission granted 1,845 scholarships in Philippine colleges and universities, as well as a number of foreign scholarships.

THE PROTECTION OF SETTLERS

We have added fresh meaning to social justice by the creation of the Small Settlers Protection Committee to see to it that the poor and ignorant settlers, who have left their homes in the hope that pioneering in the farflung hinterlands of our country could provide a better and happier future for themselves and their families, shall not be deprived of the lands they have occupied and cultivated for many years through the machinations of unscrupulous elements. The Committee in its deliberation does not, on the other hand, overlook the rights of owners over their private properties, taking into consideration illegal occupation thereon by misguided settlers.

GREATER MANILA TERMINAL FOOD MARKET

The Development Bank of the Philippines has taken concrete steps to establish a Greater Manila Terminal Food Market, which shall form the base of an overall program for the establishment of similar markets in other populated centers of the country.

In this connection, field surveys have been undertaken, covering 17 provinces for selected food crops, 13 provinces for livestock movements, 10 provinces for commercial poultry farms, and 8 principal Greater Manila markets for the marketing system. At the same time, topographical survey of an appropriate site in the Fort Bonifacio reservation is in process.

The Market, when completed, will provide farmers and producers from 20 provinces with a convenient outlet for their produce, create adequate storage facilities, and reduce distribution costs. Retail markets and stores and large scale consumers in the Greater Manila area will have, on the other hand, adequate and regular supply of foodstuff, thereby reducing and stabilizing prices.

PEACE AND ORDER

When I assumed office in 1966, smuggling, criminality and other forms of lawlessness were rampant, sapping our national will and capacity to progress.

We have instituted vigorous measures to combat this threat. The PC strength has been augmented to intensify the campaign against criminality and against dissidents. This intensification is reflected in the increasing number of combat operations. The fact remains, however, that our police strength per 10,000 population, national as well as local, is one of the lowest in the world.

Hand in hand with increasing the strength of our national police, the PC has been revitalized and revamped for more efficient prosecution of the peace and order campaign. The METROCOM was recently activated and is now effectively assisting the Manila Police Department in maintaining peace and order in Manila. In view of its success, METROCOM type units are now being organized in other urban centers of the Philippines. Recently, I mobilized the entire Armed Forces to augment the still limited resources for the peace and order campaign.

POLICE ACT OF 1966

A vital piece of legislation, the Police Act of 1966, was enacted to carry out badly needed administrative reforms in our local police forces. The full implementation of this law will go far toward up-grading the efficiency and quality of these police forces.

To harness civilian participation and cooperation in the anti-crime drive, peace and order councils have been oragnized on the national and local levels.

Despite all these measures, the incidence of crime index (major crimes per 100,000 population) continues to show an upward trend. Peace and order, therefore, remains a serious problem which will require our increasing attention in the years to come. One reason for this is the uncertain and diffused location of responsibility for maintaining peace and order on the local level. At the proper time I will propose the placing of local police forces directly under the Police Commission, and thereby liberate police forces from politics. Its immediate improvement is one of our major aims this year.

INTERNAL SECURITY

The campaign against dissidents was intensified in 1967, resulting in the death or capture of 24 Huks in battle, including four top commanders. The military operations against dissidents, however, although prosecuted with greater vigor, was matched by an increase in civic action work in Central Luzon.

ANTISMUGGLING DRIVE

Smuggling activities decreased considerably in the past year, as indicated by the volume of goods confiscated and the number of persons apprehended in the relentless anti-smuggling campaign. Although the forces engaged in the anti-smuggling drive have multiplied, only P3.5 million worth of goods were seized in 1967, compared to P8.5 million worth in 1965 when smuggling was at its peak. Similarly, 900 persons were apprehended, compared to 3,000 in 1965.

THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST GRAFT

We have carried on a determined campaign to stamp out graft and corruption, especially in the most sensitive areas of government. Last year, in the course of this campaign:

One district judge, 12 municipal judges, and five court employees were dismissed from office; three municipal judges and one employee were suspended; and several judges and employees were either fined or reprimanded.

Thirty-five cases were filed with the courts of first instance against customs personnel and private persons, 70 criminal cases were brought before city and provincial fiscals, 170 administrative cases were filed against customs employees, while 4 fixers and 4 government agents were recommended for criminal prosecution.

Criminal and administrative charges were brought against 211 internal revenue collection agents and cash clerks and 100 taxpayers criminally charged in courts.

The success of our relentless drive against grafting officials and employees is reflected, we believe, in the increase in our customs and internal revenue collections as well as in the increased efficiency and new vitality of our lower courts.

JUSTICE

The administration of justice, as well as the machinery therefor, has been substantially improved. The sensational cases that have appeared in the front pages of our newspapers have been brought before our courts of justice and dealt with in record time. The preliminary investigation of criminal cases has been shortened, simplified and made uniform with the promulgation by the Department of Justice of Circular No. 74, series of 1967. Two administration measures were enacted, one enlarging the prosecution staff the Department of Justice and the other creating 16 circuit criminal courts. Incompetent judges and erring court employees are being dealt with administratively, to complete the effort towards improvement of the administration of justice.

The stand taken by the Administration on various legal controversies has been sustained by our courts of justice thus underscoring this Administration's avowed policy of adherence to the rule of law.

CODIFICATION OF LAWS

The proliferation of statutes in different areas of legislation has become alarming, indicating the urgent need for codification of laws. I have, therefore, directed the Code Commission to initiate immediately the revision and updating of existing codes as well as the preparation of new ones.

In line for updating and revision are the Revised Penal Code, the Code of Commerce, the Revised Administrative Code, the Internal Revenue Code, and the Customs and Tariff Code. On the other hand, there is now a demand to codify our labor and social legislation, and the laws on natural resources.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The Presidential Arm on Community Development has cooperated with religious and student volunteer groups; and has initiated some 43,000 self-help projects and 23,000 training and information activities involving 953,000 participants. Some of these self-help projects are: spring development for communal water supply and irrigation; rural electrification; the establishment of communal rice and corn mills; the distribution of IR-8 seeds, as well as the construction of feeder roads and the assembly on-site of pre-fabricated schoolhouses.

OEC FIRMS: P53.3 M PROFITS

The corporations under the Office of Economic Coordination realized profits amounting to P53.3 million for fiscal year 1967, representing an increase of 29 per cent over the previous year. To further improve the profitability of these corporations, allowances of board members and per diems for committee meetings have been standardized. In their role as developers of new industries, all investments are now required to be funneled strictly to pioneering or pace-setting ventures.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Recognizing technology to be the foremost factor in economic development today, as strikingly demonstrated in the economic recovery of Japan and Germany after World War II, the government has embarked on a new program to invigorate the scientific climate of the country. Additional funds have already been channeled to support new projects in the field of applied science. About P2 million has been allocated to augment the facilities and admit a larger enrollment in the Philippine Science High School. Thirty-five hectares of public land has been proclaimed by the Office of the President as a grant to the National Science Development

Board to accommodate the science community.

In support of new projects in the field of industrial research, more than P6 million yearly has been allotted by the government for the Philippine Textile Institute, the Metals Industry Development Center and Coconut Research.

The government has also been active in tapping foreign assistance for the support of research in applied science. In the field of mineral resources development, the government has undertaken jointly with international agency special projects in coal development and applied geology. More than P8 million yearly in counterpart funds is being expended by the government for foreign-assisted research in dairy, fish, soil and training in agriculture, forestry and meteorology.

The government is also supporting, through bilateral foreign assistance agreements, an Institute of Small Scale Industries and a Technological and Research Center for Cottage Industries. The Administration is drafting a plan providing for increased financial support for science and technological development, including the possibility of establishing regional science high schools in the Visayas and Mindanao.

GOVERNMENT SCHOLARSHIPS

Recognizing the need to develop talent and provide it with greater opportunities, I have created a committee to formulate a new scholarship program. I am determined that poverty or lack of opportunity shall not prevent real talent from developing to its fullest possibilities. The committee on this new program of scholarships is now studying ways of financing the program and laying down the criteria for the grant of scholarships. I expect its recommendations shortly.

At the same time, we shall soon put into effect a scheme for the benefit of students, building on an existing service of the Social Security System, whereby students may be provided loans, under special terms and conditions, to cover their school expenses. This will be financed from a special fund contributed by various financial institutions of the government.

ECONOMIC GROWTH AND SECURITY

The progress we are striving for goes beyond the mere requirements of survival. Our economy must prosper if our society is to be truly secure. I have repeatedly said that the greatest peril to a people, to the safety of their lives and institutions, is their own country's improvident economy.

For the task of providing our society with sufficient guarantees of stability and security, in the form of more abundant goods and a greater sense of well-being, I have consequently enlisted the services of the Armed Forces. Although it is proper that our soldiers must be prepared to perform their role in the military defense of the country, it is necessary that today they must also participate in the more immediate and vital defense of the nation against poverty, ignorance, disease and injustice.

A NEW MISSION FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Accordingly, the Department of National Defense has participated actively in the rice production, schoolbuilding, public works, rural health, peace and order and civic action programs.

We have harnessed and augmented the manpower and equipment resources of the military establishment in our heightened drive for economic development and providing for internal security.

In pursuance of this, we have activated 15 engineer construction battalions, increased the intake and expanded the concept of training of 20-year-olds, intensified the AFP's civic action role, broadened its peace and order operations, and increased its capability not only to provide for national security but also for participation in national development implementation. The AFP has achieved outstanding success in this additional mission of assisting in our infrastructure development.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC, OTHER ROLES

More specifically, we acquired equipment under the U.S. Military Assistance Program to complete the requirements for 5 engineering battalions, activated 27 civic action centers, trained a total of 119,082 reservists and trainees, including 118,082 ROTC cadets, for various economically useful skills in Calendar year 1967 alone, acquired modern aircraft and vessels and other military hardware to bolster our defense capability, effectively blunted smuggling operations and organized the METROCOM and other PC units to intensify the peace and order campaign.

We also sent the PHILCAG to South Vietnam to participate not in combat operations but in purely civic action operations, assisting that distressed country in the long range but equally important task of social and economic rehabilitation.

MEETING THE INSURGENCY THREAT

In the meantime, we have been intensifying our efforts to meet the insurgency threat. However, the threat remains real and has assumed greater urgency. This is reflected by the increasing number of combat operations and the increasing number of casualties sustained both by our troops and by the dissidents. On the credit side a substantial number of HMBs including 4 top commanders have been killed or captured.

Despite the continuing insurgency threat and the increasing number of civic action mission assigned to the Armed Forces, its proportional share of our total national budget has actually declined over the past 13 years. Budgetary data show that this has gradually decreased from 17.5 per cent in FY 1965 to 14.6 per cent in FY 1967.

INTERNAL SUBVERSION—THE MAIN THREAT

As I stated upon arrival from my recently concluded three-nation state visits, I am now convinced that the primary threat to our national security within the immediate future lies in internal subversion rather than from any external aggression. The military establishments will be developed along this basic premise in the years to come. However, since the development of our economy provides the permanent solution to this threat, I intend to harness to a greater extent the resources of our defense establishment in our task of nation-building. It would be culpable negligence on our part if the peaceful uses of military forces were not availed of to the fullest extent possible in our continuing program of economic development.

In this regard, we will activate 5 additional engineering battalions and establish 38 new civic action centers so that each province will have one such center. We will create 100 military rural health teams to minister to remote and medically depressed areas where civilian doctors are reluctant to venture for reasons of personal security or inadequacy of compensation. We will also establish 13 coast guard stations to strengthen our anti-smuggling posture, and continue to acquire more modern weaponry for our ground, sea and air units. I wish to point out in this connection that additional equipment for 5 complete engineering battalions, procured through the U.S. Military Assistance Program, will arrive before the end of this Fiscal Year 1968.

CIVIC ACTION

In the field of civic action, we have generated tremendous enthusiasm in our people, particularly in the rural areas, and we feel that the challenge of civic action today is now to meet the growing appetite and yearning of our people. Toward this end, we will reorient our civic action programs from impact-oriented to development-oriented ones.

It is also our purpose to exploit fully the capabilities of the AFP for manpower development and training, tying this in with the annual call of 20-year-old trainees. More 20-year-olds will be called and given training not only in the basic military arts but more importantly in agricultural, construction and other technical skills. They will be drawn from and trained in their respective localities and their non-military training will emphasize those skills that are responsive to the manpower needs of the particular locality.

AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL PROJECTS

As a further extension of this scheme, quasi-governmental companies composed of retired officers with managerial competencies will be organized and encouraged to develop economically viable agricultural or industrial projects in these localities, procuring their workers from among the 20-year-olds who have completed the training. Thus, aside from meeting the demand for skilled labor the program will assure the continued utilization of valuable managerial and technical skills at no extra governmental cost because the retired officers are already receiving their retirement pensions. In case these companies can generate enough income to pay higher salaries in lieu of these pensions, this will further relieve the government's ever increasing financial burden of paying for such pensions.

We are also studying a phasing out program, over a ten-year period, of the military units and installations located in the metropolitan Manila area. For national security and economic purposes, these military installations could best be moved out of population and industrial centers and transferred to more militarily secure and underdeveloped areas. The valuable real estate presently occupied by the Armed Forces can then be sold to provide the much needed funds for economic development, such as financing the operations of the Land Bank or building vital infrastructure projects.

MOBILIZING RESOURCES FOR PEACE AND ORDER

I consider peace and order a continuing major problem. This is, however, concentrated in the metropolitan Manila area where about two-thirds of the reported index crimes for the entire country are committed and over which the PC incidentally has no jurisdiction. An increasing number of piratical raids in Manila Bay and the Visayas-Mindanao area has also been noted. I have been informed that these raids are abetted by the encouragement and support of certain affluent sectors in these areas. Our anti-piracy efforts have resulted in the breaking up of the notorious pirate gang operating in the Cebu area and our employment of the PC has enhanced our anti-crime drive. Nevertheless, the solution to the peace and order problem requires nothing less than the complete mobilization of government resources and the utmost participation and cooperation of the citizenry.

MAXIMUM USE OF ARMED FORCES

We have prepared the groundwork for a peace and order program that will call for the total involvement of all government entities hand in hand with civic organizations and the general public. We will make maximum use of the Armed Forces in this all-out integrated peace and order campaign.

Certainly we shall continue to maintain PHILCAG in South Vietnam as an international commitment. Valuable as the PHILCAG's civic action operations are now in the country, they will be increasingly valuable in helping provide the means for South Vietnam's economic and social recovery once the fighting is over.

NO DUPLICATION OF FUNCTIONS

It is not correct to say that the military is usurping or taking over civilian functions.

There is neither usurpation nor duplication of efforts. The military merely supplements civilian performance, especially in areas where civilians, in and out of the government service, are either unwilling or unable to operate effectively. For instance, we are sending a naval medical corps to practice in Lanao and Sulu, in order to augment the extremely inadequate civilian medical service available in those remote areas.

What we have done is to refashion the role of the military towards civic action—the reassignment of soldiers from housekeeping in the barracks to active participation in the *epic of development.*

THE PHILIPPINES AND ASIA

The concern for an accelerated and expanded program of economic development, using all possible means and resources, led me to explore recently, with the leaders of Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand, possibilities of closer cooperation in economic development. My state visits to these three countries have increased my confidence that national development and regional development can and must go hand in hand. We and our neighbors, in a region where the opportunities for growth have been largely unfulfilled, must now bring our skills and resources together to establish the only real basis for peace and security.

AN OBJECTIVE OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

The community of interests in our immediate neighborhood, reaffirmed during my recent state visits, is in line with one of the fundamental aims of our foreign policy, which is to achieve economic development through close cooperation with other countries.

Thus, by specific agreements with the leaders of Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand to undertake with the Philippines joint economic, cultural and educational projects, we can look forward to more speedy economic development on a national as well as on a regional scale.

THE ASEAN AND ASPAC

Only recently, we helped build the framework for progress through cooperation by joining, as one of five founding members, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. The ASEAN as an instrument for economic advancement figured prominently in my discussions with the leaders of Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand. The promise of success that the ASEAN holds has confirmed the validity of the increased emphasis in our foreign policy on our relations with the rest of Asia.

Our Asian identity has been further strengthened by our participation in the Asian Pacific Council. Concrete projects under the ASPAC, such as the Experts Services Register in Canberra, the Social and Cultural Centre in Seoul, and the Food and Fertilizer Bank, all designed to accelerate regional economic and material growth, are now in the final stages of implementation.

MISSIONS FOR PROSPERITY

It was primarily the need to strengthen this ever-widening fabric of regional cooperation as a means to prosperity and peace in Asia that moved me in 1967 to undertake, personally, missions to several nations in our region.

I journeyed to Australia, following the tragic death of Prime Minister Holt late last year, to convey the sympathy of the Filipino people to that great country, with which we are allied in SEATO and ASPAC.

My visit to the Republic of Vietnam about the middle of last year enabled me to witness the humanitarian efforts and constructive building projects of our officers and men in the PHILCAG. That visit also gave me the opportunity to assess with the leaders of South Vietnam the chances of restoring peace, a requisite of enduring progress, in our part of the world.

SECOND AIM OF FOREIGN POLICY

I am determined that the momentum for Asian prosperity and stability, which we gained through our recently renewed contact with Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand, shall be maintained, if possible increased. For the second fundamental aim of our foreign policy, which is to ensure the security of the Philippines from aggression and subversion, is inextricably linked with our economic development. A better life for our people is the best guarantee of their security.

REORIENTATION IN REGIONAL SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS

Present regional security arrangements should be recast to conform to a vital change in outlook. The real danger to our democratic life and institutions comes from internal subversion rather than external aggression. This danger grows and solidifies in direct proportion to the discontent among the people. It should be the primary concern of every government, therefore, to provide for the comfort and well-being of its citizens. On a regional scale, governments must find every possible means to align their efforts towards cooperation in economic development. The SEATO must now shift its emphasis from military preparedness to economic assistance among its members.

CREDIT AND PRICES

In recognition of the increased investment requirements of business our monetary authorities began the last calendar year by continuing the policy of credit ease which had been adopted during the previous year. The result, however, for the first half of the year, was a credit expansion more than 10 times the amount over the comparable period in 1966. Also, much of this credit went to finance imports, which increased by 45 per cent in the first six months as compared to the first half of 1966, while exports lagged behind. The result was the June circulars of the Central Bank, which were designed to curtail imports and redirect bank credit to other activities, especially production for export and food requirements; these circulars were later modified in October.

The measures that were contained in the June circulars and the subsequent October circulars contained a mixed policy of partial restriction and partial relaxation. The burden of the restrictive measures fell on imports financing because of the disturbing trend of our external trade.

POLICY OF LIBERAL CREDIT

At the same time, to ensure the continuation of the more desirable roots of economic growth, credit continued to be more liberal for the producers of rice and corn as production was exempted from the rediscount ceiling; and half of the ceiling was earmarked for the financing of export production. If some banks then still feel that their liquidity was reduced, it was perhaps a sign that their loan portfolio were unbalanced, favoring activities which, in the opinion of the government, were less conducive toward economic development. The increased activity in our stock market shows that there is certainly considerable capital available.

A second purpose of these credit restrictions was to contain the increase in prices; but the ultimate solution to high prices, as our recent experience clearly demonstrates, is to improve production and distribution facilities, especially of food products. The early success of our rice program was reflected in a decline of the Philippine Consumer Price Index in the months of April and May 1967 from its level in December 1966. Then two typhoons occurred, which damaged the rice crop and blocked roads leading from production to market centers; and prices promptly rose again. The movement of vegetable prices is an even more striking demonstration. In April of last year, vegetables prices were 27 per cent below their December 1966 level. Then the storms came; and prices rose by more than half of their year end level.

FINANCING OF DEVELOPMENT

Over the last fiscal year, domestic savings exceeded the expectations of our economic program; unfortunately, investment requirements also exceeded expectations by a similar amount. The domestic savings short fall was financed almost entirely by reparations and grants, with reserves and a small capital inflow making up the remainder.

The government during this period significantly influenced the size and direction of private investment, as well as the conditions under which business was done. Domestic markets were protected against dumping by proceedings against undervalued synthetics and chemicals, and against actual and technical smuggling particularly in textiles and luxury items.

Massive support was also granted to the private sector by government financial institutions. Between January 1966 and November 1967, as has been mentioned, no less than P4.4 billion had been extended by the five major government financial institutions to private concerns in the form of loans, guarantees and equity investment. These institutions are the DBP, PNB, GSIS, SSS and NIDC. Of this total, P1.7 billion, or 40 per cent, went to manufacturing, and over P786 million to agriculture, forestry and fishing.

MANAGEMENT OF GOVERNMENT FINANCES

The year just passed also saw a number of innovations in the management of government finances, again generally with striking success. The improvement of our tax collecting organization is now a matter of public knowledge and pride, and I shall only note here that it continues unabated. Total BIR and Customs collections for 1967, (January to October) were about 20 per cent over 1966; which in turn had been 10 per cent over 1965. Internal revenue collections were up by over 13 per cent and Customs collections (when volume of imports increased by 14 per cent) were up by almost 32 per cent. Both of these had also increased over 1965, by 5.7 and 16 per cent, respectively. Since no new tax measures were passed, and since the economy did not grow by nearly the same amount, most of this increase may be attributed to greater efficiency in both these important government areas.

The management of government debt was also undertaken with imagination, efficiency and success. The market for government securities for the first time in our financial history became truly widened with treasury bills becoming available to the private commercial sector, at competitive interest rates. We have realized as much as P175 million from this source, with the balance now standing at about P130 million. The Progress Bonds of the Development Bank of the Philippines have been an outstanding success, and had tapped private savings to the extent of P200 million as of the beginning of this month.

THE INVESTMENT INCENTIVES ACT

Finally, last year also saw the passage of the most sophisticated and potentially the most significant piece of economic legislation in the last twenty years. This is of course Republic Act 5186, the Investment Incentives Act. It sets forth in one place the investment policy of the government; but it goes beyond other incentives legislation in more than just comprehensiveness. It recognizes that economic conditions are constantly changing, and defines desirable areas of investment with corresponding flexibility. Most important, it creates in the Board of Investments a permanent machinery for planning investment in productive sectors, whose objectives are both to increase the amount of investment in the aggregate and to rationalize its structure.

In short, we have used with imagination

and skill the resources we have for increasing the rate and improving the structure of capital formation, and we have added significantly to these resources. But both our recent success and the pressing needs of the people inspire us to further ambition.

BUDGETARY POLICY

The search for economic prosperity demands that we straighten out the state of our financial affairs. Fiscal irresponsibility breeds conditions that are not conducive to monetary stability. When we sow the seeds of currency and price instability, we ultimately lose the benefits of economic progress.

Our budgetary policy, therefore, ever since I assumed the Presidency, is to maintain a balanced budget in so far as the ordinary operating expenses of the government are concerned. Funds raised through the issues of bonds and other forms of borrowings have been applied to infrastructure, development expenditures and investments.

In the allocation of funds, more emphasis has been given to economic development and less on general government. Two years ago the budget for economic development amounted to only 25.0 per cent of total expenditures. We have increased this to 3.8 per cent.

On the other hand, the budget for general government has been decreasing percentage-wise. It was 14.4 per cent of the total budget in fiscal year 1966. During the current fiscal year it amounts to only 11.5 per cent. Moreover, contrary to the common impression, the budget for national defense has not grown in proportion to the total annual budget. In spite of the increased responsibilities of our Armed Forces, due to its dual military duties and civic-action activities, its expenditures even decreased from 14.5 per cent in fiscal year 1966 to an estimated 14.2 per cent for the current fiscal period.

Capital expenditures also increased from 9.3 per cent in fiscal year 1966 to 17.5 per cent in fiscal year 1967, while current operating expenditures decreased from 90.7 per cent to 82.5 per cent for the same fiscal years.

REMAINING PROBLEMS

We began this message by defining three major economic problems of long standing. After two years of the present Administration, we can say with reasonable confidence that the first of these, the problem of producing enough food for our needs, is no longer of primary concern. This does not imply a diminution of our efforts to aid agriculture—two-thirds of our people still live in rural areas and we have a long way to go before we can be satisfied that their way of living has improved sufficiently.

Of the problems that still confront us, the most serious one, and one that is important to national self-respect as well as economic life, is the problem of improving our foreign exchange earnings. With our rapid growing population and in our present stage of industrialization, our country must trade in order to live acceptably well. The limits of easy import substitution have been reached, and substantial overcapacities already exist in many industry lines. At the same time, the country's list of exports has not changed markedly over the last twenty years, and remains composed primarily of agricultural products and industrial raw materials, for which the world market grows too slowly. Furthermore, our preferential trade relations with the United States are due to expire in a few years.

NEED TO INCREASE EXPORTS

First priority must therefore be given to increasing our exports, and to sustaining this increase over the long term. Our ultimate goal is self-sustaining growth, i.e. a high growth rate which can be maintained without undue reliance on foreign borrowing. Domestic savings are rising fast enough to be sufficient for our investment requirements in about ten years; but exports continue to fall short of our import requirements. We must eventually aim at an annual growth rate of 8 per cent for our exports; and efforts to attain this goal must begin immediately.

This is a problem of the greatest importance; it affects every aspect of our economic life; and the pressure to increase export earnings will continue as far ahead as we can foresee.

The export drive must begin immediately, and continue far into the future; later on, I shall outline the measure I believe necessary to undertake immediately.

FINANCING THE INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM

The second major problem that remains is financing our infrastructure program. The government has committed itself to providing many services which are essential to welfare or even to life. Half a million children annually enter our school system; health services must be expanded; training programs are urgently needed to reduce unemployment; the HMB continue to be a threat to our national security, in spite of recent success in this field. Our support of these and other essential services are current, not capital expenditures; they already absorb the bulk of government earnings, and annually become more expensive to provide. Still, a large and growing surplus must be obtained for capital expenditures; and not even the greatly increased efficiency in collecting existing taxes can do this.

REQUIRED MEASURES

Measured against the achievements of previous Administrations, the performance of the last two years is impressive; measured against the people's needs, they remain modest. The confidence we have gained from past success, as well as our consciousness of the needs which remain great, inspire us to set even higher goals for the future.

These longer-term goals are set forth in the rolling programs of our planning and implementing agencies. We shall merely outline here what has to be done over the next year. Our operational program involves activities in four areas: continuing government reorganization for efficiency; projects to be directly undertaken by the government, especially in infrastructure; manpower development and land reform; the improvement of our foreign trade; and the direction of domestic and foreign investment.

ORGANIZATION

In public administration, the most pressing need is for legislative action of the Reorganization Bill and the Revised Administrative Code, already submitted to Congress. We need to transform our administrative structure into the dynamic and synchronized machinery needed to perform effectively its role in economic development. In support of this, we also have to recast our long-established but now outmoded processes and procedures. We, therefore, propose to continue the reassessment of the organization and operations of our administrative machinery.

INFRASTRUCTURE

In infrastructure, our basic objective remains the provision of a structurally safe and sufficient network of major thoroughfares, with supplementary integrable developmental road systems, complementary water and air transport facilities and a comprehensive communications network; together with the irrigation and other facilities necessary to support economic growth.

Our basic criterion in the selection of our infrastructure projects has been their contribution to economic growth; but our selection has been realistic as well. We have also considered the financial resources available to the government and what we hope to obtain from new taxes, as well as the capabilities of the agencies to utilize capital funds.

In highways, we propose the concrete and asphalt paving of a total of 1,000 kilometers, the construction of 2,000 kilometers of developmental and feeder roads and 9,900 lineal meters of permanent bridges.

We have started the groundwork for the construction of the 3,000-kilometer Philippine-Japan Friendship Highway which running from Laoag City in the north to Zamboanga City in the south would link Luzon, the Visayas and Mindanao. This highway will serve two purposes: it will also contain emergency airstrips, to augment existing airports, to make possible aircraft landings along the whole stretch of this cross-country highway at regular intervals.

NATIONWIDE TRANSPORT SURVEY

We have also taken initial steps for the conduct of a nationwide transport survey which we hope to get off the ground this year. The purpose of the survey would be to provide a comprehensive and coordinated transport program on the basis of the expected socio-economic development of the country and its various regions, suggesting measures to be taken in the field of planning and regulating transport services, in the field of the responsibilities and organization of the public and semi-public entities involved and in identifying investments in the entire sector and priorities there.

We propose the irrigation of an additional 140,000 hectares to comprise our main irrigation program. In addition, we will continue the construction of communal and pump irrigation projects which will extend irrigation benefits to some 50,000 hectares more. We are pursuing the construction of the multi-million peso Upper Pampanga River Project which is designed primarily for irrigating 81,000 hectares in and providing domestic water supply to Nueva Ecija.

In airports and airways, we propose the concrete paving of runways and taxiways in 20 airports. We will improve and modernize the air navigation facilities throughout the country urgently needed for the safety of life and property in air travel. We also expect to complete runway resurfacing of the Manila International Airport by April this year.

Various projects at the port of Manila will be completed and provision has also been made for the improvement of 31 other ports throughout the country.

The most conspicuous of the communications projects is the permanent earth station of the Philippines Satellite Communications Project to be completed in April of this year. An interim earth station for this project was completed in a record time of 45 days and made operational in April of last year.

Other targets include 14,000 school units, 9 flood control projects costing some P13.6 million, low-cost housing, 40 waterworks projects, and various community projects.

To achieve these targets, we will need P580 million this year. This however does not include the whole cost of special projects like the Philippine-Japan Friendship Highway.

LAND REFORM

These facilities, by making it possible to increase production and income, will contribute indirectly to augmenting the livelihood and dignity of our people. But the government must also continue to make a more direct contribution. In addition to the services we normally provide, such as education and health services, we propose to concentrate on two programs, Land Reform and manpower development.

In Land Reform, we shall concentrate our efforts on the second Land Reform district of Pampanga, to make the program more effective. Also, two sources of funds were authorized last year for the Land Bank; we shall encourage this year the utilization of these sources, to make the operations of the Land Bank more effective. New funds will be drawn by the Bank from the issue of bonds

up to P10 million, which I authorized last year; and from the proceeds of the sale of 16 government properties in Manila authorized by Republic Act 5169. The sale is expected to realize up to P120 million, of which three-quarters is to go to Land Bank and the remainder to the Agricultural Credit Administration.

To complement our land reform efforts, we are opening up the 33,000 hectares Barira Farm in Parang, Cotabato for Army veterans, former dissidents and landless tenants. Later this year we shall also open 30,000 hectares in Tuao, Lanao del Norte.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT

Unemployment continues to be a pressing problem, with about 8 per cent of our labor force totally unemployed last year. We are considering several proposals to improve the skills of our idle manpower and thus make them productive members of society.

Among these measures are: an in-plant skills training program responsive to current and projected needs of industry; training for employment of out-of-school youth and unemployed adults through a network of practical training centers; and free vocational instruction at the secondary school level. These proposals shall be embodied in an omnibus manpower development and training bill which I shall shortly submit to Congress for consideration and enactment.

We are laying the groundwork for a national youth development program. Eventually, it will redeem some three million of our out-of-school youth, teach them civics, physical fitness, occupational and food production techniques. It involves the establishment of a national institute for youth leadership, pilot training centers, and the cooperation of the Manpower Development Council, the National Youth Coordinating Council, the Departments of Education, Labor, National Defense, the PACD and the private sector.

Finally, in the area of housing, we shall aim at increasing the credit resources available for low-cost housing as well as orienting lending practices towards the needs of low-cost homes. Likewise support shall be given government housing agencies to make them effective instruments for low-cost housing.

Our Social Security System, for example, has finalized its plans for building 7,000 low-cost houses annually. This project is scheduled to start this year.

FINANCING THE PROGRAM

Partly because of the growing needs of the people, partly because of their neglect in the past, the government is forced to spend this year and the next very large amounts for the provision of services essential for public welfare and facilities essential for economic development. To promise such things is popular; but we must not shirk the less attractive discussion of how they are to be financed.

In the drafting of this program, every possible reduction has already been made. The proposals have been subjected to ruthless scrutiny and pruning; only those that have met the strictest criteria of economy, efficiency and necessity have been allowed to pass, and these often in severely reduced form.

As evidence of this testing, I have laid down, in a proposal unprecedented in the history of Philippine budgeting, an absolute upper limit on the level of current expenditures. For this fiscal year, current expenditures from the general fund will not be allowed to exceed P2 billion. This limit will hold absolutely, in spite of the fact that the cost of providing the services that these expenditures represent has risen considerably.

Every other centavo that the government can raise will go into our capital program. But this money must not only be spent wisely, it must also be raised wisely.

FOUR ALTERNATIVES

There remain four alternatives open to us, and we have already utilized as much as is possible or prudent those alternatives that are open to purely executive action. First, we can borrow from abroad. We have already secured extensive foreign financing for capital projects; what keeps us from borrowing more is that we cannot raise the necessary local counterpart funds. Second, we can borrow domestically; and we have in fact programmed sizeable bond issues for both this year and the next. But fiscal prudence sets a limit to this sort of financing, to which we are already disturbingly close. The two remaining alternatives must also be used.

APPROACH TO PROBLEM OF REVENUES

We propose a two-pronged attack on the problem of raising government revenues. The first line of attack is to continue as we have done, and I think done conspicuously well, to improve the efficiency of collecting existing taxes. But this has not proven sufficient; many important programs have had to be curtailed for lack of funds. All that is humanly possible to increase the efficiency of the tax collecting agencies have been done and will be done. But this is not enough. A second line of attack is therefore necessary, has been necessary, for many years, and is especially urgent at this time precisely because it has been so long delayed. This is the passage of several new revenue measures, most of them long since proposed, others more recent, all badly needed. This has been the recommendation of recognized authorities on fiscal and monetary matters including former Central Bank Governors Miguel Cuaderno and Andres Castillo and present Governor Alfonso Calalang. Likewise this has been the recommendation of the IMF and the World Bank. The alternative to their non-passage would be continued pressures on our international reserves which would compel us to further restrict credit and/or cut back on our development program. Failure to pass them could lead to unmanageable price increases for which you and I must bear the responsibility. While a moderate increase in prices is admittedly compatible with and concomitant with economic growth, a runaway inflation, which we seek to avert with new taxes, would certainly not be conducive to growth and disruptive of it. How badly we need new taxes can be seen from the following example. We wish to raise P580 million for our capital program this fiscal year. Foreign financing has already been netted out of this figure. Existing taxes, even allowing for continuation of the increase in efficiency of collection, after deducting current expenditures, and programmed bond issues will lead us some P250 million short of this goal. A rather large amount remains, opposite the hopeful notation, "To be financed from other sources."

TAX REFORM

This enormous disparity between government needs and government means has existed too long; and the makeshifts and compromises that have been employed to bridge the gap have at last become insupportable. The reform of our tax system is long overdue. We ask that it be undertaken immediately.

The justifications are compelling. We can certainly afford more taxes: the proportion of national income our government disposes of is about half the comparable percentage for Malaysia and about 50 per cent less than that of Thailand, neither of which countries is conspicuously richer than we are. Furthermore, our present tax structure was essentially created before 1939, when our needs were much simpler, and when we had a colonial father to run to in case of need.

MEASURES PROPOSED

Most of the measures we propose are to increase tax revenues. But there is a second purpose for tax reform, besides increasing government revenue. We wish as well to distribute income more equitably, and to reduce the consumption of luxuries, especially those that are imported. The measures we recommend are thus of several kinds.

Some of these rationalize the existing tax structure. These comprise the measures to promote a more equitable distribution of income tax collection between the national and local governments; to amend certain sections of the Tariff and Customs Code of the Philippines; and to revise the rates on the individual income tax, some rates downward and other rates upward.

Other measures increase particular taxes, in the interests both of raising national savings and government revenues, and of discouraging conspicuous consumption, which is particularly harmful in this period of threatening unrest. These measures include increase in amusement taxes, and in specific taxes on certain distilled spirits and fermented liquors; requiring the payment of certain charges for foreign travel and for the registration of motor vehicles; increasing the rates of corporate income tax; and increasing the specific tax on oils and other fuels.

TEMPORARY SURTAX

Our final revenue proposal imposes a temporary surtax for economic development purposes. The main aim of this surtax is to enable us to carry on several essential capital programs, which have long been necessary, are more essential now than ever before, and have been suspended for lack of funds. The collections from this surtax are to be allocated to a special economic development fund, which is to be used solely for capital projects. The surtax is to be charged on certain taxes; but it is to be strictly temporary. It will cease when the backlog of capital projects has been erased, and will not in any case be imposed for more than four years.

By all these means, we hope to raise by prudent methods about P1 billion for capital projects over the next four years. Our past performance guarantees that the funds will be spent wisely; and if these measures are passed, especially the last, there will be an additional guarantee, in that we shall be spreading more widely the national stake in economic development, and hence the national determination that economic development does take place.

DIRECTING PRIVATE INVESTMENT

At the same time we must make sure that private entrepreneurs channel their energies and their funds in the ways that best promote economic development. We remain committed to free enterprise; controls are a cumbersome and an inefficient tool. Our method is simply to make certain industry lines attractive to private business as well as essential to development. In the encouragement of priority lines industries, the Board of Investments and the Presidential Economic Staff will take a leading part.

We are also determined that this development should be primarily in the hands of, and to the benefit of Filipino nationals. But this places on us the obligation of making clear precisely what the conditions are that we impose on foreign investment. This we have already done in general principle, with the passage of the Investment Incentives Act. But there are a few particular uncertainties that must be cleared up immediately.

OTHER MEASURES

For the guidance of private investment, domestic as well as foreign, we are therefore considering two measures among others. The first of these is the re-classification of land used by factories as non-agricultural. This is a classification that conforms more closely than the present one to the facts. It has the further advantage of acting as an incentive to the promotion and continuance of productive investment.

A second uncertainty concerns the definition of the term national treatment with respect to foreign investment, especially in the fields of manufacturing, commerce and finance. This should be cleared up by congressional action.

Finally, the mining law should be revised to encourage exploration for domestic sources of petroleum. The present law classifies the processing of petroleum from domestic sources as a public utility, and is hence severely restrictive to foreigners; but it does not so restrict the processing of petroleum from foreign sources. Thus our petroleum industry remains heavily import dependent. Domestic entrepreneurs have the incentive to prospect for oil here, but not the resources. Foreign companies have the resources and knowledge, but not the incentive.

It is difficult to justify this policy, especially in the present circumstances. The discovery here of oil in commercial quantities would be a tremendous asset, not only to our international reserves but also to our national security. We should no longer deny ourselves this possible good fortune.

GUIDELINES

In all these matters, we will adopt a broad approach, marked by four related guidelines. They are:

First, the encouragement of forward integration in our mining operations toward the processing of ores for local use or for export as higher priced products, as well as the backward integration of manufacturing to develop domestic sources of material requirements which are still being imported.

Second, the promotion of industries which utilize indigenous raw materials and which will service foreign markets aside from meeting the demands of the domestic market.

Third, the expansion of import substituting ventures geared to local raw materials and whose products are competitive with imports in quality and cost. And

Fourth, the stimulation of industries which provide material requirements to our agricultural sector and which support the capacity of the domestic market to absorb our agricultural products.

BANKING AND MANUFACTURING SECTORS

We will also encourage cooperation between our banking system on the one hand, and our manufacturers on the other, toward the production of capital equipment for our industries and possibly for export. It is an established fact that our engineering industries are capable of turning out equipment, components and other durable consumer goods at lesser cost than their counterparts in other countries. What is needed in this respect is a financing arrangement between our public and private financing agencies and our manufacturers, which will render financially feasible the undertaking of significant capital goods production.

A REALISTIC TAX PROGRAM

Since its enactment in 1939, the National Internal Revenue Code, which is the basis of our existing tax system, has remained basically the same. About 72 per cent of tax revenues are from indirect taxes; the remaining 28 per cent come from direct taxes. This must now be revised.

A realistic tax program, one attuned to the development requirements as well as the structure of our society, is now imperative. We must produce a system which would not only increase tax revenues for financing intensified government action in economic development but also distribute the tax burden fairly and justly. The rich, rather than the poor, should bear the greater weight of the tax responsibility.

SPECIAL FUNDS

It is important that the funds we seek to generate shall be utilized with extreme prudence. I shall therefore define as clearly as possible the major areas in which we must sustain or accelerate our development efforts, and mark out the funds that shall be utilized to finance them exclusively.

I propose tax measures for the following special funds, and their corresponding uses:

1. *A special land reform fund,* consisting of 50 per cent of the proceeds from the specific taxes on distilled spirits, wines and fermented liquors, and to be administered by the National Land Reform Council.

This fund shall be used exclusively to hasten the implementation of the land reform program of the government as embodied in the Land Reform Code. Among others, the fund will be utilized for the (a) acquisition and expropriation of private landed estates; (b) survey and subdivision of lands into capability survey; and (c) provision of infrastructure needs of land reform areas.

2. *A special school fund,* consisting of all proceeds from: (a) a P3.00 levy on all individuals and P50.00 levy on all corporations required to file income tax returns; and (b) P1.00 for every P3,000 worth of real property and/or salaries, gross receipts and earnings, on all individuals and corporations required to file income tax returns or pay the real property tax.

This fund shall be used exclusively to finance the preparation, printing and purchase of ordinary teaching aids, such as blackboards, chalks, erasers and visual paraphernalia.

3. *A special manpower development fund,* to consist of the proceeds from the imposition of a tax of 10 per cent and 5 per cent on the f.o.b. value of exports of logs and molasses, respectively.

This special fund shall be used exclusively to finance manpower training and development of technical skills in the labor force.

4. *A special fund for free hospitalization and free medicine,* to consist of 40 per cent of the tariff or taxes collected on imported blending leaf tobacco and of specific taxes collected on locally manufactured Virginia-type cigarettes, less 4 percent thereof but in no case less than P3 million annually for use by the BIR in specific tax enforcement and collection.

This fund shall be utilized exclusively to finance a comprehensive hospital and medical care program for the efficient operation and maintenance of government hospitals, puericulture centers, and rural health units and distribution of free medicine to indigents.

5. *A special science and technology research and development fund,* to consist of the proceeds from the imposition of an additional 2 per cent miller's tax and a new travel tax of P500 per foreign trip, under certain conditions.

This fund shall be used only for scientific research on a sustained basis.

6. *A community development and social welfare fund,* to consist of (a) increased collections resulting from the cutting down of the number of firms that can qualify for exemption under the Cottage Industries Law (RA 3470), through a reduction of the maximum capitalization requirement, and (b) proceeds from taxes to be collected from firms whose exemptions are proposed to be deleted from the Basic Industries Law (RA 3127).

This fund shall be utilized exclusively to intensify government efforts at improving living standards among the people at the grassroots level and to provide resources for aiding the needy and victims of natural calamities.

7. *A special infrastructure and development fund,* to consist of the proceeds from the imposition of a 15 per cent surtax on the following taxes:

(a) Personal and corporate income taxes
(b) Transfer taxes
(c) Real property tax
(d) Fixed tax on business and occupation
(e) Specific tax on alcoholic beverages
(f) Sales tax on luxury goods
(g) Percentage tax on luxury goods
(h) Amusement taxes
(i) Ordinary import duties

This fund shall be used exclusively to finance development projects in order to broaden the base of economic development.

8. *A special low-cost housing fund,* consisting of the proceeds from a tax of two per cent on the assessed value of idle lands, in addition to the regular real property tax payable thereon, the improvements on these idle lands being exempted from the regular property tax for a period of five years.

This fund shall be exclusively for the construction, maintenance and operation of low-cost tenement buildings or units for laborers and squatters in order to improve their standards of living.

9. *A special agricultural development fund,* to consist of the proceeds from the imposition of a tax on all acquisitions by a Philippine citizen residing in the Philippines, residents of the Philippines who have stayed in the Philippines for not less than one year, and corporations incorporated, organized, and existing under Philippine laws of (a) foreign stocks, (b) foreign debt obligations, and (c) land and improvement thereon which are situated outside the Philippines.

This fund shall be utilized exclusively for intensifying the development of agricultural pursuits, including the importation of cattle for breeding purposes for distribution to the barrios.

EXTERNAL TRADE AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS

I have saved until the end, to emphasize their over-riding importance, the measures to alleviate the most critical of the problems that still confront us. This is the shortage of foreign exchange. Our development program requires, as well heavy investment, large imports of capital goods and some raw materials; and recent world developments indicate that we may shortly have either to give up some of our protected markets or share them with other developing countries. Furthermore, the improvement of our export earnings requires that we first improve our relations with other countries; so that external trade becomes a question of international prestige as well as of national development. The world at large, as well as our national entrepreneurs, will judge us by the efficiency with which we act on these measures.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

The most urgent of these is the impending negotiation of our economic relations with the United States. A preparatory discussion has been held in Baguio in which we succeeded in making our wishes known and, even at that early stage, securing agreement on two important matters. The first of these is the American acceptance of the principles of the Charter of Algiers; that non-reciprocal preferences should be granted to developing nations, and their guarantee that important Philippine export will be assured of continued entry into the United States. In the event of general preferences being granted, Philippine exports are also assured of additional special preferences, at least until 1974. The second is their agreement that problems arising out of the termination of the Laurel-Langley Agreement will be resolved through the Philippine judicial process.

But that conference was only a preliminary exchange of views. The actual negotiations could take place in a few months: and for this, preparations must be undertaken immediately. Furthermore, the outcome of the negotiations will be a new treaty of economic relations between the Philippines and the United States, to replace the Laurel-Langley Agreement. Congress, as well as the Office of the President, is therefore involved, and Congress most directly, for it will have the final responsibility for the result.

Committees should therefore immediately

be set up in Congress to discuss these questions. Our entire economic relationship with the United States should be reviewed. We must attempt to gauge the national feeling as to what concessions we are willing to grant the Americans, and what we wish to accept from them in return. We must send to the United States a well prepared negotiating panel, with Congress and private business well represented.

Our economic relations with other countries as well need to be tidied up. There are treaties already negotiated and awaiting approval with the United States on tax relations, and with Japan, Germany and Sweden. Action should be taken on these as soon as possible, and in accordance with the will of Congress.

As a last measure in the field of international economic relations, we must increase our international bargaining power. Alone, we are economically weak against the industrial giants of the world; in union with similar countries in the Southeast Asian region, we can carry a little more weight. Our relations with these countries will be examined; we are particularly interested in the idea of a regional payments union.

INCENTIVES FOR EXPORTERS

On the domestic front, our own exporters are in need of more incentives. They must be encouraged to export more, and different things, to different markets. In this way, we protect ourselves from the uncertainty of being tied to a few buyers of a few products. In addition to the encouragement provided by the Investment Incentives Act, we should therefore like to see a special incentives act for exporters, in which additional tax exemptions are granted in proportion to the degree of domestic processing. A particularly attractive measure is the creation of an export processing zone. All activities within this zone would be tax-exempt; but taxes and duties would be levied if goods manufactured therein were to enter the domestic market.

Other measures are needed as well, to increase productivity and efficiency in our traditional export industries, especially sugar, coconut products and mineral production. And we must continue to attempt the restriction of non-essential imports. The measures currently in force have achieved some success; and there is hope that more restrictive measures will not be necessary.

By these and similar measures, of which I shall submit full particulars as the session progresses, our balance of payments may be improved to the extent and measure necessary.

CONCLUSION: APPEAL FOR MORATORIUM ON POLITICS

Politics is the art of decision through the will of the majority.

Supposedly, both the majority and minority parties are mere instruments of the people for the enforcement of their will.

The issue of performance as well as criticism has been submitted to the sovereign people.

The popular mandate in the last elections was clear: it was a mandate for the vigorous pursuit of a policy of performance—directed to the improvement of the lives of the people, but especially in terms of their basic needs—food, clothing, shelter and education.

This was not only a mandate for performance, but a verdict against excessive politics. On this point there could be no mistaking the popular will and temper.

The election of 1967 has just occupied our nation. Now the signs indicate excessive political activity for 1969.

I ask you to unite with us now in a concerted effort to promote our development efforts because this year should afford us a respite from politics and partisanship. This is our last year for constructive legislation. The 1969 elections certainly should not be allowed to engage our thoughts and energies now and therefore deflect us from the more urgent tasks demanded by the welfare of our people.

Those who persist in politicking at so late or so early an hour deserve the reproach and censure of the whole nation.

This is one of the tragedies of our democracy. But under my administration all parties have agreed by law to limit the period of political activity to three months for the local level and five months for the national level. This decision we all welcome as a guaranty against either majority or minority party members being guided by narrow selfish interest, their eyes dimmed by the prospect of the next election no matter how distant it may be, to the prejudice of the entire nation.

The need of the hour are men whose perceptions are clear. We must break from the crippling habits of the past. Let us cultivate only those ways and customs that will make us an effective and progressive people.

I appeal to all, whatever be your party or whether party man or not, to discard politics, at least this year. There will be enough time for the cruel, pitiless, exhausting, time consuming and often sterile and pointless pursuit of politics in 1969.

History may not record what we say. But it will record what we do. Let us now discard the pernicious habits of the past.

I hope and pray that the high-minded and noble responsiblity of lawmaking will prevail over partisanship and personal ambition.

To change their lives men must first change themselves. The challenge of nation-building is first of all a call to character-building.

It is the business of a free people to develop habits proper to freedom—to be purposeful, active, energetic and strong. We must at the very least, continue the pace that has been set in the past two years, the pace and tempo that mark a nation of achievers.

Thus may our people achieve their own development and write their own story of nation-building.

From a race, despondent, weak, vacillating, resigned and helpless—groping for salvation to a nation confident, bold and resolute, seeking not survival alone but progress.

From a nation of the *ningas-cogon* to a nation of achievers.

Let this be our epic of nation-building.

PERPETUATION OF THE HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION PROGRAM

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act became Federal law in 1920. Its purpose was to provide land and funds for settling native Hawaiians on homesteads in Hawaii. Since its inception, this program has helped many native Hawaiian families obtain house lots and farms on which to live and earn a livelihood.

At the time the constitution of the State of Hawaii was being drafted, the sentiment to perpetuate the Hawaiian Homes Commission program was so strong and overwhelming that the convention delegates adopted the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act as a law of the State of Hawaii. This is recited in section 1, article XI, of the State constitution. To further emphasize this determination, section 2 of article XI pledges the people of Hawaii to a compact with the United States:

The State and its people do hereby accept, as a compact with the United States or as conditions or trust provisions imposed by the United States, relating to the management and disposition of the Hawaiian home lands the requirement that Section 1 hereof be included in this constitution, in whole or in part, it being intended that the Act or Acts of the Congress pertaining thereto shall be definitive of the extent and nature of such compact, conditions or trust provisions, as the case may be. The State and its people do further agree and declare that the spirit of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act looking to the continuance of the Hawaiian homes projects for the further rehabilitation of the Hawaiian race shall be faithfully carried out.

Without these provisions in the constitution of the State of Hawaii it is doubtful that the constitution would have been ratified by the people of Hawaii.

Subsequently, the same compact contained in article XI of the constitution of the State of Hawaii was written by the Congress into the Hawaii Statehood Act as section 4. This section vested control and administrative responsibility for the Hawaiian Homes Commission in the State of Hawaii. However, to insure that the State of Hawaii complied with the provisions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, the Congress wrote into section 5(f) of the Statehood Act a provision reserving to the U.S. Government the right to sue the State should there be a breach of trust by the State of Hawaii in the use of Hawaiian Homes Commission lands and funds.

Retention of this right was necessary to insure that the almost 186,000 acres of Hawaiian homestead lands would be administered for the benefit of the native Hawaiians as required under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920.

Legislation has been introduced in the Senate and the House of Representatives, S. 1832 and H.R. 11133, respectively, to remove the right of the Federal Government to enforce the trust provisions regarding Hawaiian Homes Commission lands. This legislation has caused much concern among our native Hawaiian people. There is great fear that if the Federal Government's right to enforce these trust provisions is removed the assets of the Hawaiian Homes Commission may be subverted to the detriment of the homestead program.

I had the privilege of serving as vice president of the constitutional convention of the Territory of Hawaii which wrote the constitution of the State of Hawaii.

I am proud to have taken an active part in having the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 adopted as a law of the State of Hawaii through the State constitution and to have it incorporated as a compact with the Federal Government. The Hawaiian Homes Commission effort has served Hawaii well. Although problems of administration may arise from time to time, I believe the homestead program has helped tremendously in placing native Hawaiians on house lots and farms throughout the State, which they would not have received without this help.

I believe the Federal Government has a responsibility to insure that this program is perpetuated and administered in a proper manner. I am emphatically opposed to any changes in the law which would weaken or threaten the assets or existence of the Hawaiian Homes Commission program. I also am

opposed to repealing the right of the Federal Government to enforce the trust provisions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, which right is contained in section 5(f) of the Hawaii Statehood Act.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter and a resolution I received from the Nanakuli Hawaiian Homesteaders Association, Inc., objecting to H.R. 11133 and S. 1832, be printed in the RECORD. The resolution was approved by 99.89 percent of the homesteaders on Hawaiian Homes Commission land in Nanakuli, Oahu, Hawaii.

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

NANAKULI HAWAIIAN HOMESTEADERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Nanakuli, Hawaii, March 8, 1968.

HON. HIRAM L. FONG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FONG: On behalf of the "Nanakuli Hawaiian Homesteaders Association Inc.", representing 99.89% of the Homesteaders on Hawaiian Homestead Commission Land in Nanakuli, Oahu, Hawaii, I, Marie Olsen do strongly urge and forthrightly recommend that you, Mr. Hiram L. Fong, our duly elected Representative express and convey the feeling and wishes of the "Nanakuli Hawaiian Homesteaders Association Inc.", on SB 1832 by announcing on the floor of Congress and thus entering into the Congressional Record, the Resolution of March 4, 1968, as adopted by the "Hawaiian Homesteaders Association Inc." A copy of said Resolution enclosed herein to accompany this communication.

On behalf of the "Nanakuli Hawaiian Homesteaders Association Inc.", I, Marie Olsen do also strongly urge and forthrightly recommend that the open letter to Congress and accompanying petitions, enclosed and accompanying this communication, be announced with forenamed "Nanakuli Hawaiian Homesteaders Association Inc." "Resolution", be announced on the floor of Congress and thus be entered into the Congressional Record, and I hereby request that all forenamed entries be made immediately prior to any vote on SB 1832 by our representatives to Congress.

Your compliance with our request will be greatly appreciated and the progress of SB 1832 closely scrutinized.

Sincerely,

MARIE OLSEN,
President.

MARCH 5, 1968.

HONORABLE SIRS: We, the Hawaiian citizens presently residing on homestead land at Nanakuli, Hawaii, do respectfully request your support against H.R. 11133. The bill at present is in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. A hearing was held by the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on February 19, 1968. Congressman Walter Baring of Nevada, by request, introduced the bill on June 26, 1967.

The Hawaian Homes Commission Act of 1920, which was originally the Organic Act of 1895 and during the time of the great "Mehele" (land gift from our beloved Prince Jonah Kuhio to the Hawaiian people), made definite provisions for homestead lands, and such lands to be held in trust and leased only to people of Hawaiian ancestry. When Hawaii became a state, this trust was then placed in the hands of Congress.

With the inception of Model Cities Programs, according to Executive Order 11063, in order for the program to qualify for federal monies, our homestead lands must be broken apart. For Executive order 11063 denies federal monies for any urban renewal recipient found in violation of the Chief Executive's discrimination opinion on race, color, creed, and national origin.

We, the citizens of the Nanakuli Hawaiian Homestead lands, do not wish or desire to participate in the Model Cities program, and must take an opposing position to H.R. 11133, which would enable the Model Cities program to become a reality on our Homestead lands. We wish to see the present status of our homestead lands kept intact.

Because our state does not provide for initiative or petition referendum in our state constitution, we respectfully submit the enclosed petitions under the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, that is, the right to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. Be it known, also, that said enclosed petitions were signed by 99.89% of the adult population of the Nanakuli Hawaiian Homestead.

Once again, we respectfully ask for your support in opposition to H.R. 11133, and do humbly pray that you will make others aware of our plight.

Mahalo Nui Loa.

Sincerely,

THE NANAKULI HAWAIIAN HOMESTEADERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

RESOLUTION OF NANAKULI HAWAIIAN HOMESTEADERS ASSOCIATION, INC., NANAKULI, OAHU, HAWAII, MARCH 4, 1968

Resolved: That the Nanakuli Hawaiian Homesteader's Association, Incorporated, by the membership, opposes the proposal to remove Federal power to intercede in the administration of State lands granted by the Hawaiian Statehood Act of 1959.

Be it further resolved that the proposal, known as H.R. 11133, would needlessly remove an essential check to the arbitrary exercise of State power. Moreover, it is not clear how this legislation could benefit any party, for if the State does not act in a manner violative of the public trust described in the Statehood Act, the continued existence of the Federal power to intervene will never come into operation; however, only if the State violates the public trust can the Federal power operate. It would seem that the proposal to remove this guarantee serves no legitimate purpose.

Adopted by the unanimous vote of all members in attendance at the Association meeting of February 23, 1968.

Mrs. MARIE OLSEN,
President.

Mr. WILLIAM C. ACHI,
Vice President.

Mrs. BETTY ANN KAAHAAINA,
Secretary.

PETITION TO THE HONORABLE HIRAM FONG, U.S. SENATE

STATE OF HAWAII,
City and County of Honolulu,
The People of Nanakuli Homestead, ss:

GREETINGS: We, homesteaders and citizens of the Nanakuli Homestead, of the city and county of Honolulu, whose names are subscribed hereinunder, being aggrieved at the manner in which certain officials and quasi-officials of the City Demonstration Agency as proposed on April 24, 1967, to the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development under the provisions of Public Law 89–754, have blustered their authority, exaggerated and distorted matters of fact and of law, and ignored the desires of the people at numerous public meetings, do hereby petition for relief, to wit:

1. The Homestead land is protected and retained by The Hawaiian Homestead Commission Act of 1920 as amended.

2. We are opposed in principle and particular to the entire Model Cities Planning Grant Application, dated April 24, 1967, and demand rejection or withdrawal of the Application.

3. We further demand that the Application submitted, if not rejected or withdrawn, be rewritten to omit the Nanakuli Homestead area entirely.

In witness whereof, we have solemnly subscribed to this position.

NEW YORK TIMES CHARGES CAPITOL HILL ARCHITECTS CHOSEN ON BASIS OF WHO, NOT WHAT, THEY KNOW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Monday the New York Times reported that eight out of nine contracts for construction on Capitol Hill have gone to the members of the partnership of DeWitt, Poor & Shelton. Although the contracts were awarded to the seven architects involved in some instances before they became business partners the fact remains that, in the words of Philip Hutchinson, Jr., director of Government affairs for the American Institute of Architects:

There has been a monopoly created on Capitol Hill.

When a man of Mr. Hutchinson's reputation levels this sort of a charge it deserves to be carefully explored. This is all the more true when it is revealed that Mario Campioli, Assistant Architect of the Capitol, and one of the men responsible for advising Congress on new building here on the Hill, worked for two of the seven DeWitt, Poor & Shelton partners before resigning to take his present job.

As a member of the Legislative Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which appropriates funds for Capitol construction, I intend to carefully explore the charge that it is who, not what, an architect knows that gets him a contract to redesign this repository of our Nation's heritage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

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

ARCHITECTS SEE CAPITOL JOB FAVORITISM

WASHINGTON, March 17.—Eight of nine major design contracts awarded by Congress during a Capitol Hill building boom that began in 1955 have gone to seven architects—eventual business partners—whose fees to date total $5,197,737.

There is nothing illegal or unethical about Congress' hiring and rehiring the same group of architects. But architects who have been shut out are sharply critical of Congress for giving one project after another to members of the firm of DeWitt, Poor & Shelton.

"There has been a monopoly created on Capitol Hill," said Philip Hutchinson Jr., director of Government affairs for the American Institute of Architects, which claims 22,000 members among 30,000 licensed architects in the United States.

"The system up there is designed to play favorites," Mr. Hutchinson said.

Mario Campioli, assistant architect of the Capitol, who is one of the men responsible for advising Congress on Capitol Hill construction, testified before a special House subcommittee in 1966 that the same architects were used regularly because there were very few others trained in the architecture traditional on the hill.

Mr. Campioli—who worked for two of the

seven DeWitt, Poor & Shelton partners before resigning to become assistant architect of the Capitol—testified:

"There are very few who do the old work. The architects we have do both classical and contemporary."

"That's hogwash," Mr. Hutchinson said. "To imply that these are the only architects in the country trained in classical work is pure hogwash."

The seven architects are Roscoe DeWitt and Fred Hardison of Dallas, Alfred Easton Poor and Albert Swanke of New York City and Jesse M. Shelton, the late Alan G. Stanford and A. P. Almond of Atlanta.

They went into partnership under the name of DeWitt, Poor & Shelton after being collectively awarded a contract for extension of the Capitol.

Mr. DeWitt defended his firm's record in Capitol Hill construction.

"We did a good job," he said in an interview. "In many instances you hear about a job and you try to get it and somebody says, 'Well, so-and-so has been doing our work for years and we don't see any reason to change now.' "

"We had just finished the east front of the Capitol when the Library of Congress job came up and everybody was very pleased . . . so we were given an opportunity to do the library."

There is no competitive financial bidding for architectural contracts, on Capitol Hill or elsewhere. Architects traditionally do not quote price. Instead they submit brochures of their work, and a selection is made on that basis.

Selection of architects for Capitol Hill jobs over the last 13 years has been done by six different committees of the House, the Senate, or both.

When Congress set up the National Capital Planning Commission in 1952 to oversee the orderly development of Washington, including its architecture, Capitol Hill was exempted from the commission's jurisdiction, leaving control of the hill's 131 acres in the hands of the Congress.

The chief adviser to Congress in its selection of architects is Architect of the Capitol J. George Stewart, a landscape architect by profession.

Neither Mr. Stewart, nor his assistant, Mr. Campioli, could be reached to discuss the selection process despite five requests for interviews.

MARKET DEVELOPMENT FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, this morning, I attended a breakfast sponsored jointly by Great Plains Wheat, Western Wheat Associates, and the National Wheat Growers Association, at which various speakers presented views on farm legislation and agriculture in general.

Mr. Merle Gifford, of Gardner, N. Dak., president of Great Plains Wheat, reported on market development throughout the world and increased sales of wheat. The long-range solution to the farm problem lies in our ability to secure new markets, a subject which is embodied in Mr. Gifford's report. It is a message, I am sure, that Senators would wish to read.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gifford's address be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY MERLE GIFFORD, PRESIDENT, GREAT PLAINS WHEAT

The United States is a commercial country. We are constantly thinking in terms of money—How much does this cost? Is this item worth what they're asking? We answer these questions either yes or no, depending upon whether we buy or do not buy.

But there are also many other things on which we are asked to place a value—Things which we cannot touch or see, things we only feel within us. One of these is market development. Specifically today we are referring to wheat market development—a priceless plus for both the country and the producers.

Wheat market development, as carried on by both Western Wheat Associates and Great Plains Wheat, is the only agricultural program financed entirely by producers. And it is truly a worldwide operation.

For wherever there exists a market capable of expansion, or the potential of a new market, the two organizations are there. In many cases, these organizations are the advance eyes and ears of the wheat industry.

We do not call upon our trade contacts with an order book in our pocket. We are only interested in creating a climate in which the importer will look more favorably upon the value of U.S. wheat to his business.

To achieve this goal, for instance, Great Plains Wheat has regional offices in Rotterdam, the Netherlands; Caracas, Venezuela and a country office in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The organization is financed by the wheat commissions or similar organization in the states of Colorado, Kansas, North Dakota, Oklahoma, and South Dakota. In addition, the Nebraska Association of Wheat Growers, affiliated with the National Association of Wheat Growers, contracts with GPW to further the work in the vast potential market of Brazil.

Western Wheat, on the other hand, is supported by the producers in Idaho, Oregon and Washington. Regional offices are maintained in Tokyo, Japan; Taipei, Taiwan; Manila, The Philippines, and New Delhi, India under the name of Wheat Associates, U.S.A.

In addition to the support from the Pacific Northwest, Great Plains Wheat contributes to the Asian program and the Nebraska Wheat Commission also contracts with WWA for certain programs.

Both organizations also contract for foreign currencies accrued under P.L. 480 from the Department of Agriculture.

Market Development programs vary but usually fall into three categories—market information, technical assistance and consumer promotions. Market information takes the form of supplying the foreign trade with current information on quality, availability, price and credit, mainly through contacts by GPW staff.

Technical assistance is the services of a bakery technician, cereal chemist or establishing a baking school. Consumer promotions are programs of market development in cooperation with local trade associations to place bread, pasta, cake or other wheat product directly before the public.

Market development programs have played a tremendous part in the increased exports from the United States. For instance, during the marketing year before large-scale market development programs began, wheat and flour exports totaled only 401.7 million bushels.

Exports increased in seven short years to 869 million bushels for the 1965–66 marketing year, the current record. Although total exports this last marketing year fell off slightly, the United States set a new record of 416.3 million bushels for commercial exports.

Market development has been responsible to a large degree for these increased exports. For many years, the U.S. producer has been operating under heavy acreage controls. But with the increase in exports, the burdensome surplus has been lowered and producers are again producing for the market.

Increased exports means a market for about half of each year's total production. The export market, both commercial and concessional, has exceeded the domestic market in the United States for seven consecutive years. This is the value of market development to the producers.

But what of the value to the United States? The record commercial wheat and flour exports of the last marketing year meant more than $668 million towards easing the balance of payments deficit.

And the concessional sales under Public Law 480, which is before your respective chambers for extension, also provided funds in lieu of dollars for payment of many government expenses.

P.L. 480 funds have played another part in this success. It was the availability of these funds to market development associations like Western Wheat Associates and Great Plains Wheat which has allowed us to enlarge our programs to effectively work in more countries.

Yes, these programs, coupled with the cooperation from government and grain trade, have significantly contributed to the increase in U.S. wheat exports. It has not only changed many concessional markets into commercial buyers, but has strengthened the U.S. position in traditional dollar markets.

This has happened in Peru, Japan, Italy and Ecuador. Japan has become the largest dollar market for U.S. wheat. Italian purchases of U.S. wheat under commercial terms have increased from 1.2 million bushels to 7.5 million in fiscal 1967.

Peru increased dollar imports from 720 thousand bushels in 1955–56 to 7.6 million last fiscal year. Ecuador's purchases for dollars increased from 268 thousand bushels to more than 1.8 million bushels. Venezuela, a long-time cash market, increased her purchases to 17.2 million bushels last fiscal year compared to 3.4 million in 1959.

All of these are success stories. There are many, many more. But the need for market development has not passed. It is a continuing operation.

APPOINTMENT OF MRS. ELINOR L. GORDON TO PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION FOR HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR IS LAUDATORY STEP

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in tribute to the current observance of the International Human Rights Year, the United Nations General Assembly has urged that all member states will approve ratification of the human rights conventions.

Helping America become more fully aware of the need for ratification is the 10-member President's Commission for the Observance of the Human Rights Year, a highly respected group of distinguished Americans selected by President Lyndon Johnson earlier this year.

Among this outstanding group of dedicated people is Mrs. Elinor L. Gordon, of New York, who is now serving as president of the Citizens' Committee for Children. Mrs. Gordon was appointed to that post in 1966.

She also is a member of the New York City Advisory Board of Public Welfare for the past 7 years and is an active member since 1963 of the Community Service Society of the Committee on Housing and Urban Development.

Some of her other civic activities include membership in the Board of the Family Institute of New York and the Lower East Side Action Project.

I am indeed pleased at Mrs. Gordon's

role in the President's Commission and know her contribution to help promote the Senate ratification of the human rights conventions will be of considerable merit.

THE PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION—211 CASE STUDIES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, during the Monopoly Subcommittee hearings being conducted on competitive problems in the drug industry, the issue of therapeutic equivalency has been debated for many months.

The question has always been whether drugs—either generic drugs or brand name drugs—which meet standards set down by the U.S. Pharmacopeia and the National Formulary, the officially recognized compendia of the U.S. Government, are in fact therapeutically equivalent.

The question has been raised repeatedly and discussed almost endlessly.

Eminent pharmacologists, practicing physicians, hospital staff doctors, teaching doctors, and pharmacists have testified to the committee that drugs which meet the same USP or NF standards are of equivalent therapeutic value—with proven exceptions rare.

The drug industry has consistently argued that even though two drug products meet official compendia standards therapeutic equivalency cannot be claimed for them unless there is an actual clinical test. This argument, of course, serves the purpose of protecting brand name products against competition. Of the several thousand drugs in the marketplace there are less than a half dozen in proven cases in which drugs meeting compendia standards produced differences in clinical performance.

The drug industry pursued its line of argument in testimony last fall purporting to support their position.

On November 29, 1967, Dr. A. E. Slesser, associate director of Smith, Kline & French Laboratories, testifying with the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association on behalf of the drug industry stated:

> I have a notebook here which contains 211 references, which relate to this matter of pharmacological equivalency . . .

When Dr. Slesser was asked how many of these 211 studies were duplicate studies, he said he did not know.

When he was asked whether the 211 studies covered 211 different drugs, he said he did not know.

When he was asked how long a period of time the 211 studies covered, he said he did not know.

When he was asked how many of the 211 studies were scientifically controlled "double blind" studies, he said he did not know.

When he was asked how many of the 211 drugs did not meet the required standards set for them by the USP and NF, he said he did not know.

The subcommittee's minority counsel finally said in exasperation:

> I was waiting for these 211 examples of doctors reports, but when you ask any questions about them, frankly you cannot answer them.

I would think basically you would come up here and have fairly accurate and detailed knowledge about each of these 211 cases, or at least be able to say of the 211, half of them did this. But it seems like you are throwing 211 things that you want everybody to read, and you know nobody is going to read.

When you were asked whether they were below USP standards and so on—there was no answer.

The committee accepted for the record the 211 studies Dr. Slesser submitted, in spite of his inability to answer pertinent and fundamental questions about the data on which the studies were based.

The committee asked Dr. Edward Feldmann, director of the National Formulary—NF—one of the two recognized official drug compendia, to examine the documents. He agreed to give the committee his judgment as to whether the studies were, as Dr. Slesser and the PMA claimed them to be, proof of the fallacy of the existence of therapeutic equivalency in drugs which meet USP or NF standards.

I have here Dr. Feldmann's reply to my letter of March 5. Dr. Feldmann stated:

> . . . this compilation actually supports and substantiates the testimony presented by me and a number of other witnesses during the hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Monopoly during 1967. In my testimony before your Subcommittee on June 8, 1967, I stated: "Information available in the published literature reveals only isolated case histories, and very few scientifically performed studies, which demonstrates substantial differences in therapeutic equivalence between two comparable drug products. . . . I would be hard pressed to name more than even a few—less than five—well-conducted clinically acceptable studies which have demonstrated significant differences between two or more products clinically where they have met all the chemical and physical standards as provided by the official compendia . . . the number certainly does not exceed five and probably is even smaller than five."

Mr. President, it would seem to me that there is but one conclusion to be drawn from the 211 studies submitted by Dr. Slesser on behalf of the PMA—if the studies proved anything at all, it is, quite simply, the fact as stated time and again by the distinguished pharmacologists and physicians, who have testified before our subcommittee—the scientific evidence available indicates that in very few cases, perhaps less than five, are there demonstrable differences in the therapeutic equivalence between two comparable drug products which have both met USP and NF standards. The PMA's own studies have corroborated this for us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to Dr. Feldmann and his reply of March 13, 1968, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

MARCH 5, 1968.

Dr. EDWARD FELDMANN,
Director, National Formulary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. FELDMANN: During your testimony on June 8, 1967 before the Senate Small Business Committee's Monopoly Subcommittee you stated that you "would be hard pressed to name more than even a few—less than five—well-conducted clinically acceptable studies which have demonstrated significant differences between two or more products clinically where they have met all the chemical and physical standards as provided by the official compendia."

On November 29, 1967 Dr. A. E. Slesser of Smith, Kline and French submitted a notebook containing 211 references which, he stated, "are related to factors which can affect the therapeutic effectiveness and safety of products," and which show that there are many more than the small number of cases you, yourself, mentioned. Dr. Slesser, however, was unable to tell the Subcommittee how many different drugs were involved in the 211 references; whether they met USP or NF standards; or to describe the scientific quality of studies which he was supplying.

To complete the record on this subject, I am taking the liberty of sending you the material which Dr. Slesser gave us, and I should be extremely grateful if you would examine its contents to ascertain how valid is the documentation for his position.

Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

GAYLORD NELSON,
Chairman, Monopoly Subcommittee.

THE NATIONAL FORMULARY,
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1968.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: This will reply to your letter dated March 5, 1968 relative to the notebook or compilation of 211 literature references and reprints entitled "A Measure of the Volume and Contents of the Literature Pertinent to the Topics of Generic and Therapeutic Equivalency."

In response to your request to me, I have examined this compilation and have evaluated it in a general way from the standpoint of its scientific character and the pertinence of its content to its subject title.

The preface statement in this compilation describes the division of the material contained therein into five sections identified as items A through E. From my examination of these five sections, it is my conclusion that items B, C, D, and E are largely supplemental to the information provided in item A. This conclusion can be drawn from the fact that item B principally draws upon many of the same references as those listed in item A. Item C is a chapter from a textbook, and as such is based principally upon information drawn from the literature—again largely information covered under item A. Item D is an annual review of all areas of research for a specific year in the broad field of the pharmaceutical sciences. As such, the articles in item D of pertinence to this compilation already have been listed under item A. Finally, item E is simply a listing of all periodicals and journals dealing with pharmacy which are published throughout the world.

On this basis then, it appears that greatest attention should be devoted to a consideration of the scientific aspects and pertinence of the material appearing under item A.

As noted in the preface to the compilation, item A consists of a listing of 211 articles (along with the abstracts relating to some of them, and along with photocopies of certain of the other articles). A detailed and thorough examination of these articles would constitute an enormous undertaking. My review of this material has been limited to a general examination of the material as presented in this listing. From this general review and survey, I believe that the following conclusions can be validly drawn:

1. The literature covered by this survey ("item A") is sufficiently broad to indicate that it represents a reasonably comprehensive review of the subject field. It is rather unlikely that any significant areas have been overlooked in assembling this compilation.

2. The periodicals and journals which are

cited as references constitute recognized and respected publications in the medical, pharmaceutical, and related professional or scientific fields. As such, they are appropriate sources for the collection of information on the subject topic of the compilation.

3. Of the 211 references, the first group of 102 references—according to the preface statement—pertain to *in vivo* clinical observations, which is the subject of greatest interest to the question that the compilation attempts to answer. *On this basis, the succeeding observations will be limited to references from this first group of 102.* However, it appears that this first group of references is quite analogous to the second group of references in all other respects, so that the same general observations could be validly drawn regarding the source of the information, the applicability of the studies, the scientific veracity of the conclusions, etc.

4. The absence of either abstracts or reprint copies of a substantial number of the references cited makes it difficult to evaluate the conclusions or pertinency of such articles without consulting the original literature. Certain of the articles listed by title only appear to be of questionable pertinency to the topic of this compilation; for example, references number 37 and 71.

5. A number of the references appear to pertain to isolated case histories or other types of casual observations which were not conducted in a scientific manner—nor were they intended to be. Such articles are equivalent to testimonials and while interesting, are usually regarded as almost meaningless by trained scientists and experienced clinical investigators. A few examples of this type include references number 13, 14, and 19.

6. A few of the references do not appear to be appropriate for inclusion in this listing since the titles and/or abstracts of the articles indicate that the study involved is concerned only with the pharmacology of the drug under examination and not in any way with dosage forms or matters of formulation; for example, reference number 35.

7. Somewhat along the same vein, certain references appear only to compare entirely different routes of administration of a drug rather than different dosage forms or formulations to be administered by the same route. It is obvious to all that a drug administered by injection will be physiologically available more promptly than virtually any oral dosage form. Examples in this category include references number 24, 25, and 97.

8. Many of the studies compare entirely different types of oral dosage forms—for example, a drug in the form of tablets or capsules in contrast to that drug substance in some liquid dosage form such as an elixir or suspension. Selection of the optimum dosage form is important and unquestionably can have an effect on the therapeutic effectiveness of the drug involved. However, I am unaware of any suggestion or claim that "therapeutic equivalency" exists between completely different types of dosage forms. This is quite another matter from comparing the tablets made by one firm with the tablets made by another firm. Therefore, references of this nature do not seem appropriate for inclusion in this compilation on "generic equivalency"; some examples include references number 7, 10, 12, 89, and 98.

9. By the same token, certain drugs are *purposely formulated* in a manner to provide slow or gradual release of the drug. Studies comparing such timed-release or sustained-release preparations with drug products intended for regular drug release should not be included in this listing. Since such products are purposely intended to have different properties or characteristics of drug release, it does not seem appropriate or valid to include such references in this listing. It is implied that the listing consists of references demonstrating differences observed in drug products where no such differences were intended. Examples of some of the references which should be excluded on this basis are numbers 4, 21, 32, 48, 70, 76, 84, 85, and 90.

10. Many of the articles cited appear only to compare completely different compounds. It is quite obvious that formation of a water-soluble salt of a water-insoluble organic compound will result in a new compound which is more readily soluble in aqueous body fluids. For this reason, different salts and esters are regarded by the FDA, the official compendia, and the scientific community as entirely different drugs, since in fact they are entirely different compounds. It is inappropriate, therefore, to include in this listing studies which principally appear to compare different compounds rather than different formulations of the same drug entity. This would exclude, for example, references number 27, 30, 34, 41, 72, 73, 80, 86, and 96.

11. Certain references appearing on the list are duplicative of others already included on the list. The duplicative references include editorials, review articles, and general statements which are based on studies already included in the listing. Consequently, inclusion of these latter references could be misleading since their presence suggests a larger number of original reports in the literature than actually exists in fact. References in this category which appear to provide no new data include, for example, numbers 22, 26, 38, 45, 51, 53, 58, and 66.

12. Several of the references referred to appear to be inconclusive or borderline regarding the conclusions which are drawn as to existence or nonexistence of therapeutic equivalency. Such references include numbers 5 and 31.

13. A number of the references cited indicate that current standards are satisfactory to assure quality drugs. See, for example, references number 57 and 65.

14. Several of the references listed appear to constitute articles in which the conclusions of the respective authors show that drug product variation was *not demonstrated* on the basis of the particular study reported. The references which appear to support therapeutic equivalency include numbers 61, 62, 63, and 77. Moreover, references 61 and 77 specifically refute other articles appearing on this list which apparently report clinical differences among drug products.

15. None of the examples of questionable references listed in the above paragraphs are duplicative. Furthermore, in each instance the references cited above are just some examples chosen at random to illustrate each of my points; hence, additional references probably could be similarly disqualified if a closer scrutiny were made. Consequently, significant question exists concern the pertinency or appropriateness of including a large proportion of the references tabulated. Moreover, it appears that a substantial portion of the remaining references may in fact support the idea of "therapeutic equivalency" of drug products rather than refute it.

16. After eliminating the above-mentioned questionable, inappropriate, or refuting references, a limited number of references still remain which appear valid as documentation to demonstrate instances in which "therapeutic equivalency" may not exist. It should be noted, however, that these remaining references do not all pertain to studies on different drugs. In other words, some of them constitute confirmatory studies regarding certain drugs discussed in other reports on this list. Hence, while it is appropriate to include these confirmatory references in this listing, the number of drugs concerning which non-equivalency of some sort has been observed is substantially less than the total number of references which remain after excluding the invalid or inappropriate reports. For example references 18, 32, 42, 43, 49, and 67 all pertain to enteric coated aspirin tablets.

17. Your letter to me dated March 5, 1968, quoted a statement by Dr. Slesser explaining that the compilation contained references which: ". . . are related to factors which can affect the therapeutic effectiveness and safety of products."

After eliminating the inappropriate studies, some of the remaining references do appear to provide some support to Dr. Slesser's statement. It should be noted, however, that his statement says that these considerations are *"related to factors,"* and that the factors *"can effect"* effectiveness and safety. This broad generalization does not really answer the basic question implied during the Subcommittee hearings; namely, "Does the scientific literature reveal many studies showing that a significant clinical difference (effectiveness or safety) has been demonstrated in comparing two drug products which meet applicable official compendia standards?"

In conclusion, it appears from the above point-by-point evaluation, that this compilation actually supports and substantiates the testimony presented by me and a number of other witnesses during the hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Monopoly during 1967. In my testimony before your Subcommittee on June 8, 1967, I stated under conclusion number 6:

"Information available in the published literature reveals only isolated case histories, and very few scientifically performed studies, which demonstrate substantial differences in 'therapeutic equivalence' between two comparable drug products (also referred to as generic or brand equivalence). Consequently, while we must recognize that this factor exists, currently available evidence indicates that only very seldom is there a difference in clinical performance if the official compendia standards are met by both drug products."

In subsequent testimony both FDA Commissioner Goddard and USP Director of Revision Miller, among others, also commented to the effect that differences do exist in the case of some drug products, but that there are relatively few documented cases in literature references, indicating that from a clinical standpoint this problem has been greatly exaggerated. In your March 5, 1968, letter to me you also quoted from my statement made to your Subcommittee that:

". . . I would be hard pressed to name more than even a few—less than five—well-conducted clinically acceptable studies which have demonstrated significant differences between two or more products clinically where they have met all the chemical and physical standards as provided by the official compendia."

The references which remain after eliminating those that are inappropriate may include a few such studies, but the number certainly does not exceed five and probably is even smaller than five.

Consequently, it appears that the above-quoted statement from my testimony is actually confirmed by a review of the compilation of references which you supplied to me and concerning which you requested my evaluation and opinion from a scientific viewpoint.

Sincerely,

EDWARD G. FELDMANN, Ph. D.,
Director.

HARMONIOUS RELATIONS BETWEEN THE RACES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Texas poll, which is published in several newspapers in my State, reported this month that there has been a substantial increase in the willingness of white Texans to accept Negro social and business contacts.

Contrary to the President's Riot Commission Report allegation that America

is moving toward two societies, I submit this evidence that Americans, including Texans, are living and working together better than ever before and in increasing harmony and progress.

I ask unanimous consent that the findings of the Texas poll be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE TEXAS POLL: WHITES INCREASE NEGRO TOLERANCE

While the President's Commission on Civil Disorders has recently painted a grim picture of deterioration in white-Negro relationships—blaming much of it on "white racism"—The Texas Poll finds that since 1966 there has been very substantial increase in the willingness of white Texans to accept the Negro in many areas of social and business contact.

Progress in the acceptance of Negro equality has been measured through a series of five statewide surveys conducted beginning in 1963, each using the identical battery of questions. In spite of some fluctuation in particular attitudes, the over-all trend has been toward more ready acceptance of the Negro's new states, except for a slow-down noted in 1966.

Some of the changes since 1966 have been so marked that we have double-checked the findings: Two surveys have been conducted recently, one last November and another one last month; the results verify each other. In the table below we have omitted the November results since they were so close to those obtained in February of this year.

When these questions were first asked in 1963, only one of the situations posed—working side by side in the same kind of job—was acceptable to a majority of whites in Texas. In 1968, six of the eleven areas of contact with Negroes are accepted by large majorities.

Two-thirds majorities or better—and size of these figures is important here—say they are ready to accept various business and social relationships of a non-personal nature, and even in the most personal of the propositions tested—having a Negro roommate for a son or daughter in college—shows unmistakable, though gradual, change.

Interviewers have taken the questions to a representative cross section of Texans for each survey, asking them to express acceptance or rejection to the situations listed below. Only whites were asked the questions, and Mexican-Americans have been omitted from the analysis below since they usually favor integration measures overwhelmingly.

[In percent]

	1963	1964	1966	1968
How about Negroes riding in the same section of trains and buses with you?				
Accept	49	62	64	74
Reject	47	35	35	23
No answer	4	3	1	3
Eating in the same restaurants with you?				
Accept	40	54	56	70
Reject	57	44	42	27
No answer	3	2	2	3
Staying in the same hotels with you?				
Accept	36	49	50	63
Reject	60	47	48	33
No answer	4	4	2	4
Sending your children to the same schools?				
Accept	41	52	53	67
Reject	55	46	45	30
No answer	4	2	2	3
Attending your church?				
Accept	46	59	54	69
Reject	50	38	43	28
No answer	4	3	3	3
Using the same public swimming pools with you?				
Accept	19	27	29	33
Reject	77	69	68	62
No answer	4	4	3	5

[In percent]

	1963	1964	1966	1968
Working side by side with you in the same kind of job?				
Accept	56	67	69	79
Reject	40	31	29	18
No answer	4	2	2	3
Attending the same social gathering outside of your home?				
Accept	23	32	37	46
Reject	73	65	61	50
No answer	4	3	2	4
Attending a social gathering in your home?				
Accept	13	19	23	32
Reject	83	77	75	64
No answer	4	4	2	4
Living next door to you?				
Accept	23	30	29	39
Reject	74	67	69	58
No answer	3	3	2	3
Having as roommate for your son or daughter at college?				
Accept	8	14	18	22
Reject	88	82	80	72
No answer	4	4	2	6

The above results are not typical of all sections of the state. East Texas whites, for example, are usually more opposed to all phases of integration than other areas of the state.

While letting down many of their old bars against an integrated society, a majority of white Texans still believe integration is being pushed too fast by the national government. This figure is now at the same point as in June 1965 when the same question was asked:

"Is the Johnson administration pushing integration too fast, too slow, or about right?"

[In percent]

	1968	1965
Too fast	53	54
Too slow	2	5
About right	33	33
No opinion	12	8

MIAMI HERALD ANALYZES GOLD CRISIS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the recent "gold rush" has been a matter of grave concern to the United States and her free world allies. While the decision to establish a dual price for gold has, for the moment, halted the wave of speculation on gold in foreign markets, most of us recognize that we are only buying time with this plan.

The Miami Herald of Tuesday, March 19, had some excellent editorial comments on the decision of the gold pool countries and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled, "Two Prices for Gold and a Partial Answer," be inserted in the record at this point of my remarks.

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

TWO PRICES FOR GOLD AND A PARTIAL ANSWER

Gold's crisis weekend was not a loser. There is every indication—in "free" gold prices themselves, in the stock exchanges, in public attitudes—that the seven-nation agreement on two-price gold has checked the panic.

For this, many millions of people dependent on a stable world monetary system should be grateful. But they will remain apprehensive.

Simply stated, what the gold pool nations have agreed to is to peg the official monetary price of gold at $35 an ounce, as they have done since 1961 and as the United States has done since 1934. They promise to buy and sell gold for dollars at that price in all foreign central bank transactions.

On the gold markets, however, the price of the metal would be allowed to seek its own level. It might go sky-high, though yesterday in the first test it didn't. In time it might settle back to a price somewhere near the present $35 an ounce.

The arrangement, however, has two possible flaws.

The central banks will be tempted to buy gold from the U.S. at the pegged price and sell it to speculators. "There are a lot of crooks around, and some of them are central bankers," an anonymous foreign treasury official told The Wall Street Journal.

The second potential weakness is a price variance which would throw real doubt on the true value of the dollar. Is it worth $35 an ounce? Or is it worth X dollars? Once again the world could be beset with suspicions which caused all the trouble in the first place.

These suspicions, indeed, may remain. For two-price gold is a temporary cure. The minipanic began when financiers lost some of their faith in the dollar, the world's major currency. So they began hedging it with gold.

There will be a crisis of sorts until the U.S. approaches its balance of payments deficit, which wore away confidence in the dollar over many years, with a sense of sacrifice as well as dedication.

Yesterday President Johnson called on the nation for "a program of national austerity" and an all-out effort to win the Vietnam war, win the peace and "complete the job at home."

We are dubious about the President's priorities but we like the word "austerity." The trouble is that it comes two years late.

If by "austerity" Mr. Johnson means determined budget cuts, tax increases, limitations on spending by the private and government sectors abroad, then the term has some meaning. It can have little effect if the whole apparatus of sacrifice is simply to escalate a war whose costs may jump $4 billion in a blink.

The U.S. has barely escaped serious trouble through the kind offices of its monetary friends. But the end is not yet. Only a firm President, fully resolved to protect the national economy and persuasive enough to take Congress with him can get us from a shaky short-run to a safe long-run of confidence in the dollar.

SOVIET UNION'S ROLE IN A VIETNAM PEACE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a speech I delivered at the Broome County annual Republican dinner, at Binghamton, N.Y., on March 18, 1968. I believe it will be of interest to my colleagues in the Senate.

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

The anxiety and confusion which pervades the nation about what course we should now follow in Vietnam was demonstrated graphically during last week's meeting between the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Secretary of State Rusk. Despite the wide disagreements evident during the hearings, it seems to me that two guidelines did emerge. First, there were no serious suggestions that we abandon the enormous effort we have so far put into the Vietnam struggle; and second, there was very evident dissatisfaction with the Administration's apparent intention of plunging ahead with "more of the same".

There have been a number of watersheds during the long struggle in Vietnam. Nonetheless, I am convinced that we are now at the most portentous watershed we have faced there. For years we have been asked to

regard Vietnam as a safe, limited, "mini-war", which could be prosecuted with little serious effect on life at home or events in other parts of the world. But, now—like the egg of the cuckoo bird—the mini-war in Vietnam has hatched into a monstrosity which threatens to eat us out of house and home.

Despite Dean Rusk's professed continuing confidence that Vietnam is the most manageable of all our post-war confrontations with the communists, I believe that the earlier "margins of safety" have largely been dissipated by the escalations of the past year.

The mood of the people of the U.S. is such as to deprive comfort to anyone espousing the theory that we should wait until after the November elections before acting to change our policy. The American people are ready, I believe, for a genuine compromise settlement of a reasonable character. If that cannot be obtained despite sincere overtures, the same movement among the people could express itself in demands for much higher and determined escalation. The people want to feel that we are now working to attain at least the beginning of the end of our struggle in Vietnam.

In short, the present ongoing glacial movement in the American body politics is to seek to end the stalemate in Vietnam. Any enemy assuming that this means we will simply give up, is an enemy taking a big gamble indeed. The power and the resolution of the U.S. remain incredibly great. It would be unwise for any enemy to overlook this reality.

While the dilemma of what to do about Vietnam has become very acute for us, the Soviet Union faces an equally acute dilemma. Despite the fact that the USSR is not directly engaged in Vietnam—as we are—the Soviets have contributed in a big way to the dangers to world peace which the Vietnam war now poses so menacingly.

Leaving aside for the moment the mistakes we have made in Vietnam—and there have been many—the direct danger to world peace stems from the attempt of small North Vietnam to inflict a humiliating defeat on the world's greatest power—the United States. Hanoi's intransigence in refusing to go to the negotiating table, and Hanoi's arrogance in thinking that it can win its own terms on the battle field in Vietnam—these are the root dangers to world peace in the Vietnam war.

There is no doubt in my mind that the U.S. has also been ill-advised in believing that we could totally thwart Ho Chin Minh's political aspirations in South Vietnam by limited American military intervention. The U.S. also has been grievously mistaken in thinking that we could create, by an act of our own will, a viable anti-communist democracy in a South Vietnamese society which lacks the elementary attributes of nationhood.

But for all of our sometimes naive self-confidence and our inclination toward overhasty action, the U.S. is, above all, fair-minded and instinctively willing to find compromise settlements to human disagreements.

Hanoi's intransigence, and the dangers of its effort to inflict a military defeat on the U.S., have been made possible by the continuing flow of sophisticated weapons it receives from the Soviet Union. *By equipping Hanoi with a highly sophisticated air defense system, and by providing the new weapons systems which made the Tet Offensive possible, the USSR has made itself a party to Hanoi's standpatism.*

I do not believe that there is any significant segment of the population of this country which is prepared to accept Hanoi's contemptuous terms for peace in Vietnam. I trust that this is understood by the wiser and more responsible heads in the Kremlin.

It is in this context that the USSR faces a dilemma as acute as our own, with regard to what happens next in Vietnam. *Unless there is a move toward negotiation and de-escalation, the war could expand in every dimension, including a widening of the ground war into Laos, Cambodia and perhaps North Vietnam itself.*

Whatever satisfaction the USSR has derived hitherto from our disappointment and frustration in Vietnam, I do not believe that Party Chairman Brezhnev and Premier Kosygin could view the prospect of a significant expansion of the Vietnam war with anything but the most serious sense of anxiety and foreboding.

Therefore there is not only the desirability but the necessity of enlisting the USSR in the search for a negotiated compromise settlement. I use the word "compromise" advisedly here. In my judgment there can be no peace so long as the Administration stubbornly seeks to defeat Hanoi and the Vietcong militarily and totally to thwart their political aspirations. It is just not reasonable for us to expect that the USSR will acquiesce in—or contribute to—by pressure and withholding of arms—the total "defeat" of communist North Vietnam.

What needs to be defused on both sides is the symbolism of "defeat" and "victory". I think it is in this area that the deficiencies of Secretary Rusk's and President Johnson's handling of Vietnam have been gravest. Against all wisdom, they have continued to escalate the allegd "stakes" at issue in Vietnam. The more apparent it has become that our objectives were unrealistic, the more they have insisted that fulfillment of those goals was necessary to the security of the world and the prestige and honor of the U.S. By constantly proclaiming to the world that our pledged word elsewhere would be meaningless if we did not stand in Vietnam to the last ditch and that the deterrent effect of military power is essential to avoid collapse in South and Southeast Asia—ideas that surely never occurred seriously to others before we proclaimed them—President Johnson and Secretary Rusk have really complicated the problem of a peace settlement.

Aside from the foregoing, and the exaggerated ideological significance which Mao Tse Tung has attempted to give it—an effort which the Administration has so eagerly abetted—the conflict in Vietnam should really be an obscure struggle between contending indigenous strong-arm bands for political control of the remnants of France's Asian jungle colony.

South Vietnam has no intrinsic strategic importance either to the U.S. or the USSR. I seriously doubt that Kremlin ideological sophisicates have any more confidence in Ho Chi Minh's "true faith" as an apostle of Lenin than ADA President Kenneth Galbraith has in General Thieu's fidelity to the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson.

Accordingly, I see this course for the U.S. to adopt:

First, is to signal to the Soviet Union that Hanoi's effort to inflict a humiliating defeat on the U.S.—with Soviet-supplied armaments—is utterly unacceptable and has brought matters to a dangerous stage which could lead to a serious widening of the war and produce grave risks for all concerned.

Second, notwithstanding our earlier ideological hyperbole we should tell Moscow the U.S. in fact is prepared to negotiate a real compromise settlement, and that the USSR can bring this about.

The fact of the matter is that only the USSR has the leverage at this time in Hanoi, and that we cannot get peace in Vietnam without the cooperation of Russia. As I have pointed out, the USSR has its own inducements in the situation to move it away from a big power confrontation. The challenge and the opportunity to our diplomacy is to enlist Soviet cooperation in the search for peace, in a way which commits and at the same time contributes to Soviet prestige and Soviet national interest in a durable compromise settlement.

I have made this suggestion previously several times on the Senate floor—last on February 5—in a less comprehensively developed way and in perhaps less urgent and auspicious circumstances.

I am very pleased to note that one of the leading contenders for our party's Presidential nomination—former Vice-President Nixon—has taken up this idea and added his own thoughts to it.

Also, it is significant to note that in his foreign policy declarations, Governor Rockefeller—whom as is well known, I have urged to seek the Republican Presidential nomination—has declared his view that U.S.-USSR concurrence is essential to major steps toward peace in the world. I have little doubt that he would include the Vietnamese problem when he addresses himself to this crucial aspect of our foreign policy.

I think it is an approach which all Republicans can support and I urge that it be developed and refined as a basic element of the Republican Party's thinking on Vietnam.

CONSUMERS UNION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently the National Observer published an excellent article by Mr. John Morton concerning the activities of Consumers Union. This organization has, for a number of years, been at the forefront of efforts to provide American consumers with objective and impartial appraisals of a wide range of products. The product evaluations and comparisons presented in the organization's publication, Consumer Reports, have gained extensive public confidence and, consequently, have prompted manufacturers to correct product deficiencies and advertise products more directly on their merits.

The mobilization of consumer interest in recent years has had a marked influence on public policy. A number of important pieces of consumer legislation have become law in recent years largely as a result of the interest generated by such efforts as those undertaken by Consumers Union. The strong amendments to the Federal Meat Inspection Act adopted in 1967 are the most recent example of the great power possessed by the consuming public when it makes its wishes known in no uncertain terms.

Mr. President, I commend this excellent review of the activities of Consumers Union to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the National Observer, Feb. 26, 1968]

PRODUCTS PUT TO THE TEST—CONSUMER REPORTS: READ, RESPECTED, AND FEARED

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.—Everything is fair game to Consumer Reports.

A target can be as prosaic as canned orange juice (most was judged pretty poor) or as venerated as the life-insurance industry. It can be as specialized as the high-fidelity component industry or as vast as the Federal Government, an agency of which the magazine plans to sue on the ground it is withholding consumer information.

In recent months, Consumer Reports has told its 1,250,000 subscribers that:

The Rambler Ambassador and Chevrolet

Chevelle are "unacceptable" on safety grounds. An investigation into the television-repair industry shows "fraud is rife." Federal controls on the health aspects of the cigaret industry are "a sick joke so far."

In the March issue, a test of high-fidelity tape recorders will reveal a model costing $179.50 that Consumer Reports says is far superior to others costing twice as much or more. An article on exercise and heart disease will contain worrisome statistics for those who, to paraphrase the magazine, propose to remain sedentary until they become permanently recumbent.

A TARGET FOR CRITICS

This independent, irreverent approach to all things has won Consumer Reports influence and dedicated readers. It has also brought it ample criticism.

The magazine has been accused of being political, prejudiced against business, and slipshod in its tests. It has even been accused of being a Communist front; for a time in the early 1950s it appeared on a list of subversive organizations maintained by the House Un-American Activities Committee, from which it was removed in 1954 after a hearing before the committee.

Declares a spokesman for the photographic industry who is dismayed over the magazine's influence: "If you don't do well in Consumer Reports, it's like having your throat cut."

The reverse can also be true. A Norge executive once said a favorable rating "put us in the washing-machine business."

The headquarters for this monthly round of excoriation and occasional praise is a collection of old factory buildings in an industrial section of Mount Vernon, a northern suburb of New York City. It is here that Consumers Union (CU), the membership corporation that publishes Consumer Reports, maintains five laboratories and editorial, market-research, and circulation offices. There also is an auto-testing facility in Lime Rock, Conn. Employes number 300, including 40 engineers and an editorial staff of 12.

Walker Sandbach, a baldish, 51-year-old Midwesterner has been executive director of CU since 1965. A soft-spoken, friendly man whose manner seems to encourage the first-name atmosphere that prevails at CU, he explained for a visitor how CU decides what to test and how to test it.

PICKETING THE PRODUCTS

Seventy different types of products are tested each year. Some, like automobiles and major electrical appliances, are rated annually, others less often. CU's market-research department conducts surveys to determine which brands should be tested. The major sellers will be included, along with one or two less well-known brands that offer something special in price or features. "We try to cover at least 80 per cent of the market," says Mr. Sandbach.

The product is then assigned to an engineer and a writer. The engineer determines what tests will be needed and whether an outside consultant will be necessary. The writer is kept informed of developments and eventually is given a lengthy, final engineering report. His condensation of this is reviewed by the engineer and editors before being published.

CU itself buys, through shoppers located throughout the country, the goods it tests and the equipment used to test with. Since it is nonprofit and tax-exempt, CU permits no advertising in its magazine and does not permit its ratings to be exploited by advertisers elsewhere. In almost any month, CU starts half a dozen law suits to stop such exploitation.

The money for CU's operation comes solely from subscriptions, newsstand sales, and sales of paperback books published by CU on a variety of consumer subjects. Its budget was $6,500,000 last year.

Mr. Sandbach is confident that circulation and hence income will continue their dramatic increases of recent years. Subscriptions climbed 300,000 in the past two years, and he expects the total to double to 2,500,000 within five years.

FINANCING A FELLOWSHIP

Some of the new income has already been committed to finance a $10,000 fellowship in Washington for a young lawyer, who will start digging into auto safety on April 1; more fellowships will be forthcoming. Also, CU plans to establish a Washington office to expand its role as a watchdog of Federal agencies.

"There isn't any question about it, the Federal Government's role in all that we do now is such that we ought to have somebody down there watching to see what they are doing on behalf of the consumer," says Mr. Sandbach.

One sign of this closer look at Washington is the plan to sue the Veterans Administration (VA) under the new Public Information Act. The VA tests hearing aids to assure that veterans will receive the best possible models, but so far it has refused CU's requests to make the results public.

Says Mr. Sandbach: "They used the public's tax money to make the tests, and there's no reason in the world why the public shouldn't know the results. It costs us $50,000 to test hearing aids. If the VA makes its findings public that's $50,000 we could spend testing something else."

Automobile testing, while expensive, has had one saving factor: CU could trade in one year's models on the next year's. But testing autos could become very expensive if CU starts crash-testing for safety features, something Mr. Sandbach thinks is sorely needed. He says if the Federal Government fails to crash-test on a significant scale as part of its new concern over safety, CU probably will be compelled to. Such an expensive undertaking would make a big dent in future budgets.

An auto test in the January issue brought CU national publicity when for the first time in its history it rated a car "unacceptable" for consumer use. The car was the Rambler Ambassador sedan, which CU said leaked gas when braked from high speeds. American Motors termed the leakage insignificant but said it would alter the fuel system to correct it.

In the February issue, CU rated the Chevrolet Chevelle unacceptable for swerving uncontrollably when braked from high speeds. "Chevy engineers informed us they were unable to duplicate our results," says Mr. Sandbach. "We offered to provide them with details on how we did it but we haven't heard from them yet."

The life-insurance industry was offended by a series of articles that ran last year, then were compiled into a book. CU's principal point, based on information from consultants, was that most people would be better off if they bought simple, inexpensive term insurance instead of high-premium life policies with savings clauses. The money saved on the premium then could be invested for a better return than the life-insurance policy could offer, CU argued.

NOT FOR EVERYONE?

Insurance men complained that CU's advice was extreme in being recommended to everybody. They said it might be good advice for a sophisticated investor, but that the average person benefits from having a certain amount of his insurance premium go automatically into savings. An agent who was incensed by the articles contended that CU used loaded words and slanted phraseology—"all elements of the typical sensationalized expose"—to appraise the different types of insurance.

Robert Smith, CU's assistant director, replies that CU does not intend to steer people away from investing in life insurance if they have trouble saving otherwise. "But we do try to point out there is a very substantial difference in where his estate ends up if he has it in a policy which has a large savings segment to it at 2 or 2½ per cent, or 3 per cent at best, as against investing those same funds at 3½ or 6."

A frequent critic of CU is Frederick J. Schlink, president and technical director of the only competing product-testing organization, Consumer Research of Washington, N.J., which publishes Consumers Bulletin. Consumer Research was the pioneer in the field, being founded in 1929, seven years before CU. In fact, CU was founded by a former employe of Consumer Research, Arthur Kallet, who had sided with strikers in a labor dispute in the organization.

"THEY'RE POLITICAL"

"The main difference between us and Consumers Union is that we're nonpolitical and they're political," says Mr. Schlink. "They're not only political but left political. They carry a running fusillade against business and advertising and want more government and more things run by the Government."

Mr. Schlink says that Consumer Research, by contrast, concentrates on product testing and criticizes only those business practices it considers wrong, not business as a whole "on general principles." Safety critic Ralph Nader, who has just joined Consumer Reports' board of directors, is a recipient of Mr. Schlink's barbs as well: "We don't consider ourselves crusaders, the way Nader and Consumer Reports are." Mr. Schlink refuses to say what his mazagine's circulation is; most estimates put it at 100,000.

CU has returned the fire. It has, for example, criticized an arrangement under which Consumer Research tested photographic goods for Davis Publications, Inc. The results were published in a magazine that contained advertisements exploiting the test results.

CU ran an article in Consumer Reports deploring this link to advertising. It said test organizations so far had been able to offer only a modest guide through the Alice-in-Wonderland realm of advertising claims and lamented: "To see the granddaddy of them all becoming a courtier of the Queen of Hearts, even to a limited extent, can only evoke sorrow."

Nevertheless, says a CU official, "We think they do a remarkable job considering the limited budget they have to work with."

A number of industry leaders find fault with CU's testing methods. Herbert Keppler, editor of Modern Photography magazine, complains that CU's camera-testing procedures as explained in Consumer Reports seem inadequate, especially in apparently not testing lenses at close distances. Not so, say CU engineers; lenses are tested up close. They say the tests on cameras are so thorough, in fact, that the final report often runs 40 pages and that many details have to be left out to reduce the report to the three or four pages that appear in the magazine.

But even if Mr. Keppler is a critic, neither he nor most others question CU's basic integrity and independence. Says Mr. Keppler: "My wife reads it from beginning to end, and she wouldn't think of buying an iron without consulting Consumers Union." A critic in the insurance industry says simply: "They're clean."

A major goal of CU, of course, is to help its readers get their money's worth, whether in buying goods or services. That the odds are often stacked against the customer was demonstrated by CU recently in testing the honesty of television repair men. Twenty sets with identical, uncomplicated defects were presented to 20 repairmen. The bill should have been about $8; all but three charged inflated prices up to $37, and many of them

charged for work that subsequent investigation showed wasn't performed.

Or consider the results on tests of tape recorders in the March issue, wherein a $179.50 machine outperformed more expensive ones. Says Mr. Sandbach: "Now an uneducated consumer would just assume that for $399 he was going to get more than he was going to get for $179. I think the American public ought to have this. I think it's good for our country and our economy to have this kind of competition. The pressure is on to improve quality."

When it comes to ferreting out bargains, *CU is willing* to consider anything, including liquor. A panel of tasting experts gathered by CU, for example, found all Canadian and American blended whiskeys almost indistinguishable, despite prices ranging from $4 to $9 a fifth.

The same thing was true with vodka, except for one test sample singled out as the experts' favorite in smoothness and over-all quality. What brand was it? It wasn't vodka at all. It was a mixture of ethyl alcohol and distilled water, concocted specially by CU's technicians.

JOHN MORTON.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT MARITIME PROGRAM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, recently the Maritime Labor-Management Unity Committee, which is comprised of some six unions and 18 shipping companies, presented their recommended program for revitalizing the U.S. merchant marine.

Revitalization of our merchant fleet is essential, and many of us in Congress have worked diligently to promote a revitalization program.

I request unanimous consent that a brochure entitled "Labor-Management Action Program for a Strong U.S. Merchant Marine," which outlines the Maritime Labor-Management Unity Committee's 15-point program, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, and I urge all Senators to carefully read and consider the proposals advanced.

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

LABOR-MANAGEMENT ACTION PROGRAM FOR A STRONG U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

To the President and the Congress:

We believe that it is imperative that our Government—the Administration and the Congress—come to grips with the Merchant Marine problem. In times past the American flag was second to none on the high seas. Today, as Senator Warren G. Magnuson has pointed out on the Senate floor:

"There is no dispute that our Merchant Marine is woefully inadequate. We are now carrying—and this is a startling figure—under 8 percent of our foreign waterborne trade. The United States has dropped to 16th in the world's shipbuilding statistics. While the world fleet increased by 61 percent in the last 15 years, America's privately owned fleet has decreased by 24.5 percent."

This deplorable condition must be corrected immediately. We must revitalize the U.S. Merchant Marine. Our national security, as well as our pressing domestic problems, characterized by the balance of payments situation, cry for action now.

To help the Administration and the Congress in its formulation of a new Merchant Marine policy and program, we, the representatives of 90 percent of maritime Labor and Management, have held a series of meetings together to formulate a joint legislative program.

We believe that the following elements of our program are essential to a sound maritime policy and legislation should incorporate these points with parity continuing to be the keystone of our national policy. An increase in the percentage of U.S. Exports and Imports carried on U.S. Flag vessels is an essential predicate.

Following we are outlining the fifteen points of a program which we believe will accomplish the task of revitalizing the U.S. Merchant Marine. We respectfully urge the Administration and the Congress to give it immediate and careful consideration.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Adopted February 8, 1968.

Presented to Congress March 7, 1968.

1. Thirty-five to forty new commercial ships a year.

2. Operating differential subsidy for nonberth vessels as well as liners for foreign trade, retaining the basic parity concept.

3. A positive program for the revitalization of passenger ship fleet.

4. An extension of tax deferred construction reserve fund to all American merchant and fishing vessels.

5. A more simplified system for determining construction-differential subsidy retaining parity as a basic concept of such support.

6. Research and development funds to revitalize the Merchant Marine and expand the cargo carrying capacity of U.S. ships, with full guarantees for jobs and security for the workers to be carried out.

7. Establishment of quasi-judicial subsidy board.

8. Establishment of a revolving construction reserve fund to provide for continuing fund replenishment from customs receipts.

9. A fleet of nuclear powered vessels for foreign and domestic commerce.

10. The strengthening and full implementation of the Cargo Preference laws.

11. Opposition to the Department of Defense appropriation for the Fast Deployment Logistic Ships.

12. Support of reorganization plan to place the Maritime Administration in the Department of Transportation and Cargo Preference in Marad.

13. Support of measures (S. 2086 and S. 2087) to require U.S. citizens for replacements in foreign ports and eliminate abuses of provisional registry.

14. Support for the revitalization of the fish industry (bill to be introduced shortly).

15. The use of U.S. flag ships in greater numbers as a positive tool to help eliminate the U.S. dollar gap.

A VICTORY FOR THE CONSUMERS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the electric power consumers of America have now been relieved of the threat of extremely troublesome legislation which has been pending in the Senate Commerce Committee and was defeated by a vote against it of 13 to 5 today. The measure which threatened the interests of consumers of electricity, was the bill, S. 1365, a mischievous measure designed to permit escape of the private power companies from regulation by the Federal Power Commission. The ambiguous language of the bill obscured its real purpose which was to cause private utilities to organize distribution systems entirely within individual States and, at the same time, allow certain interconnections with other States without the supervision of regulatory provisions of the Federal Power Act.

As one who has long championed the cause of consumers of electric power and the importance of adequate regulation of suppliers of electricity, I am very glad that, at last, the threat of regulatory exemption of the principal suppliers of power has been defeated. At a time when it is clearly in the public interest that networks of power transmission facilities be constructed throughout the Nation to prevent blackouts and breakdowns in electric service, S. 1365 would have encouraged an entirely different approach.

As for the necessity of Federal regulation of public utilities, this has been apparent since an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission pursuant to a Senate resolution in 1928 revealed to the public the shocking manner in which the electric power companies, without any regulation, had made fortunes at the expense of helpless consumers. I recounted this scandal in my book "The Public Pays," published in 1931, and republished in 1965 as "The Public Pays—And Still Pays." The battle for adequate regulation of utilities goes on through the years and those who would protect the consumers' interests must be ever vigilant.

Now those who are concerned with protecting the interests of electric power consumers may advance those interests steadily without the imminent possibility of enactment of legislation which would make their efforts increasingly difficult.

THE SILENT INVASION

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, recently there appeared in Pace magazine an article entitled "The Silent Invasion," concerning our returning young veterans from Vietnam. The article was written by Pace Associate Editor Malcolm Roberts.

As Mr. Roberts points out, the young men returning from Vietnam are not the boys who left the States 12 to 24 months previously.

He said:

As a result, though they are moving almost unnoticed into schools, jobs and politics, they could become the most powerful influence in this country.

Mr. President, I for one do hope they become an influence and I hope further that these men who have risked their lives for their country will influence many of our young people who do not fully understand the price of freedom. I congratulate Pace magazine for choosing such a worthy topic and Mr. Roberts for a job well done.

This article should be of interest to every Member of this body and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SILENT INVASION

(By Malcolm Roberts)

Watch out, America. They're coming!

The vet invasion, silent, without fanfare, has begun. Last year 609,791 discharged servicemen hit U.S. shores with a quiet yet bulldozer determination.

This year 790,000 will come, with more than a million to follow in 1969. Where are the veterans headed? What do they think? How will they affect the election of 1968?

Something happened to these men in the jungles of Vietnam that has put maturity

into their thinking and determination in their guts. They are not the boys who left the States 12 to 24 months previously. They are trained men, disciplined and sobered by the wrenching experience of living through a shooting war. As a result, though they are moving almost unnoticed into schools, jobs and politics, they could become the most powerful influence in the country.

One of the scores of returning veterans interviewed by Pace for this penetrating report summed up the feelings of many. "One thing I learned overseas: if you get down in the same ditch with a Vietnamese or anyone else then you know you're just two men." Said another, "I was pretty wild when I was younger. I had to go to Vietnam to find out what an American should be."

AT VETS' ROUND TABLES NEW IDEAS ARE EMERGING

The 277-pound veteran with a crew cut hitched his chair up to the table and said, "You can't tie us together as a group. Every one of us thinks differently." His words fired the opening gun of a Pace Editors' Round Table on "The Veteran in Civilian Life, 1968," held at the magazine's editorial office in downtown Los Angeles.

Nineteen young veterans, many recently returned from the war in Vietnam, were seated around a large table facing a battery of editors. The burly vet's comment proved sound. The striking similarity about these men, and scores of other veterans interviewed throughout the greater Los Angeles area, is not their uniformity but their realism and clarity of thought. "That evening as a whole," summed up an observer, "was the best description of democracy I have ever heard."

These men have a maturity of outlook rarely matched by students and civilians of commensurate age. "When your life and your buddies' lives are on the line," commented Dr. Joseph Lenihan, 33, a dentist and former Naval lieutenant who served in Da Nang, "this matures the average guy a whole lot."

On dropouts dropping in

The colleges, particularly the junior colleges, are filling up with veterans, many of whom were high school and college dropouts. "I winced when my college asked for my high school transcripts, they were so bad," remembered ex-Marine Eric von Hurst, 28, student body president of Cerritos College and a member of the honor society.

A classmate, Pat Dodero, 24, a dropout from Long Beach State, has now accrued two straight semesters with a 4.0 (A) average. The Cerritos Vets Club has the highest scholastic average of any club on the campus.

"The difference is we know what we want," explained Ken Suarez, 22, ex-Marine and member of the student senate. "We started later, so we have to run faster."

"After five years in the Service I'm behind other guys now," remarked James McCurry, who is about to graduate from the Northrop Institute of Technology as an airplane technician, a trade he began in the Army, "but some of the things I learned in the Service in terms of my trade and experiences in life will put me ahead of the others later."

On the responsibility habit

Heavy responsibility shouldered at a young age can become a habit. Men who never thought they had it in them have now set higher targets for themselves. A typical comment: "My aim was just to make corporal and forget it. When I got my sergeant's stripes I felt I could take on the world."

Jack Jones, 29, a policeman and former "spat" or self-propelled antitank gun commander with the Airborne, was in charge of constructing a school for 120 Vietnamese children in Bien Hoa. His unit built the school as a volunteer project. When it was dedicated, Jones received a flag and a gift from the Vietnamese people. This was an accomplishment that has made a deep impact on his life.

"My whole value system has completely changed," said Steve Cobb, 23, ex-Army man and current member of the Long Beach City College veterans' group. "Things that have been so important to you in America just aren't when you get away."

On jobs for machinegunners

A pet peeve of the returnee is the question often asked by a prospective employer, "What special training did you get in the Service?" A common reply is "jungle training."

When a department store personnel chief asked the same question of Sammy Marquez, 21, he replied, "I was a machine gunner for four years. Need one?" He got the job (clothes salesman).

The returning Negro serviceman looks for a job with the same responsibility and prestige he had in the military. After a series of rejections and closed doors, some have been wooed by the black militants. The majority take strong exception to these groups and like Charles Walker are going to keep plugging away until they find the work they are looking for.

Richard West, in charge of the Urban League's program to help the returning veteran in Los Angeles, warns, "They were fighting in Vietnam for the freedom of a people. They come back full of hope. They find industry not hiring and housing not available. Unless this country is as aggressive an equal-opportunity employer as the military, we've got a problem."

The vets as a group hold no truck for the hippie and the demonstrator. Many defend the right of dissent, but they resent the way troop morale has been undercut by these groups. One returnee of less than a week admitted he had planned with several of his friends to get discharged in Japan rather than return to a "hippie America."

"My heart bleeds for my buddies back there," remarked Cory Beall, who had been through some of the heaviest action of the war with the Airborne. It bugs him that many are paying a heavy price and feeling all the time that no one Stateside cares.

Younger men in political office is a common desire among the vets. They are practically unanimous that the nation needs younger leadership at all levels. For many this means they want a chance to lead themselves. A political career appeals to a high percentage of them.

Most of them see America's role in the future to be one of "setting an example for the rest of the world." But, they contend, we must be careful about how we go about it. "Different people have different tastes," stated one. "We can't force people to do things our way. If they want to pattern themselves after us, let them take the initiative."

This wave of returnees is different from earlier generations of veterans. At least they believe they are. They have no illusion that they have fought the war to end all wars. They have no intention of escaping from everything.

On hippie professors

Suprisingly they have little dialogue or debate on campus with the Students for a Democratic Society and other New Left elements. "The SDS has their religion," commented Cory Beall. "They believe in it. They don't talk to you about Vietnam. They can care less about the facts."

The vets have considerable influence in class and with other students. "The hippie professors can't control our minds like they can the other kids'," said one ex-Marine. "When we're in class they get bent all out of shape. Sometimes they even lower our grades because of it." Several complained that they are continually baited by such professors.

Asked if war had soured his desire for involvement in curing social issues. Sammy Marquez shot back, "It has added fuel to the fire. When you see the Vietnamese civilians dying, their children crying and your own buddies shot up, you want to make sure that never happens here."

"We want change, but not just for the sake of change," said another. "The hippies attack society, but I haven't heard one practical idea from them about how to bring about change."

On change equals work

The general philosophy of the vet is that change takes place when you get in there and work for it. To prove their outlook they point to what they have already accomplished on their campuses. President Jack Mears of Cerritos College backs them up. He invited veteran Eric von Hurst, student president, to attend the board of trustees meetings, the first such move in the State.

"All the machinery of student government was there," explained von Hurst, "but the students weren't using it. We've put it in motion for the benefit of all."

The Cerritos Vets Club has taken the leadership in blood drives, a banquet for the athletic fund, a toy drive and numerous other community-oriented activities.

The younger students fondly refer to the vets as the "dirty old men." They in turn are dubbed the "bubblegummers." The pressure from the vets for high grades causes friction as does their effectiveness in running student affairs.

"What we've done is create some honest competition on the campus," said Phil Romans, president of the Santa Monica City College Vets Club.

On campus hostility

On some campuses the vets have diplomatically overcome initial fear or hostility. At Cerritos, for example, other students who at first resented them now come to the veterans and ask their advice on personal problems.

The Vets Club at SMCC was founded just last September. As elsewhere the administration tried to discourage them. "They thought we were just going to sponsor wild parties," laughed founder Mike Davis.

The SMCC club has become a dynamo in student activities.

At their first annual banquet, their faculty advisor, Herbert Roney, was moved when he was asked to speak.

"I was in a vets club here at SMCC after the Second World War," he recalled. "We drank ourselves into oblivion. You men, however, have brought to this campus maturity, dedication and leadership. You've accomplished more in one semester than most groups have done in their entire existence. You've undertaken things that other groups wouldn't consider. To quote Thomas Jefferson, 'Every citizen should be a soldier.' "

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The BILL CLERK. Calendar No. 996, Senate Resolution 266, a resolution to provide standards of conduct for Mem-

bers of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 67 Leg.]

Anderson	Dirksen	Mundt
Baker	Griffin	Nelson
Bartlett	Gruening	Pearson
Bennett	Hansen	Pell
Boggs	Hatfield	Prouty
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Spong
Carlson	Mansfield	Stennis
Case	McGovern	Talmadge
Cooper	Metcalf	Tydings
Curtis	Moss	Young, Ohio

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms is instructed to execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	Montoya
Allott	Hartke	Morton
Bayh	Hayden	Murphy
Bible	Hill	Muskie
Brooke	Hollings	Proxmire
Burdick	Jackson	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Scott
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Smathers
Clark	Kennedy, Mass.	Smith
Cotton	Kennedy, N.Y.	Sparkman
Dodd	Lausche	Symington
Dominick	Long, La.	Thurmond
Eastland	Magnuson	Tower
Ellender	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Fannin	McGee	Williams, Del.
Fong	Miller	Yarborough
Fulbright	Mondale	
Gore	Monroney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF SENATOR KUCHEL

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the financial statement of Senator and Mrs. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, and statement of income for the year ending December 31, 1967. My colleagues will remember that Senator KUCHEL is a cosponsor of my bill, S. 1104, the latest in a series of disclosure bills I have included in each Congress since 1957.

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

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF SENATOR AND MRS. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

ASSETS

Cash in checking and savings accounts (prior to payment of State income tax)	$67,839.03
Life insurance policies (death benefits—$42,000):	
U.S. group life insurance (term insurance, no cash surrender value):	
National service life insurance (cash surrender value)	876.50
Accumulated contributions to retirement funds	27,306.77
Real estate: Personal residence:	
Original cost plus improvements	41,000.00
Less: Existing mortgage	12,834.57
Total	28,165.43
Stock owned: 100 shares—South Seas Mining, Ltd	1,536.37
Tangible personal property consisting of automobile, furniture, jewelry, and personal effects, approximately	8,500.00

LIABILITIES

None—except existing mortgage on residence.

INCOME IN 1967

Senate salary and allowances	33,036.38
Less: Expenses allowable as income tax deductions	5,849.18
(Deductions do not include itemized personal deductions or total actual official expenses)	27,187.20
Interest on savings accounts	2,652.28
Public speaking honorariums	3,400.00

PUBLIC SPEAKING HONORARIUMS

Cal Tech YMCA.
Active Ballot Club.
Wayne State University.
Brookings Institution.
Calvin Bullock Ltd.

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 266) to provide standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I should like to make another brief statement on the Clark-Case amendment or, as the Senator from Pennsylvania would say it, the Case-Clark amendment.

As other Senators have said, I also appreciate the great service rendered by the select committee which has labored long and hard at its difficult task. I welcome its decision to recommend a requirement that Members of the Senate and staff earning $15,000 or more submit annual financial reports. I regret, however, that the committee resolution provides that these personal financial statements shall be submitted in sealed envelopes and filed with the Comptroller General.

To call confidential submission of a sealed report disclosure is a misnomer. Disclosure to the public is vital to the effectiveness of the disclosure principle.

I have therefore joined with Senator CLARK in sponsoring the pending amendment which would require full public disclosure of the personal financial interests, all sources and amounts of income, assets and liabilities, gifts and transactions in real and personal property by each Member of the Senate and Senate officials and staff receiving $15,000 or more. Our amendment would not require the inclusion of income tax returns which do contain personal information, such as medical expenses, which is not relevant to the purpose of our amendment or the purpose of the pending resolution.

Public disclosure is the approach which polls have shown again and again the public favors by an overwhelming majority.

The public is right in considering this the best approach to a chronic problem that Congress has repeatedly shown itself unable to deal with effectively in other ways.

There are a variety of reasons for this. Congress is one of three coordinate branches of Government. As the Supreme Court recently held, the constitutional provisions designed to protect the independence of Congress from an unfriendly President or hostile judiciary generally rule out outside inquiry into the motives of a Member of Congress.

Further, since each Member of Congress is primarily accountable to his constituency—and this is right—colleagues are reluctant to sit in judgment on him.

Nonetheless, recognition is growing of the need for forthright action to assure the integrity of the Congress.

In 1957 I first introduced a bill to require Members of Congress—and candidates for Congress—top legislative staff and top officials in the executive branch to make annual reports covering all income and its sources, gifts of more than nominal value, liabilities and assets, and all transactions in commodities, real and personal property. Slowly but steadily support for it has grown. Last year when I reintroduced the bill for the sixth time three other Republicans and four Democrats joined as cosponsors. Too, several Senators who previously opposed disclosure have now endorsed it.

Disclosure has several advantages.

First, it is preventive. The knowledge that one's financial activities and interests will become known is the best possible "stop and think" signal—the surest way to sharpen awareness of any possible conflict of public and private interests.

Second, it is automatic in operation. When the facts are on the table, the press and the public can make their own judgment.

Third, disclosure will strengthen the people's right to elect whom they wish by giving them full knowledge of the personal financial interests of those who present themselves as candidates for election or reelection.

Though our amendment does not by name include candidates for senatorial election, practically speaking, I am very sure that it would include them. Experience has shown that whenever an incumbent Senator running for reelection has made public disclosure, the pressures on his opponent have forced him also to disclose.

For years Congress has required top executive officials to disclose specific financial interests. I must say in passing that this is not a completely satisfactory arrangement in my opinion. It suffers in general from the same defect as the committee-proposed resolution. It does require that this information be filed, but it is rather filed with the head of the department in which the specific employee is employed and not made public. This, therefore, does not meet with the main purpose which disclosure was designed to satisfy.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the requirement to disclose the amount and identity of each liability apply to monetary liabilities only, or to all liabilities?

Mr. CASE. This is designed to do only what human beings can do. There are liabilities that certain people have—the color of their hair, the absence of hair—as they may regard it. This is not the kind of thing covered by the amendment. The kind of thing we are talking about is the kind of thing that would not possibly gives rise to conflict of interest between a man's duties in the Senate and his own interests.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose a Senator had been speaking for pay before a certain group of people, until he really felt very kindly toward them. Would that be a liability? Would he be obligated to them? Is an obligation to any person or group of persons a liability?

Mr. CASE. The Senator may have been deflected from an originally facetious course, and, if so, this is an advantage.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe I am being sound.

Mr. CASE. Now the Senator—perhaps he has always been—is being serious, and I answer him seriously now.

This is one of the kinds of situations with which disclosure is designed to deal. It is quite true that the receipt of honoraria for speeches or other types of emoluments can give rise to prejudices in favor of certain action or opposition to it.

Our thought is that whether or not such things are likely to happen—because nobody can be entirely, by any means, free of all interests—the best thing to do is to have the facts made public and let the man, himself, and his constituents look at it.

Mr. AIKEN. And if one received $1,000 for making a $20 speech, would that be a gift, a fee, or a liability?

Mr. CASE. So long as it was laid out—and it would be laid out, I believe, without any question—as an item of income, which is defined in our amendment to include gifts above a small amount, it would be listed there. The important thing is not how it is described but the fact that its existence is disclosed.

Mr. AIKEN. The public would be the judge.

Mr. CASE. The public would judge whether or not it gave rise to a conflict of interest.

Mr. AIKEN. Back in the 1940's, our executive branch of Government was hiring many people who had news connections to do a little work for them after hours. One lady, who had a radio program at the time, was offered so many hundred dollars to do a few minutes' work. I do not know just what I want to say, but that looked like buying influence by the Government itself.

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. And different groups of people tried to gain influence.

Mr. CASE. Congress has tried to handle that type of situation. I believe that is at least one of the purposes of a statute which, as I recall, was enacted in 1948, under which it is unlawful for a Federal employee to receive outside pay for performing his Federal function; and it is unlawful both for the man to receive it and for any person to give it.

Mr. AIKEN. It was around that time that the public agency was paying the nonpublic people. It is pretty late to bring it up now. I do not believe it is as prevalent now as it was then.

Mr. CASE. This is a matter of attempting to prejudice what should be an impartial news medium or medium of information. All such efforts should be dealt with as effectively as we can. That is not the specific purpose of the proposed resolution, which is to deal with the conduct of Members of the Senate primarily.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator, like the Ethics Committee, is trying to perform a very useful purpose. It is an uphill job. It is just as difficult to write a fair ethics resolution as it is to write a fair tax bill or a fair draft law or a few other things.

Mr. CASE. The Senator is correct. As a matter of fact, I believe that this perhaps is the strongest argument for the amendment that Senator CLARK and I are urging at this time. The very difficulty of attempting to set down categorically things that are right and things that are wrong leaves an area of this sort, in which so many factual situations necessarily arise, where relationships are so delicate, and where many times, in the last analysis, a man is obliged to act in accordance with his conscience.

I believe disclosure is better than attempting by prescription to deal with it in detailed ways, and I believe that one of the difficulties the committee got itself into is that it has attempted to avoid complete disclosure and still to meet certain problems that were the direct reason for its creation. I believe it would be better to turn to the disclosure method and to eliminate some of the specifics.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe it would be very difficult for anyone to make a perfectly accurate report, either under this proposal or the committee's resolution. It would be almost impossible to do that. I suppose allowances would have to be made for that.

We have had people come before us who were appointed to a high position in Government and they have said, "We are severing all connections with our law firm. We have disposed of all our assets, and so forth. We have completely quit our position with the company that we have been associated with." Then they go to work for the Government. The day after they get through with the Government, they are back at the same old desk that they left in the first place.

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. We could name a few names, too.

Mr. CASE. This is a very real problem. The problem has many ramifications. One of them is the difficulty of getting people to work for the Government—on the other side of the picture.

Mr. AIKEN. You get somebody to work for the Government who has never been successful in his own business, and he will not be successful for the Government, either.

Mr. CASE. The Government wants good people.

Mr. AIKEN. Capable people.

Mr. CASE. It has proved difficult to get, for example, counsel to work for the Government, without providing for exemption from existing legislation which prohibits practicing in certain areas for some time after public service ends.

Mr. AIKEN. Most Government employees are conscientious.

Mr. CASE. Most of them.

Mr. AIKEN. The career employees are particularly conscientious. But we know that industry is constantly screening Government agencies, with a view to picking off the most capable people and offering them two or three times the pay they can get from the Government. In some cases, that leaves the less capable people in charge.

Mr. CASE. In some cases, I believe the Senator is correct. Of course, this is true.

Apparently, we are in an age in which business is no longer as attractive to the best minds coming out of our schools and colleges. Business feels this keenly, and feels that it is necessary, and has therefore offered higher salaries, a good deal higher than was customary when everybody went into business because that was what all bright and able people did.

Mr. AIKEN. And they often found more than they could hope to get by going into Government work.

Mr. CASE. The Senator is correct. To a degree, I believe this is the result of the fact that so many of our wonderful young people coming out of schools and colleges now regard business as somewhat of a secondary attraction, and regard public service—Government service among other public service—as far more attractive, even at lesser pay.

Mr. AIKEN. If they are not high minded at that age——

Mr. CASE. They never will be.

Mr. AIKEN (continuing). They never will be.

Mr. CASE. The Senator has been high minded all his life, so I cannot use him as an example. I do not rule out the possibility of conversion.

Mr. AIKEN. What kind of conversion?

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator from Michigan wish to be recognized?

Mr. HART. Following the Senator's remarks I shall seek recognition in order to express support for the Senator's point of view.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator. I shall be finished with my remarks soon.

Before leaving my friend from Vermont, I wish to deal with one point he made. There are different kinds of interests, other than those which are strictly financial.

Mr. AIKEN. Some cannot be reduced to a monetary value.

Mr. CASE. The Senator is correct. Here we are pretty much compelled to rely on the conscience of the Members of Congress, their knowledge of each other, and the knowledge of the public and the press of the individual.

For example, the Senator from Vermont is very much interested in wild flowers. That interest transcends any financial interest he may have. He likes them but I do not know that it is a prejudice. Knowing the Senator, I do not think it is likely that he would do something prejudicial in favor of wild flowers as against those of the garden variety. I would trust him in such a case.

Mr. AIKEN. I would be inclined to vote for wild flowers in that instance between them and the garden variety.

Mr. CASE. Then, there are people deeply interested in education.

Mr. AIKEN. Education is an asset.

Mr. CASE. It may be, but it is one of many items in the public interest.

Mr. AIKEN. A mean disposition would be a liability.

Mr. CASE. I think the best we can do in dealing with the problem is to talk about it in terms of factors of property and interest that can be given a financial value. I think that is as much as we can try to do.

Mr. AIKEN. That is as far as we could go.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, as I was saying, for years we have required top executive officials to disclose specific financial interests, and Congress has done this largely on the occasion of the officials presenting themselves for confirmation of nominations which have come to us from the President. I think this has been quite proper and a great amount of good has been accomplished by making this a common standard practice. It is high time that Congress applied the same principle to itself and did away with the double standard so long followed.

Of course, disclosure, as provided by the pending amendment, inevitably involves intrusions into privacy, but, as one who has done it regularly for several years on a voluntary basis, it is my experience, just observing my own reactions, that it is a very small price to pay for the privilege of public service. The cost becomes insignificant when compared to the great public good which would be served.

I am confident that institution of a public disclosure requirement—and I do not think the committee's suggestion along this line is adequate at all—would bring reassuring evidence that most Members of Congress are honest men who regard public service as a public trust. It is because I am jealous of my own reputation, and my reputation as a Senator, and, of course, the reputation of the Senate as an institution, that I am anxious that the public image of people in positions which we have the honor to hold should be raised, not only to the level I think it deserves presently, but to an even higher level.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to. I think it is long overdue.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield the floor. The Senator may speak on his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted. I support the effort which is now pending. I voice the hope that after several earlier and less successful efforts, the Clark-Case amendment now pending will be agreed to. It is an amendment which I have cosponsored.

There is very little that one could add to the discussion in terms of assigning reasons in support of the pending amendment. The effort is not a new one, as the Senator from New Jersey and others have reminded us.

When I first came to the Senate I found that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] were in the process of trying to persuade us to this point of view. I joined them then and ever since in cosponsoring amendments comparable to the amendment we are considering now.

I recall testifying with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] before the Committee on Rules and Administration about 4 years ago in one of the earlier efforts. It is, I believe, worth noting that when Senators are confronted with the suggestion that they disclose income they are confronted with a rather curious paradox. If the disclosure indicates there is very substantial wealth, one or two conclusions could be drawn, and knowing human nature we must recognize this will happen. The judgment will be either that he has such personal interest to protect that he has to be suspect; or, because he is economically secure he can be a very independent character.

Conversely, if the disclosure shows a man of little or no wealth there are equally contradictory conclusions to follow. It will be said, this man will be objective because he has no interest to protect; or, this fellow has such a tenuous economic base that he will bend to any sort of pressure.

Yet, I believe the public's right to all of these fiscal facts about us when making their judgment is desirable, and that a law requiring annual disclosure and disclosure in the sense of being available to the public and not in a sealed envelope, is the best course.

Incidentally, I have followed this course, as have a number of Senators, for several years now. Over the years I have reported to the people of Michigan on occasions my feelings about this subject. I dipped back into those earlier files and I found a monthly report that I had sent to the people of Michigan in April of 1964.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report entitled "The Case for Disclosure" which is dated April 1964 and which reflects my views then and now.

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

THE CASE FOR DISCLOSURE

(Senator HART reports, April 1964)

The Senate hearings into Bobby Baker's complex financial affairs were held just across from my office and for several weeks the hall was crowded with cameras and reporters.

Emerging witnesses each had their moment under the television lights and the interviews rumbled through the corridors like restless thunderclouds seeking a place to drop their burden.

Earlier, a Congressman was found to have a financial interest in a firm he had helped in government negotiations. And, some years ago, there was the case of the Senator who had to explain how he had drawn income from his law firm back home—a firm that represented railroads in government dealings.

What all these men were undergoing, of course, was disclosure of income—but the disclosure was being made in a strikingly awkward and painful manner.

Is there any way of avoiding these unfortunate situations? It seems to me that a system of regular income disclosure would be a considerable help. Certainly, it would give every office holder a powerful incentive to avoid business dealings that might trouble the voting public.

What would disclosure do? It would give the public a record of all the office-holder's outside interests and income.

The voters could then match this information with the man's record, check it against their estimate of his integrity and mark their decision at the polling booth.

If a Member of Congress accepts money for a speech, the public should know how big the fee was and who did the hiring.

If he owns stocks or has business interests, the public should know what companies are involved and how much they pay.

If he maintains a law practice, the public should know the clients and the compensation.

If he writes magazine articles for a fee, the public should know what group controls the magazine and how big the check was.

If he accepts contributions to make television and radio reports to constituents, or for any purposes, the public should know who the contributors were and how much they sent.

Disclosure seems to me a simple solution to a very complex problem. It's unfortunate but politics—let's face it—is an increasingly expensive business. We cannot expect capable men to run for office if they must sterilize all their transactions. But we can take steps to keep all transactions innocent.

Why not set up an enforced system where Members of Congress, top staff people and high-level appointed officials each year declare all sources of income?

Congressmen already require disclosure by newly appointed administration officials. Why not for themselves?

A bill has been introduced to do just that. At the moment it is lying dormant while the Senate remains strangely becalmed in

the windy confines of the filibuster but I am hopeful that soon the Rules Committee—having digested the Bobby Baker experience—will decide that disclosure is the answer.

I am a co-sponsor of the bill along with Senators Neuberger (D-Ore.), Case (R-N.J.), Clark (D-Pa.) and Javits (R-N.Y.). All of us, as one measure of our support, have made the first of our yearly declarations.

Public confidence in Congress has not hit any all-time high in recent months. Disclosure would be an effective way to reverse the tide. Washing always tends to be cleaner if it is slated to be hung in public. And forthrightness—like the kitchen cleaner whose name I have forgotten—is cleaner than dirt.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I do hope that this time our effort will be marked by success. As one who has for a period of years made disclosure of his unearned income and income from outside activity, I can report that after the first go round, very little attention is paid to it, but it is there. In my book, it is information useful to a citizen who wants to make a judgment, and perhaps more important, helpful in dispelling the often expressed attitude with respect to the Congress that there is too much mystery about each of us. We will never be judged as anything other than human beings with human frailties and that describes our judges also. Every time we cast a vote we cast a vote which offends a large group of people. Some will never believe it reflects our best judgment in response to the usually complicated public question involved. Some will always believe that there was direct economic interest which compelled us to a point of view which they think is outrageous.

I think public disclosure would allay some of this criticism and mistrust and we would all be the better for it.

Again I thank the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Pennsylvania for leading us in this effort over the years.

Mr. CASE. I want to call the attention of the Senate to the supplemental views of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] in support of full public disclosure, which our amendment would provide for. I want to pay personal tribute to the Senator from Kentucky because much of my sensitivity to this issue is due to my association with him. I thank my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair), I pressed for the adoption of a public disclosure rule in our committee. I was not able to prevail in committee but I presented my position in my supplemental views. I said on the first day of debate on the pending resolution that I support that position. I said the same thing yesterday on the floor of the Senate.

My position has been made clear. I have voted for public disclosure in the past and I shall vote for the amendment which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] have offered.

The arguments which have been made by the sponsors of the amendment are those which I have considered in the past and which have led me to this position.

The very difficulty of writing a disclosure rule which does not require public disclosure is indicated by effort to establish categories, limitations upon income that must be reported, the requirement that certain types of income be reported because they are closely associated or are the consequence of the duties of a Senator such as honoraria, contributions for political purposes, contributions for office expenses. All of these raise questions. Public disclosure would prescribe the same rule for all members.

There is, of course, the argument that places on an incumbent Senator who is a candidate for reelection in an unfavorable position relative to an opposing candidate who is not a Senator.

This argument was answered by the Senator from New Jersey. If an incumbent Senator declares publicly, inevitably it will be demanded of his opponent that he also declare publicly. But whether or not an opponent declares his income publicly—the public disclosure of the incumbent Senator would, I believe, be accepted by the voters as an act of good faith.

There is another problem, the question of privacy, which we cherish and value as one of the most important rights of an individual. But, holding the office of U.S. Senator, we are in the public eye. Everything we do is connected with the public interest and public trust. It is that interest more than any other which has caused me to support public disclosure. It is my judgment that it would do no harm in any way to the position of an incumbent Senator. To the contrary, it would remove, or at least answer doubts and suspicions against a member or against the Senate, a great institution which must be trusted in our system of government.

That is the position I have taken, Mr. President, and it is the position I shall maintain. I shall therefore vote for the amendment requiring public disclosure.

In the difficult task which the committee has undertaken—and it is a difficult task and one which I doubt many would like to undertake—we have worked together without political partisanship. We have known that if we were to be an effective committee we must consider and respect each other's judgments and opinions, insofar as it is possible, when not a matter of conscience, and that we must try to come together on decisions.

It is our responsibility to move along and progress in this field. We could not progress at all if we split and maintained separate positions upon every rule. But on this rule I felt that it was beyond mere judgment or procedures. The subject of disclosure is so important, I must maintain my position, apart from the majority views of the committee.

I will vote for the pending amendment.

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I respectfully commend Chairman STENNIS and the members of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct for bringing to the Senate their recommendations for standards of conduct for Members and officers and employees of the Senate. The task of this committee has not been an easy one and its members deserve and receive our deep respect for the conscientious efforts they have made. There is no one in public life for whose character and integrity I have more respect than the able and dedicated chairman of this committee.

It now becomes the task of every Senator to measure the specific recommendations made against his own personal concept of the most effective manner of achieving that which all desire—the strengthening of the integrity of this body as an institution in which the American people have confidence and respect.

As the committee states well in its report:

A Senator is extended an extraordinary measure of trust and confidence not given to ordinary members of society. The Senate must therefore require higher standards of conduct than those generally required in the marketplace.

Mr. President, for many years I have supported the idea that disclosure by Senators of the sources of their income would afford the electorate information to which they are entitled as one basis for decision as to how they will vote; and in effort to be persuaded that the confidential financial disclosure to the Comptroller General proposed in rule 44 would serve the same purpose, I hope studied the committee's report.

The committee points out that public disclosure will result in unfair attacks by the sensationalists in our society. I believe, however, that this is a burden which elected officials will always bear. For my part, I am inclined to believe that the recommendation in rule 44 for a confidential report to the Comptroller General could subject a Senator to equal or even greater abuse and harm from sensationalists, as leaks and guesses are made, as to the contents of the confidential reports.

No one is forced to become a public official. He does so of his own volition, subject to the wishes of the people he represents. It is to them that he is responsible.

The committee fears that a requirement of public disclosure would deter some from seeking the office of Senator. I believe that is true, and that condition is an important consideration. Widespread notions now prevail, however, that politicians are somewhat tainted; and this would seem to discourage some interested and talented people from seeking public office.

On balance, it seems to me that this price—public disclosure of financial assets and income—would not in the long run deter those who seek to serve any more than the present climate would have that effect.

All of us recognize the growing volume of effort now required of a U.S. Senator. In analyzing the reason for rule 42 proposed in respect to contributions, the committee points out:

It is general knowledge that the expense of conducting the office of a Senator has risen steadily over the years. The increasingly better informed public is taking a greater interest in public affairs. This brings about more communication between the public and Senators, with consequent rising costs of correspondence, telephone and telegraph, radio and television broadcasting, quasi-official entertainment, and travel for a Sen-

ator. In addition, many constituents look upon their Senator as a kind of ombudsman. Long gone is the day when a Senator could simply legislate.

That is true, but it seems to me that the increased workload of a U.S. Senator is but another reason for the public to have the right to know the sources of a Senator's income. Surely it affords some basis for assessing the time and efforts devoted to his official position.

These are but some of the reasons that I will support the amendment offered by Senator CLARK to require public reports of the financial interests of Members of the U.S. Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRITICS OF HANGINGS IN RHODESIA DENOUNCED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Critics of Hangings in Rhodesia Denounced," written by James J. Kilpatrick, and published in the Washington Evening Star, of March 19, 1968.

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

CRITICS OF HANGINGS IN RHODESIA DENOUNCED

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Rhodesia has been suffering lately from a very bad press: The State Department denies a visa to Prime Minister Ian Smith. The Virginia House of Delegates shouts down a resolution of support for Rhodesia. Back in Salisbury, right-wing pressures toward apartheid grow more intense. Defying Queen, Pope, and world opinion, the Smith regime proceeds with the hanging of five "freedom fighters."

At the United Nations, the Afro-Asian bloc demands new measures against Rhodesia, more punitive than the present sanctions. A lead article in the prestigious American Journal of International Law defends the sanctions; the theory of the authors, one of them a Yale professor, is that Rhodesia has offended the "shared sensitivities" of her neighbors, and thus created an actionable threat to the peace. The fury is especially intense in England, where members of Commons denounce Ian Smith as "a murderer."

It is true enough that the Rhodesian government, struggling for survival in a hostile world, has taken some actions in recent months that American friends must regret. Laws relating to housing and to segregation of public parks are steps backward, not forward. The Smith government has not impeded the reregistration of black voters, but it has done little to encourage the African franchise; the number of registered blacks is half what it was three years ago.

But the current uproar, touched off by the five hangings ought to be denounced as blatant hypocrisy on the part of most of those who are whooping it up. Macaulay once remarked that he knew of no spectacle so ridiculous as the British public in one of its periodical fits of morality. This current fit qualifies. And no spectacle in Africa is more contemptible than the criticism hurled at Rhodesia by despotic black regimes which are themselves guilty of bloody crimes and the repression of political freedoms.

It is said that the five condemned men were "freedom fighters." Let us see how they fought for freedom.

James Ndhlamini and Victor Mlambo were members of a terrorist group known as the Crocodile Gang. They threw a block of trees across a country road. When a white farmer named Oberholtzer came along, with his wife and small daughter in the car, they fell upon him with knives and stones. As he was dying at the steering wheel, they attempted to set the car on fire in an effort to kill the woman and child. This was a fight for freedom?

Duly Shadreck waylaid an elderly black man at midnight, killed him with an axe, and robbed him of seven shillings. Noble, was it not?

Francis Chimsoro Risa and Takauyare Jeremiah stole into a tribal hut where a subchief named Nedewedzo was sleeping with his wife. They tore off most of his head with a shotgun blast. It seems an odd exercise in self-determination.

For these brutal murders, the five defendants were brought to trial in the High Court of Rhodesia. They had the assistance of counsel. In each case, a judge and two "assessors," under the Rhodesian system, found them guilty without extenuating circumstance. The death sentences followed. These were sustained on appellate review.

Why the outcry? In terms of moral principle, those who deplore the death penalty may deplore its imposition anywhere. But as a matter of law, these punishments were peculiarly the business of Rhodesia. Pietistic Americans might restrain themselves long enough to acknowledge that 3,857 executions were carried out in their own United States between 1930 and 1966.

It is said that Rhodesia "defied the Queen." But the Queen in this affair was no more than a pretty figurehead; the clemency decree came from the Wilson government, which had no authority, even under the pre-independence Rhodesian constitution of 1961, to exercise the prerogative of mercy. The incident was patently trumped up. It is a fair surmise that Wilson's object was to divert the British public from troubles at home by fabricating some vicarious outrage abroad.

One expects opportunism from the Communists and hypocrisy from the Afro-Asian bloc. One has learned to expect anything from Harold Wilson. But it is a sad commentary on the United States, which once also proclaimed its independence from the British crown, to see our own people join in the calamity howling against Rhodesia now heard across the land.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

EXCISE TAX BILL—AMENDMENT NO. 637—TAX, SPENDING CUT MEASURE REQUIRING PRIORITIES FOR POVERTY WAR, CITIES CRISIS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to H.R. 15414, which I send to the desk, may be printed as a part of my remarks, and printed under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, and printed, and will lie on the table; and without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 637) is as follows:

On page 2, after line 2, insert the following:

"TITLE I—LIMITATION ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES; IMPOSITION OF 10 PERCENT INCOME TAX SURCHARGE

"SEC. 101. LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURES DURING FISCAL YEAR 1969.

"(a) Expenditures under the budget of the United States (referred to in the budget message of the President as totaling $186,100,000,000) during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, shall not exceed $182,100,000,000, except by those expenditures in excess of $25,000,000,000 that the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia.

"(b) To effectuate the provisions of subsection (a), the President shall reserve from expenditure such amounts from such appropriations or other obligational authority, heretofore or hereafter made available, as he may prescribe, except that the President shall not reserve from expenditure any amounts from appropriations or other obligational authority available for the following purposes:

"(1) education,

"(2) low-income housing,

"(3) water and air pollution prevention,

"(4) prevention and detection of crime,

"(5) the District of Columbia,

"(6) training and employment of disadvantaged persons,

"(7) war on poverty,

"SEC. 102. IMPOSITION OF 10 PERCENT INCOME TAX SURCHARGE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 (relating to determination of tax liability) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"'PART V—TAX SURCHARGE

"'Sec. 51. Tax surcharge

"'SEC. 51. TAX SURCHARGE.

"'(a) IMPOSITION OF TAX.—

"'(1) CALENDAR YEAR TAXPAYERS.—In addition to the other taxes imposed by this chapter and except as provided in subsection (b), there is hereby imposed on the income of every person whose taxable year is the calendar year, a tax equal to the percent of the adjusted tax (as defined in subsection (c)) for the taxable year specified in the following table:

"'Calendar year	Percent	
	Individuals	Corporations
1968	7.5	10
1969	5.0	5

"'(2) FISCAL YEAR TAXPAYERS.—In addition to the other taxes imposed by this chapter and except as provided in subsection (b), in the case of taxable years ending on or after the effective date of the surcharge and be-

ginning before July 1, 1969, there is hereby imposed on the income of every person whose taxable year is other than the calendar year, a tax equal to—

"'(A) 10 percent of the adjusted tax for the taxable year, multiplied by

"'(B) a fraction, the numerator of which is the number of days in the taxable year occurring on and after the effective date of the surcharge and before July 1, 1969, and the denominator of which is the number of days in the entire taxable year.

"'(3) EFFECTIVE DATE DEFINED.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the 'effective date of the surcharge' means—

"'(A) January 1, 1968, in the case of a corporation, and

"'(B) April 1, 1968, in the case of an individual.

"'(b) LOW INCOME EXEMPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the adjusted tax for the taxable year does not exceed—

"'(1) $290, in the case of a joint return of a husband and wife under section 6013.

"'(2) $220, in the case of an individual who is a head of household to whom section 1(b) applies, or

"'(3) $145, in the case of any other individual (other than an estate or trust).

"'(c) ADJUSTED TAX DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the adjusted tax for a taxable year means the tax imposed by this chapter (other than by this section, section 871(a) or section 881) for such taxable year, reduced by any credit allowable for such year under section 37 (relating to retirement income) computed without regard to this section.

"'(d) AUTHORITY TO PRESCRIBE COMPOSITE TAX RATES AND TABLES.—The Secretary or his delegate may determine, and require the use of, composite tax rates incorporating the tax imposed by this section and prescribe regulations setting forth modified optional tax tables computed upon the basis of such composite rates. The composite rates so determined may be rounded to the nearest whole percentage point as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. If, pursuant to this subsection, the Secretary or his delegate prescribes regulations setting forth modified optional tax tables for a taxable year, then, notwithstanding section 144(a), in the case of a taxpayer to whom a credit is allowable for such taxable year under section 37, the standard deduction may be elected regardless of whether the taxpayer elects to pay the tax imposed by section 3.

"'(e) ESTIMATED TAX.—For purposes of applying the provisions of this title with respect to declarations and payments of estimated income tax due more than 45 days (15 days in the case of a corporation) after the date of the enactment of this section—

"'(1) in the case of a corporation, so much of any tax imposed by this section as is attributable to the tax imposed by section 11 or 1201(a) or subchapter L shall be treated as a tax imposed by such section 11 or 1201 (a) or subchapter L;

"'(2) the term "tax shown on the return of the individual for the preceding taxable year", as used in section 6654(d)(1), shall mean the tax which would have been shown on such return if the tax imposed by this section were applicable to taxable years ending after March 31, 1967, and beginning before April 1, 1968; and

"'(3) the term "tax shown on the return of the corporation for the preceding taxable year", as used in section 6655(d)(1), shall mean the tax which would have been shown on such return if the tax imposed by this section were applicable to taxable years ending after December 31, 1966, and beginning before January 1, 1968.

"'(f) WESTERN HEMISPHERE TRADE CORPORATIONS AND DIVIDENDS ON CERTAIN PREFERRED STOCK.—In computing, for a taxable year of a corporation, the fraction described in—

"'(1) section 244(a)(2) (relating to deduction with respect to dividends received on the preferred stock of a public utility),

"'(2) section 247(a)(2) (relating to deduction with respect to certain dividends paid by a public utility), or

"'(3) section 922(2) (relating to special deduction for Western Hemisphere trade corporations),

the denominator shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be increased to reflect the rate at which tax is imposed under subsection (a) for such taxable year.

"'(g) WITHHOLDING ON WAGES.—In the case of wages paid after March 31, 1968, and before July 1, 1969, the amount required to be deducted and withheld under section 3402 shall be determined in accordance with the tables prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate in lieu of the tables set forth in section 3042 (a) or (c) (1).'

"(b) MINIMUM DISTRIBUTIONS.—Section 963(b) (relating to receipt of minimum distributions by domestic corporations) is amended—

"(1) by striking out the heading of paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(2) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING IN 1963 AND 1968.—', and

"(2) by striking out the heading of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(3) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING IN 1965, 1966, 1967, AND AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1968.—'.

"(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'Part V. Tax surcharge'

"(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply—

"(1) insofar as they relate to individuals, with respect to taxable years ending after March 31, 1968, and beginning before July 1, 1969, and

"(2) insofar as they relate to corporations, with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1967, and beginning before July 1, 1969."

On page 2, after line 2, insert the following:

"TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS"

Renumber sections 2 through 7 of the bill as sections 201 through 206, respectively.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to limit Federal expenditures, to impose an income tax surcharge, to continue the existing excise tax rates on communication services and automobiles, to apply more generally the provisions relating to payments of estimated tax by corporations, and for other purposes."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am today submitting an amendment to the bill which would propose to extend the excise taxes with which we will deal very shortly.

My amendment would set new priorities for Government spending to meet the crisis of the cities, provide a 10-percent tax surcharge, and require a net cut in Federal Government expenditures of $4 billion.

Mr. President, the amendment is designed to implement the program announced on March 6 by a group of Republicans in the other body led by Representative CHARLES GOODELL, of New York. I ask unanimous consent that the names of the other Representatives who announced the program may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The names of the Representatives who announced the program on March 6, are as follows:

Representative Charles E. Goodell (R., N.Y. and member of House Republican Leadership) and Representatives W. E. (Bill) Brock (R., Tenn.), Albert H. Quie (R., Minn.), Howard W. Robison (R., N.Y.), Donald Rumsfeld (R., Ill.), William O. Cowger (R., Ky.), George Bush (R., Tex.), William Steiger (R., Wis.), William H. Ayres (R., O.), Alphonzo Bell (R., Cal.), Edward G. Biester, Jr. (R., Pa.), Benjamin B. Blackburn (R., Ga.), Clarence J. Brown, Jr. (R., O.), Garry Brown (R., Mich.), James C. Cleveland (R., N.H.), Barber B. Conable, Jr. (R., N.Y.), Robert J. Corbett (R., Pa.), John R. Dellenback (R., Oreg.), Robert V. Denney (R., Nebr.), John N. Erlenborn (R., Ill.), Marvin L. Esch (R., Mich.), Paul Findley (R., Ill.), James C. Gardner (R., N.C.), James R. Grover, Jr. (R., N.Y.), Gilbert Gude (R., Md), James Harvey (R., Mich.), Edward Hutchinson (R., Mich.), Hastings Keith (R., Mass.), Dan Kuykendall (R., Tenn.), Robert McClory (R., Ill.), Jack H. McDonald (R., Mich.), Clark MacGregor (R., Minn.), Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. (R., Md.), Thomas J. Meskill (R., Conn.), Robert H. Michel (R., Ill.), Rogers C. B. Morton (R., Md), Charles A. Mosher (R., O.), Donald W. Riegle, Jr. (R., Mich.), William V. Roth (R., Del.), Herman T. Schneebeli (R., Pa.), Fred Schwengel (R., Ia.), J. William Stanton (R., O.), Burt L. Talcott (R., Cal.), Fletcher Thompson (R., Ga.), Guy Vander Jagt (R., Mich.), Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (R., O.), William B. Widnall (R., N.J.), Roger H. Zion (R, Ind.).

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the same objective as legislation introduced by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Finance. The Williams amendment would cut expenditures by $8 billion. My amendment would cut expenditures by $4 billion.

The plan of the Republican group in the other body is to cut expenditures by $6.5 billion, and restore $2.5 billion as a priority to the cities, in the poverty program, manpower, and other programs, which would reorder priorities and deal with problems of the cities. It is that plan I am submitting to the Senate.

We must begin to break the deadlock betweeen the White House and the Congress, and proceed to bring our economy into line with the reality of our wartime situation. I feel the program proposed by the group of House Republicans presents the best approach because it attempts to assure that cuts in spending are made in those areas where expenditures can be deferred while reallocating current expenditures for programs designed to fight poverty and the crisis in the cities.

In essence, we need a program of sensible austerity, one which requires the action the Nation should take in war, but which does not impose counter-productive economies that compound our grave problems in the cities.

My amendment would—

First. Provide for a 10-percent tax surcharge on corporations and individuals;

Second. Require a mandatory reduction in actual Government spending of $4 billion in fiscal year 1969; but

Third. Specifically exempt from such cuts expenditures for the military effort in Vietnam, for education, low-income housing, water and air pollution prevention, prevention and detection of crime,

the District of Columbia, training and employment of disadvantaged persons and the war on poverty.

On March 13 I sent a telegram to the President in which I urged him to call an immediate emergency session at the White House of the leadership of both Houses and of the ranking members of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Finance Committee and the two Appropriations Committees to resolve the present dangerous deadlock between the Congress and the President over fiscal policy and to come to an agreement on budget priorities, needed expenditure cuts to meet those priorities and on the tax surcharge.

To date no such action has been taken, although I have reason to believe the President is considering the suggestion embodied in this amendment and as far as anyone can tell, the deadlock remains unresolved. The resolution of this deadlock is urgent and overrides partisan politics. At stake is the continued confidence of the world community in the management of the American economy and in view of recent demonstrations of a serious lack of confidence abroad, we must take action now and deal with inflation in an effective way.

To economic questions I am not a Johnny-come-lately. As long as 3 weeks ago, in this Chamber I urged our Government to do what it and six other nations did last Sunday with respect to gold and the international monetary system.

At stake also is the survival of our cities torn today by dissent and crying for revitalization. Only by rearranging our priorities, by reducing spending in other areas can our programs directed at our urban crisis be adequately financed under wartime conditions. While we still have a better price record over the past 9 or 10 years than six other major industrial countries, during the past 2 years only Canada and Japan had consumer price increases steeper than ours.

It is for these reasons that I introduce today an amendment to the bill to continue excise taxes on communications services and on automobiles. The amendment would call for a 10 percent tax surcharge on corporations and individuals and for a $4 billion cut in fiscal year 1969 expenditures, except for necessary military expenditures for Vietnam, for education, low-income housing, water and air pollution prevention, prevention and detection of crime, the District of Columbia, training and employment of disadvantaged persons and the war on poverty. Most importantly this amendment would require a careful reassessment of priorities which has thus far been absent from the administration's economic strategy.

I understand the President is now ready to accept cuts of this magnitude and this is what is needed to deal with inflation at home and to finance the war in Vietnam at current force levels.

In my judgment steeper cuts in spending are unrealistic and, at this time, would very likely require cuts in those domestic programs which are essential to deal with the manifold and unmet problems of our urban society.

A net $4 billion cut in the fiscal 1969 budget, along with adoption of the administration's $12.9 billion package of fiscal proposals, would leave a deficit on the new unified budget basis at a level of around $4 billion, which is considered acceptable under wartime conditions and one which could be financed without crushing pressure on our capital markets.

Enactment of these anti-inflationary measures should be accompanied by the submission to the Congress in 1968 of a tax reform package to spread the tax burden among our citizens more equitably. The tax reform package should include, for example, the reduction of the oil depletion allowance from 27½ to 20 percent which would bring an estimated $350 million into the Treasury. I support the amendment introduced by Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware, which would bring a reduction of this allowance in three stages. I agree that the current fiscal situation cannot wait until a tax reform package is enacted but it is perfectly reasonable to expect that tax reform proposals be submitted to the Congress so that hearings can begin this year.

Only the ending of the war in Vietnam can effectively solve our fiscal crisis, make possible the allocation of large resources for our cities, and bring our balance-of-payments deficit under control. Even the President's Council of Economic Advisers admits that Vietnam has absorbed 25 percent of the country's growth since 1965. I have said repeatedly that I favor the beginning of the end of the war as do most Americans and I believe so now. However, I see no other choice but to pay for this war as long as the fighting continues. Any other course would be irresponsible.

I urge the administration again to call for the tax surcharge in the name of the war in Vietnam and then they will get it. As long as they continue to kid themselves and the American people, they will not.

In my January 31 statement on the domestic situation, among other steps, I called for a 10-percent tax surcharge and a reallocation of $4 billion within the proposed fiscal 1969 budget for such high priority items as job training, education, health, housing, and poverty. In view of events since that time, particularly the recent gold rush, it is evident that the dollar is in grave danger and cuts in fiscal 1969 spending are unavoidable. Unless inflation is brought under control, it would be difficult if not impossible to deal with our domestic problems.

In drafting my amendment, I have carefully reviewed the proposals made by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Incidentally, he made his proposals for fiscal restraint on the same day, January 31, as I did, and our proposals paralleled, which is rather interesting to the whole country and to many of us here, as the Senator from Delaware and I are considered not necessarily to have the same ideological outlook.

Now, Mr. President, I also considered the proposals of the able Republican House group of which I spoke, headed by Representative CHARLES GOODELL, of New York. I think their proposal is so reasonable and intelligent that I have taken the liberty of adopting it, with their permission, and am introducing it as an amendment to the excise tax bill.

I concluded that a cut in the order of magnitude proposed by the House Republican group—a reduction of $6.5 billion in expenditures coupled with reallocation of $2.5 billion yielding a net of $4 billion—was what the situation called for. While I do not agree with every one of the 23 items slated for cuts in the Goodell proposal, I can live with most of them; and I believe that most Members of Congress could live with most of them under present wartime conditions.

I realize that the Goodell proposal called for a $6.5 billion cut followed by a $2.5 billion increase to finance a human renewal fund; however, we are dealing here with a tax measure rather than with an appropriations bill. In my judgment the best way to proceed is to require a $4 billion reduction in expenditures which would have the same effect as the proposal of the Goodell group.

The reallocation of $2.5 billion in an effort to deal with our urgent urban problems is fully justified and represents a relatively small sum, considering that we spend as much in a month in Vietnam and in view of the enormous problems disclosed by the President's Commission on Civil Disorders.

I like very much the idea of a reallocation of priorities which the Goodell proposal contains, because the administration is not doing it, much as I think that it should. So, we have to do it for them. That is not the best way, but it is the only way it is made available to us.

The measures Senator WILLIAMS and I propose are clearly measures that are dictated by the current emergency. They must be followed by a fundamental reexamination of our national priorities—about which the President's budget spoke a great deal and did little if anything—and our Federal budget. Clearly new and greater emphasis must be placed on urban America and less on programs which have long outlived their usefulness. This will be a most difficult task which should be carried out in a nonpolitical manner. As long ago as 1963 the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee—on which I am the ranking minority member from the Senate—proposed a nonpartisan Commission on Federal Expenditure Policy to establish priorities in public spending and to identify those activities which could be better performed and with superior effectiveness by State and local governments and by the private sector. We repeated that recommendation in 1964 only to have it rejected outright by the administration in both years.

It was never more pertinent than today. I hope very much that as a permanent suggestion, the administration will take kindly to the idea. But, first and foremost, we must put our house in order. The hour is perhaps even too late now. I am submitting the amendment, therefore, which I feel within the limits of prudence will give proper attention to

the crisis in the cities, which the amendment is capable of doing.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 266) to provide standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is a cosponsor of the pending amendment. As he is necessarily absent from the Senate today, he asked me to have a statement of his placed in the RECORD which he has had prepared, indicating support for the pending amendment.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Senator from Oregon supporting the pending amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

The Congress continues to be the one branch of the federal government where public confidence in honesty and ethical practices has never been firmly earned and probably not deserved. It is the fault of Congress itself. We have written statutes to codify ethical practices in the executive civil service, and among the judiciary. But we have neither statutes nor codes for the standards of Congress in which the public can have any confidence.

It would be impractical to apply the same statutes to Congress as apply to the civil service, since there is no tenure in Congress, either for members or for their staffs. But there is one protection which we continue to deny the public. It is the knowledge upon which to pass the judgment of public opinion.

It was in 1946 that I introduced in the Senate the first measure calling for public disclosure of the financial interests of members of Congress. The Senate was plagued then with commodity speculation by members, by a member of the Agriculture Committee in particular. I have introduced that measure, with variations to expand its coverage, in every Congress since that time. My current bill is S. 313.

Give the voters the information about the financial income, assets, and liabilities of a member of Congress, and they will decide whether the votes he casts and the position he takes upon the issues are financially self-serving to the degree that he should be retired from Congress. That is the check we need. That is the means whereby we can reassure the American people that their Congress, like their civil servants, are not using public office for personal gain.

Until we have such a system of full public disclosure, the halls of Congress will continue to be clouded by rumors and suspicion. And deservedly so.

For what we have in the pending measure as it came from the Ethics Committee is an effort to take care of the evils that have already been exposed, but nothing more. It is the utmost minimum, aimed at those cases of unethical practice that we have already uncovered and passed judgment upon.

What it suggests is that in place of a general code of ethics, we will only correct each unethical practice as it is dragged out into public view, and that all our remedies will come *after* the public has the goods on some member of Congress.

That is no way to restore public confidence. It can only enhance public suspicion that there is a lot more going on here than they suspected, and about which we do not want anyone to know.

I am pleased to have an opportunity to co-sponsor the pending amendment with the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Clark, who has done so much to advance this principle within the Senate. I believe our amendment is the only real, solid, meaningful improvement in Congressional standards of ethics and conduct that we can adopt.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly on the pending amendment. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Just before adjournment yesterday, the Senator from Mississippi made a short statement in opposition to the pending amendment. I should like briefly to comment on what he had to say at that time.

I honor and respect the views of the Senator from Mississippi and again wish to congratulate him for the fine work the committee has done under his chairmanship in bringing the present resolution creating new Senate rules to the floor of the Senate.

I am afraid, however, that the fundamental philosophy of the Senator from Mississippi, with regard to ethical conduct of Members of the Senate and how the Senate should check on it, and my philosophy are quite different.

The Senator from Mississippi states—and I am now referring to his comments appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, page 6960:

Before a man ever gets to the Senate he is passed upon by the electorate of his State which always includes a great many people of discriminating thought, intuition, and evaluation. The battle is fought out on the firing line and between the parties. The people of the State pass upon the facts and they pass upon the man. The people judge all the facts relating to the man and the problems he will face.

There is a refining and filling-out process that has been going on in our country for almost 200 years. That has been a major part of the committee's thinking on disclosure.

Mr. President, if that is a fact, then there is no need for any disclosure amendment at all. I would aver that it is not a fact. I would aver that throughout the history of this country there have been instances after instances where, because the people did not know what they should have known about a candidate running for the Senate, they were—let us not say duped—but misled into voting for a man who did not have the proper qualifications or the integrity to serve in this body.

It so happens that the comments of the Senator from Mississippi have reference to candidates for the Senate, but the proposed rules do not deal at the moment with candidates for the Senate. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] has an amendment which he will offer, and which I shall support, which would impose the same disclosure requirements on candidates as would be imposed on Senators by the pending amendment.

As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said in his statement which I just placed in the RECORD:

The Congress continues to be the one branch of the federal government where public confidence in honesty and ethical practices has never been firmly earned and probably not deserved. It is the fault of Congress itself. We have written statutes to codify ethical practices in the executive civil service, and among the judiciary. But we have neither statutes nor codes for the standards of Congress in which the public can have any confidence.

Mr. President, it is because the Senator from Oregon is quite correct in his comments, as part of his statement which I have just read, that I believe we need public, not merely private, disclosure of the financial affairs of Senators.

Actually, the matter which brought the whole problem to the attention of the Senate dealt in large part with the conduct of one of our Members before he was in the Senate as such, and dealt with conduct outside the Chamber.

The Senator from Mississippi further stated:

A candidate is examined, exposed, and picked to pieces to a considerable extent. Many of the people know the man personally, where he was reared, what his habits are, what property he holds, and what his faults are.

The people pass on all of these factors. They pass upon the man, his moral character, and fiber. They know what he will do under pressure. They know what he will do under coercion. They know what he will do under political persuasion. The people have a good idea as to that when they deliberately select him to represent them in the Senate.

Mr. President (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair), with all deference to my good friend from Mississippi, I would categorically deny that statement as to what happens when a man runs for the Senate.

It may well be that in a relatively small State with a restrictive franchise, such as the fine State my friend from Mississippi represents, his statement may in part be true. But I can assure him and other Senators that it is not true in a large State with a huge urban population, or even a relatively small State with a large urban population, such as the State of New Jersey. Certainly it is not true in Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Massachusetts, and elsewhere.

In those States, it is a rare thing when a majority of the electorate know the man who is running for the Senate. More often than not, he is just a name to them. It is for that reason, among others, that I believe the most extensive amount of public disclosure is highly desirable before a man reaches the Senate, and is equally desirable after he reaches the Senate.

For that reason, I feel it is most important that we should have public disclosure of financial affairs.

Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi further points out in his argument that the original record of the finances of a Senator, secret though it may be, does provide what might be called a secret weapon which could be used against him if he were not actually acting in a manner of integrity with regard to his finances; but that is, indeed, a frail tool with which to create for this great body the same ethical standards which we require for members of the civil service and executive branch of the Govern-

ment. I do not believe that this hidden, financial statement is adequate in any way to deal with the problem which has brought the Senate into such grave disrepute from time to time during its history, and particularly during the past few years.

Finally, the committee says the committee believes that the rule which they propose is the American rule. I must say I find great difficulty in bringing patriotism into this particular debate. It does not seem to me the pending amendment is any less American than the rule proposed by the committee chaired by the Senator from Mississippi. I think what we are trying to do here, in all candor, is to deal, in a commonsense way, and hopefully without emotion, with a problem of ethics which has vexed this body all too frequently all through its history, but particularly during the last few years, with the incidents which have occurred with which all Senators are familiar. So I do not believe calling one way the American way and implying that the other way is un-American is helpful. I therefore hope the amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only wanted to check this situation. In talking with the Senator yesterday, it appeared that he had interests in oil fields in Louisiana, and other interests, from which he receives income. I commend him for it. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania was not elected because of any oil interests he might have in the State of Louisiana, or anything of that nature. His work as the mayor of a large city, I believe, is far more of a recommendation to be a public official, because his work, which was excellent and of high grade, qualified him far more than any possessions he might have otherwise. I think it is very important that candidates for office be judged by the electorate, and I do not think the dollar signs make any difference.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his kind words. I may say that I do not think there was anything in my private life or in my financial affairs which, had they been disclosed in my running for the Senate, or for mayor, for that matter, would have made any difference; but I do think my constituents were at that time, and are now, entitled to know what matters may involve conflicts of interest when I am called on to vote on a particular bill.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. With his permission, and the permission of the Senate, I would like to ask that I be allowed, without the Senator's losing the floor, to propose for us jointly, an amendment to our amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield the floor in order that the Senator may propose that amendment.

Perhaps the Senator from New Hampshire would like to ask me to yield to him first.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I was hoping the Senator would yield to me for a question.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to yield, if it is all right with the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator's explanation of the amendment states that the reports would be filed with the Comptroller General, who would make them available for inspection by members of the public under appropriate regulations. I wondered what the authors of the amendment meant by "appropriate regulations." Something is either public or is not.

Mr. CLARK. It is public. The regulations would deal administratively with how the public would be able to see them. For example, we would not want to have them stand in long lines. We would want to have certain hours. We would want to have restrictions, if copies were to be made of the records, that the originals would be maintained. It is that kind of regulation we had in mind.

Mr. COTTON. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Perhaps I had better read the language into the RECORD at this point. I quote from page 6, line 1 of the amendment:

> 4. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be made upon forms which shall be prepared and provided by the Comptroller General, and shall be made in such manner and detail as he shall prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping within such reports and certificates of items which are required by paragraph 1 to be disclosed whenever he determines that separate itemization thereof is not feasible or is not required for accurate disclosure with respect to such items.

And so on. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and myself, I offer the following amendment to our amendment, if the clerk will please take it down.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. May I say, for the benefit of the Presiding Officer, the Senator from New Jersey has conferred with me on this amendment, and I am prepared to accept it.

Mr. CASE. I was offering it for both of us.

On page 2, line 3——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that the Senator from Pennsylvania has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am offering this amendment in behalf of myself and the Senator from Pennsylvania, so, in a sense, I am offering it as the Senator from Pennsylvania. Is that agreeable with the Senator? If not, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified in the following form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no reason for objecting except I would like to hear what it is.

Mr. CASE. The amendment is on page 2, line 3, after the word "value," the sentence starting out "The fair market value," insert a comma and the words "or in the case of each specified parcel of real property, the assessed value."

That ends the amendment except for the excission of the words on lines 5, 6, and 7 "exclusive of any dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family," and, on lines 21 and 22, "other than a dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family."

Mr. President, if I may explain the amendment, it was suggested by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that in the case of real estate, it might be a real hardship for a person to make a declaration of actual value. It might be against his interests. It might be used against him in litigation or by tax authorities, and whatnot. So, since we are requiring identification of each parcel of real estate, we think the purpose will be served by merely having it listed in this way with the assessed value.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment? The Chair hears none, and without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as a member of the committee, I would like to respond to the proposed amendment and express my reaction to it and my interpretation of its effect on the standing of the Senate before the people of the United States.

Perhaps I should not say that if the Senate adopts the Clark amendment, it is obviously a rejection of the committee, because the Clark amendment was brought to the Senate before the committee was organized and before it was given the job assigned to it. The Senate rejected that amendment, and then appointed the committee. Now, after the committee has done its work, if we come in with our report and the Clark amendment is adopted, the Senate is telling us in effect that the committee has failed.

But I think, more seriously, the adoption of the Clark amendment represents a feeling by the Senate that it has no faith in itself and no faith in its Members. Anyone who wants to make a disclosure, under any circumstances and in any way, about his assets or his income or any other feature of his private life is perfectly free to do so. There is no prohibition against it.

It has been my observation—and I say it in all kindness—that I think many, if not all, of my colleagues who have decided to make a disclosure of their personal assets and income have done so because they thought it would help them politically. They think they would have a political advantage. Then, apparently, they are not quite sure about that, because they want to force their point of view on the rest of us in the Senate, maybe with a little bit of the fear that it may not be so good a political advantage and think it would be better to put the same burden on the rest of us.

It has been my observation that there is no political advantage or disadvantage one way or another. Over the years, Members of the Senate have disclosed their assets and their income. That disclosure appears on the page of their

hometown paper for a day, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for a day, and then is forgotten.

There are, however, in my opinion, some very serious moral factors involved in this attempt at forced disclosure of the essentially private lives and activities of Members of this body.

There are those who claim that this amendment would restore the faith of the American people in the integrity of the Senate. But to make that argument, they have to say, as the Senator from Pennsylvania did rather plainly say a minute or two ago, that they believe that the American people have lost their faith in those of us who serve in the Senate.

The effect of this amendment, in my opinion, is a joint and official declaration on the part of every one of us that we probably have something to hide and that the only way the American people can be protected is to force a complete revelation of all of the aspects of our financial and economic lives—a condition that is required of no other American.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this is a proposed amendment, as I understand it, to the rules of the Senate.

What right do we have, under the rules of the Senate, to require a Senator's wife to disclose her personal affairs? She has a right to have such matters as separate and apart as she may wish, even from the knowledge of her own husband. And what right do we have to require that one's brother or his sister, or his son or daughter, disclose their private affairs? They are not running for the Senate, and perhaps never will. What business is it of the Senate's what those people may own personally and privately?

Mr. BENNETT. This just demonstrates to me that we are dealing with something that is beyond our grasp.

If you assume that a Senator is crooked, and you also agree that he is smart, if he has an asset that he wants concealed, he can conceal it.

This is essentially a test of Senators' own moral standards, as I said at some length yesterday. If everyone of us is to be forced to reveal all the income and assets of himself, his spouse, his brothers and sisters, and his children, and we then go into the records of every corporation of which he may be an officer, or any trust of which he may be either a trustee or a beneficiary, pretty soon we have not only invaded the privacy of every Senator, but have also invaded the privacy of a lot of innocent people who have no connection at all with the Senate.

By forcing all of us to make a complete statement which is not required of anyone else, either in Government or private life, we label ourselves as guilty; and I wish to talk a little further about that. Does the Senator from Louisiana wish me to yield further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask one further question.

Is there not a difference between the situation that exists in the executive branch and that in the legislative branch, in that in the executive branch, in many instances, decisions must be made where the sole person who makes the decision can make it possible for someone to succeed or fail in obtaining a contract or other advantage from the Government?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A Senator, on the other hand, has only one vote out of 100; and his job in the legislative branch is often only a part-time endeavor. Even if his one vote is successful in securing the passage of legislation in the Senate, it is still of no ultimate effect until a majority of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives have also voted favorably.

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad that the Senator brought that up. A great deal has been made of the fact that, in certain historical instances in the past, men, particularly those who have been invited to serve in the President's Cabinet, have been brought before the Senate and have had all the information about their private investments stripped away from them, largely, it has been argued, to avoid embarassing the President or hurting him politically.

But that does not continue. Men in important, policymaking jobs, while their confirmation by the Senate is required, are usually expected to give that information to the committee that recommends their confirmation; and the chairman of that committee can handle the information in any way he pleases. I do not know of any case where it has been made public, as by publication in the newspapers, as has been inferred; and persons who are appointed to jobs that do not require confirmation are usually asked by their superiors for a list of their assets, upon examination of which the superior will say, "You had better get rid of this, because it may become embarrassing either to you or to me," and the superior then locks the list up in his safe. One cannot go down, for example, to the Department of Defense and ask to be shown a list of all the personal property of the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Army, or of any policymaking official under them.

Yet one of the arguments that has been used in support of such proposals as this is that we are trying to impose on others a standard we do not impose on ourselves.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure that the Senator from Utah will recall when, some years ago, John McCone was appointed Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. When the time for his confirmation came, he filed his complete financial report, and when it was discussed by former Senator Knowland and other members of the committee, we thought there was nothing in it except one or two particular items which might be questionable, amounting to about 5 percent of the total assets of Mr. McCone. When that matter was called to his attention, he said, "What will I do?"

I said, "If you want my advice, sell these two items."

A month later, he came to me and said, "Do I owe you any money?"

I asked, "What do you mean?"

He said, "I sold those two items, and they both subsequently dropped in price."

So the disclosure is not always a matter of embarrassment; sometimes it happens entirely differently. Not long ago the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the members of his very fine committee examined some people and felt there was sufficient reason why an appointment should not be approved, and the matter was worked out without embarrassment.

The Senator from Utah is a sound, solid businessman, and knows how these situations arise.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I appreciate that comment. Recently the President appointed a new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Clark Clifford. I ask Senators whether they read anything about any requirement that Mr. Clifford publicly state what his assets were. He did not do so. I believe I remember seeing a general statement that he had satisfied the President that he had no assets that were in conflict with his job; but we did not find the assets of Mr. Clark Clifford listed publicly.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am interested in this colloquy, but I believe there is one important difference between members of the executive branch and the legislative branch which should not be overlooked. I have been a member of a committee with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, when he was chairman of the Interior Committee, and as a member of the subcommittee which he heads, when we examined the affairs of people who were appointed, particularly in the Interior Department; and what the Senator says is entirely true.

The important difference is this, however: When the President picks Mr. Jones, we will say, to be a member of his Cabinet or to fill a high-ranking position in the Government, he may choose a man who is not even generally well known in his own State.

He might be very well known in his own professional area, and that may be the exact reason why the President chooses him; but he may not be generally known even in his own community.

On the other hand, no one can be elected to either House of Congress without being well known in his congressional district, if not throughout his State. So when a man announces, as in our case, that he wants to run for the Senate, he opens himself up completely and entirely to whatever questions, whatever statements, whatever innuendoes any member of the public might make—and God knows that includes an awful lot of crackpots.

I happen to feel strongly about this matter. I feel that a Senator has a right to retain some of his own privacy. I have

now run for statewide office five times. I have been elected each time with an increasing majority, both by number of votes and by percentage. And never in all of that time have I ever had anyone in a meeting or by letter or otherwise ask about the state of my finances. The truth of the matter is that if the majority of the people do not have confidence in the Senator from New Mexico, [Mr. ANDERSON] the Senator from Mississippi, [Mr. STENNIS] the Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] or the senior Senator from Colorado, they simply will not elect him in the future, and they certainly will not return him to the Senate.

This points to the one essential difference that exists, and this is a very easy argument that is used because it appeals to the stupid. It is said that the people of the executive branch have to reveal what they have before they are appointed. It is said that Congress therefore should do the same.

The facts are that each and every Member of the Senate has already, and in some cases several times, laid himself out before the people of his State. The people of his State have had the opportunity to ask every question they wanted to ask. And if the man had not answered those questions satisfactorily, he would not be here. So, we have this screening process before the public itself which is not true with the executive branch, and herein lies the difference.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I return to this guilt concept. I say that this amendment requires each of us to make an essential confession that we may be guilty and that the only way we can reassure our friends is to spread all of the information about our economic life, what we own, and what our income is, before the people.

This is a reversal of the basic American concept on which our whole law rests. That concept is that a man is innocent until he is proven guilty.

The pending measure, however, states to us:

> You must prove you are not guilty by telling us everything before you can serve in the Senate.

To go back to another concept of guilt that has been customarily discussed over the years, particularly by my more liberal friends, by requiring such a disclosure, we would be reverting to the essential concept that was developed during the Joe McCarthy days—guilt by association. Why do I say that? Suppose that in my portfolio—and it is not a big one—I have a certain type of stock, and suppose a bill is pending on the floor of the Senate which may affect the whole industry of which the company in which I hold stock is a part. Somebody is going to say, "Well, BENNETT voted this way because he holds stock in this company which is a part of this industry."

That is guilt by association as plainly as anything can possibly be. And what is worse than that, it assumes that we in the Senate make our decisions on the basis of the lowest possible motivation; that we make them fundamentally in order to benefit ourselves; that we ignore the responsibility we accepted to our States and their citizens and to our country; and that we are here simply to show what we can do to use our votes to bring financial benefits to ourselves.

I think that the whole proposal is an unworthy attack on the essential responsibility of the Senate and its Members. I think that it places us in a position in which no other American is placed because it reverses the assumption of guilt or innocence. And I for one believe that the Senate should reject the proposal again as it has already done in one form or another several times in the past.

Mr. President, to sum up I think that a vote for the pending amendment would clearly reveal a lack of faith in the Senate as an institution and a lack of faith in his Senate colleagues on the part of the man who votes in favor of the amendment. And, as I said in the beginning, it would reveal a lack of faith in the committee because the Senate rejected this provision before the committee was appointed, and action now to agree to the provision would say that the appointment of the committee was a mistake, that its whole report is unworthy, and that we should proceed without the committee report and go back to this earlier guilt complex point of view which we have rejected.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, with all due deference to my friend the Senator from Utah, I cannot follow the last argument he made. It seems to me that what those who are proposing the amendment are saying is that the Senate ought to have another chance to reverse the vote of 46 to 42 by which it rejected the amendment last September when it was considering other legislation.

I do not feel in any way that the amendment is a reflection on the committee. I have nothing but praise for the committee. I think the committee did an excellent job.

There is a matter of close judgment on which the Senator from New Jersey and I differ with the judgment of the Senator from Utah. We agree with the judgment of one member of the committee, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

I hope that no one will think that the Senator from New Jersey and I are attacking the committee and saying that it did not do a great job. I think they did a wonderful job.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am happy to have a share in that general praise. However, if the pending amendment is agreed to, the whole report of the committee is gutted and its 2 years of work will be down the drain.

It reminds me of the old story they tell about the fisherman down South who had a fish in one hand and a knife in the other hand. The fish was squirming around and the fisherman said, "Don't wiggle so much, little fish. All I am going to do is gut you."

I think that is what is going to happen to the committee.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, this is a matter which I have been concerned about for 16 years now, and nothing that the Senator has said has shaken my confidence in the fact that we are on the right rather than the wrong track.

Of all the legislative bodies that I know about, municipal, township, committees, village boards, city councils, county governments, and State legislatures, I think that probably the Congress of the United States has the highest level of honesty and the highest standards and practice of responsibility. I think that it is a requirement of Congress up and down the line, all the way.

There are occasionally instances, and only occasionally, in which men have made from the prestige of their offices what I regard as completely improper financial benefits. And in some cases the financial benefits have even been purveyed. The man has not been seduced, but has offered himself—sold himself.

This is not a frequent occurrence in the Senate, I am very happy to say, and it is not a frequent occurrence in the House. However, it has existed in both bodies, and it is much more common than I like to believe in other branches of government and other legislatures of this country.

In fact, some of the opposition that I have received to my stand in this matter has been from friends of mine in politics who say, "What are you trying to do, kill us? What do you think we're in this game for?"

It is high time that we adopted standards that require the highest possible level of conduct in relation to possible conflicts of interests. And who will set the standard, except the Senate of the United States, the highest legislative body in the land? That is part of what we are doing, my colleague; that is part of what we are doing. We are not accusing each other or any individual of wrongdoing. But we are trying to establish a situation in which this matter will be automatically constantly called to our attention. I am convinced that it needs to be called to our attention and, even more, to the attention of the general public and to other legislative bodies.

So far as this being an unwarranted breach of privacy, this is a matter of balancing values. I hope my colleague will not repeat the suggestion that I am trying to have any unworthy motive in trying to pry into anybody's personal affairs. I do not give two hoots and a hurrah about the stock this gentleman used to have in the XYZ Motor Co., of Salt Lake City or anything else.

My own affairs, I expect, fall into the moderate category, and I am not embarrassed either way by this. But I do believe that, whatever the facts are, it will hurt nobody to lay them on the line. It will end a lot of suspicion, and it will set a standard for legislative probity that needs to be set in this country and, more, in many places other than the Senate of the United States. But we have the responsibility because of the position that we have the honor to hold.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, one thing I object to is the suggestion implicit in this—that Senators are guilty of some kind of misconduct and that it is improper for a Senator to own property or to have private investments. The inference is that it is the investments a Senator has or the property he owns which are responsible for his vote.

It seems that any time Drew Pearson runs out of anything to say, he runs through his old files and brings out the fact that the Senator from Louisiana owns an interest in some oil production in Louisiana, which I inherited. It is good for a column about once a year. He suggests that I vote for the oil and gas industry because I have an interest in oil and gas production.

The truth is that that industry happens to be the largest employer in Louisiana. If I were against the oil and gas industry, I suppose I could expect the strongest kind of opposition, because, after all, that industry involves a lot of jobs and a lot of investments in the State, from the farmers who own the land on which the oil is discovered, on up. But because a Senator's personal interest is parallel to the interests of his State, he must be upbraided about once a year, on the theory that his owning an interest in what happens to be the largest single industry in his State is why he votes for oil depletion, rather than because his State produces more oil for its size than any other State in the Union.

That type of thing is implicit in this type of situation. It would enable Mr. Pearson to go down and pick out information, any time someone votes—or someone who does not like the Senator can do it—and can say, "Here's why he voted that way. It didn't have anything to do with the merits of the issue. This fellow owns 15 shares of stock in a company involved in the matter and that's undoubtedly why the man cast his vote the way he did."

Contrary to such thinking, I believe every Member of this body votes in accordance with his deep conviction on the issues, and as a representative of the State and the people who sent him here. He discharges his duty to his country as the good Lord gives him the ability to see it in his own conscience.

If you vote for this kind of amendment, in my opinion, you are asking for the type of false inference to which I have referred.

Any time a Senator should, for any improper reason, for his own advantage or for his own account, help to pass a bill or help to defeat a bill, it seems to me, Mr. President, that he will come to a very unfortunate end. He should be and would be investigated. Any information of the sort that the Senator has in mind would be available to those who have the responsibility of investigating and suggesting what should be done. But then you would have a situation in which six men who are regarded by the Senate as six of its most reputable and outstanding Members—three on each of the aisle—would have occasion to look at the matter and to determine whether there had been any impropriety in a person's conduct.

A better way to judge someone's conduct, as to whether he was favoring his own financial interest in acting as he did, is to have the matter investigated by a committee of high-type men, selected by their colleagues because they are respected and admired.

I have seen a campaign in which each side accused the other of being a crook. I have seen a campaign in my State where both sides challenged the other to produce income tax returns, and each side went to work on the income tax returns, to convince the public that the other fellow was a crook, and it all seemed inconclusive.

People wisely decided to elect one man or the other based on what the men seek to do if elected, rather than based on what they earned, owned, or did not own prior to the election. It seems to me that is an improper way for the public to judge.

The members of the committee would be in the best position to judge if what a man owns is relevant and if he did something wrong.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have tried to follow this debate and have studied the amendment carefully. I have attended most of the meetings during the long period that the Committee on Standards and Ethics has been considering this matter.

This has not been a pleasant task. We had two cases to investigate and study. I believe we displayed as full and deep a concern in trying to bring about justice and fairness and responsibility to the task with which we had been entrusted by the Senate as any group could possibly do. We were blessed by having a great chairman, for whom everyone has the highest regard.

GREAT RESPONSIBILITY

The idea of writing a code of standards and ethics for the 100 men who have the responsibility of the Upper House, to make worldwide decisions, is, indeed, an important task.

We would have found it completely impossible to have brought out such a code that would have received the instantaneous approval of the 100 Members of the Senate. We worked for days and weeks, line by line, word by word, point by point, policy by policy, and tried to effectuate what we thought were the necessary safeguards of the ethical standards of this great and historic body and the task that we had.

We also tried to evaluate the human rights with which even the 100 Senators are endowed, the fairness with which 100 Senators are endowed, and the trust that we have, that practically all, if not all, are just as ethical as every one of the six who were passing upon them.

STANDARDS MUST BE FAIR

We did not enter upon this matter with a guilt complex of being too rich or being too poor, but rather to try to make possible a situation in which the public and the Senate could be satisfied that their interests were properly protected and that there would be an ethical standard written to which all could repair.

This is the report before the Senate. It has been changed often; it has been modified, considered, and debated within the confines of the committee without the benefit of fanfare or publicity. I think it has been considered more in the privacy of the committee, with respect to markup, than any other bill that has been brought before the Senate.

TIME TESTED POLICY

I think there has been suggested a good plan in taking the time-tested policy that the Senate committees largely have observed in connection with the confirmation of nominees. In our regular committee we have cross-examined them and asked them generally about business connections they had, their attitudes toward these jobs, and their standing in their profession and community. We have asked for a financial report to be filed with the committee such as we require here of every Senator.

We have not embarrassed in any way the man who comes to serve in the executive branch, although we know them only slightly; yet we know each other as we do the palms of our hands. Under this amendment we would be asking our Members to do far more than the hundreds and hundreds of people who are nominated for minor executive positions. These nominees are only requested to give us a revelation of their business activities, and to file with the committee a list of securities, income, and other private financial data, which in all fields of private service are held to be a confidential report.

TWO DIFFERENT STANDARDS

No one expects his opponent to run for office and file a copy of his bank statement on page 1 or a copy of his income tax return on page 1. However, this amendment provides different tests. There is involved here a situation where the candidate who has never been tested for the Senate or for the House of Representatives, who is running for his first office. His official life is not a public matter for years and years, as is the case with distinguished Senators who now sit before me in the Chamber today, nor has his honesty and integrity been tested and voted upon and ratified every 2 years in the case of Representatives and every 6 years for those who serve in the Senate.

People know rather well of the standing of the elected representatives, their character, their reputation, their business interests. It is always an issue in the campaign.

However, under the Clark amendment this would not apply to the candidate who runs and is unknown, but it would apply to every Member who is known. Yet the new candidate is not required to meet any regulation for filing of any kind.

Many Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives have gone back again and again in elections to receive approval of their ethics, standing, and general reputation. I think this is an important thing.

LOSSES COULD BE HANDICAPS

We overlook another matter. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is concerned that all the wealth should

be revealed. I would say to him that some of us hesitate to reveal how much of what we had when we came in has eroded through the years we have served. Or how we have abstained from making investments in oil prospects—I have.

Or how we have abstained from going into business enterprises that might have constituted a conflict of interest; or those who held real estate far too long that was perhaps inherited because the Member believed in the community from which he came.

When one starts to write down, and someone wishes to compare those figures, it will be found there will be not only a pity, but also a question of whether or not the person is smart enough to serve because the new balance sheet or net worth is not as great as people thought it should be. Therefore, it would have a backlash in that regard.

AMENDMENT QUESTIONED

I do not know what to do about the amendments that have been placed on the measure. I know one that we accepted with alacrity is fuzzy and we would now require the fair value or assessed value of property.

Mr. President, this is a carelessly drawn amendment because distinguished Senators know that practically every State in the Union has a different method of property assessment. In my State it is 50 percent.

If a person is heavy in real estate he would figure 50 percent under the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, or if it is 100 percent he would file 100 percent.

Therefore, I do not believe this provision has been very carefully drawn.

Mr. CASE. The point of the amendment is that we are not trying to hurt anyone or place anyone in a position of making declarations against interest that would be used against him in other proceedings. Therefore, at the suggestion of the Senator from Delaware, and not upon our own initiative, but willingly, in the case of real estate, we changed the fair market value of whatever it is to assessed value, because the real point is not value so much as the kind of property and location of the property. Property, in the case of parcels and real estate, has to be described.

If the Senator wishes to change this language, fine.

Mr. MONRONEY. One could borrow money, as many persons do. One tries to give the bank a true evaluation. Very few banks would take an assessed value in States where the rate is 50 or 100 percent.

Mr. CASE. We are not trying to draw up a balance sheet of total assets and liabilities and discover how much a person may have. We are trying to indicate what he has so that those who run may read it—would know whether a person's public actions are likely to be in conflict with his private interests.

I think the question of value of property, except at it may relate to a description thereof in the case of real estate, is not terribly relevant.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator for the matters he has pointed out.

In New Mexico the assessment is 16 percent of value. That sort of scale could not apply.

Mr. MONRONEY. That was my point. It is not careful enough.

I shall give another point where this proposal seems to be hastily drawn. Many other Senators may be as concerned as I am with this matter.

There is supposed to be reported the fair market value of each asset held, but a residence is not allowed to be counted as an asset. Many of us have an investment in our residence that is substantial, although modest. This is an asset we cannot count but we must show as a liability the mortgage that is on that property, because the protecting clause with respect to "occupied as a residence," eliminates the counting of that as an asset on the statement but indebtedness on it is counted as a liability.

SONS' LIABILITIES, TOO

If one had five sons and they all owned their homes, as they would be likely to do, that is not counted here in the asset statement; but because they are members of the immediate family, the five mortgages would have to be counted as liabilities. One could easily show a negative figure between assets and liabilities if he had enough members of the family, sons and daughters, and counted as liabilities the mortgages on their homes; it would almost negate an average Member's total net worth after deducting these matters.

Mr. ANDERSON. As the Senator knows, it is set forth here that we were to list all liabilities and notes above $5,000.

There was an operator in west Texas some time ago who operated with all kinds of fancy mortgages. He had millions of dollars, borrowed from the public. Is there any way a person could know that that kind of situation was phony or not.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would not know.

Mr. ANDERSON. He had issued mortgages in all these areas. The liabilities, I believe, are very important to us.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree. Now, if the Senator will let me refer to section C, he must report the source and amount of every capital gain realized. There is nothing in here to report expenses or losses on these matters of the previous year, or of the succeeding year. It is part of the public disclosure that we are asked to make. It is far more important, if we are trying to get the facts from confidential holdings, that the committee judge what is right, because that is from the Federal income tax returns, and under penalty of law. Thus we establish at least a net gain or a net loss in the report on a capital gain.

AMENDMENT IGNORES STUDY

We are not ignoring the report. We are saying that this is a matter which should be carefully considered by the committee. We have a report from the Committee on Standards of Conduct. I, for one, hope that we will choose six men, after this resolution passes, and let the present Members get off and let the new six men get on with the job.

I am sure that they will do a very fine job of carrying out the work the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has done so well as chairman of the present committee, and which the other Members, myself included, have also done.

This does not avoid the financial reporting. It makes the report on all finances from the Federal income tax go where it belongs. That is what is important.

Instead of having a casually formed balance sheet mimeographed and sent out to a mailing list or in a press report; it is not necessary to do that. It is not necessary to put Members who have been endorsed by the public but the opponent, who has never been passed on by the public, is not required to file anything.

Mr. PEARSON. Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. The point I want to make is the point to which the Senator referred, that the sponsors of the amendment and, indeed, the Senate, should know that when we began consideration of this entire code, we began with the subject of disclosure. I suppose it occupied most of the time of consideration by the committee. From time to time we got off into another field of inquiry, but inevitably we came back to this subject.

For what it is worth to the sponsors of the amendment and to the entire Senate, it was gone into time and again. It was the central and the principal point of the inquiry and discussion.

In doing that, let me refer to one other point: We looked as best we could, by research, into all of the activities in this particular field. I may stand corrected later on, but now I think it is close to the truth to say that throughout the country today, State legislatures have enacted codes of ethics. Our research uncovered that in recent years some eight, nine, or 10 States have enacted codes of ethics and conduct for their legislative members. Many States have single provisions or a conflict of interest statute, but a legislative code of ethics has been enacted in recent years in Massachusetts, New York, Texas, Louisiana, and other States, the names of which escape me at this moment. But, in every case save one, there is no open disclosure as proposed by the pending amendment. That, of course, is not to influence us one way or the other. But it is some evidence of the judgment that certain people have made in the consideration of this important question.

The sole exception is the State of New York. There, they provide that every person, every member of the legislature, spouse, or minor child, who has an interest in any property of the value of $5,000 which is subject to a regulatory agency of the State of New York must make a public disclosure.

I cannot cite the New York State law at this moment, but I have a copy of the

statute in my hand and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

M'KINNEY'S CONSOLIDATED LAWS OF NEW YORK, ANNOTATED, PUBLIC OFFICERS LAW, SECTION 73(6)

a. Every member of the legislature or legislative employee shall, on and after December fifteenth and before the following January fifteenth, in each year, file with the secretary of the senate, if a member or employee of that body, or with the clerk of the assembly, if a member or employee of that body a written statement of

1. each financial interest, direct or indirect of himself, his spouse and his unemancipated and minor children in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency or name of the entity in which the interest is had and whether such interest is over or under five thousand dollars in value.

2. every office and directorship held by him in any corporation firm or enterprise which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency, including the name of such corporation, firm or enterprise.

3. any other interest or relationship which he determines in his discretion might reasonably be expected to be particularly affected by legislative action or in the public interest should be disclosed.

b. . . . Copies of such reports shall be open to public inspection in the office of the secretary of the senate and the clerk of the assembly. Each house may adopt rules to implement the provisions of this subdivision, insofar as they relate to members of the legislature and legislative employees.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for yielding to me.

PUBLIC REPORTING OF ALL GIFTS AND FEES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I want to close in one moment, but there are some questions which keep coming back again and again.

One question is, What are we going to do about gifts? Obviously, gifts should be reported. It will strengthen the reporting of campaign donations and things connected in other ways with campaigns, which prohibit anyone employed by a Senator from actively soliciting campaign contributions, and provides that one man out of all the members of his staff can receive a fund voluntarily from someone.

But, on gifts, honoraria, and those matters, they should be made public. That is one of the great criticisms leveled at some of the activities of Members of the Senate in the field of gifts and receiving honoraria.

That is in the public domain. Everyone will see it in a public report.

On the matter of legal fees, retainers, and things of that kind, I am not a lawyer. I do not know much about it, but I do know that lawyers engage in the practice of law, that they write wills, and take care of clients for whom they may have done work for years. Obviously, I think it would be unfair to require public disclosure of every single fee they collect on the basis that one out of 10,000 might be tainted by a special interest of some kind. We require the reporting of all legal fees over $1,000, and that would be a matter that would be in the hands of the ethics committee.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at that point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Those legal fees, however, are not made public, whereas honoraria are. I have not been able to understand why one should have to report honoraria but not legal fees.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am not a lawyer. The Senator from Pennsylvania is.

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. A lawyer is entitled to any of his time to add to his income as a part of his former business, the same as a capitalist would be to earn dividends from his investments, or a businessman if he had a business, or a farmer. I think that is part of his right. We are asking to identify something special in the case of the lawyer, in that this is a reporting of legal fees, which has never taken place before.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not the right of every man to go out and make money by writing articles for magazines, or making speeches? Why is that a right which is not protected with privacy in the same way that legal fees are? In my opinion, none should be.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think that honoraria should be made public. I get a few—very few. I do not have very much success with my writing. It usually comes back. I would be kind of glad if I could report some income, though, on $5,000 or $10,000, say, on something I wrote for an eminent national magazine, such as those published in the home State of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I think that a lawyer would be equally as glad to receive a $10,000 fee from General Motors.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am not a lawyer. But we did discuss that point at some length, that there is a legal code among lawyers and they do consider these and other matters of confidence.

I have long since learned that we cannot change a long-prevailing precedent on the part of lawyers. Again, I say, I am not one, so I am not so well versed as I could be on that point.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. To pursue this matter a little further, I think that, implicit in this whole business, is the fact that it is an effort to raise standards, and not merely to recognize current practices, even as a whole. Take the matter of lawyers' fees, or other sources of income. It is true that normally a lawyer's relationship to his client is confidential. What an average lawyer receives from his client in remuneration for services rendered is a matter of no consequence to anyone else. It is confidential. But, there are exceptions to that.

It does not shock me, because I am a lawyer, that this should be required to be made public, because if it would violate the confidential relationship between lawyer and client, then that means that Members of the Senate who would be insisting upon that relationship would have to stop practicing law. I think probably that would be a reasonable thing.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, at present there are 67 Members of the Senate who are members of the bar. They are well acquainted with the customs of lawyers, naturally. I will therefore leave it to them to defend that matter. But I certainly feel that the committee has at least put it where it belongs and that is in the hands of the Committee on Standards and Conduct, whoever they may be, the five Senators who will get the job after the pending resolution is adopted.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is there any statement by the committee as to why this requirement is made of lawyers, and not of doctors? Should not a doctor, if he receives a $1,000 fee, have to disclose it?

Mr. MONRONEY. The theory was that businessmen would take their problems to senatorial lawyers, and in that way there would be some business advantage the lawyers would get for them. I think, in the case of doctors, we do not quite have the relationship of someone accepting a Senator as a doctor. He would select a non-Senator probably much quicker than a Senator, because the Senate might be in session late, and the patient might die while he was waiting for the Senate to adjourn.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Senator has made a good point. I think we pay a cheap price to lawyers. I am not a lawyer, but when I do pay a fee, I think it is not a high fee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, before I close, I would like to relate an incident that took place in my early days as a newspaperman. It seems that in 1926 Congress had passed an income tax law, and on the floor passed a provision that allowed public inspection of everybody's income tax return.

On March 15, or whatever the date was, all the income tax returns filed in Oklahoma City or Philadelphia or Richmond or Seattle or Boston would be available for the public to come and inspect. Well, there was the longest line you ever saw. It took about all the wire services out of Washington to inquire and recheck whether they were the right figures. People stood in line at the Federal building. They called it Peeping Tom Day.

Believe me, 3 days after this demonstrated interest in an individual's having the opportunity to look at the income tax returns of everybody else—perhaps it was his landlord or his uncle or somebody he did business with—that provision was repealed within 1 week, because of the objections of vast numbers of the public to that law.

So, certainly we want everything dealing with the life of a Senator that could be in any way corruptive of his public duty to be under the surveillance—and in some cases under the complete surveillance—of the public. In other cases, where it was an intimate financial matter, a matter of someone's having too much or too little of the world's goods, I think the way the committee has chosen is the proper one. The committee handling the work will be in charge of

these vital matters that are intimate to the life and financial integrity, and, shall we say, the wealth the Senator may have, or how much he is losing in other cases.

I yield the floor, and I hope the Senate kills the amendment, which I think is not well drawn. I think there are many things in it which do not belong in the resolution.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I asked the Senator to yield. I am not trying to get the floor, and I have not asked for it, but I want to state that, so far as the Senator from Mississippi knows—and I have conferred with the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from New Jersey—we are about ready to come to a vote, if it be the will of the Senate. That is not trying to hasten any Senator or cut off any Senator or limit his time.

For the information of Senators who may be interested, I believe we can dispose of the proposed amendment tonight or this afternoon at a reasonably convenient hour. I want a small amount of time near the end of the debate for the committee to sum up a few points. I make that announcement. I do not ask for a unanimous-consent agreement, but we are within striking distance.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Here is one of the things that concerned me in the whole problem of people getting concerned about ethics. If I owned a farm and I reported the worth of that farm, whatever the value might be, and the amount I made on the farm during the year, and then I served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and voted for farm subsidies, would that be a conflict of interest?

Mr. MONRONEY. I hardly think it would be a conflict of interest. I think it would identify the Senator as being a farmer and as having received x dollars in income from that farm. It might have been in wheat or cattle.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would not reporting legal fees be in the same category as receiving fees in a different profession?

Mr. MONRONEY. I think it would.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Most members of the Judiciary Committee are lawyers. I think that is one criterion. I think both farming and the practice of law are professions, in a sense. I do not know why they always pick on lawyers, but apparently they do. There are other people who have businesses. It would be difficult to think of any business today which did not have, directly or indirectly, some Government regulation or activity in which it was involved. I cannot think of any business which would not be so involved. Perhaps we ought to enlarge this resolution, and not confine it merely to lawyers, but include farmers, business people, doctors, and everybody else.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Washington brought out the point. I think he emphasizes the special nature of our position. The reason why disclosure is probably the only effective way to get at most of the possible areas of conflict of interest is that we are either asked to do something or asked not to do something. There is no phase of activity or no possible kind of interest we are not dealing with every day. Therefore, I think the best that can be done is to disclose what our situations are, and then leave it to our constituencies to decide whether there has been a conflict. I think that is behind the committee's proposal and, to an extent, our amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have been in politics long enough to know that the people back home know pretty well what you have.

Mr. CASE. They may suspect.

Mr. MAGNUSON. At one time a Governor of the State ran against me, and he kept insisting that I report my income tax return. I said I did not think that was necessary during my campaign. I did not do it until the day after the election. Then I did it, and the papers published it. I wanted to prove the point. I have not heard any more about it since.

The Senator from Oklahoma brought out another point. It is possible that some Senators could gain financially by being in the Senate. I doubt it. If there were only some way that we could have a little counterbalance here, if we are going to show our finances, to show how we lose by being Senators. Of course, it is each individual's choice. Most Senators would not have it any other way. They want to be public servants. I am sure that probably 90 percent of the Members of this body could make as much in their chosen profession and earn at least the same amount as they receive in salary or more. I am sure of that.

As I told the Senator from Oklahoma before, I have a conflict in interest in reverse. When I came to the Congress I had been an attorney for an airline for a long time, and I owned some airline stock, because I got paid in stock.

When I came to the Senate and became a member of the Commerce Committee, because we handled general aviation—the situation being no different, really, than that of a farmer on a committee which handled general agricultural bills—I thought, "Well, I will sell it."

So I did, at the then market price. I think the stock has been split several times since, and is now worth perhaps 20 times what it was then.

I am not saying that this is something to my special credit; it was something I should have done, and I felt so at the time. But I think that once in a while, when the Senate is put on the defensive, the American people should be told the facts. I am sure there are a great number of Senators—I would say perhaps 98 percent of us—who do give up something financially for the privilege of becoming U.S. Senators. We think it is worth it.

Mr. CASE. I think the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that point has already been covered. The enhancement in value of any asset which occurs while one is a Senator is, I think, a proper matter for public interest. If, by reason of the fact that you have served in the Senate, you enhance your assets for some reason or other, that is a legitimate matter for inquiry.

But I think the people ought to realize, too, and I am sure many of them do, that most Senators—and I know a good deal about the financial situations of many of my fellow Senators—have given up many things, dollarwise, because they made the choice that they would rather be in the Senate. Anyone who thinks that is not true would only have to look at the intimate finances and assets of the Senators.

It is no doubt true that some Senators have investments which, in the course of the growth of the economy of the country, have become worth more during their service here. But that was nothing of their doing. It just happens that almost everything one might have owned 20 or 25 years ago—or, in my case, 35 years ago—has enhanced in value, sometimes doubling its value many times over. But that was not because the owner of the assets served in public office. It was due to the natural economic growth of the country, as a result of which the assets became more and more valuable.

If we do establish some provision for reporting, I am hopeful that there may be some means provided for looking at the matter from the standpoint of the overall effect of what it has actually meant, not necessarily to myself, but to many who have served in the Senate. It is their choice, and I feel it is very much worth while; but sometimes people who read about these matters do not go into the matter beyond the mere fact an asset may have increased in value.

A story was published the other day about various Senators who were worth x number of dollars, the writer thought, and things of that kind. I do not know if that is a political detriment now. Of course, these days one has to be a millionaire to run for President.

Mr. CASE. At least.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Or perhaps a multimillionaire. Anyone who aspires to that office has to make a show of great wealth in order to place himself on the springboard.

But I am hopeful, regardless of how this vote comes out, that provision will be made for some means of acquainting the public with the fact that often Senators, as we all know, give up many financial benefits by virtue of the fact that they come to the Senate. As I have stated, it is their choice, and they believe it is well worth while.

Mr. CASE. I could not agree with the Senator more.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator——

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the Senator from Pennsylvania has indicated that he wishes to modify his amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Very well. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, after the Senator from New Jersey and I indicated that debate on this amendment might disclose some areas where there was manifest unfairness, and asked that such areas be called to our attention so that we could propose modifications, one such modification has already been

made, dealing with real estate, and another one has just been called to my attention, involving a situation that might easily arise where a Senator was divorced, and his wife was given custody of minor children.

In that event, under the amendment as presently drafted, the Senator, who no longer had custody of his minor children, would nonetheless be required to reveal the trusts or other assets which those children might have.

In order to remedy that situation, which I think is unfortunate, I now suggest that the amendment be modified by inserting, on page 8, line 9, after the word "person" the following language: "Provided such person has legal custody of such minor child."

With the approval of my friend from New Jersey, I will modify the amendment accordingly.

Mr. CASE. I concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from New Jersey? I understand that the Senator from Iowa wishes to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from New Jersey?

I propose to make a unanimous-consent request, Mr. President, if I may have the attention of Senators.

As far as I know, we do not know of anyone else who has any extensive remarks he wishes to make on this amendment, and as far as we know it is now agreeable to vote.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, has the matter been cleared with the minority?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I had understood that this matter had been cleared, in effect, with the minority, but I am now advised that the matter had not gone quite that far, so I withhold my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a few questions of either the Senator from New Jersey or the Senator from Pennsylvania, to clear up my thinking on some aspects of the proposed amendment.

For one thing, at the bottom of page 2, in subsection (d), the amendment would require the source and the amount of each item of income received by or accruing to a Senator, for example.

Suppose that the Senator had received $5,000 as an income distribution from a trust. I assume that, in order to comply with this requirement, the Senator would list on the schedule sent to the Comptroller General's office $5,000 received from XYZ trust; would that be correct?

Mr. CASE. Yes; I think the Senator is quite right.

Mr. MILLER. Suppose that a Senator had received a payoff of $5,000 from someone doing business with the Government or one of the committees of which he was a member, but instead of having the $5,000 come to him, he said to the person he was dealing with, "Make the check payable to the XYZ trust," and that is what happens, and the trustee of the XYZ trust endorses the check and deposits the $5,000 in the trust account. Under the reporting system that I understand this amendment would require, all that the public could possibly know, or that anyone could possibly know, would be that the Senator concerned had merely received $5,000 from the XYZ trust.

If that is true, it seems to me that there may be a gap in the amendment. I should like to suggest to my fellow Senators that in my amendment No. 617, which runs to the resolution proper, I have sought to cover that type of a gap by requiring the filing of a copy of the Federal income tax return and amendments thereto and supporting documents made for the preceding year, in compliance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, by each trust or fiduciary relation in which he, the Senator or employee covered by the resolution, or his spouse or their children, held a cumulative interest of 25 percent or more.

If that provision were in the pending amendment, there would be a further disclosure which could reveal the nature of the income—or at least provide a lead to be checked out as to the nature of the income—from the trust which, in the present state of affairs, would never possibly come to light. I was hoping that the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from New Jersey might consider that point.

I would like to pursue this a little further. Suppose that a Senator or one of the Senate employees covered by the pending amendment should receive a $5,000 dividend distribution from the ABC Corp. I suppose that all that would be shown on the list forwarded to the Comptroller General would be, "$5,000 stock dividend from the ABC Corp."

Would that be a correct analysis?

Mr. CASE. The Senator means a dividend in cash on stock held by the Senator would be listed as a dividend received. That is correct. However, would the Senator continue with his point so that I can be a little more sure of what he intends.

Mr. MILLER. Suppose that a Senator and his wife or one of the Senate employees and his wife held all of the stock in the corporation, that it was a closely held family corporation. That fact would not be required to be disclosed.

Mr. CASE. The fact that he and his wife had received $5,000 dividend on the stock?

Mr. MILLER. No. As I understand it and as I read the proposed amendment, all that would have to be shown on the list sent to the Comptroller General would be "$5,000 income," and a notation that it represented dividends from the ABC Corp. It would not be required to show that it was $5,000 income received from dividends from the ABC Corp., the stock of which is owned by the reporting party and his wife.

Mr. CASE. I do not believe I get the point. There is a separate listing of assets.

Mr. MILLER. I know that, but I am referring to the income requirements in subsection (b) on page 2 of the pending amendment.

Mr. CASE. I would say that the amount and source of each item of income would be disclosed. However, if the Senator would continue to develop his point better, perhaps I would be better able to respond. I have not gotten the point yet.

Mr. MILLER. The first point is whether a man would be required to report $5,000 income from dividends from the ABC Corp., or would he be required to report $5,000 in dividends from the ABC Corp., the stock of which is wholly owned by the man and his wife.

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

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

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. It would not make any difference. I would say that the man would be required to state it. However, I am not as sharp on tax law as is the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. This is not a tax law matter. I merely want to know how far this disclosure goes on this type of reported item.

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

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, my own curbstone answer, and I am not a tax lawyer, either—although I used to play around with it, I am not a great expert in the matter as is the Senator from Iowa who is one of the great tax lawyers in his State and in the Senate—is that it seems to me, as I understand it, the inquiry of the Senator concerns a deal being worked out whereby the party making the report would acquire income to the tune of $5,000, but would direct the other party engaged in the deal to pay the $5,000 to, let us say, the XYZ Corp.

Mr. MILLER. No. My good friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, is talking of the first matter I raised. I think that has been answered to the satisfaction of the Senator from New Jersey and myself.

Mr. CLARK. I had better let the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from New Jersey argue about this matter. I do not understand what is being talked about.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have now left the question concerning the trust. I merely said on the colloquy concerning the trust that I hoped my friends the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Pennsylvania would consider a matter that I consider is a gap so far a trust is concerned.

Let us move now to a closely-held family corporation.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, for the purpose of legislative history in the event the pending amendment becomes part of the resolution, so that the matter will be clearer and stronger than it is at the present time, I would say specifically that if money were coming to me, a Member of the Senate, and I directed that, instead, it be paid to my grandson or to a trust for someone else, I think it would still be a gift or income to me and would have to be reported as such. Therefore, I think there is no gap there.

Mr. MILLER. I would agree with my colleague. However, I do not believe that matter is involved in what I am trying to get across here.

Mr. CASE. The Senator is correct. However, I wanted to be sure that we understood each other on the first point.

Mr. MILLER. Let me get back to the first point. What I am trying to point out is that if there is an employee or a Member of the Senate who really wants to avoid the impact of the proposed code of ethics as envisioned by the pending amendment, all he would have to do would be to say to some person with whom he is dealing and with whom he has made an arrangement to avoid showing that he got a $5,000 payoff, would be to say, "Look. Don't send the check to me. Make out a check payable to the XYZ trust."

He would then get together with the trustee, who might be an old friend of his, and say: "When that check comes in, you endorse the check and deposit it in the trust account, and everything will be fine. Later in the year, you can send the check to me for $5,000. All I have to do is to put down in the report to the report to the Comptroller General, '$5,000 income representing income distributed from XYZ trust, and nobody has any knowledge or lead as to where this comes from.' "

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I would say that the income is received when the money is paid to the trust and that it would have to be reported then. Therefore, I do not think that in fact a gap exists.

Mr. MILLER. The gap does exist. I am suggesting that the money would be reported, but when it is reported all that the public would know would be that the individual reported the receipt of $5,000 income from the XYZ trust. Unless we require the trust itself to report that income as represented by its annual Federal income tax return, where are we going to get a lead as to where that income might possibly have come from?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, as I have said, the incident of the receipt of the income occurs when the money is paid to whoever receives it on the direction of the Member of the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. I would accept that.

Mr. CASE. And he would not meet the requirements of this rule merely by showing that he got, on some later distribution, that same amount of money from a trust.

It is a beneficial interest, it seems to me, clearly, and this would be an evasion. That matter is covered under definition of assets.

Mr. MILLER. I understand, and I agree. I think the Senator has covered the beneficial interest and assets very well.

We are now engaged in discussing the income reporting section of this measure. That is what bothers me. How, for purposes of what we are seeking to do here, is it going to be helpful if somebody merely puts down on the report filed with the Comptroller General that he received $5,000 income from the XYZ trust? It would comply with the requirements of the amendment, as I understand it, but I do not believe it would be worth anything at all from the standpoint of revealing the potential source which, in the example I cited, would be an unethical source.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from New Jersey can speak for himself, but I think the Senator from Pennsylvania agrees, and I think we would all agree that in the case the Senator from Iowa is proposing, there would be a receipt of income which would have to be reported at the time the money is paid to that trust, not later, and that the description of the receipt of the income would be income from XYZ bandits, or whatnot, received by the Senator, when the payment is made to the trust on his direction.

Mr. MILLER. I do not want to have my question get complicated on the question of when the income was received.

Mr. CASE. No, but from whom?

Mr. MILLER. Let us not complicate it on that.

I believe the Senator would be correct, from an income tax standpoint, in saying that at the time the money was paid to the trustee, it was income. But I am talking about when this is reported to the Comptroller General. As I understand it, all that the Senator would have to put down on that report is, "I got $5,000 from the XYZ trust."

Mr. CASE. That is where the Senator from New Jersey disagrees with the Senator from Iowa. The Senator in that case would not be meeting the rule unless he reported, "I got and ordered paid to XYZ trust so-and-so dollars from Yumitity Yump Contracting Co."

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator from New Jersey.

I understand that the Senator did take this matter up with the Ethics Committee, and they take the same position that the Senator from New Jersey and I take.

Mr. PEARSON. I can say, in response, if the Senator will yield, that this is a misunderstanding, to this extent. There is an amendment pending, the Miller amendment, which the Senator from Iowa has described to the Senator from Pennsylvania in asserting that there is some loophole in the proposed amendment. I would not presume to speak for the committee or for the chairman as to whether that is not acceptable or to say anything in relation to it until it is submitted. But it is before us here in the form of an amendment, rather than before the committee—unless the Senator, in the inquiry we sent out, submitted this as a suggestion.

Mr. MILLER. I do not believe it was. But I would merely say that I have offered the same amendment on a good many occasions during the consideration of this type of problem.

What I am trying to do—I am just talking about the trust situation—is to make sure that when there is a reporting, it will be a meaningful reporting and it will enable the public or the Senate Ethics Committee to do something or to have a lead that would be meaningful.

I can understand how the trust situation might be complicated a little. The Member may be only a one-third beneficiary of a trust. He might have one-third, and the other two-thirds might be in the hands of someone else. Nevertheless, he tries to comply with this amendment by saying on his report to the Comptroller General, "I received $5,000 by check, dated so-and-so, from the XYZ trust."

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

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I do not believe he has to have any interest in the trust to make it obligatory on him when the trust receives—not when he gets anything, even if he gets nothing from the trust later.

Under this rule—and it is a rule, and it would be interpreted in the spirit of our intentions—when the trust, upon his direction, receives any money at all that represents something payable otherwise to him, then I believe he has received income at that point. I do not believe it has to be a trust.

If I asked someone who owed me $10 for work I have done—in drawing his will or a deed or what-not—to pay it to the Senator from Kentucky, just out of love and affection for him on my part, I believe that would be the receipt by me of income at the time the payment is made to him, no matter what he does with it.

Mr. MILLER. I believe the Senator is on perfectly sound ground, and I would not disagree with him on that interpretation. But that, I suggest, is not what our problem is. Our problem is: How does he report that?

I point out that, according to the amendment, as I read it, all he has to do to satisfy the requirement is put down, "I received $5,000 of income as a distribution from the XYZ trust."

And he might even put down the number of the check from the XYZ trust. Any member of the public could take a look at it, or the Ethics Committee could take a look at it, and say, "Well, he got $5,000 income from the XYZ trust." And that is all there would be to it.

But if you would add to this requirement that a copy of the trust income tax return must also be filed, then I suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that we would have something meaningful, which would provide a meaningful lead at least in the case of an investigation. That is what I am suggesting so far as the trust is concerned.

Let me go on, if I may, unless the Senator from Kansas wishes to speak.

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

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. I just wish to say this: In the situation that the Senator from Iowa has described to the Senator from New Jersey, in which the trust has received compensation and then pays it out to the beneficiary and it shows on his income tax return as filed, pursuant to the Clark-Case amendment, and you do not have a complete disclosure, I say to the Senator that the committee, in providing for a limited disclosure, accepted the proposition that basic instruments would be filed and that thereafter questions would arise and the investigation of those instruments would lead to further investigation.

The committee has, and always will have, the power to call for income tax

returns from the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

So there is a point at which too many records can become involved. We provide for certain statements, as well as income tax returns. All those, I would say, are basic, fundamental instruments under a limited disclosure procedure and under a full disclosure procedure. They lead to other things, and you are not handicapped from pursuing any inquiry you want to pursue.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the Senator's comments.

So far as a beneficial interest in a trust is concerned, it seems to me that the amendment is quite adequate. My problem is, What about the income from a trust? There, I suggest, there could be a gap.

I have used only one of many examples that could cause trouble. I have used an example of an outright, brazen, unethical deal. But suppose a trust is operating a business, a manufacturing firm, and a deal is made by a Member of Congress because of his activities on one of the committees, as a result of which certain business is thrown to the factory that is being operated by the trust.

How is the Ethics Committee, or the general public going to have any knowledge about this, or even a lead, if all they find is that the net result is that during a particular year the Member received his share from the profits of that business by a $5,000 check from the XYZ trust? There is no constructive receipt in that connection.

I do not believe it will complicate matters very much to say, "If you have a 25-percent beneficial interest in a trust, or if you and your wife and immediate members of your family have a 25-percent or greater beneficial interest in a trust, then you will file a copy of the annual income tax return of the trust."

I should like, if I may, to move on to the corporation problem. Let us say that the member received $5,000 in dividends, cash dividends, from a corporation, the ABC corporation. As I understand it, according to item (d) on page 2 of the pending amendment, all the Member would have to do in his report to the Comptroller General would be to show $5,000 income from stock dividends from ABC corporation.

Mr. CASE. So far as that particular income statement is concerned, that might be correct. But I call to the Senator's attention the fact that in accordance with the provision on page 4, there will have been listed, either previously or at the same time, a statement of assets.

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Which describe the corporation.

Mr. MILLER. Yes. And I repeat that I believe here, again, the amendment is very effectively drawn so far as the assets are concerned.

I can assure the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that if we are trying to have full disclosure, income may be much more important than assets, especially in a particular year.

The next matter I wish to clear up is whether dividends received from a closely held family corporation, let us say husband and wife, would be required to be disclosed under this amendment.

Mr. CASE. My interpretation is that I would not feel I had met the requirement unless I made full disclosure of the fact that this income came to me or the corporation wholly owned by myself and my wife.

The interposition of corporate entity which I wholly own with my wife, and the income, it does not seem to me, would prevent my obligation under this rule to show that I received that income, or that my wife and I received that income.

Mr. MILLER. I cannot understand why there should be any particular difficulty over this matter. There are many husband and wife corporations, which are very honorable businesses.

Mr. CASE. I do not say that there are not.

Mr. MILLER. If a Member or one of the Members of the Senate and his wife had been operating a corporation for a long period of time, I do not see why it would not be sufficient if they show they receive dividends. They probably receive dividends every year, and probably this year they received $5,000 in dividends from the ABC corporation. I do not see why they have to put down that they own the corporation.

Mr. CASE. In the case of a wholly owned or largely owned family corporation it would not be full disclosure unless that corporation were disclosed as a part of the report.

Mr. MILLER. I think there is a gap on this point.

Mr. CASE. The Senator must not have any feeling that we are resisting any amendments to change the matter.

Mr. MILLER. I think there is a gap on this point, although I am not sure that it is a serious gap.

However, I wish to get to what I regard as a serious gap. Suppose the husband and wife own a corporation which has a factory and as a result of the activities of a Member on one of our committees here certain business is drawn into that factory. At the end of the year the corporation decides to have a distribution of the profits in the form of stock dividends. Let us assume that the distribution is $5,000. As I read this requirement, all that would have to be shown on the Comptroller General's report would be the $5,000 stock dividend from the ABC corp.

If that is so, I think there is a serious gap here and that it could be filled by a requirement that where a husband or a husband and wife or their children hold for Federal income tax purposes a cumulative majority stock interest in the corporation, then they have to file a copy of the corporation's Federal income tax return. That would give the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and the general public meaningful information.

As a matter of fact I would guess that both in the case of the trust and the wholly owned or majority interest family corporation it would serve as a deterrent from exercising this type activity. In my judgment that is the greatest virtue of all.

The reason we are here is that we hope whatever we do in connection with a code of ethics will never have to be enforced because it will be voluntarily complied with.

I have thought about this for a long time. I remember when the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] had a similar amendment that he introduced 3 or 4 years ago. At that time we had quite a colloquy about the trust and the small family-held corporation. It was a matter where I thought there was a gap. Anybody who has practiced tax law knows how easy it is to divert income through trusts and closely held family corporations. The only way to grab hold of that fact is to require the filing of the tax returns on the trustee and the closely held corporation. Then, I think we would have adequate coverage. I am afraid we do not have adequate coverage.

This is one reason why I did not vote for this amendment when it came up before. I pointed out at the time we do not want the general public to think we are covering the gaps when we are not.

I do not believe this would require a great deal of difficulty. The reason I offer the amendment to the amendment simply is due to the fact that I feel very strongly there are gaps here.

I have a pending amendment with the committee report which would do the same thing. I would suggest, if this appeals to my friends, the Senator from New Jersey and the Seantor from Pennsylvania, all we would have to do would be to add the language of my pending amendment at the end of line 12, page 3. I think it would fit pretty well.

Where the language says on my amendment, page 6, "insert following at end of line 3" starting with the quotation, insert that language on page 3 at line 12.

I might point out one more matter. In their amendment they have well covered the interest in a partnership. All that my amendment would do, in addition to the trust and the corporation situation, would be to add the requirement for filing the partnership information return. Then, I think we have the income and asset situation covered.

The Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Pennsylvania have covered the assets very well. All I am trying to do is help them cover the income as well.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator is a patient man; he is a helpful man. He has improved our amendment greatly, and the Senator from Pennsylvania authorizes me to say for him and me and all of our pals that we accept his amendment and modify our amendment accordingly.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

I hope this is agreeable to my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. CLARK. It cannot be agreeable to him. He opposes the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. I am talking about my amendment. If the amendment should fail, I would propose to pursue it with respect to the pending bill.

Mr. CASE. This is without prejudice to the rights of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to register my support for the amendment, dealing with the question of public disclosure, introduced by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

In arguing in favor of this amendment, I want to point out, at the outset, that I am not taking a new position—that I have, on the contrary, voted repeatedly for public disclosure every time the issue has been raised in the Senate.

Some of the reasons justifying disclosure have been recognized by the committee in the legislation it has presented on this point.

Basically its purpose is to prevent any conflict of interest or any suspicion that Members of the Senate may be involved in any conflict of interest.

Members of the Senate may in certain instances have financial interests in a corporation or a line of business which stands to benefit from legislation upon which he is called to vote.

Or a Senator may, as chairman of a committee, find himself involved in an investigation which may prove helpful or injurious to a business concern or line of business in which he has a financial stake.

Or a Senator might, with no evil motivation, establish contact with an executive agency on behalf of some constituent corporation. There is nothing wrong with doing this. Indeed, it is a necessary and proper part of our jobs. Those people who voice suspicion about every action a Senator may take to assist a business concern, simply do not understand that it is a vital part of a Senator's job to render every proper assistance to constituent companies in their dealings with Federal agencies.

I am confident from what I know of the Senate that the overwhelming majority of the Senators are men of scrupulous personal integrity. Indeed, I do not know of a single instance of conflict of interest involving a Senator.

However, we have to recognize that there is always the possibility of a conflict of interest; and we also have to recognize the fact that our failure to agree to financial disclosure has stimulated public suspicion about congressional ethics.

I do not believe that this suspicion can be allayed simply by requiring Senators to file sealed envelopes containing statements of net worth and their income tax returns with the Comptroller General. On the contrary, there is a grave danger that such handling of the situation would serve to increase public suspicions and promote speculation and gossip.

To allay suspicion and to promote public confidence in the Senate as an institution, it is essential that financial disclosures be made public.

The argument has been made that to require a Senator to publicly disclose his income and net worth in effect deprives him of his right to financial privacy and converts him into a second class citizen. I have to agree that there is much truth to this argument.

When a man becomes an elected public official, however, he must be prepared to forfeit a large measure of the right to privacy and certain other rights enjoyed by the average citizen.

I am not saying that all this is right.

In many respects, I think it is most regrettable.

I think it particularly regrettable, for example, that it has become virtually impossible for an elected public official to seek redress against unscrupulous newspapermen who may slander or malign him, because, as the law now stands, it not merely requires that you prove that a newspaperman has lied about you: it requires proof that the lies were told deliberately and maliciously. More often than not, of course, this is something that is virtually impossible to prove.

I am sure that it was not always so. But it is impossible to turn the wheels back. And I think we have to recognize that a climate of public and press opinion has now been created which makes it necessary for an elected public official to accept certain disadvantages as the price of office.

In any event, it is impossible to turn the wheel back. In my years, I have watched a growing tendency in the film industry, on radio and television, and in the press and in books to have us appear as knaves or fools. This tendency has grown apace in the country. We are fair game.

One of the most important things we can do for ourselves and for future Senators is to try to strike down this tendency. The best way would be for us to say, "Here is all the information. It is all made public. Come and take a look at it." I think that would be good for the Senate and good for the country.

The public clearly has the right to seek assurance that their Government conducts its business according to rigid ethical standards and that their elected representatives are not betraying their trust.

The public, therefore, has a right to know what a Senator's financial interests are.

They have a right to know whether Senators enrich themselves in the course of their office.

They have a right to know what income Senators have from salary, honoraria, gifts, interest in law firms or businesses, or trading on the stock market.

The amendment offered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania does all of these things.

I would have liked to have seen the amendment tightened on one minor point.

While it requires Senators to file statements of net worth, it would exclude from these statements any residence or residences owned by Senators or the members of their immediate family. I would have preferred to see this exemption eliminated.

However, I do not wish to delay the proceedings further by offering an amendment to an amendment.

I hope Senators will give the Clark-Case amendment to the resolution their support and will adopt it.

AMENDMENT NO. 638

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the recommendations of the Select Committee on Standards and Ethics have brought an enthusiastic response from Members of the Senate. It is a comprehensive document reflecting close counsel and political impartiality with respect to the views that have been voiced over the years.

Senator STENNIS and members of his committee have covered a broad legislative domain. Since 1960 more than 200 bills dealing with various aspects of conduct and financial disclosure have been introduced in the House and Senate. That conveys to some extent the deepening concern that prompted the creation of this special committee in 1964. Its task has been an exhaustive one—to frame recommendations that will be acceptable to every Member of this body. This matter because of its personal nature offers no really ideal compromise.

Although I have not yet been very enthusiastic about some of the proposals suggested in the past for exploring the behavior of Members of Congress, I believe the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct has done its job well.

Several amendments may be needed to clarify certain provisions. Several other colleagues have questioned the provisions restricting Senate employees in their campaign duties which have always included solicitation of funds. It has already been brought out that certain staff members—the administrative assistants—are invaluable liaison with people in the home State. They are seen as an extension of a Senator's own commitment and are turned to frequently by constituents. This loyalty should not be jeopardized by requiring such an assistant to be removed from the Senate payroll to carry out such duties. Senator COTTON and others have already noted that retirement benefits would stop the day an employee leaves and he and his family would both be deprived of health and accident insurance 31 days after his name is taken off the payroll.

Mr. President, how can we who have come to rely on these assistants ask them to choose between their duties to us and the protection of their families? I think that we cannot and should not now put ourselves in such a position which suggests taking an assistant off the payroll as the only lawful way he can participate fully in the campaign. The Hatch Political Activities Act governing the participation of Federal employees in the executive branch has long recognized the special position of Senate staffs and officers and exempted them from undue restrictions.

Therefore, I propose an amendment to be inserted on page 5, line 13, after the period, the following:

> This prohibition does not apply to any assistant to a Senator who has been designated by that Senator to perform any of the functions described in the first sentence of this paragraph if such designation has been made in writing and filed with the Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. President, this amendment carries with it the original intent of this section with the additional provision that such public funds are being handled by a designated staff member whose identity and obligation to the public and his employer are a matter of public record.

I believe we should exercise caution in restricting ourselves too greatly in these matters. It has always been my view that personal conduct cannot be measured by a set of rules; that what we need is not more rules but a ruling spirit inside each person that would compel him to observe proper conduct whether or not any law is available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I should like to commend the able Senator from Mississippi and his committee for their diligence and effort in providing suggested standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate. I believe, however, that the proposed rule XLIV relating to disclosure of financial interests should be amended to require that such disclosure be public. Therefore, I have joined the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] in sponsorship of the amendment before us which would require that public disclosure be made a part of the pending resolution. We are seeking to adopt standards which will maintain the public confidence in representative government. As stated in the report of the select committee:

> The Senate must therefore require higher standards of conduct than those generally required in the market place.

I believe the pending amendment requiring public disclosure would help achieve this and accordingly shall support it.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Deseret News for March 16, 1968, printed an editorial regarding the ethics resolution now before the Senate. I subscribe to the admonition of the editorial and will vote for public disclosure.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ETHICS CODE INADEQUATE

As far as they go, the proposed new ethics codes for the U.S. Senate and House are an improvement—but only because something is always better than nothing.

Measured against what ought to be done, the new ethics codes don't go nearly far enough.

In the Senate, detailed but confidential financial reports, including federal income tax returns, would have to be filed annually by senators. Public disclosure would be limited to contributions received and to payments in excess of $300 for speeches, written articles, television appearances and similar activities. Campaign contributions would have to be used for campaign purposes and reasonable costs of running a senator's office. Senate officers and employes would be barred from handling campaign funds—a provision aimed at preventing aides from gaining power as Bobby Baker did—and would be restricted in their outside activities.

In the House, members would be required to disclose the source—though not the amount—of their outside income. The amounts involved would be filed in a sealed envelope for use in any subsequent investigation. Moreover, the code would bar House members from making personal use of campaign funds and from accepting gifts from vested interests.

By failing to recommend full disclosure of lawmakers' assets and income, the Senate and House ethics committees have muffed an opportunity to bolster public confidence in Congress.

The provisions for continued secrecy are based on a false premise—that congressmen are entitled to as much privacy as anyone else. But when a man offers himself for a position of high public trust, everything affecting his performance as a public servant becomes a legitimate subject for thorough public scrutiny.

According to the Senate Ethics Committee, full disclosure of a lawmaker's financial affairs would "invite abuses and engender serious problems." What abuses and problems? When George Romney recently make a full disclosure of his financial affairs, he won widespread praise—and rightly so.

Indeed, 15 congressmen published statements of their financial interests and the sources of their income last year, and many are doing so again this year, including Utah Senator Frank Moss, who has made such reports four different times. What problems—if any—have they encountered as a result of their frankness?

Instead of merely trying to cure congressional scandals after they have arisen, the Senate and House ethics committees should aim at prevention.

Moreover, the proposed codes leave untouched a number of abuses from use of the franking privilege to send thinly disguised campaign propaganda through the mails, to expensive junkets by lameduck congressmen.

In fairness to Congress, unethical lawmakers are few and far between. But it only takes a few to erode the public confidence in both the men who make the nation's laws and in the laws they make. For its own sake as well as the country's, Congress should hold itself to the highest standards possible.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I hope we may soon reach the point where we can vote on the amendment, either in the ordinary course of events or by an agreement to limit debate. For the time being, I note the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE 52D SESSION OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE—APPOINTMENTS BY VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, under the provisions of Public Law 80–843, appoints the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to attend the 52d session of the International Labor Conference to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, June 5 to 28, 1968.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE—APPOINTMENT BY VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, under the provisions of Public Law 86–420, appoints the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] to attend the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference, to be held at Honolulu, Hawaii, on April 11 to 17, 1968, to replace the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 266) to provide standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for recognition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for a statement he wishes to make in connection with the pending amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment suggested by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], which has been discussed, be made a part of the Clark-Case amendment at the place indicated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday I objected to any unanimous-consent agreement on this proposal, but I think we have reached that time now where probably we ought to vote within a given length of time. I think perhaps 1 hour and 30 minutes, equally divided, would be ample for all purposes. I think the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would want recognition.

So I ask unanimous consent that the time on this amendment be limited to 1 hour and 30 minutes, to be equally divided between the committee and the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is the request limited to this amendment, or to all amendments?

Mr. DIRKSEN. This amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate too long, but I want to be sure that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey can hear the questions I raise concerning the amendment.

First of all, on page 3, line 6, the words "fee or other honorarium received by him for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article," and so forth.

Yesterday I raised the question as to whether a political contribution is an honorarium.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it seems to the Senator from New Jersey that, in context, those things which we customarily regard as political contributions

for campaign purposes are not included as income. That would be my interpretation. If this amendment becomes a part of our rules, and I have to make a filing under it, I would not include it. I have not included—in my own voluntary filing—such contributions as income. I think the Senator has raised a good point.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to make sure the legislative history and legislative intent are very clear, because one can travel from here to Chicago to make an address. They offer one an honorarium in advance. One replies, "Well, I would rather not have an honorarium, because, in the first place, it becomes personal income and it is taxable. If it is all the same with you, you can give the same amount, but you can make it as a contribution to my campaign."

I want to be sure that that is a political contribution and that it is covered by the so-called Federal Corrupt Practices Act and not by some rule of the Senate.

Mr. CASE. I repeat what I said before to the Senator. That would be my impression. I would not want to give an opinion as to whether or not, under some circumstances, it would not be something that the tax people would construe as income if there were an obvious arrangement to avoid the income tax.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How can it be if the check says, "Pay to Joe Doaks' campaign, 1968"? The evidence on its face is there. It is a document. It is a written document. How would anyone go behind it?

Mr. CASE. I would feel the Senator would never find the matter questioned, but I can conceive of circumstances in which a lawyer, let us say, would say, "All right, I will do this big job for you. I don't want any money, but can you put a like amount into my campaign fund? In that way I will not have to pay taxes on it."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am not a tax attorney, but the question then turns on the right of the group before whom the Senator spoke to make political contributions. They may be forbidden under law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it may be a noncorporate group.

Mr. CASE. It might be a nonprofit group.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It could be any kind of group. It might be an assemblage of individuals.

Mr. BENNETT. If it is under the Corrupt Practices Act, I do not see any problem.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We use the word "honorarium" indiscriminately. My question is, What does it embrace?

Mr. CASE. My own interpretation is that we do not attempt to change matters of this kind, and ordinarily political contributions are not included in "income."

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the pending amendment, at the bottom of page 4, starting on line 24, is this language:

No such report—

Meaning the report filed with the Comptroller General—

shall be required to be made for any calendar year beginning before January 1, 1968.

And then this language:

No report made for the calendar year 1968 need include any interest held—

Precisely what is meant by "any interest held"?

Mr. CASE. Again——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does it mean ownership in real estate?

Mr. CASE. It does not mean interest in the sense of a fee paid for the use of money.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It means 100 shares of stock?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Or 10 acres of land?

Mr. CASE. Yes. It means any kind of property.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The words are:

No report made for the calendar year 1968 need include any interest held—

It may be large or it may be small, but we ought to know what it means.

Mr. CASE. It means any interest in property—any ownership.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It says "any payment received." A fee is a payment received. An honorarium is a payment received. A royalty check is a payment received. Do we conclude that those are not included and they would not have to be filed in a report to the Comptroller General?

Mr. CASE. We are talking about when the rule comes in effect, and that is the whole purpose of the section. We say the first report has to be made for the calendar year beginning January 1, 1968, and not before.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it is a separate sentence:

No report made for the calendar year 1968 need include any interest held, payment received, or liability owed before the date which follows by ninety days the adoption of this rule.

Mr. CASE. This sentence relates only to the report for the year 1968. It states, in regard to that, that it need be only for that part of the year which begins 90 days after the adoption of the rule. That is the purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to point out to the authors of this amendment that it is proposed to file a statement regarding assets, which is not sworn to. Everything filed with respect to liabilities is not sworn to. Information as to the source and amount, as well as capital gains, is filed, and that information is not sworn to.

When the committee brought in its version of this ethics matter, it relied upon the income tax return, and the income tax return is sworn to. So these are just naked statements that are made, and one cannot be held for perjury if he does not include this or that, or if he shortchanges the report. He can do pretty nearly anything with it, because these are not sworn statements.

That is the first weakness in the amendment, if I were going to call attention to weaknesses.

The second weakness is this. A Senator's wife or his children or his inlaws are included in the so-called Case-Clark amendment.

Because it requires the fair market value of each asset held by him or by any members of his immediate family, or by him and any member of his immediate family jointly.

So there is your immediate family; and that includes your spouse.

For a hundred years, Mr. President, we have been laboring at the business of emancipating women in this country. It was 50 years ago that we amended the Constitution of the United States—by amendment No. 19—to give the vote regardless of sex. Thus we enfranchised women.

Since the common law days, we have been busy trying to take away the restrictions and limitations upon wives and spouses, because they could not own property solely, they could not have property of their own, it was all merged with that of the husband, under the common law; and for all this time we have been going along in this fashion.

Now it is proposed to say here, "Well, you are going to have to account for what your wife owns."

Mr. President, I do not know what she owns and I do not know how she got it.

"Well, you ask her, and see what kind of an answer you get."

She is a pretty independent person, and she is pretty smart, and she has her own methods and ways of doing whatever business she does. I frankly do not make very much inquiry. I wait for her to volunteer, to tell me if she wants to. But it is not my business.

If she wants to go into the stock market, I do not tell her what to buy. I am the greatest dub in the world about the stock market. The few times I bought a couple of shares of stock, I lost money, and I kept my hands off from then on. But she dabbles around a little now and then. I do not know the extent of it. Why should I be required to say to her, "I have got to account for it"? Was she elected to the Senate? Is that one of the qualifications of a Senator?

The Constitution says that the Senate shall be the sole judge of the qualifications of its Members, and that is as far as it goes, except to prescribe the age limit and a couple of other things. Tell me how I can go to her and say, "Mrs. D, give me a statement that I can file with the Comptroller General."

Suppose she says, "I will do nothing of the kind, because it is not the Senate's business." That is the right answer.

But that is what it is sought to do here, as to every asset, every liability, and every item of income. We file a joint income tax return. I do not know what portion is hers, but I do know we file it with some expert help, in order to make sure we do not pay more than we have to. That is the reason we use an income tax man. Everybody uses him. He comes up here, operates an office over in the old Senate Office Building, and gives us his advice. I could not put the thing together for the life of me. In the first place, I would not have time.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I assume, from the very eloquent fashion in which the Senator

addresses himself to this subject, that he has studied it carefully. I wonder whether, directing the Senator's attention to page 2 of the amendment, in subparagraph (c), whether or not the Senator has come to any conclusion about the proposed attempt to exercise jurisdiction over "any member of his (the Senator's) immediate family," for the purpose of disclosing the capital gain on transactions in real estate or real property, and all the other things.

By what possible stretch of the imagination can the Senate pretend to exercise jurisdiction, by the standing rules or standing orders of the Senate, or even by public law, over the members of a Senator's immediate family? I presume that would include his sons, his daughters, and his grandchildren. That is the immediate family, as far as I know.

Mr. CASE. To clarify this point, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. HRUSKA. I wonder a little bit about what basis for jurisdiction there would be in a matter of that kind.

Mr. CASE. If the Senator will yield, the term "immediate family" is defined later, on page 8. It includes the spouse and each minor child, and that is all.

On the substance of the question, and the point raised also by the Senator from Illinois as to this being an invasion of the privacy and the separate rights of the Senator's or employee's wife and perhaps even of the children, as suggested here, though they are minors only, I point out to the Senator that this is not unique. For example, under the Securities and Exchange Act and other regulations governing investment companies, complete disclosure of all interests of the officers and their spouses is required.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They do not have to serve as such.

Mr. CASE. Neither do we.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In that sense, no. But here it is sought to require, by this mandatory language, some information by way of implications as to our personal conduct as Senators. Here it is made to appear that unless a Senator accounts for everything his wife and family may have, assets, liabilities, income, and everything, he is in some way culpable. If he does not know anything about, or too much about it, how is he going to get the information?

If you cannot get it, Mr. President, suppose they ask for a sworn statement; how do you make a sworn statement? If it is not sworn, it is not the equivalent of the income tax form at all, that the committee is asking for.

The Senator from Pennsylvania laughs. I say this is not a laughing matter. I know how people feel. I meant it when I said I refuse to let you make me a class B citizen. The fact that I went out and got myself elected does not make me a class B citizen, and I do not propose to be one.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I apologize for having treated the Senator's eloquent indignation with levity. I should not have done so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As far as lividity is concerned——

Mr. CASE. Levity.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the indispensable point I wanted to raise. How do you make a sworn statement? I do not know how you can. I would rather not try to fill it out, and ignore the so-called Comptroller General.

There is another point here. When does that report have to be filed? By the 30th of April, I think. Perhaps that is the date the House of Representatives picked out, but I believe it is not. But they went much further. Their bill, with all its provisions, would not become effective at all and will not be applicable until the 30th of April of 1969.

Since the committee did not consult with the Ethics Committee of the House of Representatives, I took the trouble to consult with some of the members of that committee, to make sure that I knew what I was talking about. They make their bill effective the 30th of April 1969.

I raised the question yesterday because it is so singular, it seems to me—perhaps this is a weakness in both measures—that they go along under one moral standard, and we go along under another.

Where do you get your competition for a seat in the Senate? I served 16 years in the other body, and every time I came over here and saw the liberal rules of debate, where, after 5 minutes the Speaker's gavel could not fall and shut you off, and you could stand as long as you had the energy and shoe leather and make yourself and your ideas known to the Senate, I would say to myself, "Oh, I pray for the day when I can go to the Senate, when I can graduate, after 16 long years in the House."

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. And so I did graduate, and I graduated by running against the majority leader of the Senate. That is where you get your competition.

Not that it bothers me, except to see that they now propose to operate under one banner, and we, running on parallel tracks, to operate under another.

Frankly, Mr. President, how do you explain that to your country? I do not know how you do.

Getting back, however, to the pending amendment, will the Senator tell me how a Senator is going to make out this report and file it with the Comptroller General if his wife says, "I am not going to tell you. This is my business."

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have lived 40 happy years together. And only a couple of months ago we had our 40th wedding anniversary. It just proves that love and harmony and sweetness of life still prevail in the Dirksen family. But she is her own boss.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest that in the unlikely event that the Senator's devoted and loving spouse is unwilling to tell him what she owns, if the Senator were to report that fact to the public and to the Comptroller General, they would be very lenient with him, indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What she says is that she knows what is in here. She says, "I am not a Member of the Senate, and the Senate has no control over me and my assets. And I do not propose to tell the U.S. Senate."

Is that a proper posture or is it not? We have spent a century emancipating women and giving them their rights.

Mr. CLARK. I think that question might be put up to the Senator's constituents. They might agree that she has every right to refuse to reveal that information.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is open to all of them. I have never concealed anything from them. The real ethic is inside. And anybody can stand in any meeting anywhere at any time and say, "Senator, how much stock and how many bonds do you own?" They can ask me if they want to. And they can ask me how many oil wells and how much undivided interest in oil wells I own. And I can tell them, "Exactly none."

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that the amendment before the Senate deals only with disclosure of assets by Members of the Senate and not by those individuals who oppose a Member of the Senate for election?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct. Nothing is contained in here that would apply to an opponent who might pop up.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, to clarify that matter, the Senator from Nevada raised that question yesterday. And in a colloquy with the Senator from Pennsylvania, it was indicated that we would be happy to receive any suggestions for an amendment to that effect.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The amendment that has been offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from New Jersey states that only the Members of the Senate shall be suspect and that none of their opponents shall be suspect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Ohio is as right as rain.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The fact is that only Members of the Senate shall be required under the pending amendment to disclose the various factors required in the pending amendment.

I shall read from a memorandum that I have just picked up. I have been away.

The memorandum states:

The reports would contain the following information:

1. Fair market value of each asset, excluding family residences;

2. Amount and identity of each liability;

3. Source and amount of each capital gain;

4. Source and amount of each item of income, and each gift—other than gifts from relatives—over $100;

5. Association with a professional firm, identity of any client represented by the firm before a United States agency, description of services performed, and fees received—

I have been in public life for 30 years. I have never received one penny as compensation outside of my compensation as a public official.

I continue to read from the memorandum:

6. Association with business enterprise as an officer, director, partner or manager.

I have never been associated with a business enterprise as an officer, director, partner, or manager. Throughout my whole career, I have aimed not to earn a single nickel except out of my public service.

I continue to read from the memorandum:

Spouses and minor children would be covered, and transactions through a straw man would have to be disclosed.

Mr. President, I submit that I have no right and Congress has no right to invade the privacy of the life and the economic standing of the wife of a Congressman.

What right do I have to tell my wife what to do? What right does Congress have to say that a Senator's financial standing has a relationship to that of his wife?

I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I have never transferred one penny of my money to my wife.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I want to make that fact clear.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The Senator referred to me by name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. STENNIS. I want to clear up a matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I would rather give up the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. I beg the Senator's pardon. No time is allowed under the unanimous-consent agreement for the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from New Jersey. An error was made, and the time was put under the control of the minority and majority leaders.

I think that the Senator can speak on the committee's time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He can do that.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have had no relation of transferring property to my wife. I have had no associations with any legal firm of any character since I have been in public office.

My earnings have been related only to the salaries which I have received as a public official and honorariums, rather mediocre, as a public speaker.

The measure before the Senate would provide that my wife and my minor children—and I have none, so that it would not apply to me—must disclose their holdings. I cannot subscribe to that type of conduct by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I have been in public office since 1932. My record is open. I have no one to fear. Why should I occupy a position different than any other citizen? Why should there be a prima facie case of suspicion of delinquent and criminal conduct concerning me when that same suspicion is not directed to other citizens of the Nation?

I have no hesitation about disclosing my account. However, I am not going to be put in the position of saying that every public official is a crook. I am not going to carry the burden and the shadow of those who indulged in this conduct and have that shadow thrown upon me. Mr. President, when my account is filed, it will show income in conformity to what I have said.

The income will be in a measure accentuated by dividends which are received. But no compensation as a director, no compensation as a lawyer. I have very meticulously followed the course of not having any relationship to a law office.

In conclusion, I wish to say, give me the same consideration you give to every other citizen, prima facie, that I am honest, and do not place upon me the burden of a presumption that I am dishonest and therefore have to file these reports which are suggested by the amendments now pending before the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is no point in my taking more time. This amendment ought to be summarily rejected, and we ought to go back to the committee resolution that has been developed over a long period of time and perfected, because I have some amendments that I think are necessary for its clarification. And then we will not have struck the heart out of the committee bill and laid into the dust its labors over a long period of time. So the pending amendment, Mr. President, ought to be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Mississippi, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the righteous indignation of the Senator from Ohio is, in my opinion, entirely irrelevant to the issue before the Senate in connection with the pending amendment. I do not imagine a single Member of this body would cast the slightest aspersion on the integrity of the Senator from Ohio—certainly, I do not; nor is there anything in this amendment which could in any way even remotely be construed as making the Senator from Ohio either a second-class citizen or a man against whom a presumption of wickedness exists.

I would hope that this amendment could be considered objectively, calmly, without undue emotion, in the light of what is good for the Senate's reputation as a great institution, of which we are all very proud indeed, the kind of institution which has been under recent attack, the sort of institution which, in my judgment and I believe in the judgment of the committee, too—for they have brought in some excellent rules, although they do not go as far as I would like—deserves protection.

It is no secret that practically the entire press of the United States is supporting strict and public disclosure of assets, liabilities, and other relevant data. Just as one little example of it, many Senators may have seen in the New York Times this morning an editorial entitled "Slow Start on Ethics."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SLOW START ON ETHICS

Since Congress has been notoriously and deliberately obtuse on the subject of ethical standards, the reports submitted to both houses last week have to be considered progress. But the report to the House is less than ideal, and the Senate committee's "important beginning" is hopelessly inadequate.

The chief merit of the code recommended to the House by a committee chaired by Representative Price of Illinois is that it provides for a substantial disclosure of members' assets and income. Public disclosure of income or capital gains from any single source would be required if the sum involved was more than $5,000. This threshold seems unnecessarily high, but at least the principle of disclosure would be firmly established.

More serious is the failure to ban testimonial dinners. Everyone knows that the people who attend such dinners for Congressmen are to a large extent favor-seeking lobbyists, businessmen and trade union leaders, who have received or hope to receive sympathetic treatment of their special interests. The noxious practice of the testimonial dinner has no place in the nation's political life.

The proposed Senate code drawn up under chairmanship of Senator Stennis of Mississippi makes only the smallest possible bow to the principle of disclosure. A member would have to make public the fees he received exceeding $300 from lectures, articles and television appearances, on the sound theory that this income is a by-product of public office. But what about the Senator whose income from legal fees and stock options may also be a by-product of his office? Each year Senators would have to prepare, in effect, a statement of net worth, but these statements would be kept secret in the General Accounting Office. There is no increased protection for the public in that curious procedure.

A majority of the Senate committee, although taking note of the evident evils in the practice, decided that it is permissible for members of the Senate to raise money from private sources to pay for travel, entertainment and office expenses. This decision is indefensible. It would be a serious step backward for the Senate to legitimize such funds. Senator Percy of Illinois a short time ago wisely abandoned such a fund because of the unfavorable publicity it aroused. This newspaper agrees with Senator Cooper of Kentucky, the committee's lone dissenter, that if such expenses are indeed necessary and legitimate, Congress should provide for their payment out of the public purse.

It is up to the members of the Senate to demonstrate more clarity and firmness on these issues than did the Stennis committee. As a starter, it is essential that the code be amended to require full financial disclosure and to forbid testimonial dinners and "office expense" slush funds.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that the Senate, in order to protect itself and its reputation, will support the pending amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Clark amendment. I believe it would be very bad for the U.S. Senate. I believe it will encourage corruption. I believe it will punish the innocent.

If the Clark amendment is adopted, a secretary working on Capital Hill, who buys a house, will have to reveal publicly how much she owes. A secretary who——

Mr. CLARK. That is not true.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it is.

Mr. CLARK. You have to make at least $15,000 a year.

Mr. CURTIS. Plenty of them make $15,000 a year.

Mr. CLARK. Secretaries in your office, not mine.

Mr. CURTIS. I have competent help.

Mr. CLARK. Those figures are already listed in public.

Mr. CURTIS. No, they are not. There is no place where we require the employees of the Senate to make public all their debts. There is no law by which we require employees of the Senate to disclose their indebtedness. It may be incurred in helping a parent, or a relative through school, or for many other reasons. This amendment calls for the filing of an unsworn statement, to be made public.

I am convinced that the vast majority of Senators and employees are honest. I am afraid there is a minority, a tiny minority, that sometimes yield to a temptation to do something questionable. Those people will still operate under the table.

I sent word that I was going to ask Mr. CLARK some questions, and if Mr. CLARK is in the Chamber, I will ask him right now.

Mr. CASE. In the meantime, you may ask me.

Mr. CURTIS. No. I do not think you are qualified, because you were not a member of the committee.

Mr. CLARK, you were a member of the Rules Committee during the Bobby Baker investigation.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I call the Senator to order under the rule, and I ask that he proceed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). The Chair will give the Senator from Nebraska an opportunity to revise and state his remarks.

Mr. CLARK. I suspect, myself, that rule XIX, section 2, has been violated.

Mr. CURTIS. No. I think that an individual who is not a member of the committee is not qualified to testify to what took place in the committee. I stand on my original statement, and I object to these interruptions.

Now, in the case of Bobby Baker, they had an employee of the Senate who, by his own admission, accumulated over $2 million under the dome of this Capitol. We needed witnesses. And a motion was made to call Margaret Broome, who had been Baker's secretary, as a witness, to find out about it. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] voted against calling her. Why?

Mr. CLARK. Because in my opinion—I am going to be very careful about rule XIX, section 2—the Senator from Nebraska and one or two, but certainly not all, of his colleagues were engaged in a public relations witchhunt intended to discredit the innocent. I could not be a party to it. And may I add——

Mr. CURTIS. No, no.

Mr. CLARK. I am answering. I filed a dissenting report to the views of the committee because I did not think they did the kind of job which should have been done in connection with that investigation.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, you all of a sudden want everybody to disclose everything, and you did all you could to cover up wrongdoing.

Mr. CLARK. That is the Senator's opinion.

Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege. I ask the Chair to admonish the Senator from Nebraska, and that, under rule XIX, section 2, he be required to take his seat.

Mr. CURTIS. And the Senator from Pennsylvania voted against calling Mr. R. J. Vander Zee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May we have order while the Chair consults the Parliamentarian?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator said I was guilty of condoning wrongdoing. That is a violation of rule XIX, section 2. I ask that the Senator take his seat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania please state his request again; or, perhaps, the Official Reporter should read the statement to which the Senator from Pennsylvania referred.

Mr. CLARK. I should like the Official Reporter to read the statement which the Senator from Nebraska just made in which he said that I was guilty of condoning wrongdoing.

I ask that the time not be charged to either side while the Official Reporter is looking for the statement.

Mr. CURTIS. While the Official Reporter is looking for the statement, I ask that I be permitted to read the Senator from Pennsylvania's voting record in the Bobby Baker case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to get the request with respect to the previous point raised by the Senator from Pennsylvania. The Chair would like it clarified for the Senators as well as for the Chair.

The Chair directs the Official Reporter to read the statement of the Senator from Nebraska to which the Senator from Pennsylvania has referred.

The Official Reporter (William D. Mohr) read as follows:

Mr. CURTIS. Well, you all of a sudden want everybody to disclose everything, and you did all you could to cover up wrongdoing.

Mr. CLARK. He said I did what I did to cover up wrongdoing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska did, indeed, suggest that the Senator from Pennsylvania, according to the Official Reporter, did all he could to cover up wrongdoing.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Nebraska may be allowed to proceed in order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I object and I ask for a ruling on the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the ruling of the Chair that the point of the Senator from Pennsylvania comes within the rule to which he referred. The motion is sustained.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senator be allowed to proceed in order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair put the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi. [Putting the question.] The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Nebraska may proceed in order.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his motion. I wish to apologize for any violation I have made of the rule.

I do wish to present the record in the Bobby Baker case.

It was necessary, if we were to expose wrongdoing or find out if there was wrongdoing, to have the testimony of Jessop McDonnell. He had been an assistant to Mr. Baker and perhaps could have furnished evidence. There was a motion made to call him. The Senator from Pennsylvania voted against it.

Matthew McCloskey could have given us some evidence. There was testimony that there was a meeting here in the Capitol. They discussed the bonding for the contractor when they built the D.C. Stadium with taxpayer money. There was a discussion about the division of the commission. The record shows an employee of the House got $1,500. The record shows Baker got $4,000 out of it.

We asked to call Mr. McCloskey. The Senator from Pennsylvania voted "no."

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

Mr. CURTIS. I will not yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his unfailing courtesy.

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, that is all right. That is all right.

I fought to try to get to the bottom of the Bobby Baker matter. We never did. It brought a bad name upon the Senate. I dislike to have an unworkable proposal brought in here as an aftermath of that, one that will not put a stop to transactions that occur under the table, but which would say to the faithful employees of the Senate, disclose in public all your debts.

There are Members of Congress who will file an honest statement and they will be ridiculed because they do not have any property. There will be Members of Congress who will file an honest statement and be ridiculed because they have property. That is not a test for holding property.

I have a reason for bringing this record in here. I love the Senator from Pennsylvania. It is not that I want to hurt him at all. However, I do not believe that this proposal has anything to do with ethics. I do not believe it will make one single employee of the Senate ethical. I think it will hurt a lot of people. I think if there are some shenanigans going on by Senators, officers, or employees under the table, they will go on in spite of this proposal.

Some of us have read some of the voluntary financial statements published in the newspapers. They have not been very informative, to say the least. However, here we have a situation where an individual has brought shame and disgrace on the Senate by accumulating what he claimed was over $2 million.

Paul Aguirre was a business associate of Baker. A motion was made to call him as a witness. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania voted "no"; yet he comes in here today with an amendment that would tell everybody who works for the Senate, who makes over a certain figure, that he must disclose all his assets and all his debts.

Mr. President, no one here believes that will stop an evil person from doing something dishonest and undercover. Why all this change of procedure?

Warren Neil was another business associate of Baker. We wanted his testimony. The Senator from Pennsylvania voted "no." I am not surprised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 12 minutes have expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there is a long list here. There is Nick Popich of New Orleans. The committee had evidence of many telephone calls between that gentleman and Bobby Baker. We needed him as a witness. The Senator from Pennsylvania voted "no."

On one occasion the very distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] moved that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be called and that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] be called. The Senator from Pennsylvania was against it, in a case involving facts that were disgracing the Senate and bringing the public service into ridicule.

Mr. President, why bring in today something like this proposal as a remedy for wrongdoing?

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The Senator from Nebraska, I understood, referred to Mr. Baker and, as I remember, Mr. Baker was an officer of the Senate.

I have read in the explanation of the amendment offered by Senators CLARK and CASE that it would "provide for mandatory public disclosure for Senators and Senate employees with an annual salary of $15,000 or more."

Will the Senator yield so that the authors of the amendment may explain why the officers were not included in this amendment?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield 1 minute for that purpose.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator. I am sure I speak for both the Senator from Pennsylvania and myself and all other sponsors of the amendment.

The term is intended to, and I am sure does, include officers as well as all other employees. The officers are employees.

Mrs. SMITH. Would the amendment include all Senate employees and all Senate officers?

Mr. CASE. All Senate employees and all Senate officers, and that includes also all employees of all Senators.

Mrs. SMITH. In other words, no exemptions for any Senate employees or any Senate officers?

Mr. CASE. Except those receiving less than $15,000.

Mrs. SMITH. It would not exempt any officer or any employee of the U.S. Senate receiving $15,000 or more?

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Maine for bringing out that point.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, during the course of the Bobby Baker investigation, we needed the testimony of Mr. Walter Jenkins because there was testimony before the committee that he had a part in requiring Don Reynolds to pay $1,208 for TV time on a television station down in Texas because Don Reynolds had sold a $200,000 life insurance policy. We never did get the testimony of Walter Jenkins. The Senator from Pennsylvania opposed calling Mr. Jenkins. A subpena was finally issued for Jenkins, but he did not appear that day.

Two psychiatrists appeared and were examined all day, and at the end of the day the Senator from Pennsylvania joined in voting not to call Walter Jenkins.

There was another motion made that we make public the doctors' testimony as to why Mr. Jenkins could not come, and the Senator from Pennsylvania voted against that, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I shall not take time to give everything in these volumes, and there are more volumes. I have a hard time understanding why the Senator from Pennsylvania is going to require every employee of the Senate and every Senator to make public all their debts, as well as assets, in light of his distinguished public record.

The Select Committee on Standards and Conduct has had a hard job. Perhaps there are those who think no report should be filed at all. Then there are those who say: "Let us expose all the assets of every person even though we know they are conscientious and honest and have chosen a middle course."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CURTIS. That, I believe, is in the public interest.

I question the wisdom and the purpose of the amendment before us and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I regret very much that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has seen fit to rake up the old, dead coals of the Bobby Baker investigation but it is necessary for me briefly to defend myself against his attack.

Bobby Baker has been convicted and sentenced to jail and is presently out on bail. The evidence which was brought forward at his trial was significantly contributed to by the investigations of the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which I was a member.

That committee filed two reports, both of which were unsatisfactory to me.

The first was on June 29, 1964, and I ask unanimous consent that my individual views, expressing my disapproval of the inadequacy of the report may be printed in the RECORD.

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

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR JOSEPH S. CLARK

The committee, by a large majority, has voted to require Members of the Senate, and Senate officers and employees to disclose, to some extent at least, the existence of certain assets and professional connections. This, it is thought, will reveal any potential conflict of interest which might affect their public behavior.

The case for disclosure is a strong one.

First, there can be little doubt that if Baker had been required to reveal his financial holdings and business and professional connections he would, at some point, have been required by the Senate to dispose of them and devote himself exclusively to his job as secretary of the majority. It seems wise to adopt procedures which should prevent a repetition by others of his improprieties.

Second, there is little logic and no moral justification for requiring disclosure by officers and employees but not requiring Senators to disclose.

Third, the Senate has long been under severe public criticism for requiring nominees of the executive branch to disclose, and often to dispose of, holdings and professional connections while applying no such rule to itself.

Fourth, it is clear that the business, financial, and professional holdings and connections of Senators are pertinent information to which the public is entitled in judging the public actions of those sent to the Capitol to represent them.

Fifth, in the present public climate of skepticism respecting the integrity and public performance of the Senate, emphasized by the disclosures of the Baker case, but originating in the early days of the Republic and continuing intermittently ever since, it seems wise to take strong steps to rehabilitate the public image of the National Legislature and to establish beyond question the propriety of the public behavior of each of its Members.

But if we are to require disclosure we ought to see to it that the disclosure is adequate for the purposes intended to be accomplished.

While I have joined with the committee in voting to report this resolution to the floor,

I view it as merely a small and timid first step toward an adequate set of rules to guard against conflicts of interest of Senators and Senate staff members. I believe that far more comprehensive measures are warranted not only by the long, detailed, and thorough record which the committee has compiled in this investigation, but also by the very logic of the situation which vests in Members of the Congress, and to some extent in their aids and employees as well, great power to influence decisions affecting a myriad of business and financial interests.

Although I believe that a burden also rests upon the Members of the other body to deal similarly with their problems, two considerations have impelled me to the conclusion that it is imperative that the Senate act for itself now: (1) The disclosures which prompted the recent investigation were concerned primarily—although certainly not exclusively—with the Senate. These are improprieties which have taken place under our own roof. It therefore behooves us, whatever the other body does, to take effective action to see that they do not recur. (2) If these badly needed reforms are made conditional on concurrent action of the other body, then we shall have no reforms at all. It is now late in the second session of a Congress which has suffered more than most from legislative deadlock. Worse than that, this is a presidential year, and with the coming of the conventions the chance that anything more than the most routine legislation will be enacted is slim indeed. In such a case, no realist could hope for concurrent action by the other body this year. To require it is to require what is virtually impossible, and to doom these vital reforms. If we let this moment pass without taking prompt, comprehensive, and effective action, the damage done in the past year to the public image of the Senate may take decades to mend.

For these reasons I intend to offer on the floor of the Senate an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee resolution, which was proposed before the committee, but—most unwisely, it seems to me—rejected. The text of my amendment is set forth at the conclusion of these individual views. My proposal would strengthen and broaden the committee's resolution in these regards:

1. *Asset disclosure.*—The committee's proposal would require disclosure of the identity of business entities in which an interest is held, but not the value. My amendment would also require disclosure of the fair market value of the asset. The committee's proposal applies only to assets having a value equal to one-half of the annual salary rate of the person required to disclose. My amendment applies to each asset having a fair market value of $5,000 or more.

2. *Liability disclosure.*—In my view the holding of an obligation of a person in high public office is as much a lever for evil influence as the sharing of a business undertaking. Consequently, my amendment would require the disclosure of each liability in excess of $5,000 together with the name of the holder thereof, owed by a member, officer, or employee of the Senate, or by his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly. There is no equivalent provision in the committee's resolution.

3. *Capital gain disclosure.*—A familiar means of passing a reward to one to whom a gift cannot be given is the "hot issue." By means of this device one in possession of information concerning a future dramatic rise in the value of a particular security can pass that information on to others, thus permitting them to take advantage of the surge in value and realize the profit through the low tax, capital gains route. In earlier days this was known as the preferred list. There is nothing in the committee's recommendation which would force disclosure of transactions of this sort if the securities had been sold prior to "reporting day": January 1 of the preceding year. My amendment, on the other hand, requires disclosure of both the source and amount of all capital gains realized during the year in any amount exceeding $5,000, by (1) the person required to report; (2) by his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly; or (3) any strawman; that is, any person acting on behalf or pursuant to the direction of him or his spouse. But as with asset disclosure, matters relating to real property which is used as a dwelling occupied him or his immediate family are exempted.

4. *Income disclosure.*—There is no provision whatsoever for the disclosure of items of income in the commitee's resolution. This strikes me as a most grave, if not a fatal, defect, particularly if it is coupled with an asset disclosure provision which would, under the proposed new pay scale, exempt from the disclosure requirement for Senators assets worth $15,000.

My amendment would require the disclosure of the source and amount of every item of income in excess of $100 received during the preceding calendar year by the person required to disclose, his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly. It expressly includes gifts, other than gifts received from a spouse or other relative, as well as fees or honoraria received for preparing any speech or article, whether in cash or in kind, as in free travel, subsistence, or entertainment. Income is given the broad meaning which it has under section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

5. *Disclosure of association with professional firm.*—The committee resolution goes part way toward meeting the problem of the Senator or Senate aid who maintains an association with a professional firm which engages in practice before an agency of the Federal Government, by requiring disclosure of the name and address of the firm. My amendment carries the rule to the logical next step by requiring disclosure also of the name, address, and principal business of any client of the firm for whom any services involving representation before a Government agency are performed, and a brief description of the services performed, together with a statement of the total fees which were charged for such services.

6. *Disclosure of financial condition and activity of spouse.*—The splendid cartoonist Lichty, in his "Grin and Bear It" which appeared in the Washington Post of May 26, 1964, depicted an address at a typical Lichty version of a woman's club meeting, being delivered by "Mrs. The Hon. Sen. Snort—On the Power Behind the Throne." The words in the caption were Mrs. Snort's: "The pressures of public office are indeed terrific and a wife must do all she can to help * * * such as letting the Senator put all his investments in my name."

By failing to make any provision at all for the possibility of evasion by this time-honored technique—which incidentally has inheritance tax benefits as well—the committee left a gaping loophole which renders all but worthless the other provisions of its resolution. My amendment is an effort to sew this loophole shut.

7. *Prohibition of joint ventures with lobbyists.*—In my view there are some business relationships which are so likely to be corrupting, or at least to raise reasonable if unfounded fears of corruption, that they should be prohibited outright. Chief among these, I would say, is the engaging in business ventures for profit with persons actively engaged in lobbying, or in counseling or advisory activities relating to the procurement of Government contracts. These activities would be prohibited by my amendment. There is no comparable provision in the committee's resolution.

8. *Accepting gifts from lobbyists.*—As I have noted, the committee's recommendation does not even contain a provision requiring the disclosure of gifts. My amendment does require the disclosure of gifts in excess of $100 from persons not in one's family. But in addition, it would seem to me to be wholly salutary to set a limit on the value of a gift which a Senator or a Senate aid might properly receive from a lobbyist. My amendment sets this limit at a most generous $100, which should surely be sufficiently high to permit the expression of a bountiful, if not scandalous, generosity on the part of persons in the business of influencing the passage of legislation.

9. *Testimony of Members of the Senate before committees.*—There is at present an unwholesome cloudiness in the Senate rules about the duty of Senators to appear and testify before Senate committees acting within proper jurisdictional bounds about matters regarding which they have personal knowledge. While the balance of opinion seems to be that no such enforcible obligation now exists, it seems to me most clear that it should exist, and that the procedures by which it can be made effective should be spelled out quite plainly in the Senate rules.

For this reason my amendment contains a new Senate rule XLIII, which would authorize any duly authorized committee of the Senate to request any Senator to come before it and give any pertinent testimony which it has reason to believe he can give on the subject matter under investigation. A Senator receiving such a request would be required to appear and give testimony, unless within 10 days he delivers to the chairman of the committee a signed statement to the effect that he is without knowledge of the subject matter under investigation.

There is no analogous provision in the committee's resolution.

10. *Moonlighting by Senate officers and full-time employees.*—The facts of the Baker case, as disclosed in the record compiled by the committee, are such as to cast grave doubt on the practice of permitting officers and full-time employees of the Senate to serve as managers or proprietors of business enterprises, to engage in a regular professional or consulting practice, or to maintain an association with a professional or consulting firm. My amendment would create a new Senate rule to prohibit moonlighting of this sort, in the absence of permission obtained by special leave of the Senate.

In addition, the substitute amendment which I propose would permit moonlighting of other sorts only on two conditions: (1) that the activity or employment is not inconsistent with the conscientious performance of the officer's or employee's official duties; and (2) that express permission has been given by the Member of the Senate charged with the supervision of the officer or employee. For the purposes of the rule, each Senator would be responsible for supervising his own staff; chairmen of committees would supervise committee staffs; the majority leader, the minority leader, and the Vice President would supervise their own employees; and the President pro tempore of the Senate would be charged with the supervision of outside employment engaged in by all other officers and employees of the Senate.

I point out that this new Senate rule would not prohibit various types of moonlighting by Senate officers and employees which seem to me wholly inoffensive, such as giving lectures, or writing books or articles. It would, however, require the disclosure of these activities to the responsible member of the Senate.

Even if there had been no Baker case, this rule would stand well recommended by the Biblical dictum that no man shall serve two masters. But in view of what the committee has brought to light about Bobby Baker's extensive financial operations, I believe the case in favor of the adoption of this rule is conclusive. Nevertheless there is no com-

parable provision in the committee's recommended resolution.

The amendment I propose would meet the minimum requirements of an effective disclosure procedure.

In my opinion the committee resolution does not.

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CLARK, in the nature of a substitute for Senate Resolution 337, reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, relative to disclosure of financial interests and definition of prohibited activities:

"Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rules:

"'RULE XLI

"'DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS

"'1. Each individual who at any time during any calendar year serves as a Member of the Senate, or as an officer or employee of the Senate compensated at a gross rate in excess of $10,000 per annum, shall file with the Secretary of the Senate for that calendar year a written report containing the following information:

"'(a) The fair market value of each asset having a fair market value of $5,000 or more held by him or by his spouse or by him, and his spouse jointly, exclusive of any dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family, at the end of that calendar year;

"'(b) The amount of each liability in excess of $5,000 owed by him or by his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly at the end of that calendar year;

"'(c) The total amount of all capital gains realized, and the source and amount of each capital gain realized in any amount exceeding $5,000, during that calendar year by him or by his spouse, by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on behalf or pursuant to the direction of him or his spouse, or him and his spouse jointly, as a result of any transaction or series of related transactions in securities or commodities, or any purchase or sale of real property or any interest therein other than a dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family;

"'(d) The source and amount of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts received from any relative or his spouse) received by or accruing to him, his spouse, or from him and his spouse jointly from any source other than the United States during that calendar year, which exceeds $100 in amount or value; including any fee or other honorarium received by him for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, or other facilities received by him in kind;

"'(e) The name and address of any professional firm which engages in practice before any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States in which he has a financial interest; and the name, address, and a brief description of the principal business of any client of such firm for whom any services involving representation before any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States which were performed during that calendar year, together with a brief description of the services performed, and the total fees received or receivable by the firm as compensation for such services;

"'(f) The name, address, and nature of the principal business or activity of each business or financial entity or enterprise with which he was associated at any time during that calendar year as an officer, director, or partner, or in any other managerial capacity.

"'2. Each asset consisting of an interest in a business or financial entity or enterprise which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in each report made pursuant to that paragraph by a statement of the name of such entity or enterprise, the location of its principal office, and the nature of the business or activity in which it is principally engaged or with which it is principally concerned, except that an asset which is a security traded on any securities exchange subject to supervision by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States may be identified by a full and complete description of the security and the name of the issuer thereof. Each liability which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in each report made pursuant to that paragraph by a statement of the name and the address of the creditor to whom the obligation of such liability is owed.

"'3. Except as otherwise hereinafter provided, each individual who is required by paragraph 1 to file a report for any calendar year shall file such report with the Secretary of the Senate not later than January 31 of the next following calendar year. No such report shall be required to be made for any calendar year beginning before January 1, 1964. The requirements of this rule shall apply only with respect to individuals who are Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate on or after the date of adoption of this rule. An individual who ceases to serve as a Member of the Senate or as an officer or employee of the Senate, before the close of any calendar year shall file such report on the last day of such service, or on such date not more than three months thereafter as the Secretary of the Senate may prescribe, and the report so made shall be made for that portion of that calendar year during which such individual so served. Whenever there is on file with the Secretary of the Senate a report made by any individual in compliance with paragraph 1 for any calendar year, the Secretary may accept from that individual for any succeeding calendar year, in lieu of the report required by paragraph 1, a certificate containing an accurate recitation of the changes in such report which are required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year, or a statement to the effect that no change in such report is required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year.

"'4. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be made upon forms which shall be prepared and provided by the Secretary of the Senate, and shall be made in such manner and detail as he shall prescribe. The Secretary may provide for the grouping within such reports and certificates of items which are required by paragraph 1 to be disclosed whenever he determines that separate itemization thereof is not feasible or is not required for accurate disclosure with respect to such items. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be retained by the Secretary as public records for not less than six years after the close of the calendar year for which they are made, and while so retained shall be available for inspection by members of the public under such reasonable regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe.

As used in this rule—

"'(a) The term "asset" includes any beneficial interest held or possessed directly or indirectly in any business or financial entity or enterprise, or in any security or evidence of indebtedness, but does not include any interest in any organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code;

"'(b) The term "liability" includes any liability of any trust in which a beneficial interest is held or possessed directly or indirectly;

"'(c) The term "income" means gross income as defined by section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"'(d) The term "security" means any security as defined by section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77b).

"'(e) The term "commodity" means any commodity as defined by section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2).

"'(f) The term "dealing in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

"'(g) The term "officer or employee of the Senate" means (1) an elected officer of the Senate who is not a Member of the Senate, (2) an employee of the Senate of any committee or subcommittee of the Senate, (3) the Legislative Counsel of the Senate and employees of his office, (4) an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate and any person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties, (5) a member of the Capitol Police force whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (6) an employee of the Vice President if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (7) an employee of a Member of the Senate if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, and (8) an employee of a joint committee of the Congress whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

"'RULE XLII

"'PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES

"'1. No Member of the Senate or any officer or employee of the Senate may engage or participate in any business or financial venture, enterprise, combination or transaction with any person, firm, or corporation which is—

"'(a) engaged in any lobbying activity;

"'(b) engaged for compensation in the practice of rendering advisory or public relations services relating to the securing of contracts with the United States or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof; or

"'(c) engaged in, or seeking to become engaged in, the performance of any construction, manufacturing, research, development, or service contract with the United States or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof.

"'(2) No Member of the Senate or any officer or employee of the Senate may accept—

"'(a) at any time from any individual, entity, or enterprise which is engaged in lobbying activity any gift of money, property, entertainment, travel, or any other valuable consideration in an amount or having a value in excess of $100; or

"'(b) within any calendar year from any such individual, entity, or enterprise such gifts in an aggregate amount or having an aggregate value in excess of $100.

"'3. No officer or employee of the Senate may be vested with or exercise any authority or responsibility for, or participate in any way in any consideration of or determination with respect to, the allocation among Members of the Senate of any funds available for use to defray expenses incurred or to be incurred by any individual for or in connection with any campaign for the nomination or election of any individual to be a Member of the Senate.

"'4. As used in this rule—

"'(a) The term "officer or employee of the Senate" has the meaning given thereto by rule XLI; and

"'(b) The term "lobbying activity" means any activity undertaken by any person other than a Member of the Congress to influence directly or indirectly the introduction, pas-

sage, defeat, amendment, or modification of any legislative measure in either House of the Congress.

"'RULE XLIII

"'TESTIMONY OF MEMBERS OF THE SENATE BEFORE COMMITTEES

"'Whenever any standing, special, or select committee of the Senate or any joint committee of the Congress, which is engaged in any investigation within its jurisdiction has reason to believe that the testimony of any Member of the Senate may be pertinent to such investigation, such committee, with the approval of a majority of its members (including at least one member of the minority party), by written communication may request such Member of the Senate to appear before the committee to give testimony concerning the subject matter under investigation. Such Member of the Senate shall appear before such committee in obedience to such request unless within ten days after receipt thereof he delivers to the chairman of such committee a written statement, duly signed by such Member of the Senate, stating that he is without knowledge of the subject matter under investigation.'

"'RULE XLIV

"'OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT

"'1. No officer or employee of the Senate shall engage in any business, financial or professional activity or employment for compensation or gain unless—

"'(a) such activity or employment is not inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his official duties; and

"'(b) express permission has been granted by the Member of the Senate charged with supervision of such officer or employee by this rule:

Provided, however, That in no event shall any officer or full-time employee of the Senate, without special leave of the Senate—

"'(a) serve in any managerial capacity in any business or financial enterprise; or

"'(b) engage in any regular professional or consulting practice, or maintain an association with any professional or consulting firm.

"'2. For the purposes of this rule—

"'(a) each Member of the Senate shall be charged with the supervision of each of his employees;

"'(b) each Member of the Senate who is the chairman of a Senate or joint committee or subcommittee shall be charged with the supervision of each employee of such committee or subcommittee;

"'(c) the Majority Leader shall be charged with the supervision of each officer and employee of the Majority, and the Minority Leader shall be charged with the supervision of each officer and employee of the Minority;

"'(d) the Vice President shall be charged with the supervision of each of his employees; and

"'(e) the President Pro Tempore shall be charged with the supervision of all other officers and employees of the Senate.

"'3. As used in this rule, the term "officer or employee of the Senate" has the meaning given thereto by rule XLI.'"

JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the second report was made on June 30, 1965. Again, I was of the view that the report was inadequate and filed supplemental views. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of those views be printed in the RECORD.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF MR. CLARK

Although I endorse the committee's report of the results of its investigation, I am dissatisfied with its recommendations for remedial action. I do not dissent from these as far as they go, but I believe they do not go far enough. The investigation has given the Rules Committee and the Senate a penetrating insight into the dangers of conflicts of interest and improper business and financial transactions by Senate officers and employees. It has also demonstrated the ease with which vague rules and imprecise ethical imperatives can be evaded by persons of sufficient greed and ingenuity. The lesson of the investigation is that only stringent rules of financial disclosure, and the rigorous control of outside activities, can insure against a recurrence of the improprieties by public officials disclosed in this report. To the extent that the committee has failed to recommend such rules, it has failed in its primary task.

The committee has accepted the case for disclosure of financial interests by Senate Members, officers, and employees. It invokes, appropriately, the recent Executive order issued by the President, requiring disclosure by officials and employees of the executive branch, but its recommendation falls short even of that mild proposal. Specifically, it omits three categories of information from the list of disclosures it would require: first, the names of the reporter's creditors; second, his interests in real property or rights in lands, other than property he occupies as a personal residence; and third, the interests of his spouse, minor child, or other member of his immediate household. All these are now required of the Executive employee, and there is a strong case for requiring members, officers, and employees of the Senate, too, to disclose them. Once the case for disclosure is accepted in principle, it is illogical to require disclosure of business enterprises in which the reporter has an interest, while not requiring disclosure of any sources of indebtedness. The one is no less likely than the other to create a problem which the new rule is designed to eliminate: namely, a conflict of interest leading to possible public impropriety. Likewise, there is no good reason for excluding disclosure of real estate interests; and the omission of spouses' interests could render any disclosure rules meaningless, since a simple transfer of title from the principal to the spouse would make them inapplicable.

But even if the proposed new disclosure rule required as much information as the Executive order, it would be inadequate. The sources of income and of gifts are just as relevant to the question of conflict of interest as is the disposition of capital, yet they are omitted from the committee's recommendation. I would include both items in any disclosure rule, with a minimum requirement that all items of income and gifts exceeding $500 in value be specified. I would prefer that figure to be $100, just as I would prefer to have disclosure not only of the identity but of the amount of all financial interests.

A final defect of the committee's recommendation on disclosure is that it does not provide for the reported information to be disclosed to those who have the greatest interest in seeing it namely the electorate. In fact, it studiously insures that no one shall see the information, save the chairman of a committee which does not yet exist, after a majority vote of that committee. This empties the rule of almost all significance. The electorate has a legitimate interest in scrutinizing the private business and financial activities of its representatives. Senators should be ready to put their own stewardship, and that of the officers and employees for whom they are responsible to the test of inspection by a public equipped with all the facts. Business, financial, and professional holdings and connections of Senators are pertinent information to which the public is entitled in judging the public actions of those sent to Congress to represent them.

I shall offer in the Senate two alternative resolutions, as substitutes for the committee resolution, one of which meets all these objections, and the other some of them. I offered both in the Rules Committee, which defeated the first by a vote of 7 to 2 and the second by 5 to 4.

The most desirable course would be to enact a resolution requiring every Senator and every Senate officer and employee compensated at a gross rate in excess of $10,000 per annum to file an annual financial report, which would be available to the general public. The report would contain the following kinds of information:

1. Asset disclosure: The identity and fair market value of any asset having a fair market value of $5,000 or more.

2. Liability disclosure: The identity and amount of each liability in excess of $5,000, together with the name and address of the creditor. I propose this because debts, as much as assets, are potential stimulants to public impropriety.

3. Capital gain disclosure: The source and amount of all capital gains in excess of $5,000 realized in the preceding year by the reporter, his spouse, or a strawman acting for them. But as with asset disclosure, matters relating to real property which is used as a dwelling by the reporter or his immediate family are exempted.

4. Income disclosure: The source and amount of every item of income for the calendar year in excess of $100, including honoraria, expense money, and gifts other than those from a relative.

5. Disclosure of all these four categories of financial condition on the part of a spouse.

6. Disclosure of association with a professional firm which practices, on its own behalf or on behalf of another identified business, before Federal Government agencies.

A strict disclosure rule meeeting these requirements was proposed by me in the last Congress as a substitute for the disclosure rule recommended by the Rules Committee, but rejected by the Senate. The proposed rule on financial disclosure, with which I have already complied by means of an insertion in the Congressional Record, would provide as follows:

RULE XLI

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS

1. Each individual who at any time during any calendar year serves as a Member of the Senate, or as an officer or employee of the Senate compensated at a gross rate in excess of $10,000 per annum, shall file with the Secretary of the Senate for that calendar year a written report containing the following information:

(a) The fair market value of each asset having a fair market value of $5,000 or more held by him or by his spouse or by him and his spouse jointly, exclusive of any dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family, at the end of that calendar year;

(b) The amount of each liability in excess of $5,000 owed by him or by his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly at the end of that calendar year;

(c) The total amount of all capital gains realized, and the sourcee and amount of each capital gain realized, in any amount exceeding $5,000 during that calendar year by him or by his spouse, by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on behalf or pursuant to the direction of him or his spouse, or him and his spouse jointly, as a result of any transaction or series of related transactions in securities or commodities, or any purchase or sale of real property or any interest therein other than a dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family;

(d) The source and amount of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts received from any relative or his spouse) received by or accruing to him, his spouse, or

from him and his spouse jointly from any source other than the United States during that calendar year, which exceeds $100 in amount or value; including any fee or other honorarium received by him for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, or other facilities received by him in kind;

(e) The name and address of any professional firm which engages in practice before any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States in which he has a financial interest; and the name, address, and a brief description of the principal business of any client of such firm for whom any services involving representation before any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States which were performed during that calendar year, together with a brief description of the services performed, and the total fees received or receivable by the firm as compensation for such services;

(f) The name, address, and nature of the principal business or activity of each business or financial entity or enterprise with which he was associated at any time during that calendar year as an officer, director, or partner, or in any other managerial capacity.

2. Each asset consisting of an interest in a business or financial entity or enterprise which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in each report made pursuant to the paragraph by a statement of the name of such entity or enterprise, the location of its principal office, and the nature of the business or activity in which it is principally engaged or with which it is principally concerned, except that an asset which is a security traded on any securities exchange subject to supervision by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States may be identified by a full and complete description of the security and the name of the issuer thereof. Each liability which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in each report made pursuant to that paragraph by a statement of the name and the address of the creditor to whom the obligation of such liability is owed.

3. Except as otherwise hereinafter provided, each individual who is required by paragraph 1 to file a report for any calendar year shall file such report with the Secretary of the Senate not later than January 31 of the next following calendar year. No such report shall be required to be made for any calendar year beginning before January 1, 1965. The requirements of this rule shall apply only with respect to individuals who are Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate on or after the date of adoption of this rule. Any individual who ceases to serve as a Member of the Senate or as an officer or employee of the Senate, before the close of any calendar year shall file such report on the last day of such service, or on such date not more than 3 months thereafter as the Secretary of the Senate may prescribe, and the report so made shall be made for that portion of that calendar year during which such individual so served. Whenever there is on file with the Secretary of the Senate a report made by any individual in compliance with paragraph 1 for any calendar year, the Secretary may accept from that individual for any succeeding calendar year; in lieu of the report required by paragraph 1, a certificate containing an accurate recitation of the changes in such report which are required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year, or a statement to the effect that no change in such report is required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year.

4. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be made upon forms which shall be prepared and provided by the Secretary of the Senate, and shall be made in such manner and detail as he shall prescribe. The Secretary may provide for the grouping within such reports and certificates of items which are required by paragraph 1 to be disclosed whenever he determines that separate itemization thereof is not feasible or is not required for accurate disclosure with respect to such items. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be retained by the Secretary as public records for not less than 6 years after the close of the calendar year for which they are made, and while so retained shall be available for inspection by members of the public under such reasonable regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe.

5. As used in this rule—

(a) The term "asset" includes any beneficial interest held or possessed directly or indirectly in any business or financial entity or enterprise, or in any security or evidence of indebtedness, but does not include any interest in any organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is exempt from taxation under section 51(a) of such code;

(b) The term "liability" includes any liability of any trust in which a beneficial interest is held or possessed directly or indirectly;

(c) The term "income" means gross income as defined by section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(d) The term "security" means any security as defined by section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77b).

(e) The term "commodity" means any commodity as defined by section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2).

(f) The term "dealing in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

(g) The term "officer or employee of the Senate" means (1) an elected officer of the Senate who is not a Member of the Senate, (2) an employee of the Senate or any committee or subcommittee of the Senate, (3) the legislative counsel of the Senate and employees of his office, (4) an official reporter of debates of the Senate and any person employed by the official reporters of debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties, (5) a member of the Capitol Police force whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (6) an employee of the Vice President if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (7) an employee of a Member of the Senate if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, and (8) an employee of a joint committee of the Congress whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

This resolution is the one which I should prefer the Senate to adopt. However, past evidence suggests that such medicine may be too strong for the Senate to swallow. I am therefore proposing, as an alternative, a resolution based upon the committee's recommendation with certain provisions added to make it somewhat more effective. This rule would provide for the disclosure of creditors, of income and gifts, of real property interests, and of the interests of spouses, etc. It would also provide for the information to be seen by any member of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, rather than by the chairman after a majority vote.

The text of this proposed amendment to the Senate rules is as follows:

RULE XLI

REPORTING OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS

1. Each individual who at any time during any calendar year serves as a Member of the Senate, or as an officer or employee of the Senate compensated at a gross rate in excess of $10,000 per annum, shall file annually with the Comptroller General of the United States for that year a written report containing the following information:

(a) A list of the names of all corporations, companies, firms, or other business enterprises and partnerships—

(1) with which, as of the close of the calendar year, he is connected as an employee, officer, owner, director, trustee, partner, adviser, or consultant; or

(2) in which, as of the close of the calendar year, he has any continuing financial interests, through a pension or retirement plan, shared income, or otherwise, as a result of any current or prior employment or business or professional association; or

(3) in which, as of the close of the calendar year, he has any financial interest through the ownership of stocks, bonds, or other securities.

(b) A list of the names of his creditors, other than those to whom he may be indebted by reason of a mortgage on property which he occupies as a personal residence or to whom he may be indebted for current and ordinary household and living expenses.

(c) A list of his interests in real property or rights in lands, other than property which he occupies as a personal residence.

(d) A list of the sources of each item of income, and each gift (other than a gift received from any relative or his spouse) which exceeds $500 received by him from any source other than the United States during the calendar year.

2. (a) An interest or an item of income of a spouse, minor child, or other member of his immediate household shall be considered to be an interest of a person required to submit a statement by or pursuant to this rule.

(b) In the event any information required to be included in a statement required by or pursuant to this rule is not known to the person required to submit such statement but is known to other persons, the person concerned shall request such other persons to submit the required information on his behalf.

(c) This rule shall not be construed to require the submission of any information relating to any person's connection with, or interest in, any professional society or any charitable, religious, social, fraternal, educational, recreational, public service, civic, or political organization or any similar organization not conducted as a business enterprise and which is not engaged in the ownership or conduct of a business enterprise.

3. Except as otherwise hereinafter provided, each individual who is required by this rule to file a report for any calendar year shall file such report with the Comptroller General of the United States not later than January 31 of the next following calendar year. No such report shall be required to be made for any calendar year beginning before January 1, 1965. The requirements of this rule shall apply only with respect to individuals who are Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate on or after the date of adoption of this rule. Any individual who ceases to serve as a Member of the Senate or as an officer or employee of the Senate before the close of any calendar year shall file such report as of the last day of such service, and such report shall be filed with the Comptroller General of the United States not later than 30 days thereafter. Whenever there is on file with the Comptroller General of the United States a report made by any individual in compliance with this rule for any calendar year, the Comptroller General may accept from that individual for any succeeding calendar year, in lieu of the report required by section 1 of this rule, a statement containing an accurate recitation of the changes in such report which are required for compliance with the

provisions of section 1 for that succeeding year, or a statement to the effect that no change in such report is required for compliance with the provisions of section 1 for that succeeding year.

4. Reports and statements filed under this rule shall be made upon forms which shall be prepared and provided by the Comptroller General of the United States, and shall be made in such manner and detail as he shall prescribe.

5. All reports and statements filed with the Comptroller General of the United States in accordance with this rule shall be kept strictly confidential by him and shall not be disclosed except that upon receipt of a request in writing from a member of the Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, the Comptroller General shall deliver to such member of the committee an accurate copy of the report or statement requested.

In addition to my proposed rules of disclosure, I offered two other resolutions for the Rules Committee's consideration.

1. *Moonlighting.*—The committee decided to report out a modified version of my proposal to restrict outside activities of Senate officers and full-time employees. The defect of the reported version is that it merely requires that such activities be reported to the Member of the Senate charged with supervision of the officer or employee. It does not acknowledge that some activities—such as managerial service in a business enterprise, or a regular professional or consulting practice—are of such magnitude as should be approved by the Senate itself. Nor does it define precisely which Senators should be responsible for which Senate officers and employees. My resolution, set forth below, would require specific permission to be given by a specific Senator or, in certain circumstances, by the Senate itself.

2. *Prohibited activities.*—My resolution to prohibit outright certain outside activities was defeated in committee for want of a second. But it seems clear to me that there are some business relationships—notably joint ventures with lobbyists—which are so likely to be corrupting, or to raise reasonable fears of corruption, that they should be so prohibited. I need hardly emphasize that the Baker-Reynolds relationship was just such a one, and the incentive for much of Baker's wrongdoing. My definition of "lobbyists" for the purpose of resolution would embrace not only those registered as such, but anyone engaged in advisory activities relating to the procurement of Government contracts.

The texts of the resolutions which I shall offer separately to deal with these two matters are as follows:

RULE XLII

OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT

1. No officer or employee of the Senate shall engage in any business, financial, or professional activity or employment for compensation or gain unless—

(*a*) such activity or employment is not inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his official duties; and

(*b*) express permission has been granted by the Member of the Senate charged with supervision of such officer or employee by this rule;

Provided, however, That in no event shall any officer or full-time employee of the Senate, without special leave of the Senate—

(*a*) serve in any managerial capacity in any business or financial enterprise; or

(*b*) engage in any regular professional or consulting practice, or maintain an association with any professional or consulting firm.

2. For the purposes of this rule—

(*a*) each Member of the Senate shall be charged with the supervision of each of his employees;

(*b*) each Member of the Senate who is the chairman of a Senate or joint committee or subcommittee shall be charged with the supervision of each employee of such committee or subcommittee;

(*c*) the majority leader shall be charged with the supervision of each officer and employee of the majority, and the minority leader shall be charged with the supervision of each officer and employee of the minority;

(*d*) the Vice President shall be charged with the supervision of each of his employees; and

(*e*) the President pro tempore shall be charged with the supervision of all other officers and employees of the Senate.

RULE XLIII

PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES

1. No Member of the Senate or any officer of employee of the Senate may engage or participate in any business or financial venture, enterprise, combination, or transaction with any person, firm, or corporation which is—

(*a*) engaged in any lobbying activity;

(*b*) engaged for compensation in the practice of rendering advisory or public relations services relating to the securing of contracts with the United States or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof; or

(*c*) engaged in, or seeking to become engaged in, the performance of any construction, manufacturing, research, development, or service contract with the United States or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof.

2. No Member of the Senate or any officer or employee of the Senate may accept—

(*a*) at any time from any individual, entity, or enterprise which is engaged in lobbying activity any gift of money, property, entertainment, travel, or any other valuable consideration in an amount or having a value in excess of $100; or

(*b*) within any calendar year from any such individual, entity, or enterprise such gifts in an aggregate amount or having an aggregate value in excess of $100.

3. As used in this rule the term "lobbying activity" means any activity undertaken by any person other than a Member of the Congress to influence directly or indirectly the introduction, passage, defeat, amendment, or modification of any legislative measure in either House of the Congress.

4. Nothing contained herein shall be deemed to prohibit the receipt of any bona fide campaign contribution.

I am unable to agree with any of the minority's recommendations. Two of these recommendations are substantive; the third merely provides for the application of criminal penalties for violations of the other two.

The substantive changes are far too broad, and in all probability would be unenforcible. One would forbid members, officers, and employees of the Senate from performing any professional services for compensation for any person having "an interest in any congressional legislation, or any person having any matter pending before any bureau, agency, or department of the Federal Government." To the extent that existing conflict of interest laws are inadequate to deal with problems of this nature, the disclosure rule which I have proposed should provide a more feasible deterrent to unethical practices, than the suggestion of the minority. It should be augmented, by the adoption of a prohibition against engaging in joint business ventures with lobbyists, which I have also proposed.

The other substantive change recommended by the minority, as it stands, would prohibit any Member of the Senate from seeking help from his own staff employees in connection with any matter related to the raising of campaign funds. Pending a thoroughgoing and badly needed overhaul of the system by which we have traditionally financed election campaigns—a reform which, incidentally, I have long advocated—it is most unrealistic to expect Senators to deny themselves the assistance of their staff in these political activities necessary for survival. Moreover, I can see no reason for prohibiting a Senator from making use of the services of his administrative assistant in connection with an activity which it is conceeded a Senator may properly engage in himself. I would, however, support a modified version of this recommendation which would provide that "all congressional officers and employees are prohibited by law from serving as treasurer, or temporary treasurer, of any political fund or funds. All congressional officers and employees are prohibited by law from distributing political funds."

JOSEPH S. CLARK.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in both reports, the one in 1964 and the one in 1965, I proposed to the Senate some rules of conduct which included the substance of the pending amendment. Thus, I have been on record for the amendment now pending before the Senate for almost 4 years.

The failure to call witnesses referred to by the Senator from Nebraska resulted from a vote of 6 to 3 by members of the Committee on Rules and Administration. There are on that committee today, and were then, six Democrats and three Republicans. Each vote was a strict party vote. It was the opinion of all of the Democratic members—and we could have been wrong—that we had called all the relevant witnesses who were necessary to an understanding of the case. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] was strongly of a contrary opinion.

Usually, but not always, I think he was joined by his Republican colleagues.

Under the chairmanship of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], we felt that the investigation had dragged on month after month until well over a year, and it was also reopened, and had gone as far as it should.

I am quite prepared to take equal responsibility with my five Democratic colleagues for having voted not to call the witnesses referred to by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. This goes to the amendment which has been offered in describing the immediate members of a family. On page 8, the Senator describes, in subparagraph (h), the immediate family, when used with respect to any person, includes the spouse and each minor child of such person.

The question of the spouse has already been covered most brilliantly by the minority leader.

I should now like to propound a question to the Senator from Pennsylvania——

Mr. CLARK. The Senator refers to what part of my amendment?

Mr. ALLOTT. Subparagraph (h), page 8.

Mr. CLARK. Right.

Mr. ALLOTT. With respect to requirements in the State of Oklahoma, and perhaps in some other States, it is possible and it is common practice for those engaging in business—and there is a law to that effect—that a man may file a petition to have his children emancipated. He can do that for children at

least, I know, down to the ages of 10 or 12. I happen to have represented a man down there once, who had emancipated all his children. He had quite a large family. When they are emancipated, they can do business completely and wholly in their own names. A parent cannot control or negative their actions. If they sign a deed, that is their act.

How, under these circumstances, could this particular amendment change the law of Oklahoma and require a child who had been emancipated in the State of Oklahoma to file a statement of assets with the——

Mr. CLARK. I assume the Senator from Colorado is a far greater expert on law in the State of Oklahoma than I am, but I think my friend from——

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator would accept this as a fact——

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will let me finish my——

Mr. ALLOTT. If it is wrong—I know it is not wrong—because I was in it.

Mr. CLARK. I would have to have approval of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], whom I have not consulted yet. I would therefore suggest that we could easily handle this matter by amending the bill so as to insert, on line 8 after the word "each" and before the word "minor", the word "unemancipated". Would that not cover what the Senator from Colorado has in mind?

Mr. ALLOTT. Which?

Mr. CLARK. Page 8, line 8, at the end of the line, insert the word "unemancipated" after the word "each" and before the word "minor."

Mr. ALLOTT. Well, we could amend it that way, but the real question is whether we can amend the laws of the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. CLARK. I would not think that was the question at all. It is a question of what do we have to file. The laws of the State of Oklahoma would have nothing to do with it. What do we have to file under Federal law would be the question.

Mr. CASE. If I may be permitted to engage in this learned colloquy, because we are never in the Chamber for more than 10 minutes without learning something new——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CASE. I do not think any amendment is necessary, because once a person is emancipated, under the laws like those of Oklahoma, Kentucky, and other States, he is no longer a minor. It is not our intention to invade any State jurisdiction. I would be quite content to leave it alone, which I think takes care of it.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to make the Senator from Colorado happy, and I would like to amend the amendment accordingly.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am not unhappy.

Mr. CASE. The Senator is going to vote against it, anyway.

Mr. ALLOTT. Under the definition, he is still a minor, whether the word "unemancipated" is included in the language or not.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, unless the Senator from New Jersey objects, I modify the amendment by inserting the word "unemancipated" before the word "minor" on line 8, page 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania or the Senator from New Jersey answer some questions?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I had promised the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] that I would yield him 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, my reason for opposing the Clark-Case amendment is that it is totally and completely inadequate and is so loosely drawn it is almost as full of loopholes as a minnow net.

In fact, it would provide a false security for the people and many escape hatches available to those it should cover. I wrote a six- or seven-page letter to Senator JOHN STENNIS when he was appointed chairman of this committee. I said I thought there was some merit in this disclosure proposal, but I thought it should be honest and it should apply clear across the board to all governmental officials with similar responsibilities and similar duties.

If my friend from Pennsylvania would bring in a clear-cut piece of legislation which would provide that statutory requirement for Members of the Senate and its employees and officials, and Members of the House and its employees and officials, and members of Presidential commissions, who have much more temptation than do Senators in their individual capacity for right or wrong, on decisions of much more significance, because they belong to boards of six or seven or eight, and frequently, by one single vote, can determine whether one family will make a fortune from a television station, and another family cannot even get on the air; if it were provided that these requirements would apply to all those whose policymaking decisions or whose votes are as significant as those of a Senator, and if they would apply to every Federal judge, who, by his decision, can do right or wrong—and we have had some dishonest judges—then I would be the first to join in cosponsoring that kind of reform. That would provide for disclosure by law rather than just by pious resolution and it would cover all Federal officials who should be covered if the public is to be protected rather than flimflammed.

So I am not going to be a party, by my vote, to singling out the Senate, out of all the Federal officials and employees in Washington, and say that I pick out only 99 Senators and myself as being subject to temptation.

I do not want to be a party to stigmatizing the Senate by saying we have to fall within certain prescriptions and restrictions and mandates which are not applied to the House of Representatives, which are not applied to Federal judges, and which are not applied to members of presidential agencies, boards, and commissions, but simply imply that only we ourselves are so untrustworthy, among all Federal officials and employees, that specific mandates and prohibitions should be operating against us.

I think it would tend to make us the laughing stock of the country, and rightfully so.

Somebody has said there are a lot of rich men in the Senate. Maybe there are. I do not know. Somebody has said there are a lot of poor men in the Senate. Maybe there are. I do not know. I am not curious to find out. I know nothing about the voting behavior of Members of the Senate—and I have been watching them a long time—that indicates that rich men are any better or worse or have lesser or greater ethics than poor men, or vice versa.

It seems to me what we are asked to state is that we are so suspicious of each other, so lacking in confidence in each other, that we single out the Members of the upper House and say, "You have to have these restrictions. You have to operate in this goldfish bowl." But it is not necessary for members of commissions downtown, who pass on matters amounting to many million dollars each. Sometimes it is very difficult to ascertain why one family obtained the right to operate a radio station, but another did not, or why one decision should be favorably made for one airline, while another does not get that privilege. Yet members of those commissions have to make these decisions and to exercise their personal judgments.

Mr. President, if suspicion, if skepticism, is to be the order of the day, let it apply to all those in Federal Government who hold policymaking or decisionmaking responsibilities.

Give us the same requirements for every member of a board or commission downtown, for every Member of the House of Representatives. If we really want to clean up this town, I say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, come up with a legislative proposal of that kind, and I will coauthor and support it. But I am not going to vote to stigmatize the Members of the Senate alone.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I may say to the distinguished Senator that I have an amendment which I intend to propose that expresses the sense of the Senate to do what the Senator has just expressed. It would be the sense of the Senate that it should apply to Members of the House, members of the judicial branch, and members of the executive branch.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall support it. That is an honest, comprehensive plan to do something effective and realistic, and not something that seeks self-glory for some individual who says, "I am so pure. I trust myself. But I think the rest of my colleagues are dishonest and disgraceful." I deny that, whether one is rich or poor, and I do not care to find out which category is involved for every Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey seeks recognition from the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, we have time. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Addressing myself to the Senator from South Dakota, first, I would prefer the suggestion he makes. I would ask that the Senator from South Dakota become a cosponsor of S. 1104, a bill now pending, which does precisely what he suggests, applying to all those in both Houses, and also members of the executive branch, receiving in excess of $15,000 a year.

Mr. MUNDT. Including the judiciary?

Mr. CASE. I, myself, do not include them.

Mr. MUNDT. They should be included.

Mr. CASE. The reason for that——

Mr. MUNDT. I know those who are lawyers are partial to judges, but I am not a lawyer, and I want everybody included in this plan. If judges are included, I would have no objection.

Mr. CASE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be added as a cosponsor, provided we can agree on that matter.

Mr. MUNDT. With the understanding that the judiciary is included, I would be glad to be a cosponsor. I do not agree with the lawyers who hold that judges have the morality and purity that nobody else in public life possesses.

Mr. CASE. Frankly, I have covered both this body and the other legislative body, and the executive. The standards of the judiciary have raised themselves in popular esteem. They were not always so. In some cases perhaps they are not yet. But, generally speaking, judges are above suspicion, and that is the way we should be. That is the purpose of the measure that the Senator from Pennsylvania and I are cosponsoring now.

Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair address a question to the Senator from New Jersey? He propounded a unanimous-consent request. The Chair is at a loss as to whether he still wants to propound that request or under what conditions he would do so.

Mr. CASE. The Chair is correct. I did not give the Chair an opportunity to make a ruling.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota may be permitted, after the point at which he and I are in agreement, to be a cosponsor of my bill, S. 1104.

Mr. MUNDT. I will give my answer now. If the Senator includes the judiciary, I am his partner. Otherwise I am not.

Mr. CASE. I am asking unanimous consent that the Senator may become a sponsor after we agree on that matter. I am very glad to get that support. We need support, and I am pleased to get a Republican supporter.

Now, on this point, we would prefer to have this a law and not a rule of the Senate, but this is what we are operating on.

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

Mr. CASE. We cannot, on this resolution, turn the proposition into a statute.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct. This is a resolution, and that is why I think we should not move hastily into action which is going to be regarded around the world as a stigmatization of the Members of the U.S. Senate and their ethics and morals without even approximately covering the waterfront or providing the teeth required by such disclosure provisions.

Let us meet the issue squarely by agreeing to such an amendment as the Senator from Nevada has offered, or by this new piece of statuary, this new statute the Senator from New Jersey proposes, which, I repeat, I shall be glad to cosponsor if he will add the judiciary.

I do not think any Senator ought seriously to consider voting now, in haste, on an amendment which is not very clearly understoood or interpreted, and which is full of loopholes. I guarantee that any Senator so inclined could find some brother, some uncle, or some cousin, or emancipate some child at the age of 14 and conduct any nefarious activities he pleases through that child. It is ridiculous and it would stand in the way of comprehensive, corrective, effective legislation.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I assume that the Senator is talking on somebody else's time.

Mr. MUNDT. So let us do it by legislation, as we should.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 more minute.

We do not have that chance now. We do have a chance to accomplish, in a measure, the establishment of right principles; and, as far as we are concerned, our primary responsibility is for our own conduct.

The Senator talked about stigmatization, or some such word. I believe it would be in the highest degree antistigmatic of the Senate to refuse to recognize that everyone, and I do mean everyone in this country, is looking at us, and does expect us to take action toward full disclosure of our financial and other similar interests; and when we do have a chance to do that, I think we would be mistaken not to do so.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the chairman yield me 1 minute?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield 1 minute to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I wonder whether the New Jersey judiciary raised themselves to the high level which the Senator implies by being forced to disclose their incomes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I do not hold myself out as a great legal historian, but I do know it is a fact that at one time judges were as corrupt as many people think the Senate is now.

I remember that Francis Bacon, I think when he was Lord Chief Justice of England, did not hesitate to take fees from both the wine merchants of France and the importers of England in a case in which they were opposing each other, on the general theory that if he took it from both sides, he could not possibly be prejudiced in favor of either. This is history.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senator is not answering my question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 1 minute has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. I ask the chairman for 1 more minute.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield an additional minute.

Mr. BENNETT. It is very obvious that there is no answer to my question, which was, Did the judges raise themselves to that high level by being forced to disclose their incomes, as some suggest Senators be forced to do? The answer, of course, is "No."

Mr. CASE. No. I think the answer is that over the years, because of the pressure of public opinion—and this was a self-elevation, if you will—the judges got into the habit and practice of disqualifying themselves in any case in which they had an interest, and this practice went all the way, so far that if a man had a single share or a few shares of stock in a company, and some great public action was brought against it, whether for antitrust violations, violations of the tax laws, or anything else, he would disqualify himself. I have seen that happen again and again.

When we come to the point that we will all voluntarily abide by that rule of the Senate which says that in the case of a conflict of interest on a matter upon which the Senate is called upon to vote, a Senator shall ask to be disqualified, then I will say we do not need it, that this proposed rule is a dead letter.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, may I have 1 minute to ask the distinguished chairman a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the authors of the pending amendment have answered a question by saying that there were no exemptions whatever for employees or officers. I should like to ask the chairman or the ranking minority member, in view of that answer, would they tell me what section the Chaplain comes under?

Mr. CASE. Is the Senator talking about this amendment?

Mrs. SMITH. I am talking about the resolution itself.

Mr. STENNIS. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought the question was directed to the Senator from New Jersey. I yield the Senator another minute, and ask her to repeat the question.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the authors of these pending amendments answered a question of mine by saying the amendments covered all employees and officers of the Senate, and that there were no exemptions whatever.

I have looked through the resolution, and I cannot find the Chaplain mentioned anywhere. Would the distinguished chairman please tell the Senate what section the Chaplain comes under?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the committee resolution undertakes to cover all the officers and employees of the Senate, the committees, and the staffs whose salaries are $15,000 and above, except the Chaplain. He is an officer of the Senate, technically, but we did not include him.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman advise the Senate why there should be any exemption, if we are including all officers? Did he request that he be exempted, or was this a committee action?

Mr. STENNIS. No. I yield myself 1 minute. He did not make that request. It was a matter of bowing to the cloth. That is about all I can say.

Mrs. SMITH. Well, Mr. President, if we are covering officers, while I have great respect for our present Chaplain, I think we must look to the future, and it does seem to me that there should be no exemptions whatever. I would feel obliged, at the proper time, to offer an amendment, unless the chairman of the committee can give us some better explanation than he has given.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for the second chance, but I do not think that I can take advantage of it.

I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I served as a judge for 10 years, and throughout that career, I kept telling juries about the great virtues of our U.S. system of jurisprudence. I told them that in all instances, every accused is presumed to be innocent until proof beyond a reasonable doubt, in criminal cases, is brought against him.

The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from New Jersey completely upsets that philosophy of government with respect to one segment of our population. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from New Jersey states that Members of the Senate shall be presumed to be guilty of misconduct until they have offered proof that they are innocent. I challenge anyone to throw castigation upon what I have just stated.

Ten minutes ago, I stated in the Senate that throughout my whole public career I have never collected a single nickel as a lawyer, I have never collected a single nickel as a member of a board of directors, and I have never collected a single nickel in any respect as distinguished from my salary as Governor, Mayor, Judge, and Member of the Senate.

I ask Senators by what rationalization we can put the Senate on a different basis of consideration from that on which we put the lowliest criminal in the Nation. We cannot do it and justify it. I have no hesitation about my position, but the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from New Jersey states, in effect, "Members of the Senate, you are presumed to be guilty of misconduct unless you exculpate yourselves."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have an additional minute?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not have more time to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from New Jersey yield me an additional minute?

Mr. CASE. I yield half a minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask the Senator from New Jersey: If the wife and minor children of a Member of the Senate refused to give to the Senator the details of their assets and income, what would be the situation?

Mr. CASE. If I were put in that position, my answer would be that I would file a statement to that effect with the statement about my own financial transactions and assets. I would expect that the Senate would accept it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the amendment provides that the Senator shall file such a statement.

Mr. CASE. That would be a Senate rule, and it would be up to the Senate to enforce it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator concedes that if I were to tell a junior member of my family and my wife that they must file reports, and they refused to do so, they would be within their rights?

Mr. CASE. We are not talking about that; we are talking only about Members of the Senate. That is what I would interpret the rule to require.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why would I be compelled to tell what they have done?

Mr. CASE. Because, as I have said, in similar cases, involving the Securities Act and related legislation, this is a quite common requirement and takes note of the fact that the family is generally a financial unit, and that their whole interest is what is significant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have one more question. Will the Senator yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am sorry, but I have yielded all but a few minutes of my time.

Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the committee considered this proposal with great deliberation. However, we concluded that the Senate must move along and that something must be done on part of this problem, at least. And it has been a long, laborious undertaking that covered the waterfront.

We fully considered the Clark-Case proposal, every single phase of it, by comparison and in every other way. We believe that we came up with the resolution which offers the best type of a workable plan for a respectful disclosure by a Member or an employee of the Senate.

Skipping over the things that are required to be disclosed publicly, because they are semiofficial, at least, and going to the bedrock of this plan, the Senate will have in its very bosom a copy of a sworn income tax return prepared under all of the solemnity and requirements of law soon after the events occur. That information will be available for years and years for the purpose of any inquiry or consideration. It will be wrapped up in the best possible protection for the individual involved, be he an employee or a Senator.

Four out of six committee members recorded votes in favor of this procedure. There is then a chance to be heard before anything can be used against a person involved. So we believe that wrapped up in this procedure is something that is respectful to the individual, is a protection for the public if it needs it, and is a protection for the Senate if it needs it.

There is a practical way to get to the information at any time and see what the story is and search out what the leads are and the facts, if any, which are even suggested to be irregular.

That is the plan we believe after our deliberations to be the best in our judgment.

It is proposed here that we strip that section out of the proposal that is the bedrock on which many of the other proposals rest because they are interwound and intertwined around and together.

If we eliminate this section tonight, we would literally strip the entire resolution of the things that count and make it have meaning. It would mean that there would have to be a totally new start.

The Senate has had the Clark-Case proposal before it several times before and it has always refused to agree to it, even when there was no alternate proposal worked out. This time we have on the desk not only their proposal—and I speak with great deference to them—but also the plan that I have already referred to. And it is a workable, going concern, already on its way.

Defeat the pending amendment and I think that on tomorrow there will be a good chance to work on some of these other amendments. Some of them will be agreed to. Maybe some others will be modified. However, at any rate there will be a full chance for the Senate to make a judgment on the matter and write its decision in this resolution.

If we agree to the pending amendment, in my judgment the resolution would be left in a shambles. Nothing could come out of this matter any time soon.

We are not any wiser than any one else here. Of course not. However, in trying to patch together something that was fairly acceptable and workable and had substance in it, we have spent a great deal of time.

I know that everyone acts in good faith and makes every point in good faith. However, if we want to go forward, I think the committee has furnished the means by which to do so.

I do not like to use names, but I think that the Senate was hurt terribly by things that have happened right here in this Chamber by the acts of one of its officers a few years ago. Not enough was done about it. I am as guilty as anyone else, but I think we must move forward, and I think this is the only vehicle subject to further amendment that is ready and on the move.

If we tear this provision out of the resolution and replace it with the Clark proposal, there would not be enough left to travel on. It would be a dead duck, and a new start would be necessary.

For those reasons, and for the purpose of giving the Senate a further chance to work on a matter of substance here and modify it, as has already been suggested, with a good deal of merit in some of the amendments, I think I appeal now, let

us get down to action on something that counts and is pending before us, and let us move forward.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes and reserve the remaining 2 minutes for the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I, too, want to move forward. I share the views of the Senator from Mississippi. However, the way in which to move forward is to agree to the pending amendment, and not move backward by taking the committee proposal.

Nobody is clipping anything out of the resolution. Nothing could be further from the truth. The pending amendment strengthens the resolution and makes it a better resolution. It moves it forward faster than the committee would want to go.

I hope that the pending amendment will be agreed to.

After all this debate, some of which has been a little unseemly, some of which has been a little intolerant, some of which has not been in the best traditions of the Senate, we come in the end to a simple question of whether it is wiser to require public disclosure of assets or have a private disclosure of assets.

The Senator from New Jersey and those of us who support the pending amendment hope that the Senate will move forward and strengthen the proposal of the committee and agree to the pending amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oklahoma. I did not know he was in the Chamber.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 1 additional minute allowed for each side.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we are now to the point of voting whether we accept an informal, hodgepodge report, which is loosely and not carefully drafted, as the basis for our financial report, or whether we accept the sworn statement of the Federal income tax report, in the hands of the Senate's Committee on Standards and Conduct, as the basis for evaluating the financial returns. The one would be public, an informal report, and the other would be a report which the committee would have, the committee serving the Senate, a sworn statement upon which penitentiary penalties would be involved if anyone had misdeclared anything shown on that form.

Mr. CASE. With the Senator from Pennsylvania, my cosponsor, I wish to express the warmest appreciation of the service rendered by the committee—its chairman and all its members. However, I also wish to say that I am sure that within the committee this was a matter, as they have said themselves, which came up again and again and which worried them.

I believe that the only trouble with the committee's action is that they stopped worrying at the wrong time; and if they had done their stopping at a time when they were affirmatively in favor of disclosure, they would have made a far greater contribution than the great contribution they already have made.

The public will not be satisfied with this, Mr. President, and the Senate should not be, either.

I yield the floor.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CASE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. CASE. If the yeas and nays are ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been been ordered.

Mr. CASE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for one-half minute:

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this will be the last rollcall vote tonight, in addition to being the only rollcall vote today.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in an adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator reserve that request? Under those circumstances, would the Senator move that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to meet tomorrow?

Mr. DIRKSEN: No, I would have to object.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Reserving the right to object, we do have the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations trying to proceed with the riot hearings. We have witnesses from Detroit. We were not permitted to meet this afternoon. We, of course, would be glad to conform to the will of the Senate. I should like to have permission for the committee to meet and proceed with its business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 266) to provide standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 44, as follows:

[No. 68 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Aiken	Dodd	Magnuson
Bayh	Gore	McGee
Bible	Griffin	McGovern
Boggs	Hart	Miller
Brewster	Hartke	Mondale
Brooke	Hatfield	Moss
Burdick	Hollings	Muskie
Case	Jackson	Nelson
Clark	Javits	Proxmire
Cooper	Kennedy, Mass.	Ribicoff
Cotton	Kennedy, N.Y.	Scott

Spong	Williams, N.J.	Young, Ohio
Symington	Williams, Del.	
Tydings	Yarborough	

NAYS—44

Allott	Fong	Montoya
Anderson	Fulbright	Mundt
Baker	Gruening	Murphy
Bartlett	Hansen	Pearson
Bennett	Hayden	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Randolph
Cannon	Hruska	Smathers
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Smith
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Sparkman
Dirksen	Lausche	Stennis
Dominick	Long, La.	Talmadge
Eastland	McClellan	Thurmond
Ellender	Metcalf	Tower
Fannin	Monroney	

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Mansfield, against.

NOT VOTING—15

Church	Kuchel	Morton
Ervin	Long, Mo.	Pastore
Harris	McCarthy	Percy
Holland	McIntyre	Russell
Inouye	Morse	Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. CLARK's modified amendment (No. 623) was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

DESIGNATION OF THE SECOND WEEK OF MAY OF EACH YEAR AS "NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL WEEK"

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on Senate Joint Resolution 72.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 72) to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week," which were, on page 2, line 3, strike out "each year" and insert "1968."

Strike out the preamble.

And amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of 1968 as 'National School Safety Patrol Week'."

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

The motion was agreed to.

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 266) to provide standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 640

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I intend to propose an amendment to the pending resolution; but first I want to express my gratitude to members of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct for the attention and devotion they have given to their work through many difficult months. The Senate and the Nation should be proud of this committee.

In this spirit of appreciation, Mr. President, I believe sincerely that rule 41, as proposed, can be improved by amendment. As recommended by the committee, this rule would impose certain duties and responsibilities upon officers and employees of the Senate and upon those designated as their "supervisors." These duties would be imposed to guard against improper "outside business, financial, or professional activities or employment by officers or employees" of the Senate.

Under the proposal, each Senator and the Vice President would be designated as the "supervisors" of employees in their respective offices. I fully accept this responsibility for the employees in my office—because I must share responsibility for their activities regardless of whether rule 41 is added to the Standing Rules of the Senate. But, Mr. President, the proposed rule means that there may be as many as 101 standards of propriety respecting the activities of employees in the offices of 100 Senators and one Vice President. With no disrespect for the committee, Mr. President, this reminds me of a current TV commercial which describes an extra long cigarette as one "silly millimeter longer—101."

I accept this prospect of 101 standards of propriety, because I would not expect someone else to judge my office employees; and I am sure that other Senators and the Vice President feel the same way. Employees of committees and subcommittees, however, present a different problem. I am the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I do not personally select the employees of this committee, and I have frequent personal contact with only a few of them. The proposed rule would make me "supervisor" of committee employees and require me to permit or refuse to permit, by my own standard, outside activities of a scope and variety which may be very large indeed. If I had the time to devote to such a project, I could probably devise a system for and somehow arrange my time to accommodate an orderly discharge of this responsibility—but I have not the time and I am not sure it would be worth the trouble in any event.

According to the Senate telephone directory there are 46 committees and subcommittees having employees to be "supervised" by their chairmen. Thus, Mr. President, there may be as many as 46 different standards of propriety to govern the activities of these employees. Moreover, many of these committees and subcommittees have employees designated as minority staff director, or minority staff member, or minority consultant, or minority counsel, or assistant minority counsel, or minority clerk, or secretary for minority, or minority research assistant, or minority clerical assistant. Although none of the 30 employees of the Foreign Relations Committee are so designated, I assume that employees of other committees who have such titles were not selected by, and are not supervised by, the chairmen of the committees or subcommittees which employ them. Thus, there may be many more de facto "supervisors" of committee employees—thereby increasing the number of standards of propriety governing the activities of Senate employees.

In addition, Mr. President, the telephone directory lists nine joint committees which have staffs of employees. From time to time these employees may serve under the chairmanship of Members of the House of Representatives. The special situations of such employees may have been considered by the committee, but, unless I have overlooked it, they are not mentioned in the committee report. If, at times, such employees are receiving salaries "paid by the Senate" and are serving under the chairmanship of a Member of the House, I wonder whether the Standing Rules of the Senate properly may impose duties upon such a chairman. If not, I wonder whether proposed rule 41 excludes employees of joint committees.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I offer an amendment to proposed rule 41. I suggest that employees of Senate committees and subcommittees be subjected to the "supervision" of the Secretary of the Senate for the purposes of rule 41. The Secretary could promulgate a single procedure for requesting and receiving permission for outside activities, and he could apply a single standard for granting such permission. In doubtful cases, the Secretary could consult with the Member of the Senate to whom the employee reports or for whom he performs his duties. This Member of the Senate should be expected to take responsibility for final judgment regarding the propriety of the employee's activities, and should express this judgment in writing to the Secretary. My amendment does not address the special situations of employees of joint committees.

I raise this issue and offer this amendment in the hope that the Senate will recognize, first, the need to centralize some of the administrative burden embodied in rule 41; second, the need to minimize the number of standards of propriety which would otherwise be possible; and, third, the need to fix responsibility for approval of the few cases where outside activity might be construed to be "inconsistent with the conscientious performance of an employee's official duties."

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill, and I ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

CURRENT U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, members of the faculty and student body at Whitman College, in Walla Walla, Wash., have prepared a statement on the current U.S. policy in Vietnam. The petition was signed by 46 percent of the faculty and by 28½ percent of the students.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

A STATEMENT ON VIETNAM BY MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY AND OF THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF WHITMAN COLLEGE, MARCH 11, 1968

The Declaration of Independence affirms that the rights and responsibilities of gov-

ernment belong ultimately to the people, and the Constitution assures the people the liberty to engage in free and open discussion of national policy and purpose as well as of exercising their franchise in the polling booth. We believe that our obligation as citizens to exercise these rights and responsibilities demands that we now publicly express our non-concurrence with the present policy or our government in Vietnam.

We respect the spirit of patriotism, the courage, and the personal sacrifice displayed by the men of our Armed Forces; but we question whether our government is either wise or just in asking the nation's young men to lay down their lives in pursuit of its policy in Vietnam.

Some of us think that our government has misread the nature of the struggle among the Vietnamese.

Some of us regard the massive intervention of American troops as politically indefensible.

Some of us think that our involvement in Vietnam is both morally and legally indefensible.

Some of us think that we are not defending the freedom of the South Vietnamese, but imposing on them a military dictatorship.

Some of us think that the war has become so destructive, has caused intense suffering for so many, as greatly to discount the value of "victory" for either side.

Some of us believe that our present preoccupation in Vietnam is seriously limiting our ability to address the problems of our own society.

Some of us believe that in the process of waging this war we are corrupting ourselves—experiencing a tearing of conscience, an erosion of pride in our country, profound doubts about our sense of justice and humanity, the alienation of many of the nation's youth.

Some of us would prefer not to affirm all of these statements, but all of us concur in the desire to express our disapproval of the course our nation is pursuing in Vietnam and to call upon our President and the Congress to take new and determined initiatives toward a negotiated settlement of the Vietnam conflict. We recognize that the National Liberation Front and the government of North Vietnam share responsibility with us for the tragedy of this war; but we believe that our first responsibility as American citizens is to call upon our own government to take initiatives toward peace.

To this end we ask our government to cease bombing North Vietnam as a demonstration of American desire for a negotiated settlement; and to acknowledge that the National Liberation Front is representative of a significant segment of the South Vietnamese people and therefore has a legitimate claim to participation in peace talks and in the formation of a Vietnamese government.

We wish to emphasize our belief that such initiatives would be in the best interests not only of both North and South Vietnam but of own country as well.

Neither "peace at any price" nor "victory at any price" can be the motto of a people pledged to liberty and justice for all. In the name of such liberty and for the sake of such justice our forefathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor. It is not too much that we should sign our names.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, just recently, Chairman Ray Randall, of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, forwarded to all insured commercial banks detailed tables summarizing their 1967 operating results. Chairman Randall stated that the information being returned to the banks is part of the program of the FDIC to provide banks, bank supervisors, and others with more meaningful and useful data based on reports submitted to the Federal bank's supervisory agencies.

The American banker in an editorial on March 14 commended the FDIC for its action. The editorial pointed out:

The new system of information makes it possible for the management of all banks to operate in much more certain knowledge of what the other fellows are doing. What they do with that knowledge henceforward will be a better test of their skill.

The significance of FDIC's contribution is that it establishes a more rational frame of reference for the decisions of all bankers—and that is a fine thing for the industry, and for the whole society which it serves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SCORECARD FOR PERFORMANCE

A parallel channel to feed information out, as well as gather information in, has been installed by the one Federal agency that deals specifically with all the commercial banks in the country. The potentials are enormous, and at this point can only be guessed at.

"Banks will know more about themselves and the system now than at any time in the history of banking," asserted K. A. Randall, chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corp., at the news conference where the announcement was made. The new system for dispersal of knowledge is a regular report to every bank on its own performance, broken down in considerable detail, along with comparison data showing how the competition performed in the same state and in the same area.

While the reports will not go so far as to match up individual institutions on the same score card, they will make possible—indeed, inevitable—comparisons which can be powerful spurs to competition, and thereby powerful incentives to better service.

The scoring of performance is made possible by advances in computer technology, and in the FDIC's capacity to handle them; the data are drawn from the vast flow of information which banks have been providing the agency ever since it was founded, as the basis for their insurance. Essentially, the new system amounts to combining and repackaging of available information and its distribution to the local areas where it will be most relevant.

Each of the 14,000 banks insured by the FDIC will get a set of tables twice a year. They will include data on the individual bank's own performance, and comparative data on typical performance by other banks of comparable size in the same state, and even in the area within the state where that bank does most of its business.

There will be six tables sent to each bank—five of them containing detailed operating information on typical banks in the state and area, broken down into dollar amounts, ratio scales, and percentage changes, and one "personalized" table giving the same percentages and ratios of the particular bank getting that package of information.

FDIC insists that "there is no presumption that the ratios shown in the table represent either 'good' or 'bad' performance." And it observes in the same note accompanying the new tables that "there can be a number of reasons why your bank's operating results may differ from the average," and that for some banks the fact that the data on the sampling date "may not be typical for the rest of the year should be taken into account in interpreting the resulting ratios."

But it also states that "in spite of these qualifications, we believe that such comparisons may be a useful starting point in a bank's review of its operations and performance."

Indeed it will. And in spite of FDIC's warning, "Caution, Handle with Care," the new data are bound to set off chain reactions in many banks.

The norms will be there for instant reference, like par on a golf course, and departures from them will be obvious. Many, of course, will be susceptible to rational explanation; but the point is that it will be easy for management to spot those departures, and call for those explanations. Some may seek to outperform the averages in one sector or another; others may use the new information as a guide to trends, and deliberately choose to buck them or avoid them.

The new system of information makes it possible for the management of all banks to operate in much more certain knowledge of what the other fellows are doing. What they do with that knowledge henceforward will be a better test of their skill.

The significance of FDIC's contribution is that it establishes a more rational frame of reference for the decisions of all bankers—and that is a fine thing for the industry, and for the whole society which it serves.

OUTFOXING THE ARMY: HOW DRAFTEES SCHEME TO SKIP VIETNAM DUTY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there is published in the Wall Street Journal of today an article entitled "Outfoxing the Army: How Draftees Scheme To Skip Vietnam Duty." The article is worthy of the attention of Senators and the Department of Defense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

OUTFOXING THE ARMY: HOW DRAFTEES SCHEME TO SKIP VIETNAM DUTY—THEIR PLOYS CONFUSE SYSTEM, KEEP THEM STATESIDE WHILE ARMY TRIES TO UNRAVEL DOINGS

A happy soldier is Pfc. Jack S. On a recent leave, his spleen was removed by a Chicago surgeon. Since the spleen would replace red blood cells if Jack ever got malaria, Army medics have assured him that its absence means he will never be sent to Vietnam.

There was nothing wrong with the spleen, a generally useless organ. The soldier was merely gambling—correctly, it seems—that its removal would guarantee that he would never go to Vietnam. The surgery was performed for a small fee by a doctor who opposes the war. He sent the bills for "emergency surgery" to the Army.

Not many young men would go as far as Jack did to avoid Vietnam, but soldiers increasingly are devising other exotic schemes to spend their two years' service in stateside posts. While ways to avoid the draft—like moving to Canada or feigning homosexuality—are more publicized, they tend to get a young man in trouble or to stigmatize him. But simply being drafted and then working to stay out of Vietnam seldom has legal or social ramifications—though some might question the morality of ducking combat duty.

Although military officials say they can't estimate how many soldiers are using their wits to avoid combat duty, the practice apparently is widespread. "Give me a guy with a college degree, a fast tongue and a poker face, and it's better than fifty-fifty I'll find a way for him never to go," says a personnel specialist at one base.

SEARCHING FOR AN ORPHAN

The ploys are many and varied. Perhaps the ultimate one was developed by a draftee

from Festus, Mo. The plan: Find an orphan in the Army who wants to go to Vietnam and have your parents adopt him. Army regulations say that only one member of a family can be in Vietnam at a time (unless the others volunteer), so the natural son wouldn't have to go. That scheme hasn't been tried yet, but several others have. These include:

The Christian Science Ploy. A 23-year-old Virginian received Vietnam orders and was told to report for pre-shipment inoculations. When he announced he had been converted to Christian Science and refused to take either shots or pills, he was waved away by frustrated doctors.

The Crazy Letter Ploy. A corporal from Brooklyn wrote letters to Sen. Robert Kennedy and Sen. Jacob Javits, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, his Congressman and several other prominent officials, claiming he preferred suicide to Vietnam and pointing out the effects of his death on his mother. Two weeks later a Senatorial aide notified him his Vietnam orders had been canceled.

The Card-Burning Ploy. A basic trainee faked a picture of himself burning a draft card on the Berkeley campus and sent it to his commanding general with an anonymous note. A security check was ordered, and the soldier's two years were drawing peacefully to a close by the time the dust had settled.

The LSD Ploy. A glib Clevelander strolled into his post psychiatrist's office, claiming numerous LSD experiences had unbalanced his mind. Regular visits thereafter assured his stay at a Midwestern post.

THE DISAPPEARING ACT

There are others. One lad tried to remove every trace of himself from Army records—at his own post, at the Pentagon, at the Army computer center in Indiana—but he was caught when he was on the verge of success. A Fort Dix soldier applied simultaneously for a commission and a hardship discharge; it so confused things that he was kept right at Dix—where he wanted to be.

Confusion is the key to nearly every ploy. Army regulations are voluminous, and if your records get fouled up, you're in the clear.

Company clerks at Fort Benning, Ga., estimate that a sixth of the college graduates in their companies wriggle out of their Vietnam orders. The college graduate qualification is significant. These are the soldiers who are most likely to hold an administrative job, which is the best place to throw a monkey wrench into the works. Also, these men generally have the intelligence and poise to carry off a ploy.

"I can't wait until they start drafting grad students," says one Stanford graduate who loves to fight the Army, "and the whole Army is filled with people like us."

The Army is already filled with draftees; that's one reason the Vietnam-dodging works. Almost every successful ploy is based on paperwork: The reams of directives, reports and applications that define, grant and deny Vietnam eligibility. Not only are the clerks who handle these papers draftees, but their supervisors also are generally draftees or two-year-only lieutenants who occasionally are willing to look the other way.

Veteran Vietnam-dodgers assert the ponderous Army bureaucracy is easy to outfox. Arcane notations typed on a morning report by a cooperative clerk can grant overseas immunity, the code "7/2," for instance, means that a soldier is ineligible for overseas duty for various reasons. Not even a conscientious scrutiny could easily track down such fiddling with records.

For most soldiers, the crucial consideration is the margin between the time they have left in the Army and the 180-day minimum Vietnam tour. An effective ploy should fill as much of that period as possible.

Also, the Army doesn't like to send a man to Vietnam even if he has 180 days left if there is a chance it will have to bring him back right away. Soldiers capitalize on this by applying for special training important enough to keep the Army from shipping them overseas. Thus, an application for flight school can keep a man stateside up to 10 months waiting for his class to begin, at which time he "changes his mind" about wanting to attend.

The new ploys are being tried because the older, less sophisticated ones don't work any more. Asthma, bad backs, bad eyes and flat feet won't budge an Army doctor. A sergeant who shot himself in the leg is now recovered and on his way to Vietnam. Already there: A Pfc. who took every pill he could find before staggering into the overseas replacement depot at Oakland. Medics simply pumped his stomach and pointed him toward Vietnam.

Bribery also is out. Personnel clerks who will risk court-martial to help a friend of a friend disdain financial offers. Going over the hill won't help either. When he returns, the AWOL soldier is often dismayed to find he is sent to the front instead of the stockade.

Friendships are important in the modern-day ploy. It sometimes helps if a friendly clerk will alter dates on various forms for you. And it helps to know in advance that people in your specialty are about to be called to Vietnam; forewarned is forearmed, and you can change your job classification—say, from supply clerk to truck driver.

Why do the draftees plot their ploys? Most admit that fear of being killed or wounded or unwillingness to leave a comfortable situation are more important than pure political opposition to the war. But there is also an element of revenge.

"They forced me to join the Army," explains a Missouri youth now at Fort Knox, "and they can make me do anything they want. Now, I'm causing a little trouble for them."

THE GOLD CRISIS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Wall Street Journal of today the lead editorial entitled "Prodded by Disaster" puts the finger squarely on the problem with respect to our economic and gold crisis, which is only temporarily out of our system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

PRODDED BY DISASTER

The gold crisis provides another telling example of the type of leadership the nation has come to expect from the Johnson Administration. It proved incapable of seriously attacking the problem until things got so bad an American businessman in Europe found he couldn't cash dollars to buy dinner.

The gold drain, after all, didn't start last week. It has been going on some time now. The actual importance of the problem, now so clear to nearly everyone, contrasts sharply with the low priority assigned to it for many years. Only when total collapse threatened did the Administration accept—if indeed it really has now—the need for painful domestic and international measures to protect the dollar.

To be specific, take the Administration's attitude toward the budget cuts Congress has quite sensibly set as a price for the President's tax increase bill. The week before last, the Administration was stoutly insisting that reductions of any magnitude were impossible. By the end of last week's run on gold, it started talking of appropriations cuts of $8 billion to $9 billion, which would translate into considerably smaller spending cuts in the coming fiscal year. President Johnson proclaimed that "some desirable programs of lesser priority and urgency are going to have to be deferred."

That, though the President naturally didn't say so, is what Representative Wilbur Mills and other key Congressmen have been telling him all along. They have observed that since spending demands on Government are roughly infinite, few things are so permanent as a temporary tax. Thus the leader who says a tax increase is necessary must also present an austere budget.

The Administration's response had consisted of denying the obvious by pleading a bare-bones budget. Subsidies for the supersonic transport, for instance, were increased only to $350 million in fiscal 1969 from $100 million in the current year. If that represents the Administration's notion of austerity in subsidizing business, imagine its standards of austerity concerning the social experiments of which it is so proud.

That particular foolishness may or may not be over, but the Administration's leadership problems are not. The legacy of its past talk even now saps its power to shape events. Despite the crisis, Congressional approval of a budget cut and tax increase package will not come easily. Mr. Mills, for one, is doubtful the newly proposed cuts are enough. Congress has already heard enough talk about austerity; this time it will want to see the color of the money involved.

The most serious mark against the Administration's leadership in the gold crisis, finally, is that everything was so utterly predictable. Ever since the British were forced to devalue the pound, certainly, there have been recurring threats and warnings about a speculative attack on the dollar-gold relationship.

The remedy has been equally clear: Getting the Federal budget closer to balance and clamping down on the wildly inflationary policies of the Federal Reserve Board. If the Administration had at the turn of the year proposed the spending cuts it now endorses, perhaps the crisis would never even have developed. Now that it is in full bloom, though, those same steps may not prove enough.

A single instance of such temporizing leadership is deplorable enough, but with this Administration it seems to have become a habit. Thus the whole record of its Vietnamese war is that of policy being shaped only by response to one crisis after another. In its general economic management, it rebuffed warnings of serious inflation even from the "new economists" until after the warnings had proved all too accurate.

In light of that record, it came as little surprise Monday that our Mr. Janssen reported that many within the Administration saw a "silver lining" in the gold crisis. They are thankful the crisis has arrived, because now it finally may be possible to do what should have been done all along.

That may be a silver lining, but it is also a sickening indictment of their own collective leadership. This Administration, it once again seems, can take the initiative only when prodded by impending disaster.

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 266) to provide standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 632

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 632 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

Beginning with the word "All" in line 9, page 7, strike out all to and including the period in line 16, page 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Except as otherwise provided by this section, all papers filed under section 1 of this rule shall be kept by the Comptroller General for not less than seven years, and while so kept shall remain sealed. Upon receipt of a resolution of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, adopted by a recorded majority vote of the full committee, requesting the transmission to the committee of any of the reports filed by any individual under section 1 of this rule, the Comptroller General shall transmit to the committee the envelopes containing such reports. When any sealed envelope containing any such report is received by the committee, such envelope may be opened and the contents thereof may be examined only by members of the committee in executive session. If, upon such examination, the committee determines that further action by the committee is warranted and is within the jurisdiction of the committee, it may make the contents of any such envelope available for any use by any member of the committee, or any member of the staff of the committee, which is required for the discharge of his official duties."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there is no desire on the part of other Senators to make statements at this time, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 21, 1968, at 12 meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Passing of Msgr. Francis Kowalczyk

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of this country's finest statesmen, a patriot, and most revered churchman has passed away. I am sure that others in this body, including the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON], share with me the sorrow which comes from the untimely death of my warm friend the Right Reverend Monsignor Francis Kowalczyk. We shall mourn his departure not only because of the great personal loss of a longtime friend, but because of his great leadership and personal participation in countless patriotic and civic programs.

Monsignor Kowalczyk was born September 24, 1896, in Passaic, N.J., of parents who had come from the mountainous areas of Poland to establish their home in this country. Young Francis was not only given an American education, but he was constantly impressed at home with the responsibilities of good citizenship as an American and reminded of his rich Polish heritage.

He was graduated from St. Mary's College in Orchard Lake, Mich., in 1916 and from Immaculate Conception Seminary in South Orange, N.J., from which he earned his bachelor's and master's degrees. He was ordained as a priest on June 10, 1922. From this time until his death on March 8, a period of more than two score years, his life was devoted to his church, his country, and his people. He was particularly active in the interests and programs of American Polonia.

During those dark years when Hitler and his savage Nazis were subjecting the innocent people of Poland to such cruelties and privations, Father Kowalczyk devoted himself to aiding and protecting the thousands of Polish refugees escaping from the Nazis. Later he worked fervently with equal zeal to helping the refugees escaping from the same type of cruel subjugation by the Communists. For this great humanitarian work in behalf of the people of his parents' homeland, he was twice decorated by the Polish Government in exile in London.

Those of us who have labored over the years for improved immigration laws have all been grateful to Monsignor Kowalczyk and the American Polish Immigration and Relief Committee of which he was president, for continued support given us year after year.

The honors which this distinguished churchman received and the offices which he held are in themselves a glorious testimony of his consecrated service and his dedicated purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to but a few of the items which indicate the magnitude of this fine man's contribution to his fellowmen:

On September 13, 1954, he was made domestic prelate of the Pope and on July 29, 1955, he was appointed apostolic pronotary.

He served as chief consultant of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Paterson, N.J. His interest in the veterans of Polish birth and parentage was manifested in his long service as chaplain of the Polish-American Association and chaplain of the New Jersey organization the Sons of Poland.

Because of his years of civic service in Polish-American organizations he was honored by being elected grand marshal of the annual New York Pulaski Day parade in 1961.

I shall miss my longtime friend whose advice and assistance have been of greatest value over many years. I shall always honor his memory and value the help he has given me. This is one great American whose deeds will long be remembered and cherished by his many benefactors who survive him.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are many in this body who will want to join me in expressing our sympathy and extending our best wishes to Monsignor Kowalczyk's sisters in their sorrow.

A Year of Growth for Wyoming

HON. CLIFFORD P. HANSEN

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, 1967 was a year of economic growth for Wyoming. It was not a "boom year," but rather a year of solid and broad-based growth which will fuel future expansion.

It was only a relatively few years ago that we in Wyoming realized that we would have to work in a coordinated way at the State level to assure our future development. The year 1967 displayed some of the first fruits of that all-Wyoming effort.

A central role is reserved in Wyoming's economic development for the Wyoming Natural Resources Board. To date, the board's work in gathering data, coordinating plans for balanced growth, and getting the right people together at the right place and time has been well executed. Thus a sound future is assured in Wyoming.

I ask unanimous consent that the Wyoming Natural Resources Board's summary of 1967 economic activity in Wyoming be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A YEAR OF GROWTH FOR WYOMING, 1967

A careful study of the growth and development of Wyoming's economy during 1967 shows increased mineral production and exploration, expansion of companies operating within the state, entry of new companies onto the Wyoming scene and increased promotion of the state's natural resources added up to a favorable picture for the state in the last 12 months.

Mineral production in the state, according to the U.S. Bureau of Mines, reached an all-time high of $530.8-million in 1967, an increase of $6.4-million over 1966.

Wyoming is currently ranked 12th in the nation in over-all mineral production, first in the production of trona and bentonite, second in uranium and fifth in petroleum.

The oil and gas industry maintained its position of several years as the largest industry in the state. A total of 135,580,000 barrels of crude oil, according to the Federal Government reports, were produced in Wyoming in 1967. Total gross valuation of this crude oil was $349,796,000.

Natural Gas Production in 1967 was 254-million MCF, with a valuation of $37,592,000.

The state's oil industry experienced considerable growth during the year as a result of activity in the Northern Powder River Basin, discovery of the Recluse field and extension of the Kitty field.

ENTIRE STATE SHARES IN GROWTH

All sections of the state experienced growth during 1967. A recap of the major economic

developments in Wyoming during the year shows that Southwestern Wyoming now has four companies.

FMC, Stauffer, Allied Chemical and Texas Gulf Sulfur—either engaged in the production of trona for soda ash or in the process of constructing trona mine and refining facilities.

Also, the first "second generation" manufacturer in the trona field—Church and Dwight, makers of bicarbonate of soda, is currently constructing a plant which will open in late 1968.

The Southwest region of the state also benefited from the location of a plastics firm—B & H Plastics, in Evanston, Utah Power and Light's continued construction of a $33-million steam-electric generating unit which will be completed in 1971, coke shipments from FMC's Kemmerer plant to Indiana steel mills, and a $500,000 expansion of the Star Valley Lumber Company's mill at Afton.

The Northwest area of the state saw the Georgia-Pacific Corporation begin production of gypsum wallboard in November east of Lovell and the American Colloid Corporation expand production at its bentonite plant, also at Lovell.

In addition, Teton Studs, a division of U.S. Plywood, expanded operations at Dubois, the Dowell Division of the Dow Chemical Company installed oil-well servicing facilities at Powell, the Big Horn Canning Company expanded facilities at Cowley, and the Wyoming Pure seed growers completed construction of a fertilizer blending plant at Worland.

In the Northeast section of the state, International Minerals & Chemical Corporation (IMC) began production at their new $1-million bentonite processing plant at Colony in mid-1967, Black Hills Power and Light Company announced the construction of a $5-million addition to their generating plant east of Gillette, and the Sheridan Flouring Mills completed a $500,000 improvement program to meet increased product demands.

Wyoming's Southeast region experienced growth in a number of areas during 1967. Husky Oil & Refining Company announced a 50,000 barrel refinery to be constructed at Cheyenne and Petromics Co. completed a $1.5-million modernization program at the firm's facilities in Shriley Basin. Precision Millwork, Inc. also began production of wood moldings in Laramie and Benham Precast Company, the state's only pre-cast cement building component manufacturing company, occupied a new 10,000 square foot plant in Cheyenne.

The field of education also saw two important developments. Cannon Aeronautical Center, a school for the training of mechanics in all phases of aviation, announced its location in Cheyenne and plans to construct $1-million in facilities and the Wyoming Technical Institute doubled its facilities to allow a 100 per cent increase in staff and enrollment in August, 1967.

Two existing Cheyenne companies, Dynalectron Corporation and Ideal-Aerosmith, also announced expansion programs during the past year which boosted production and employment.

The Central section was one of the busiest areas of the state during 1967.

Banner Homes Corporation opened a new mobile home plant in Casper in the Summer of 1967, and United Structures began production of prebuilt homes in Riverton in the early part of the year.

Pacific Power & Light Company continued its expansion of the Dave Johnston steam-electric generating plant by announcing a fourth unit to cost $44-million which will be in service in 1972.

Uranium continued to play an important role in the growth of the central region of the state as both Western Nuclear, Inc., and Utah Construction Company announced sharply rising sales of uranium concentrate to private companies and utilities. Western Nuclear also purchased two sulfuric acid plants previously owned by Susquehanna-Western, Inc., and began construction of a new sulfur extraction plant near Riverton.

One of the most important economic announcements during the past year was the location of DATEL, Inc., a manufacturer of data terminal and communication devices, in Riverton in September. The company's Wyoming production and research facility will employ 450 men and women when it reaches full production in 1969. The firm is currently moving into its new 40,000 square foot plant in the technical research park of the Central Wyoming College in Riverton.

COAL, BENTONITE, URANIUM OUTPUT UP

Wyoming coal-production in 1967 totaled 3,750,000 tons, an increase of two per cent over the previous year, according to preliminary estimates.

Bentonite output also showed a sizeable increase as production rose from 1,559,000 tons in 1966 to 1,640,000 tons in 1967.

Value of bentonite produced in 1967 was $16,056,000, according to the Bureau of Mines.

The past year was the largest year for uranium exploration in Wyoming's history. During the 12 months of 1967, more than 27,000 claims were filed in two counties of the state. Production of Uranium (recoverable content U308) in 1967 was 4,545,000 pounds, with a valuation of $36,358,000.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENTS ACTIVITIES INCREASED

In addition to the formation of the Wyoming Industrial Development Corporation to provide venture capital for Wyoming industry, several projects were instituted to assist local industry in expansion and to attract industry to locate within the state.

One of the most important programs of this type was a series of regional meetings with regional business leaders instituted by the Wyoming Natural Resources Board and other state agencies, which was initiated in late 1967 in New Orleans and will be continued in 1968 in New York City and other metropolitan areas.

PLANNING COORDINATORS NAMED

During 1967, the NRB was designated state planning coordinator for HUD, the Federal housing and urban development agency. Following this appointment, an application for a planning grant was made and preliminary steps were taken to create such a plant. The Natural Resource Board was also named state coordinator for the Farmers Home Administration water and sewer planning programs during the year.

Anti-Semitism in Poland

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, during the past week, anti-Semitism, in its more virulent forms, reared its ugly head in Poland. This is indeed tragic for the remnants, consisting of barely 30,000 souls, of what had once been a thriving Jewish community in Poland of more than 3 million people.

Persecution of the Jewish people for all manner of reasons finds its roots in the earliest periods of recorded history. Indeed few, who are Jewish, have ever escaped the searing indignities of bigotry and prejudice.

What is deeply tragic about the rise of anti-Semitism in Poland is not so much the fate of its Jewish community but its tragic consequences for Poland and the Polish people.

In the atheistic, communistic State of Poland, persecution of the Jews means also persecution of the Catholics; repression of the Jews means also repression of the intellectuals; oppression of the Jews is the moral equivalent of oppression of the whole of the Polish people.

It is indeed striking that cries of anti-Semitism in Poland constitute an official response to student demands for freedom of speech, for freedom of press, in the Universities in Warsaw, in Cracow, and in other parts of Poland. This is the response of oppression and repression to student demands of their fundamental rights as human beings.

The students in Poland, like those in the United States, Rome, and in other quarters of the earth are engaged in protest against the iniquities and inequities of a world they never made; against conventions which have stifled idealism in the interests of materialism; where dedication to the higher aspirations of life have given way to the drive for private affluence.

The history of Poland has indeed been a tragic one. Its land and its people have been so often partitioned that their roots lie deeply buried in historical obscurities. And since the end of World War II, its land and its people have been ruled by puppets whose strings are manipulated in the Kremlin.

In addition to their own tragic traditions, the Jewish people in Poland share in the tragic history of the Polish people, suffering when the Polish people suffered and savoring its transitory triumphs.

The great outpouring of music from Chopin, voicing Polish cries for freedom, is as much a part of the Jewish person in Poland as it is a part of the Polish people, and as it is a part of freedom-loving people the world over. The Jewish people in Poland held no less in admiration the musical and political genius of Paderewski. Indeed one of the brightest chapters in all Polish history was written by the Jews in their defense of the Warsaw ghetto against the Nazi hordes.

The Communist dictators of Poland, in giving rise to anti-Semitic cries, promise oppression of their students, deny the cultural traditions of Chopin and Paderewski, destroy the urgent plea of all Polish people for a life of freedom, ascribe to its tiny Jewish population responsibility for the most constructive series of events since Polish dictators raped their own land in behalf of the Soviet Union.

There is, I suppose, but little we can do for the Jewish people in Poland. Certainly we must urgently protest against the disaster which confronts this small group of people. Certainly we can pray for their welfare and hope that the Polish people will not fall into the anti-Semitic trap built for them by their own Government—a trap which can produce only violence and oppression for the Polish people.

The Curse of Defeatism

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Mr. David Lawrence, in an editorial published in U.S. News & World Report of March 25, has presented a much needed and most thoughtful analysis of a "curse of defeatism" which seems to some to be infecting the American position on Vietnam. Knowing that other Senators will want to review the editorial, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE CURSE OF DEFEATISM

(By David Lawrence)

What the American people are reading today in their newspapers or hearing on radio and television is that the war in Vietnam cannot be won, that the American and allied forces are being checkmated, and that many members of Congress, sharing the view of the "demonstrators," want the United States to pull down the flag and surrender.

Again and again in the last half-century, the advocates of a doctrine of "peace at any price" have created situations which brought on a major war.

Apparently we have not learned the lessons of history. It seems incredible that any member of Congress would desert the Commander-in-Chief and advocate a policy that is tantamount to a surrender. Yet several members have openly called for retreat and withdrawal from Vietnam.

At the recent hearings held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, one Senator told Secretary of State Rusk, in effect, that a nation which cannot defend itself does not have a right to exist and that there is no obligation upon any other nation to come to its rescue. Another member of the Committee insisted that, before the President makes any important decisions of a military nature, he must consult Congress. Divided authority when a war is in progress is self-defeating.

What is the natural reaction of the enemy when its major opponent becomes irresolute, wobbly and vacillating? What is the effect on the spirit of the troops at the battle front when they are told over the radio that they are not being supported at home?

The United States stands at the crossroads. Will it honor its pledges, or forsake them? In treaty after treaty covering commitments in Europe, Asia and Latin America, the United States has promised to come to the aid of countries which are the victims of aggression. The Charter of the United Nations itself provides for collective action by its members. But, except for the policies of the United States and some Asian nations, the concept of collective defense against aggression has not been effectively supported. Indeed, many countries have assumed they are immune from a Communist takeover. Yet if we fail in the Vietnam war, this can only open the way for the Communists to infiltrate and subvert the governments of small nations.

The right of self-determination cannot be ignored without serious consequences to the strong as well as the weak. The United States has not had in the Vietnam war the help it deserved from other nations. There are many countries which are wavering because they do not know whether the United States intends to go through with its commitments or will in a moment of expediency abandon them.

Moscow was doubtless pleased to read that one member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee actually charged the United States with having been the aggressor in Vietnam. Also, the Chairman of the Committee declared in the presence of the Secretary of State that the resolution adopted by Congress in 1964, authorizing the use of our armed forces thereafter in Southeast Asia, was really based upon false information given to the Senate by the executive departments.

What is surprising is the amount of defeatism in America today. There was a time when patriotism was an overriding influence. It restrained Americans from openly giving aid and comfort to the enemy. But nowadays defeatism prevails in Congress itself, some of whose members think this is the best way to please the voters in an election year.

Despite the dignified and convincing way in which the Secretary of State presented the American case to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as he gave evidence that the United States was not an aggressor, criticism of the American position in the Vietnam war continues. We still hear demands for withdrawal and virtual surrender. These are couched in ambiguous phrases, but can lead the enemy to conclude that the United States doesn't possess the will to fight on and will settle at almost any price in Vietnam.

We are confronted today with a spirit of defeatism not unlike that which prevailed 30 years ago. At the Munich Conference in 1938 the Western powers tried to appease Hitler by acquiescing in the Nazi occupation of more territory. He thereupon took it for granted that he could enlarge his aggression. This miscalculation led 12 months later to World War II.

Winston Churchill, in a book written after the war ended, spoke in unequivocal language against appeasement and defeatism. He wrote that if a nation will not fight when victory will not be too costly, "you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival." He added:

"There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves."

Will our curse of defeatism encourage the Communists to challenge us and bring on World War III?

Henry H. Timken, Jr.

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Henry H. Timken, Jr., was one of God's great noblemen. Seldom do we find in one human the many great qualities this man possessed. He was a leader in business and industry; he had followed in the footsteps of an illustrious father. He was a sportsman whose sportsmanship had taken him to the four corners of the earth. A big game hunter and one who loved the out-of-doors, he was a conservationist who strived to preserve our natural resources. He was a pioneer in aviation. I remember well when he flew his Ford trimotor plane years ago. He became the Nation's first civilian to own and fly a twin-jet plane. A pilot of distinction, he traveled far and wide in his own Lear jet with his wife, who was also a jet pilot, as his copilot or with Mrs. Timken as pilot and he as navigator. But most of all, Mr. Speaker, he was a humanitarian. Few knew of the many acts of charity he indulged in. Modest almost to a fault, he wanted no headlines for the efforts he made to relieve the suffering of mankind.

To Mrs. Timken and his brothers, Robert and John, I extend my deep sympathy, and I know I express the thoughts of the people of my congressional district, the State of Ohio, and the Nation.

I include with these remarks an editorial from the Canton Repository:

HENRY H. TIMKEN, JR.

The Canton community is saddened by news of the death of its greatest benefactor, Henry H. Timken Jr.

His passing leaves a vacuum of immeasurable proportions in the city's civic and industrial life, and the impact of his loss will be felt in many fields beyond the confines of his home town.

He was a man of many interests beyond the industrial vocation that was his during all his adult life. He was a humble man who could walk among people of high and low estate and feel comfortable with both.

Mr. Timkin always shied from the limelight. He never once thrust himself to the forefront, but his presence was always felt in the quiet manner so characteristic of a man of high stature. Everyone who knew him held him in great respect.

When he was given the Chamber of Commerce Award of Merit three years ago, he was not there to receive it—not because he didn't appreciate the honor thus bestowed upon him. It simply was that he was embarrassed by it.

Typical of the man is this paragraph in a note he wrote to the person who made the award presentation:

"Thank you very much for consideration for the Chamber of Commerce Award of Merit. I cannot help but admit such consideration by my friends would have been quite enough."

Despite the extensive philanthropies of the Timken Foundation, which he and his brother, W. Robert Timken, headed, Henry Timken's contributions to the Canton community cannot be measured only in dollars and cents.

Canton was not only his home town but his first love. He never shirked from the deep sense of responsibility he felt to do what he could to improve it at every level, and he gave generously of his time, his energy and his resources in its service.

His interests beyond the Timken Roller Bearing Co., of which he was board chairman, ranged from aviation, to highways, to the rescue of downtown in a day of mushrooming perimeter shopping centers, to big game hunting, to politics and government.

He was a rugged individualist in the truest sense, and yet he always had compassion for his fellow man. He could best be described as a conservative in political persuasion, but he was always willing to discuss his convictions with those who felt otherwise, without becoming bigoted.

Mr. Timken was truly a citizen of the world as well as Canton's No. 1 citizen. He flew to many countries for business, recreation and relaxation, and he had friends in all of them. It is safe to say that he also had enemies. But no man who ever met him could have been his enemy.

Canton will miss Henry Timken. The state and the nation have lost by his passing. He cannot be replaced. We can only hope to profit by his example. He leaves a high heritage of dedication and devotion.

Chester J. Koch, of Cleveland—Superpatriot

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Sunday magazine of the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 10, dealing with the life of a patriotic citizen of the United States—Chester J. Koch.

My knowledge of Mr. Koch goes back practically 30 years. While I was mayor of Cleveland he occupied the position of coordinator of patriotic activities.

I know of no man, during my services as a public official, who was willing to give so much and ask so little from his Government in the promotion of services that would lead to the security of our country.

Chester Koch is 75 years of age, is completing his 27th year as city coordinator of patriotic activities, and is still active, having no plans to quit.

He is a sturdy devoted citizen of the United States. I salute him on this day as I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD in tribute to him.

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

SALUTE TO SUPERPATRIOT

(By Martin T. Ranta)

In this generation of unrest, this period of protest, Chester J. Koch, an institution, remains completely faithful to his country.

To Koch, who's famous for organizing parades, caring about war veterans and protecting the American flag against misuse, no other course is possible.

"As long as the government says it has to be done, we should at least be respectful about it," he said.

To Koch, whose patriotism is deeper than religion, war protest is incomprehensible, even unforgivable.

"There is an obligation to come to the aid of the country. I'm willing to trust the government."

Koch, 75, is completing his 27th year as city coordinator of patriotic activities and has no plans to quit. He holds 35 positions in veterans' organizations. He carries a copy of the Congressional flag code and consults it so frequently that he needs a fresh copy every month or so.

Back in 1943, when Koch (it rhymes with look) marched draftees off to war daily with a brass band and encouraging words, a reporter noted the mothers' tears as they said good-bye to their sons at Cleveland Union Terminal and Koch said:

"It's just pride, not fear. I don't think such tears indicate selfishness or un-Americanism. They're just so almighty proud of their sons that they simply can't help it."

In 1968, another reporter sought to find out how the personification of patriotism views the protests against the Viet war.

"I get upset over those long-haired skunks and what they are doing," said Koch. "News stories about them should be back with the obits."

He discounted war critics in Congress: "They're looking to make political hay."

He passed off critics in the intellectual community: "Lot of professors have been pinkish for a long time. They've never been good citizens."

He gave no consideration to critics of war for reasons religious: "There is nothing in my religious views that says I shouldn't defend my country. Nothing is said by the clergymen against it. It's an obligation to defend my country."

Koch, a Roman Catholic, considers compatible the callings of country and religion. Asked if he saw any conflict in conscience in men of the same religious faith killing each other in war, Koch replied: "No. If my country provides me a living and freedom and my country needs me, if the government and Congress says to fight, I believe I must fight."

The words are imposing, yet delivered by Koch they don't sound that way. His monotone is punctuated by pauses in which he unconsciously rolls his tongue to moisten his lips or front teeth, as if he were shifting a piece of candy in his mouth. But the habit aids communication because the pauses come at the end of phrases.

He doesn't look imposing, either. He's a bit stumpy at 5 feet, 7½ inches and 192 pounds (he's down about 15). He has a smooth pate with a fringe of gray hair. He has a kind face and a thin gray moustache once was black and full.

The toughtest fight the old war veteran has now is to overcome pain from arthritis every morning and get rolling. He has had it for years. There is no sure cure and, for him, no surrender.

"I can stand a lot of pain, so I can keep going."

Grit and pain tolerance can be flaws, however. Last May at the Memorial Day parade, Koch was riding with a policeman in a three-wheeler, keeping the column moving and hitting trouble spots on the route, when he jammed his right hand against the vehicle's railing. Koch is left-handed and gave the bruise little notice.

Through the summer months the wrist and forearm hurt fiercely at times and got numb at other times. In the fall, during one of his duty visits to the Veterans' Administration Hospital, he winced when a doctor friend shook his hand.

Off to X-ray the doctor sent him, and three small bone fractures were found. There followed weeks of splints and casts and a horse collar around the neck. He even spent a few days in the hospital as a patient. Then, in January, he underwent surgery.

Koch has little patience with such pamperings. In 1954 he was hospitalized for overwork and a kidney stone just before Memorial Day. Others took over running the parade but Koch persisted and assisted via a bedside phone.

"Those boys have a big job on their shoulders," he said at the time. "They need every bit of help they can get."

Every parade in downtown Cleveland for about 30 years has had Koch's direction. He's a master at organizing one. You can tell he's about done with his hundreds of calls when be makes an appeal for open cars for the Spanish War vets and the Gold Star Mothers, a most-honored organization in Koch's estimation.

The coordinator of patriotic activities—he got the title April 2, 1941, after City Council created the position—has an office in Room 44, City Hall, in the basement.

He seldom can be found there, but operators at the City Hall switchboard take his messages. Three times his office has been moved and each time Koch has moved the door with its number, too.

Room 44 is not much of an office, yet Koch considers it adequate. He certainly would not want his position to become a department. He views with alarm and scorn the department of veteran affairs in New York. He had suggested the big city name a coordinator of veterans affairs about a decade ago.

"Now they got a department with about 20 people and it's become a political thing," Koch said. "They do so many things other agencies, like the VA, do already. It's a waste."

Koch's annual salary from the city of Cleveland has risen over the years to $7,400. He has no secretary or expense account. He figures he spends more than 20% of his pay on veterans' activities. He gets paid through the city welfare department. Earlier, it was the water department, where he had been a clerk. At one time, he was paid out of city scrap fund. He thinks he missed a check when the fund expired.

It was just last May when his job was placed under Civil Service. Koch took a test to qualify as a "veterans' counselor" and passed. Civil Service classification brought job protection to the coordinator, who had just turned 75. Classifying the job wasn't his idea.

Chester Joseph Koch was born May 17, 1892, in Louisville, Ky. His father, Joseph, ran a saloon and brought to Chester's mostly German background a bit of Irish from his grandmother's side. When his sons, Chester and younger Jerome, were big enough to be in and out of the saloon, Joseph Koch showed them how the taps worked. They were not to get drunk, however, and didn't.

Chester's mother, Eleanora Eichorn, had a solid German background with some branches of her family reaching back to colonial America. A spunky little woman, she lived to be 94 and died in 1965.

"One time a drunk from the saloon kept pounding on the door trying to get into the house," Koch recalled. "She got a rifle and warned him to go away, that she had a gun. She fired right into the door. The pounding stopped and the next morning we found blood on the doorstep."

Koch's father told him it was time to find a job when he was about 16. He got hired by a Louisville department store and learned the business, but he left after a few years to do what he thought was farm survey work with a magazine writer.

It turned out that Koch was touring southern Ohio selling pictures, taken by an advance man, to farmers. He left the wandering band after a hard winter. He took a train out of Columbus to Cleveland.

He doesn't recall why he chose Cleveland. Perhaps it was the first train out. But here he was, 21 years old with a nickel in his pocket, and he found work selling hats—it was May and the opening of straw hat season—and men's clothing.

Word came in 1916 from Louisville that his father had disappeared and Koch went home. He learned that his father had left the saloon to make a bank deposit but never got to the bank. Koch said he spent weeks traveling coast to coast with a picture of his father, visiting police stations. He found no trace of him, living or dead. He believes his father was robbed and murdered.

Koch came back to Cleveland because he had a job here. When the United States entered World War I, he was courting Mary Irene Martin and he decided to join her brother's army unit. (Ray P. Martin was later city manager of Cleveland Heights and died in 1967.)

He was to meet the unit, the 308th Motor Supply Train, at Camp Sherman, near Columbus, and was to escort, for reasons Koch can't remember, five prisoners to camp.

"I didn't have a weapon so I sat on the edge of the train seat with my hand in my pocket, like I was holding a pistol. In Columbus we had to wait for an interurban and my prisoners went into a bar. At that time you couldn't serve liquor to servicemen, but we weren't in uniform. So I shouted to the bartender, 'These men are soldiers and military prisoners and if you serve them I'll shoot out your mirrors.' We left and made it to camp."

The unit was shipped to France and on the voyage Koch became a mess sergeant. It seems the food on the British transport ship was bad and the soldiers were being fed horsemeat and Koch learned something about cooking from his mother and he was

ordered to take over the cooking for the soldiers.

After eight months in France, five of them after the armistice, the unit came home. Koch was married in 1920 to Mary Martin and they had two children, Raymond J., who has two children, and Mary Eleanora Hutter, who has four children. Mary Martin Koch died in 1952.

Koch, in the 1920s, became active in Republican organizations and veterans affairs. But it was his role as a clothing salesman, not politics, that brought him his first job with the city. One of his good customers was the late Harry L. Davis, who was governor of Ohio and then mayor of Cleveland, and Davis put him in the water department as a junior clerk in 1934.

"It was in the depression and I considered it temporary. Because of that I didn't sign up for the city pension and I never have. And city employees don't pay Social Security, so now I don't have any pensions built up."

In 1936, he was fired by the public utilities director for political activity, prohibited for employes under city charter.

"I never left the job and came in every day. I talked to some people and got things straightened out and had a hearing and was put back on the payroll. I don't remember how long I was off it."

The firing had a significant effect, for Koch let all his political affiliations drop and concentrated on veterans activities.

Between his job and outside interests he apparently left little time for sleep. Late one night when driving home, he fell asleep at a traffic light. He awoke with a start and almost ran down a policeman, Koch recalled. He gave up driving.

Getting off a bus at Public Square in early 1941, Koch saw Army selectees being escorted to the depot. They deserved a better send-off, Koch decided. For months on his lunch break from the water department until his patriotic job was made fulltime, he made sure a band was on hand to lead the boys to the train. He would blow his World War I bass whistle to stop downtown traffic for the selectees to give them a sense of importance.

Koch has seen more than 400,000 young men off to the military. Draftees don't take trains to camp now but catch planes at irregular hours, so Koch no longer sees them leave, but he regularly visits the induction centers to greet the soldiers-to-be.

Most of the tales heard about his adventures with train send-offs are true. Several times he had wild rides outside rail cars for miles. ("I could see them playing craps inside but they couldn't hear me pounding.") Once he leaped off a moving train in Rocky River and walked the rails back downtown. And once when jumping off a train moving out of the station he slipped on a wet spot and conked his head on a post on the platform. Post and Koch survived.

But the function that has brought him most nationwide notice is his protection of the American flag.

In 1961, the Air Force painted an image of the stars and stripes on the tail of the jet used by the President. This drew the wrath of Koch.

"The President, like other members of the armed forces, should follow the flag, not precede it," he said at the time. "Nothing should be placed before the flag."

A letter from an Air Force aide explained to Koch that the service disagreed, that an emblem painted on the front of a plane takes a beating from the weather and gets chipped, that the flag should be in a prominent place and the big tail on the jet was certainly prominent and that the President agreed with this reasoning.

Koch bowed to the presidential sanction of the practice but had the last word. He noted that the stamp on the envelope bore the image of a flag and it was defaced by a postmark, in violation of the flag code.

This year, when he saw the new six-cent postage stamp bearing a picture of the flag, he spoke up again. He objects to use of the flag on stamps because it will be defaced and because the congressional flag code prohibits using a picture of the flag on anything that is for temporary use and discard. Koch is waiting for an answer from Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien.

The code was approved in 1942 by joint action of Congress. Koch carries a copy—a two-page leaflet—in his breast pocket at all times.

"I get asked questions about the flag 365 days a year. There's only one way to do things, the right way. The flag code is the law of the land. You must follow the law."

He often sees the flag displayed or positioned improperly, in churches, public buildings and, recently even in the mayor's office.

"I've been a nut on the flag since the day I went into the Army." His interest goes back even farther, apparently, because he took a small flag into the Army with him. He carries it in his inside breast pocket to this day, along with the flag code and a stack of miscellaneous items that may come in handy. That 3-inch-by-5-inch flag has a small wax mark on it.

"The wax dripped off a candle during a mass in the basement of a chateau in Le Mans in France. I have always felt a flag should be on the altar."

The same flag saved a young housekeeper from prosecution by Koch. Years ago his home was looted, but the flag, which he had placed atop a World War I helmet, was not taken, though the helmet was. Detectives brought a youth with some of the stolen items to Koch for identification.

"I asked him why he didn't take the flag. He said, 'I respect the flag.' So I didn't press charges so he could go into the service. It was hard to get in with a police record. A couple years later the kid came back in uniform to thank me."

His feeling for flag carries to the national anthem. "To me, it's a prayer, in a sense. It's a prayer for the boys and their safety and for the people at home."

Many of the people at home benefit from Koch's concern, especially war veterans. Of the many activities for them, one that is, perhaps, dearest to Ches—he is called Ches by most that get to know him—is the Crile Christmas Gift Shop at the VA hospital. He started it and each year supports it with appeals for contributions.

For years, he has rounded up gifts for servicemen and veterans. In this context, he once called himself the "city's greatest chiseler."

"The people of Cleveland are fine people. They always respond when a need is made known."

So does Ches Koch. A few days out of the hospital in December, he was seen downtown on a very cold and snowy day. A flannel mitten protected his ailing hand and wrist. He was out because there was need to arrange a military funeral for an old war vet.

"It's a source of great satisfaction when you know that you can help someone. People often don't know what to do or how to get help."

Honors have come his way and though the plaques have piled high he is grateful for all of them. Among the more prominent honors are a human relations award from the National Conference of Christians and Jews, a rare military citation for patriotic civilian service and a papal citation for service to mankind.

In the last few years, life has been a bit easier for Koch. On Oct. 2, 1965, he married Anne E. Tuttle, a widow 10 years younger than he. He had been a widower since 1952. She has three living sons and five grandchildren.

A change in Koch's habits has been noticed by reporters. He no longer comes daily to the news rooms. He uses the phone more often to keep editors aware of approaching holidays and parades and to report elections by veterans' groups.

Anne Koch makes sure that Ches takes care of himself and she keeps a good home for him. She helps with his correspondence. They attend conventions together and she is often with him at veterans dinners.

And Mrs. Koch worries about her husband. "He works too hard," she said. "He gets so involved in everything." Even in the hospital he got phone calls and this upset her. He has no pension and can't afford to retire. Koch said that he hasn't even thought of it.

They live in pleasant rented quarters at 4298 E. 133d Street, near a bus line and within walking distance of St. Timothy Catholic Church, where they were married and both are members. Koch sometimes gets to a mass at St. John Cathedral, where he retains his longtime membership on the ushers' staff.

The Koch living room has two desks. The neat one is Mrs. Koch's. She is recording secretary of the American Gold Star Mothers. Through GSM activity she knew Koch for years before they began courting a year before their marriage. The other desk is Koch's. Even he has trouble finding his way through the stacks on it.

The fireplace mantel at the other end of the room has a small flag and a portrait of the youngest of Anne Tuttle Koch's four sons, Leonard Tuttle, who was killed in action in Germany on Dec. 13, 1944. Like two of his brothers, he was drafted in World War II.

"When the boys were drafted, well, it was something that had to be done by boys of that age," Mrs. Koch said. "Then, after he was killed, I was numb. I was numb for a long time.

"I have granddaughters now who are 21 and 18 and I am glad they are not boys."

Chester Koch didn't realize he was born at home until his mother was in a hospital, just before her death, and said it was the first time. That house he was born in, at 7th and Broadway in Louisville, near where his father ran a saloon, has been torn down. A U.S. Post Office was built on the site and, as Mrs. Koch said, a flag always flies over it.

On the Road to Chaos

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the Wyoming State Tribune in Cheyenne, Wyo., has looked editorially at the gold crisis and concluded that it "is not within itself a malignancy, it is merely a symptom of the developing financial illness of the biggest and most powerful Nation in the free world."

In the words of Tribune Editor James M. Flinchum:

The way to reverse this—crisis—is to put our fiscal, and monetary house in order, including a cessation of our bankrupt spending policies.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Flinchum's editorial "On the Road to Chaos" from the March 15, 1968, Wyoming State Tribune in the RECORD:

ON THE ROAD TO CHAOS

The gold crisis is not within itself a malignancy, it is merely a symptom of the developing financial illness of the biggest and most powerful nation in the Free World, the United States of America.

That financial illness can be described in various ways: Weakness generated by more than two decades of a vast outpouring of wealth into other nations; the accumulation of a huge internal debt that now exceeds $330 billion; repeated spending beyond means that has created that debt; and above

all a deficit in our international balance-of-payments program.

Closing down the London gold market, increasing the rediscount rate and in effect hiking the fee commercial bankers charge for loans in this country, and removing the gold cover that in effect opens up what remains of our gold reserves to the rest of the world, are desperation measures that may, or may not, prevent the financial disaster that threatens to overtake us and the rest of the Free World nations.

What must be done immediately and imperatively is to (1) reverse our balance of payments situation so that there is shortly commenced a greater inflow of dollars than an outflow, and (2) drastically reduce the government spending that has created this mess.

In the meantime, some serious study must be given to the matter of the gold cover. The new economists preach that gold is meaningless and that the dollar is sound because it represents real rather than artificial wealth. But if this be true, why are western Europe's and America's financial centers in a frenzy over the gold buying?

Gold still means something in international if not in domestic finance, and why it does is perhaps best explained by a statement issued by the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy last May 10.

The committee, in discussing the proposed removal of the gold backing for currency, said: "Such a removal would open the way to a practically unlimited expansion of Federal Reserve notes, to a removal of the proper restraining influence of a reserve requirement; to a loss of all our gold stock, to a thorough-going fiat money (the weakest money known to man), and to a decline and even collapse in value of our currency.

"A gold reserve provides a nation with a war chest which, if dissipated, could lead to national destruction.

"The need is for a sound currency, not a weaker one. A sound currency should invite the release to our monetary gold stock of much of the approximately $13 billion of gold held under earmark for foreign account, and a flow of foreign-held gold into this country. A sound currency would involve a redeemable money at the statutory rate of $35 per fine ounce of gold."

Part of our troubles may be attributed to the fact that the new economics involves total government control of the economy including both the fiscal and monetary systems, a condition that has been brought about only recently since the Federal Reserve Board finally surrendered to an all-out assault against its integrity and its independence of the political system.

Although Chairman William McChesney Martin belatedly resisted this assault, he has subsequently given in as witness his comments last December in a speech to the American Bankers Association in New York, in which he warned that this country must not "bow down to the idol of gold," which is straight out of William Jennings Bryan and the 1890s. ("You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns. You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold.")

What is happening in the European gold markets today is essentially a gambling contest in which private speculators are betting on gold against the dollar. They also are wagering that the dollar will become a managed currency and thus subject to all of the evils of political manipulation of currency systems; with no backing or redemption, which now is signalled by the removal of the gold cover by action of Congress last night, the way is opened for the issuance of mass amounts of fiat or printing-press money. In that fashion, an economy is quickly wrecked and financial chaos results.

All of this comes about as the result of cheap, easy and will-o-the-wisp pursuits of mushroom economic growth which ultimately result in inflation and financial bust. Today we are on the verge of that chaos and the sad thing is that nobody seems to recognize it, except the gold gamblers of Europe who are getting rid of their dollars as fast as they can for the only convenient backing of currency man has ever been able to devise.

The way to reverse this is to put our fiscal, and monetary, house in order including a cessation of our bankrupt spending policies, and a restoration of the gold cover.

The Riot Commission Report

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on March 13 I placed in the RECORD six editorials and columns from across the Nation criticizing the report of President Johnson's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Today I wish to place three more in the RECORD.

It is clear that this report has not been well received either by the public or by a significant segment of the press. This is not because the subject of civil disorders does not warrant serious study. The poor reception of this report is due to the stereotyped, unimaginative, unrealistic and impractical approach of the Commission.

On March 5, 1968, the Greenville News published an editorial entitled "An Invitation to More Violence" and on March 16, 1968, a column by Holmes Alexander entitled "Kerner Group Makes Illogical Report." The Evening Star of Washington on March 18, 1968, published a column by William F. Buckley, Jr., entitled "Riot Diggers Missed Some Roots." All three of these present excellent discussions of this report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these columns and editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Mar. 5, 1968]

AN INVITATION TO MORE VIOLENCE

After reading and re-reading the full text of the summary of the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, we can only conclude that, on balance, it may do some good in some areas, but this will be overwhelmingly offset by the harmful effects which can be clearly foreseen and are frightening to contemplate.

Much of it is sound. It adopts as its own and recommends certain programs which already have been started in many localities to help the underprivileged to help themselves.

But these are lost in the Commission's attempt to produce "shock" action, in its failure to recognize that there are two sides to the race issue and in its dismissal of part of the facts in the causes of the disorders of 1967 and before.

Overall, the report is a blatant invitation to violence and rebellion by the Negro minority, which it totally absolves of any blame for its own plight, against the White majority, which it totally condemns with no redeeming deeds or mitigating circumstances.

By the same token, it is a flagrant challenge to civil rights extremists and political demagogues to do their worst.

It proposes to remake a whole society overnight and to alter human nature into something almost faultless day before yesterday. It suggests a staggering federal program of education, integration, income supplements, housing and rental and home purchase supplements and unrestricted welfare which would cost upwards of $2 billion a month. But it suggests neither a means of raising the revenue nor a plan for spending the money wisely and effectively.

In brief, the Commission has taken at face value every claim made and every accusation leveled by the most extreme of the civil rights activists of every hue and stripe. And it has wrapped up into one package every giveaway scheme that the farthest out social thinkers in Washington and elsewhere have been able to dream up. It calls for the total welfare state—now.

Worst of all, it leaves the impression that this can and must be done before summer, which of course is ridiculous. It adds the element of blackmail by raising the specter of a massive Black racist rebellion if the Whites don't knuckle down and fork over.

It is totally materialistic and paternalistic. It makes little or no mention of moral values and none of spiritual values. Nowhere does it suggest that the beneficiaries of the programs it proposes do anything to earn their share of the public largess.

The Commission seems to be preparing the country for an inevitable and probably prolonged period of violence in the streets, which is itself criminal in nature and certain to lead to more crime.

Yet it literally and figuratively would disarm law enforcement by blaming the "attitude" of police officers for much of what has gone before and recommending that they not be allowed to use maximum force to apprehend the criminals and put down the violence and insurrection it sees ahead.

The report does say at the outset that violence does not remake a society, that disruption and disorder nourish repression, not justice, and that the community cannot and will not tolerate coercion and mob rule. Yet, throughout the report, there is the inference from past events that only these tactics have produced results for the Negro.

It portrays the Negro as the hapless victim of his environment and the White man as the creator and perpetuator of that environment. Of such generalities are riots born. The report makes it official.

The Commission made some fundamental mistakes. Perhaps the most serious is its indictment, trial and conviction of the whole of White America of racial bias, to which it attributes the whole of the race problem. This is arrant nonsense. Black racial bias is a fact.

The second most serious is its failure to urge more Negroes to take advantage of the many opportunities they already have, and to point out that many of them have done so. Exceptional Negroes in large numbers have followed the example of ethnic minorities before them.

The Irish, the Poles and any number of natives of several Middle Eastern countries—to say nothing of the Jews who fled Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union during this century and especially during the last generation—and have broken out of poverty and the slums they miscall "ghettos." Negroes have. More can.

Still another mistake was to call for greater force to bring about integration as the solution to education and housing problems, rather than better schools and better housing for all. Here, as in other instances, the report merely calls for more action of the kind that has already failed.

Buried in pages of matter which is bound to become an endless source of Black racist propaganda, are a few potentially good ideas for encouraging those who are willing and able to make a better life for themselves, for creating and stimulating interest in better educational opportunity, for training and, maybe, motivating, the unemployed and the indolent for productive employment.

But it is going to be difficult for Congress and the state legislatures, the city councils and the public and private community action groups to dig them out and develop them to the point of practical implementation. The report has finished the ugly job of arraying race against race, class against class and the havenots against the haves.

The "long, hot summer" of 1968 may be longer and hotter than it might have been.

From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Mar. 16, 1968]

KERNER GROUP MAKES ILLOGICAL REPORT

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—The typical city rioter is better educated than most of his neighbors. He is proud of his race which is Negro. His most intense grievance is the presence of the police. He is a hater of Whites, and of his well-to-do black neighbors. He is a separatist, a believer in black power, a nonbeliever in one society.

These are extracts taken from the Summary of the Report of the Kerner Commission on Civil Disorders. They do not coincide at all with the most strongly-worded and most widely-quoted findings of the commission. They are part of the report, an important part, and they are at odds with the now-familiar language which finds that "White racism is essentially responsible" for the riots, and that "the primary goal must be a single society."

The report itself is voluminous and the summary is a catch-all of selective indictment, over-simplification and stupendous social planning. The make-up of the commission was such that it was predestined to bring forth a preconceived document. It is a document that reflects the historical idealism of such institutions as the League of Nations, the United Nations, in short, one worldism. It rejects by omission all the experience that is contrary to these utopian concepts.

The report assumes that No Man Is an Island, whereas science and common knowledge tells us that Every Man is an Island, and a very mysterious one. The summary comes down hard for a social monolith, whereas the way of life is that of irrepressible nationalism, parochial, individualism and jealousy-guarded customs, faiths, ambitions and preferences of association.

This is a report by an appointive group which has no responsibility for carrying out its recommendations. Thus it is bound to differ, and it does, from findings on the same subject by elective and professional investigators.

For example, the Kerner Commission's account of the Newark riot says the "rock-throwing . . . was the work of youngsters," that "the only shot fired" in the beginning was by a nervous young guardsman at an imaginary sniper and that "nevertheless" there were soon two columns of guardsmen and state troopers firing at a housing project where "they believed were snipers." Newark's Mayor Addonizio gave a different version. He told the commission last August that "police restraint, which had been the policy, was no longer an option." And he added:

"The first reality to face . . . is that rioting has acquired a kind of legitimacy . . . is a turn in American life that must be rebuffed and rebuffed sharply."

The commission finds the Cambridge (Md.) riot triggered by White people, but the Cambridge police chief was on the spot and saw it just the other way. The Kerner Commission finds no "organized plan" in the 1967 disturbances, but the McClellan Committee finds a lot of planning. The Kerner Commission calls for massive increase in all the anti-poverty programs, but Congress has not found these programs to be either penurious or very productive.

Much that the Kerner Report sets forth is beyond dispute, but is also sadly stale. It is no revelation for the country to be told that its Negro population is deficient in education, employment and income. But the conclusions drawn, the philosophy evolved and the remedies set forth are unacceptable in logic, and therefore ineffectual.

The White majority has already done so much to alleviate the Negro misfortunes that it cannot be expected to receive the chastisement of this report with equanimity. It's hard to believe that 11 intelligent persons would recommend that America change itself to accommodate the Negro minority.

It's the Negro, of course, who must change if he's to live happily in the American environment.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 18, 1968]

RIOT DIGGERS MISSED SOME ROOTS

The Kerner report on the riots last summer is likely to engage the attention of a generation of politicians and moralists as the central document of the period, accounting for our revolutionary summers and laying the blame for them squarely on the culprit—our old friend, honkey. Floyd McKissick, the director of CORE, was made a happy man, perhaps for the first time in his tortured life. "We're on our way to reaching the moment of truth," he said exultantly. "It's the first time whites have said, 'We're racists.' "

And then, the typical American response: Buy your way out. Two million new jobs, six million new housing units, vast educational programs, welfare, anti-poverty, you name it.

Now there is a very good case for trying very hard to improve the lot of the Negro in America. But it has nothing to do with summer rioting. A few years ago, our moralists used to tell us that the way to curb communism abroad was to increase welfare at home, a most tortuous non-sequitur, it being supremely immaterial to the Communists how much welfare we enjoy in America.

Rioting in the ghetto is merely the slum variant of what Martin Luther King, Benjamin Spock, and William Sloane Coffin are busily engaged in doing, to the applause of a significant sector of the intellectual community. The riot in Detroit was merely a proletarian version of well-fed, well-housed white students preventing McNamara from speaking at Harvard, or a police car from leaving the premises of the University of California.

One would have thought the old stomach-argument about how to prevent riots would have died for intellectual undernourishment after the riots in New Haven and Detroit, model cities from the positivist point of view which guided the thinking of the Kerner commission.

What caused the riots isn't segregation or poverty or frustration. What caused them is a psychological disorder which is tearing at the ethos of our society as a result of boredom, self-hatred, and the arrogant contention that all our shortcomings are the results of other people's aggressions upon us.

The Kerner commission is committing the same mistake that the Freedom Now-ers committed beginning a decade or so ago. All those civil rights bills, all those Supreme Court rulings, all the heaving about for forced integration: very good arguments can be made to defend that activity. But once again, they are not justified as bringing Freedom Now, and the high expectations cultivated by the dreamy rhetoric of Martin Luther King standing at the Lincoln Memorial in 1963 bred only frustration and resentment, not composure and faith.

We need St. Paul, counselling patience and forbearance, and reminding us that true justice is reserved for another world; not the gnostic utopianism of those who tell us how Congress can vote in paradise.

The commission, so far as one is able to judge, has added nothing at all to one's knowledge of the imperfections of our society that is unavailable to, say, the reader of Claude Brown's "Man-Child in the Promised Land." But by its emphasis on the material elements of the problem, it fails totally to account for a malaise which is mistakenly thought of as a Negro problem.

Last week, Negro sociologist Harry Edwards said: "I'm for splitting up in twos and threes, killing the mayor, getting the utilities and poisoning the goddamed water." And last week Robert Bly, the poet, on receiving the National Book Award, said: ". . . It turns out (America) can put down a revolution as well as the Russians in Budapest, we can destroy a town as well as the Germans at Lidice, all with our famous unconcern . . . In an age of gross and savage crimes by legal governments, the institutions will have to learn responsibility, learn to take their part in preserving the nation and take their risk by committing acts of disobedience."

The problem is bi-racial, and nothing said by the Kerner commission is relevant to its solution.

Evacuation Day Essay Contest, 1968

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Dorchester Heights, of historic fame during the Revolutionary War, is located in the South Boston section of my congressional district. For it was Dorchester Heights that General Washington and the Continental Forces fortified, forcing the British to evacuate Boston 192 years ago March 17.

Each year, this historic event is celebrated by appropriate exercises covering several days, with a large parade viewed by tens of thousands of persons. The South Boston Citizens Association plays an important part each year in the Evacuation Day exercises.

One of the interesting and stimulating events sponsored by the Evacuation Day Observation Committee of the South Boston Citizens Association, in cooperation this year with the Honorable Kevin H. White, mayor of Boston, is an essay contest, the judge of which was Sister M. Fides, C.S.J., of the students of public and private schools of the district.

In my remarks, I include the winning essays, and those receiving honorable mention, in the senior division, grades 10, 11, and 12; and in the junior division, grades 7, 8, and 9. In the senior division the first place was awarded to Maureen E. McDonough, of the St. Augustine High School; second place to Joyce Crowley, of the Gate of Heaven High School; and third place to Leo Paulsen, of the South Boston High School; with honorable mention awarded to Jacqueline Ford, of the Gate of Heaven School; to Edna Golabek, of the Monsignor Ryan Memorial High School; Nancy Kelly, of the Monsignor Ryan Memorial High School; Pamela Logan, of the Gate of Heaven High School; and Monica Rejt, of the Monsignor Ryan Memorial High School, the essays of which students I herewith include in my remarks:

THE DAY I WAS PROUDEST TO BE AN AMERICAN

(First place)

(By Maureen E. McDonough, St. Augustine High School)

The day I was proudest to be an American was Sunday, May 7, 1967. It was raining, but inside I was glowing with patriotism.

It all began the Friday before. Four girls and myself were chosen as delegates for a convention held in Maryland. The convention ended early Sunday afternoon so we decided to stay in Washington for the night. All of us were from Massachusetts, and we all greatly admired John F. Kennedy, so the first thing on the agenda was a visit to the National Cemetery and especially the tomb of our late President.

As we stood around his grave we relived his life—his boyhood—his senatorship—his inauguration—the Cuban Crisis—the rocking chair—and his untimely death. As the rain poured so did our tears.

We slowly walked around his grave and read his many famous sayings. "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." Suddenly I was filled with the wonder of it; I was proud as never before in my life—proud to be an American.

The last thing we saw as we pulled out of Washington on Monday morning was "Old Glory" flying in the breeze. I began to cry; inside I was singing "The Star-Spangled Banner."

THE DAY I WAS PROUDEST TO BE AN AMERICAN

(Second place)

(By Joyce Crowley, Gate of Heaven High)

When I hear our national anthem or pledge my allegiance to America I am filled with a sense of pride and elation, grateful I am a part of this great country.

On July 15, 1966, I felt exceptionally proud to be an American. It was Bastille Day being celebrated in Norfolk, Virginia, at the United States Naval Amphibious Base. The French officers were celebrating what was to be their last celebration in this country. Midst all the gaiety and color there was sadness and a certain tension in the air.

These French and American officers were friends, many long standing, and now there was a restraint between them. President Charles De Gaulle was in the act of breaking with NATO. These people were forbidden to talk or voice an opinion on political affairs.

These proud people were covering their sadness this glorious holiday commemorating the day France won her freedoms. Now these freedoms were being infringed upon, one by one smothered by wrong politics.

The disappointments and hurt of these people made me sad but very proud to be an American where freedom belongs to everyone.

THE DAY I WAS PROUDEST TO BE AN AMERICAN

(Third place)

(By Leo Paulsen, South Boston High School)

Most people regard a funeral procession as a sad affair. I am no exception.

As I reviewed the funeral procession given for John F. Kennedy I felt the grief which was evident in the faces of his compatriots. I then began thinking about these people. Certainly they did not all agree with the policies and philosophies of their deceased administrator. Indeed there were those who were strongly opposed in his principles. I asked myself, "Why had these people turned out on this solemn occasion?" Their grief appeared to be sincere. Why had not their diverse attitudes prevented them from taking the trouble to pay their last respects to their president? Then it hit me. A feeling that permeated my entire system causing a certain refined joy. This feeling was pride. I was proud to see that these people had disregarded their political feelings to pay tribute to a fellow American. A man who had not worked in their favor but diligently for what he believed was best for his country. Because of this I felt a common unity with these people. I felt secure knowing that no matter what trials the future may deal us, this unity and loyalty will give us the strength to overcome our troubles.

In truth, this was the day I was most proud to be an American.

THE DAY I WAS PROUDEST TO BE AN AMERICAN

(Honorable mention)

(By Jacqueline Ford, Gate of Heaven School)

It was a day of tenseness, wondering, imagining, and questions, filled with high hopes, mass confusion, and worrying, but a day to be crowned with success. The day when astronaut John Glenn orbited the earth was the day I was proudest to be an American. Although only in grammar school at the time, I can remember it as if it were yesterday. I can recall being so excited in the beginning, and gradually filled with a spirit of patriotism.

Many many people were proud on that day to see John Glenn orbit the earth. Not only were they proud to see their country a success, but they were proud to see one of their own countrymen perform such a duty for his country. John Glenn stepped into that capsule not knowing what his destiny would be, but he was willing and ready to find out for the United States, the country he loved.

The era of the 1960's will certainly go down in history as one to be remembered. It is the era that gave birth to the Space Age. The flight of John Glenn opened the doors to many more successful flights in the following years. His orbit ignited the spark of patriotism in many people, and produced the faith and interest needed for the leaders of our country to continue their magnificent work. Most of all it set off the explosion of patriotism and love of their country of the American people.

THE DAY I WAS PROUDEST TO BE AN AMERICAN

(Honorable mention)

(By Edna Golabek, Monsignor Ryan Memorial High)

What is an American? A person, of course, you say, but more than that. A person who can walk with his family to church on Sunday. A person who can send his children to a parochial school. A person who can say what he wants, to whom he wants, and when he wants. In other words, an American is a person wo can exercise all his God-given rights because he lives in a free country.

Being of European birth, I can more fully appreciate and recognize this freedom. Because at one time I had to secretly attend religion classes and be careful of my actions and undertakings, I am able to more fully accept and practice this precious freedom.

With the years, however, as most Americans do, I began to take this situation for granted. Being daily exposed to this wonderful freedom merely whittled it down to a routine and meaningless nothing.

It wasn't till last summer that my eyes were opened up once again, and I saw everything as if for the first time.

My family and I had the marvelous opportunity of revisiting our native homeland. After a six-week stay in this Communist-controlled country, I once more realized what privileges I had. My counterparts there cannot attend a parochial school, as I do. They don't even have any parochial schools there. Every word that is spoken has to be done so with utmost care. Our news isn't screened, sifted, and twisted as theirs. Even to go to church on Sunday is becoming more and more risky. How sad that conditions are this way. But at least they served the purpose of making me aware; aware that what I have here now can never again be taken for granted, much less ignored.

The day I was proudest to be an American is when I set foot on American soil, and could proudly, and with justification pronounce, "This is my home, the land of the free!"

THE DAY I WAS PROUDEST TO BE AN AMERICAN

(Honorable mention)

(By Nancy Kelly, Monsignor Ryan Memorial High)

It was a brisk October Sunday. A huge crowd filled Wakefield Common, yelling, cheering, and singing. Thousands of flags, large and small, snapped in the cold windy air.

That's how it was the day of the rally organized by Paul Christopher, an eighteen-year-old high school senior. The purpose of the rally was to show our boys in Vietnam that they had our support and prayers. The minute we entered the town of Wakefield, we could sense the great spirit of patriotism in the crowd. Even tough-looking motorcyclists in black leather jackets carried huge American flags.

Thirty-five thousand people awaited patiently for the guest speaker to arrive. They moved in to get closer to the podium. Nobody wanted to miss the speeches of the guest speaker, a list which included Governor Volpe and Paul Christopher.

We had listened to the words of the speakers, and observed the reaction of the supporters. Their behavior was not put on, but showed a deep and genuine sense of patriotism.

It was seeking the loyalty of these fellow Americans that made me proud to be called an American.

THE DAY I WAS PROUDEST TO BE AN AMERICAN

(Honorable mention)

(By Pamela Logan, Gate of Heaven High School)

It started out to be another routine seventeenth day of March parade. As usual it was a cold, windy, miserable day, and as usual just about everyone in South Boston appeared on the streets forming a motley mob. To some there it was mainly a test of endurance of will over weather, but others were really enthusiastic about the whole ritual. Yes, this year promised to be an exact copy of last year's event, but somehow for me it wasn't. For somewhere in the midst of the blaring trumpets and twirling batons marched 1967's addition to the celebration—South Boston's war veterans of Vietnam. Not at all bitter for all the bitterness they must have witnessed, these men smiled and waved to the thunderous applause of the onlookers although some would carry permanent physical scars which would last a life time. It was then that it suddenly came over me what it meant to be an American, a genuine American, and not just someone who's all for the country when things are going fine and in the face of a crisis cowers off; but someone who knows what this democracy of ours is all about and thinks it's worth defending.

The war heroes had passed on down the street, but the message that they'd carried was imbedded deeply in my mind. I was oblivous to the rest of the parade, lost in my own thoughts, like someone who's just come to realize a blessing that they have been gifted with all their life, and, looking back now, I know it was on that day that I was proudest to be an American.

THE DAY I WAS PROUDEST TO BE AN AMERICAN

(Honorable mention)

(By Monica Rejt, Monsignor Ryan Memorial High)

Accompanied by my mother, I proceeded to the United States Post Office and Courthouse in downtown Boston to become an official member of the citizens of this country. As we approached the courtroom that was assigned to me, I noticed other people from all over the world also waiting to be naturalized. They could never have been as nervous as I was then.

After being admitted into the courthouse, we waited approximately four hours for the judge, who was tied up in another case. We

stood as he approached his bench, which was high on a platform overlooking the entire crowd. Having experienced a courtroom's procedures only on television and screen, it was quite fascinating. All rising, we took the final oath in which we swore to uphold America's truths, and also to aid our country in time of need.

Following the oath and exit of the judge, we were handed little pin-on flags to commemorate the occasion. Not only did I receive a flag, but a few days later I received letters of congratulations from several well-known officials.

The day of my naturalization was one of the most memorable days of my life. It was then that I realized how proud I was to be a part of this great country.

Mr. Speaker, in the junior division, consisting of grades 7, 8, and 9, first place was awarded to Mary Catherine Fiske, of the St. Brigid School; second place to Dale Hilliard, of the Patrick F. Gavin School; third place to Patricia Jordan, of the Monsignor Ryan Memorial High School; and honorable mention to Mary Dorocke, of the Gate of Heaven School; Robert England, of the St. Brigid School; Joanne LaMontagne, of the Gate of Heaven School; Richard Oliver, of the Gate of Heaven School; and Charlene Vidito, of the Patrick F. Gavin School, which essays I also include in the Extionsions of Remarks, as follows:

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN
(First place)
(By Mary Catherine Fiske, St. Brigid School)

America is a great country, and she gives me many reasons for being so proud to be called an American. First, America was founded because of a strong, human desire to be free. Since the beginning of time people have wanted and fought for freedom and peace. Through the ages America has been just this—a haven of freedom and peace for all who sought it.

Secondly, as America built up from small settlements to huge, expanding cities, she voiced and defended her strong beliefs before the more powerful countries of the world. Her brave people defended the freedom of others, as well as their own. Since colonial days she has grown and matured with her people to be one of the strongest and most progressive nations in the world.

Finally, I am proud to be an American because I love my country. I love her because I was born here, because of her towering mountains, her rushing waters, her persevering peace, and her steadfast freedom. All these things give me a hopeful and secure feeling to know that even in the face of wars, hate, turmoil, and bloodshed, my country still defends her age-old beliefs of freedom, peace, and equal rights for all.

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN
(Second place)
(By Dale Hilliard, Patrick F. Gavin School)

Some of the reasons I am proud to be an American are as follows: First of all: Our freedoms of speech, religion, and press are only obtainable in our country.

Second: We are a proud nation, and I am happy that one day I will be able to be a good citizen and help to continue in making our country the proudest in the world.

Third: Our country's heart is so large it cannot be measured. By this I mean if it were not for the help that our country extends in foreign aid, a great part of this world's people would starve or die from lack of bare necessities.

Fourth: One more important reason I am so proud of our country is that our country is not a "bully" and will not stand by and let other countries be "bullied." Many proud Americans gave their lives, and they will continue to do so, voluntarily, in order that other countries may have their freedom.

These are some of the reasons that I am proud to be an American, and there are many more. I only wish other people in this world could have the same opportunities that we as Americans have.

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN
(Third place)
(By Patricia Jordan, Monsignor Ryan Memorial High)

Americans are composites of many things, many religions, many cultures, and many races all simmering in one big melting pot. They are people who care about their fellow man, as witnessed by the amount of foreign aid they have given. The average American is patriotic. He is always ready to serve his country in an emergency. These and many other traits make up an American.

I am proud to be an American for many reasons. I am proud of our high standard of living and our ability to get a good education. Anyone, if it is his desire, may receive a college education.

Our country has done much in the way of progress in space, medicine, science, and in fact is a leader in many fields.

When I hear of the great work of our young men and women in organizations such as the Peace Corps and Vista I am filled with pride.

However, the main reason that I am proud to be an American is that all these wonders have been accomplished by Americans of many colors, races, and creeds working together. This proves to me that mutual respect and trust can work miracles.

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN
(Honorable mention)
(By Mary Dorocke, Gate of Heaven School)

To be an American is to be a proud person because you are not just existing, you are living as a human person with dignity for others. You have the four basic freedoms, which are freedom of speech, religion, the press, and freedom from want. Being an American means to be safe at all times.

I am proud for what my country stands for. I am also proud because my country is the most progressive country in the world. Besides being grateful for my country, as an American I can participate and be involved in its affairs. Having freedoms, rights, and laws brings responsibility to use them well.

Being an American means to get involved. I am proud to be an American because I can help and respect others who are not as fortunate as I am.

Now at the present time I can still stand proud of being an American. In many more years to come I will still hold the exact idea and reaction toward being an American of the United States of America.

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN
(Honorable mention)
(By Robert England, St. Brigid School)

Why am I proud to be an American? Because being an American to me means being a South Bostonian. What boy wouldn't expand his chest for this honor! I am living in the same environment as Paul Revere and his dashing friends. I have the slightly "colonial tea flavored" ocean for a swimming pool. For a playground I have Dorchester Heights, where George Washington and his band of artillerymen sent the lobsterbacks home to "Sweet George."

To get my education, I have easy access to Boston College, Boston University, and scores of prep schools. Many cultural and educational institutions are in near reach. The Museum of Science also adds to the already colorful scene.

For physical fitness, Boston, the home of the Red Sox, has fabulous sports opportunities, including the ever-exciting South Boston Terriers, the hockey team of the century.

Southie is the home of Richard Cardinal Cushing, a man whose courage has "built churches and schools around the world." Southie provides for my religious training too.

Yes, I'm proud to be an American because being an American means to me being a South Bostonian!

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN
(Honorable mention)
(By Joanne LaMontagne, Gate of Heaven School)

To me the word American is more than just a name. It is a title that should be cherished and lived up to. I am proud to carry this title because it took hard, honest work to give me the great privilege of doing so. To be an American means to have freedom. America opens her arms to the poor unfortunate people who do not have such freedoms. This makes me very proud to be part of this great, generous country. America offers opportunity, and I, as an American, should take advantage of this privilege.

I am extremely proud of my American heritage. Our forefathers came to this land to obtain the rights and freedoms they were deprived of in their old country. Now, after many years of hard struggling, we Americans have the privilege of being granted the freedoms our forefathers fought for.

I am especially proud of the fact that my country is not only fighting for her own rights, but she also is sacrificing young men and women to fight for the rights of those smaller countries who are not capable of doing it themselves.

America is the "Land of Opportunity," and I am very proud to be part of such a great land.

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN
(Honorable mention)
(By Richard Oliveri, Gate of Heaven School)

I am proud to be an American because I love my country, and when one has ardent love for something he takes pride in being a part of it. Yes, I consider America a part of me, and me a part of America.

In a way, I look down on other countries, not in scorn, but in sympathy. I feel sorry for the people of those nations, and we are the ones who are to salvage them.

I am proud because my country has power, not necessarily political power, but majestic power, the kind of power which gives America and its people patriotism, and the ambition to go forward.

I am proud because my country is a symbol of liberty, and everything a man can hope for.

I take pride in living in the land of America, where, in a way, it can be regarded as a paradise. It is a paradise where freedom is plentiful, a paradise where progress is fruitful and essential, and a paradise which is easy to love, and where justice is for all.

These are all the reasons for which I, an American . . . am proud to be one.

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN
(Honorable mention)
(By Charlene Vidito, Patrick F. Gavin School)

There are many reasons why Americans are proud to live in this great country. Some of my reasons are similar to those of the majority of people. Deep down inside only I know how proud I am, because I think it's hard to express my deep, loyal feelings on paper.

Well, first there's our fair democratic government; by the people and for the people. Every American should be proud of our great

Constitution's "Bill of Rights," which gives us, among many others, the four most important rights: freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of press.

Out of those four rights, the one I love most is freedom of religion. Just think of the millions of people affected by this right. I love my religion, and I feel the world would be a better place to live in if everyone lived up to their faith just a little bit more, and we Americans have the right to practice this.

I suppose when I grow older and become a citizen, when I turn twenty-one, I'll appreciate our other wonderful rights, such as the right to vote, to run for office, and many more. But for now I'll try to be a good citizen and American and practice those rights I'm allowed at my age.

Dallas, Tex., Police Department

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Mr. Dennis Hoover, a talented writer for the Dallas Morning News, presented in the March 17 editions of that newspaper a most thoughtful and well done article detailing the full integration which has been effected in an orderly and efficient manner by the police department of the city of Dallas. It is an accomplishment of which the city is rightly proud, and I regard it as a clear indication that Texans are committed to social progress and correctly feel that our Nation never has been closer to being a unified, just, and abundant society.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

DALLAS MANPOWER HUNT: OFFICERS ALL "BLUE" NEGRO POLICEMEN FIND

(By Dennis Hoover)

Negroes are especially elusive in a major manhunt being waged by the Dallas Police Department.

The men are wanted as applicants for jobs as police officers.

Soaring crime and thickening traffic are spurring efforts to recruit 128 more policemen to bring the force up to authorized strength. Qualified men of all races are being sought for the vacancies. But Negroes, who make up 19 per cent of Dallas' population, now account for only 7 per cent of applicants, says Capt. D. A. Byrd, head of the police personnel bureau.

A career in police work would seem to offer many Negroes a welcome opportunity, and certainly Dallas would gain in improved law enforcement and race relations from having more non-white officers, say police leaders.

But thus far it has proved difficult to match this personal opportunity and public benefit.

The department has been hiring and trying to hire Negro policemen since 1947. It now has only 15 officers of this minority group: 10 patrolmen, 3 detectives and 2 sergeants. They constitute about 1 per cent of the 1,452-member force.

The Negro officers as a group have proved to be as capable as white officers. Some are outstanding.

"Our Negro officers are a valuable asset to the department," said Police Chief Charles Batchelor. "They have done a real fine job." A bureau head discussing the two Negro officers who work under him said: "I'd like to have half a dozen more like them this afternoon."

Integration of the police force was gradual, but it now is complete. The first Negro officers, beginning 21 years ago, walked beats in Negro neighborhoods of North and South Dallas, changing into their uniforms at a public housing project on N. Washington St. About 1955 the downtown police locker room was integrated. In 1961 Negro officers began appearing in squad cars. About four years ago Negroes became part of regular platoons and patrol squads became racially mixed.

Today Negro detectives work all over the city. Negro officers in squad cars patrol districts of all racial compositions, often with white partners. In one instance a Negro radio patrolman is supervising the field training of his white rookie partner. A Negro sergeant has charge of several white patrolmen in an East Dallas district. One Negro patrolman regularly directs traffic at major downtown intersections.

The Negro officers often deal with white people in making arrests, issuing traffic tickets, investigating accidents and looking into complaints of all kinds.

How well has the white public accepted Negro policemen? Almost perfectly, it appears from questioning police officials and the Negro officers themselves.

"These officers are knowledgeable and astute at getting along with the public," said Capt. Byrd.

"They have received a lot of compliments," noted Chief Batchelor.

Letters commending the Negro policemen make a thick file. A look at the praises heaped on 25-year-old Patrolman Albert Haskins, who joined the force four years ago, pretty well tells the story.

A Richardson woman involved in an accident lauded Haskins for investigating the affair "in the most professional and efficient manner." She said the officer was "very courteous and helpful while performing his duties."

Another letter about Haskins came to Chief Batchelor from a businessman. It said:

"Many times in the back of my mind I have thought that if a Negro ever tried to give me a ticket for anything, hell would break loose there and then. Well, after today I guess I am a poor liar.

"I was stopped for going straight ahead instead of 'left lane must turn left' and given a ticket by the most well trained, well behaved man I have ever met. And he was right, too, darn it!

"In the past 16 years this is ticket No. 2 for me, and if I get one tomorrow I hope it is from a man as nice about it as this (officer) was, regardless of color."

Some white people "blink twice" when a Negro answers their call for police service. But the Negro officers, one by one, told the writer they have never, or rarely, encountered racial resentment as they performed their duties.

"I have run into some drunks who objected to being arrested by a Negro," one officer related.

In another instance, a white woman telephoned police headquarters to allege that her boyfriend of several years had "stolen" her car. The Negro officer who answered the call concluded after questioning the woman that she had in fact given her boy friend permission to drive her car.

The woman wasn't satisfied. She asked the officer to call for a white policeman. About then a white officer in another squad car happened by, and he talked with the woman. "He told her the same thing I did, that there was no cause for police action," the Negro officer related.

A Negro patrolman who has had extensive contacts with the white public seemed to reflect the feeling of the other officers who were interviewed: "Dallas people are ready to have all the Negro policemen that can be hired," he said.

Another Negro officer commented: "I'd say there is actually no such thing as a white officer or a black officer. They're all blue (a reference to blue police uniforms)."

How do the Negro officers get along with their fellow officers who are white?

"Superbly," said one Negro patrolman. "There are never any conflicts."

"There's close harmony between Negro and white officers," reported another.

Many of the officers said, however, that the force still has a few racial "diehards."

"You're always going to have a few people who wouldn't accept a Negro anything," one patrolman commented.

A Negro veteran in the department apparently summed the matter: "We weren't accepted at first," he said. "But we are now and we have been for years. In the beginning some of the officers wouldn't even speak to us. We brought about the change ourselves by doing our work in an efficient manner and winning their respect.

"Ninety-nine per cent of the officers now completely accept Negroes on the force. I just don't pay any attention to the few who can't adjust to the new era. Generally speaking (the racial climate) is very pleasant."

Signs of racial congeniality within the department are abundant. Officers who work together often drink coffee and eat lunch together in restaurants. A Negro sergeant said he has visited fellow officers in their homes "and they have visited me."

Laurice Baker, a Negro patrolman, was elected vice-president of his rookie class at the Dallas Police Academy in 1964.

Frequently Negro and white officers face danger together. Once, Patrolman Josias Prelow and his partner took a biracial step into a dark living room to arrest a man for beating up his wife. The suspect was belligerent. While both policemen fought him on the floor he seized a flashlight and struck Prelow on the forehead with it. "See that scar?" said Prelow. "It took five stitches."

Where it takes courage, the Negro officers have shown they have it. Haskins once exchanged shots with a brawler, Det. Jesse R. Dawson had occasion to shoot the pistol out of a man's hand. Det. Benjamin J. Thomas, after a gun battle, captured a man who had just shot another man in a beer joint. Baker swapped lead with a car thief.

Baker also tackled and disarmed a bandit who was in the act of robbing a 7-11 store. "To keep him from hurting the store manager I had to attack him," the officer related. "We wrestled. I was able to knock his gun away, get him down and get the 'cuffs on him."

Late one Saturday night last spring Patrolman Roosevelt Ford was shot through the chest while investigating a disturbance call at a South Dallas tavern. He was off work 10 weeks. He almost died.

But the success of Negro police officers at their jobs, their acceptance by the community and the department itself, haven't given the police force much of a biracial complexion to date. Serious obstacles plague the continuing attempt to give Dallas a more racially balanced police establishment.

A major deterrent to recruiting Negro officers is the negative feeling that this race generally has toward the police. A police official described the situation this way:

"Many young Negroes believe they'd be looked down upon in their own community if they joined the city authority group. They're still thinking about days past when there were no Negro officers and many felt, sometimes with justification, that Negroes as a race were discriminated against in police methods—picked up on a slight pretext, and mishandled sometimes at the police station. The feeling persists that a Negro who joins the police department is a 'snitch' to his race."

Many of the Negro police officers who were interviewed stressed the same point in different ways. Following are some of their comments:

"One of the biggest (recruiting) problems now is worry (by prospective applicants) that their social standing would change, that they would be an outcast or looked upon with suspicion in their own community."

"Negroes as a general rule have a complex about policemen, probably a carry-over from years ago. Policeman is just kind of a dirty word. They feel the police are on one side and they're on the other. Some of the youngsters would feel disloyal to their race if they joined the police force."

"Some still feel hostile because of past maltreatment of Negroes in general by the police."

"I think Negroes resent authority a bit more than other races. In a lot of cases it's been used wrongly against them."

"In the old days a Negro wasn't treated the way he should have been, and this mistrust and enmity of policemen is still deep down inside. He feels if he became a policeman he'd lose face and friends in the community."

Some of the officers said the Negro image of police shaped by the past is no longer valid, but that it will take time to erase the misconception. Other officers said the image will be altered quicker if some white policemen improve their attitude toward Negroes.

A place for some white policemen to begin, said a Negro officer, is by ending their habit of addressing Negro complainants by first names—using instead the dignified titles of Mr., Miss or Mrs. customarily accorded white citizens who request police service.

Do Negroes "lose friends" when they don police uniforms?

The Negro policemen themselves disagreed on this point.

"Very few Negro friends really like you after you get to be a policeman," said one officer. "I've found friends dropping by the wayside."

"It's true, you do lose friends," said another. "Negro suspicion about the police force even extends to accusations against Negro discrimination against their own race. They say, 'The Negro officer is being used.' I've been accused in a white-Negro automobile collision case of taking the white motorist's side just because I'm now part of a predominantly white organization."

Other officers said, however:

"I've lost no friends and I've gained the respect of a lot of people, and in essence their friendship too."

"I've made more friends as a policeman than I would have otherwise, and the friendships are of higher caliber people. This job has real prestige."

"I've gained new friends. If any dropped me they were not worth fooling with. When I was hired I didn't come in as an undercover man, and this is a factor. My intentions were out in the open."

Police officials say many Negroes may still believe the department discriminates in job assignments and promotions. All the evidence, including statements by the Negro officers themselves, indicates this belief is false.

"There is absolutely no discrimination of any kind," a department spokesman stressed. "Any officer can climb the ladder by his own efforts through written competitive examinations."

Another police leader said he believes many Negroes who might qualify for officer posts are simply fearful about "coming up and applying."

The lowering of racial barriers in government and industry is another factor slowing the recruitment of Negro policemen.

"Negroes now are going to school and taking advantage of a wide variety of opportunities," one Negro officer pointed out. Another officer said bluntly: "For some Negroes police work might be a step forward economically. But just about any Negro who could qualify for the police department could qualify for a helluva lot better job."

A Dallas police officer starts out, as an apprentice policeman, at $500 a month. After six months his pay goes to $520. At the end of a year he becomes a patrolman and makes $542.

If he remains a patrolman for four years his pay jumps to $574. But at the end of three years he is eligible to take examinations for detective or sergeant, whose base pay is $643. The base pay of lieutenants is $705, of captains $797.

None of the Negro officers appeared to regard his pay as a whole lot of money. But the vast majority pointed to many other rewards of police work, and they seemed happy with their careers.

"How do you like being a policeman?" the officers were asked. Typical replies were these:

"I love it. I like working with people. I like the variety it gives you. It's a good profession to be in. It gets in your blood."

"It's quite a challenge. It seems as though it's the only thing I've ever done. I view the job routinely."

"I like it for many reasons. There's always something different. It's exciting. Also, you see a side of human nature you wouldn't ever see in any other type of work. You deal with many types of human problems, and helping to solve these problems gives you a sense of accomplishment."

"I love it. The job has respectability."

One officer said: "If I had a million dollars I'd still be a policeman, I had some pretty good job offers before I went on the force."

Several replies were less enthusiastic. "I like being a policeman all right. It's a good job for a man who wants to do that kind of work," said one officer.

Would the officers urge other qualified Negroes to join the force? Typical comments on this point were:

"It's a good field. It's an opportunity for many young Negroes to better themselves by getting into a respected, challenging profession."

"The Dallas Police Department is just a darn good organization to work for, and I'd recommend it to anybody."

"It's a good profession to be in, and for a Negro it's one of the top paying jobs."

"Policing is an excellent profession now opened up to members of our race, and I'd like to see more men take advantage of it. The Negro community also would benefit a great deal."

"Not only does police work offer an opportunity personally, but it is a chance to help combat one of our greatest problems by building greater harmony between races."

One officer said: "For someone who can do something else I would advise him to do something else."

Aside from needing more police manpower per se, the department recognizes that Negro officers are often more effective in dealing with members of their race than are white officers. Most of the Negro officers agree.

"I feel I have extra value sometimes when I have Negro suspects," said Det. Mackeroy Tuck of burglary and theft. "It's a little easier for me to establish rapport and get the truth out of them, because I speak their language a little better than the average white officer might."

"In many instances Negro officers would get better cooperation from the Negro public because of the similarity of background," said Patrolman Emmitt Hill Jr.

"A white officer can't do too much undercover work in a Negro area," another officer pointed out.

One Negro officer said he joined the force, in part, because "there was a lot of resentment against white officers."

"There's a great amount of crime among our people," this officer noted. "I wanted to work for improved law enforcement. I thought the presence of more Negro officers on the force might help encourage respect for law and order among Negroes."

The police department is also sure that additional Negro officers would foster improved relations between this minority group, the police and the community as a whole. As Chief Batchelor put it, a Negro officer has "an opportunity to help draw the races together."

Comments by the Negro officers themselves included these:

"The Negro community would like to see more colored officers in their neighborhoods. They feel they can communicate with them better. Negro officers can be a bridge to better relations."

"We're able to understand the problems of our people better and perhaps show them more compassion, and therefore generate a better understanding between the Negro community and police department."

"Properly used, a larger proportion of Negroes on the force could be of great advantage to Dallas and the police department in easing racial tensions."

"Seeing Negroes in uniform is good for the Negro community . . . It makes them realize that law enforcement now exists for them as much as for anybody else, and that authority is not totally in the hands of white people any more."

"More Negro officers would speak well for the city. With the population we have we should be well represented. We like to feel that people will feel secure in seeing us in the community, and that something is being done about law-enforcement."

Another Negro officer said: "I often think I may be better qualified to work in a white area than white policemen are to work in a Negro area. Few white officers have studied anything about Negro culture."

But even if the department is able to attract more Negro applicants, it faces a recruitment obstacle that may take years of improved Negro education to overcome. The harsh fact is that very few Negro applicants are able to pass the written Civil Service entrance examination to qualify for a police officer's job.

"Our biggest problem in recruiting Negroes is getting them past the exam," Chief Batchelor said.

Since the first of this year 30 Negroes have taken the test, but only one made a passing grade. "This is the way it has been running," said Capt. Byrd.

By contrast, said the personnel officer, about 60 per cent of white applicants pass the examination.

Police officials say the test is geared to the capability of the average high school graduate. But one who flunked the test this year is a 26-year-old Dallas Negro high school teacher who is working on his master's degree.

Of the 15 Negro officers presently on the force, two have bachelor's degrees, one is a junior college graduate, and eight have done varying amounts of college work short of graduation.

So the police department is looking not only for more Negro applicants but, hopefully, more who can pass the Civil Service examination. The search is going forward on many fronts.

Much of the stepped-up minority recruitment effort is being conducted by Negro Sgt. Philip R. Peace, who was moved into the personnel office for this purpose in January.

Recruiting methods include newspaper, radio and television advertising. One television pitch is made by the Negro-white "I Spy" team of Bill Cosby and Robert Culp. They get over the message that policing is an honorable, rewarding profession for men of "all races, creeds and colors."

Ages of eligibility for joining the force are 19½ through 38. To qualify, candidates must pass the Civil Service test, a physical examination, a background screening, and an interview by a board of police officials.

Fringe benefits enjoyed by Dallas policemen include pensions, insurance and an opportunity to take courses in any college, with the city government paying the tuition.

Hundreds of strategically placed posters are helping in the recruitment effort. Mobile recruiting teams are hunting for prospects in shopping centers. Police officials are addressing Negro church groups and telling Negro high school and college student bodies about the department's career opportunities.

Police personnel officers met recently with representatives of the Urban League, Bishop College, the Dallas Negro Chamber of Commerce, and the federal Community Relations Service to urge them to "send us applicants."

In a national effort to fill law enforcement ranks the Department of Defense this year gave police agencies the green light to recruit at military bases. The Dallas department has exclusive rights to recruit among servicemen due early discharge at Fort Sill, Okla. Two Dallas officers are working full-time at the project there, talking to soldiers individually and in groups. Applicants take the Civil Service and physical examinations at the base. Those who qualify for police jobs may be separated from the service 90 days ahead of schedule.

About 800 men a month are being discharged at Ft. Sill, a sizable portion of them Negroes. To date Dallas has netted seven rookie policemen from among the outgoing soldiers, all of them white.

The police department soon will open a neighborhood recruiting station in South Dallas, using space in the Urban League office on Forest Avenue. There a team headed by Sgt. Peace will interview and test applicants on Sunday afternoons from 2 to 6 p.m.

Sgt. Peace says there's little the department won't do to get more officers. It will send recruiters to talk with prospects in their homes, and even provide squad car "taxi" service to any applicant wishing to have a try at the Civil Service exam.

One applicant has already been given a free squad car ride to the Civil Service office. You guessed it: he failed the exam.

But nobody at headquarters has given up. "I just don't think Negroes are aware of the opportunities that await them," said Sgt. Peace.

Increased Veterans' Benefits

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very much pleased that the advisory commission of veterans programs has reported to the House some 79 recommendations for changes in veterans benefits in a report to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

It would appear that the major proposals of the report stress service-connected disability compensation and would increase by $100 a month the present basic rate of $300 for totally disabled veterans at a cost of about $11.2 million for the 112,000 such veterans eligible to receive these benefits.

It also appears that payment for partial disability would be increased by a percentage equal to the rise in the cost of living index since December 1, 1965. This will also be helpful to many veterans.

In addition, the panel recommended an increase of the maximum home loan guaranty of $7,500 to $10,000 and the $17,500 maximum direct loan, made in areas where guaranteed loans are not available, should be increased to $20,000, with flexible provisions permitting the Veterans' Administration to adjust the guarantee to areas where high cost levels prevail.

Moreover, the commission report stated that the present $250 burial allowance for veterans, which is separate from the burial allowance paid for soldiers killed while in service, should be increased to $400.

To my mind, these recommendations would constitute a much-needed improvement in current veteran laws, and I urge that the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs give them immediate consideration with a view to reporting them to the House at an early date for appropriate action.

Disabled veterans are greatly affected by the substantial increase in the cost of living which has occurred in recent years, and it is in the interest of fairness and justice for Congress to recognize that fact and provide early relief for those who sacrificed so much to preserve and perpetuate the free institutions of this Nation in times of great peril.

National Cash Register Presents Family of Speeded-Up Computers

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on March 20 to open an exhibition and demonstration in Washington of third generation computer equipment produced by the National Cash Register Co.

I was particularly proud of this opportunity, not only because NCR has its headquarters in my home town of Dayton, Ohio, but because the company's new Century series serves as a symbolic representation of the vitality which characterizes our free enterprise system.

Reflecting the greatest financial undertaking in the company's 84-year history, I understand that these computers represent an outlay of more than $150 million which the company has already absorbed.

The research on this project resulted in several technological innovations which are bound to be emulated by the electronics and information processing industry.

The impact and true importance of this significant achievement of NCR extends far beyond the borders of Ohio. In addition to increased savings of time and other benefits to be derived, it will mean new jobs and increased efficiencies for our economy. In this connection, I should like to quote from an article about the development of the new Century Series which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star:

New facilities include a 300,000 square foot plant nearing completion at San Diego, California, to augment plants at Hawthorne, California and Dayton, Ohio. Manufacture of the new computer family also is being carried out in Dundee, Scotland and Augsburg, Germany.

In presenting NCR's explanation of the advanced computer equipment, the Wall Street Journal on March 6 referred to the company's development of:

A new type of central data-storage unit, or memory, for the Century Series. In the memory, tiny metal whiskers coated with a magnetic material replace the thousands of doughnut-shaped magnetic cores commonly used to store electronic pulses. The computers are built with integrated circuits, each of which performs the functions of as many as 30 individual electronic components.

Our dynamic competitive system has once again been reinforced by the willingness of one of America's leading industrial concerns to invest huge sums of money and manpower to bring the results of greatly advanced technology to the international marketplace.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the notable articles from the Washington Evening Star of March 5, 1968, and the Washington Post of March 10, 1968:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 5, 1968]

NATIONAL CASH REGISTER PRESENTS FAMILY OF SPEEDED-UP COMPUTERS

(By Charles Covell)

The National Cash Register Co. today introduced a whole new family of computers with several technological breakthroughs, including a disc memory unit it calls the fastest in the industry.

The introduction took place simultaneously here and in major cities throughout the world. Owen B. Gardner, vice president for industry marketing, told a Washington press conference that the company has a sales target of more than a billion dollars worth of the new equipment. He said it had spent $150 million on production facilities and research.

New facilities include a 300,000-square-foot plant nearing completion at San Diego, Calif., to augment plants at Hawthorne, Calif., and Dayton, Ohio. Manufacture of the new computer family also is being carried out in Dundee, Scotland, and Augsburg, Germany.

The new computer family is called the Century series. Gardner said it will come in a wide range of sizes and prices geared for the "mass market," as well as the more sophisticated users.

Heart of the system is a new "red" memory, employing thousands of tiny "whiskers" in place of the usual doughnut-shaped ferromagnetic cores. Each of the hairlike copper wire rods is only one tenth of an inch long and is coated with a thin film of magnetic material. The rods are then automatically placed in solenoids—coils of two interwoven wires—with an inner diameter of only 10 mils. After assembly, the planes are coated with plastic and stacked to form memory modules.

The same memory module is used throughout the computer family. It operates at 800 nano-seconds (800 billionths of a second) and has a basic capacity of 16,000 characters which in the larger Century can be expanded to 524,000.

The Century series also includes disc memory storage units with an average access time of 45 milliseconds, said to be the fastest in the industry. Data is transferred at a rate up to 180,000 characters per second.

National Cash Register also is using integrated circuits in all its units, contrary, it

says, to other manufacturers who have used them only in some parts of their systems.

Integrated circuits compress the equivalent of 16 diodes, four transistors and 10 resistors on a single silicon chip 40-thousandths of an inch square.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 10, 1968]

FOR SMALLER BUSINESSES: LOW-COST COMPUTER SERIES INTRODUCED

(By Claude Koprowski)

Joining the march to capture small users the National Cash Register Co. last week introduced a low cost series of computers. It was the second company to do so in as many months.

Called the Century Series, models of the new machine will lease for $2000 a month and sell for $112,000. If sales meet projections, NCR will install 5000 Centuries representing a billion-dollar segment of the computer market.

A newcomer to the computer field in 1959, NCR has already installed more than 3000 of its first- and second-generation machines.

Tooling up for the Century Series cost the company $150 million in research engineering, software and new production facilities, according to NCR vice president Owen B. Gardner.

The Series includes a range of compatible peripheral equipment including card and tape readers, remote terminals, new high speed disc packs and a variety of prepackaged programs. Among the latter: bank central information file programs, police department use designs, and plans for hospital and insurance agencies.

Gardner said the programs were business-oriented and retailers doing $10 million annual sales could justify their usage.

Key to the Century's low cost is the use of tiny magnetic-coated metal rods instead of the usual ferrite cores. These whiskers can be placed and wound automatically on the memory plane, thus cutting production costs by half.

The Century Series will be offered in models 100 and 200. Model 100, with a 16,000 character memory, will be scheduled for delivery in September. Model 200, with a 524,000-character memory capacity is scheduled for deliveries in 1969.

Col. Robert L. Moorhead, of Indianapolis

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, for many years Col. Robert L. Moorhead, of Indianapolis, was an outstanding symbol of what a good citizen should be. He was one of the finest examples I have ever known of the true citizen-soldier, a man who gave all he had to give to civic pursuits in time of peace, and rendered the same selfless service to his country in time of war. He was a great patriot and a great citizen.

He was an inspiration to all who knew him and were proud to call him a friend, as I did. Bob Moorhead will be sorely missed. The following editorial from the March 19, 1968, Indianapolis News pays fitting tribute to a fine Hoosier:

ROBERT L. MOORHEAD

The death of Robert L. Moorhead has ended the long and fruitful career of one of this community's most distinguished citizens.

In military affairs, in business, in education, in public service and in humanitarian activities, Moorhead was a notable figure.

Moorhead was a veteran of the Spanish American War and World War I who long maintained an active interest in military affairs. He was a colonel in the Field Artillery Reserve from 1919 to 1939.

His knowledge of and interest in history was great and in 1920 he wrote and published "The Story of the 139th Field Artillery." He was active for years in the Indiana Pioneer Society and the Marion County Historical Association.

Bob Moorhead was keenly interested in contemporary matters, as well. He served ably as state senator from Marion County for three terms and was chairman of the first State Budget Committee.

An official in the old Bobbs-Merrill Co. for many years and in charge of its law publishing, he was able to find time to devote to his community. The Warren Township school at 8400 E. Tenth was named for him in recognition of his wise leadership in school affairs of that township.

Moorhead lived to the exceptional age of 92, not retiring from an active business life until he was 82. There are not many men who have served their community, state and nation more devotedly. He was one of his county's great citizens.

Elizabethtown Salutes U.S. Army Reserve on 60th Anniversary

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, we in New Jersey are very proud of the officers and men of the 78th Division. On April 28, the "Lightning Division" will march in the 37th annual Americanization Day parade in Jersey City, N.J. Needless to say, this will be a highlight of the day.

In the March–April edition of Pipeline, a publication of the Elizabethtown Gas Co., there is an article commemorating the 60th anniversary of the U.S. Army Reserve which is dedicated to the 78th Division and to the Army Reserve.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert this article in the RECORD following my remarks.

The article follows:

ELIZABETHTOWN SALUTES U.S. ARMY RESERVE ON 60TH ANNIVERSARY

One out of every 200 Americans today is an Army Reservist. If you know one, even if he is only 22, wish him a happy 60th birthday! For on April 23rd, the one million member U.S. Army Reserve will celebrate its 60th Anniversary. All over America the nation's Army Reserve units will participate in a series of special events to mark "U.S. Army Reserve Week", April 21–27.

"LIGHTNING DIVISION" TO MARCH

New Jersey's own 78th Division (Training), known as the "Lightning Division", celebrated its own 50th Anniversary last August. On Sunday, April 28th, they will march in Jersey City's 37th Annual Americanization Day Parade. It's an event not to be missed. 25,000 marchers representing various groups are scheduled to participate along with a crowd of spectators expected to reach 125,000. The parade will be dedicated to the 60th Anniversary of the U.S. Army Reserve.

The 78th Division, commanded by Major General John G. Cassidy of Nutley, is New Jersey's largest U.S. Army Reserve unit. It is comprised of 3,500 officers and enlisted men. Assistant division commanders are Brigadier General David B. Kelly of South Amboy (also N.J. Superintendent of State Police), and Brigadier General Harry J. Rockafeller of Manasquan.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

Citizen-soldiers have played an important role in the fight for democracy since the days of the original 13 colonies. However, they were members of militias and it wasn't until April 23, 1908, when Congress established the Medical Reserve Corps, that the Federal Government had its own military reserve.

Since then, members of the Army Reserve have distinguished themselves in two world wars, the Korean Conflict and during the Berlin Crisis of 1961. Today, in Vietnam, Army Reserve officers are continuing the tradition of service by playing a key role in providing troop leadership. Approximately 75 percent of the officers and warrant officers serving in Southeast Asia have Army Reserve commissions and warrants.

The Army Reserve successfully met its greatest challenge during World War II when more than 100,000 U.S. Army Reserve officers were called upon to assume command and staff positions. The filled command positions that ranged from platoon leader to division commander and staff positions at all levels included the General Staff in Washington and joint staffs around the world.

When the Korean Conflict broke out in June, 1950, the nation once again called upon its Reserve forces to help fight the enemy. Almost a quarter of a million members of the Army Reserve served on active duty. During the first year of the war, when the heaviest fighting took place, members of the Army Reserve won 6 of the 27 Medals of Honor and one-quarter of the other top combat decorations awarded.

Again, in 1961, when the Berlin Crisis developed, Reserve forces were activated to augment the Regular Army. About 75,000 men and women of the Army Reserve were called to active duty for tours of up to one year.

BEST TRAINED IN HISTORY

As the Army Reserve celebrates its 60th Anniversary, the nation today can boast of having the strongest, best-trained and best-equipped Army Reserve force in its history. Forming the nucleus of the Army Reserve are some 3,495 highly trained units. More than 260,000 men and women are members of these units which range in size from a four-man Judge Advocate General detachment to a 4,500-man infantry brigade organized and equipped to fight in sustained combat in any part of the world. Each unit holds from 48–72 training sessions a year, many on weekends, and spends two weeks each year at a military installation for intensified training and maneuvers.

READY RESERVE

An additional 480,000 men and women are assigned to the Individual Ready Reserve, and in case of war, would be used to reinforce units of the Army, Army Reserve and Army National Guard. Some of the officers assigned to the Individual Ready Reserve have been preselected, because of civilian specialty or military training, to fill an authorized position at a selected Army headquarters. Those officers, called Mobilization Designees, spend two weeks each year at that headquarters serving in the position they would fill in case of war.

STANDBY AND RETIRED RESERVE

Rounding out Army Reserve strength are the 266,000 members of the Standby Reserve and 201,000 members of the Retired Reserve. These men and women, who do not train with any units, can only be called up to active duty in time of war or national emergency declared by Congress.

In addition to training with their units, many Army Reservists attend special schools or take correspondence courses in order to increase their military proficiency or to learn new military skills. In 1967, 60,000 members attended Army Reserve schools or took correspondence courses offered by Regular Army

schools. Officers are required to take courses in order to be eligible for promotion.

Perhaps the most outstanding characteristic of the men and women in the Army Reserve is the large reservoir of special skills and experience they represent. Most of the officers and noncommissioned officers, as well as many enlisted men, follow civilian callings that nearly parallel their military duties.

ACTIVE IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

The Army Reserve member is also usually active in community and business affairs. Eighty-eight percent of the senior officers in the Army Reserve, for example, hold national or local office in civic and professional associations which are unrelated to military service.

With sixty years under its belt, The Reserve looks ahead with additional pride and optimism towards the future, according to Major General W. J. Sutton, Chief of the Army Reserve. "The officers and enlisted personnel are among the most dedicated men and women in the nation today," General Sutton said. "They realize that a strong and proficient Reserve force is a prime requirement for the preservation of our democratic society. That's why they are giving so much of their time and energy to the Army Reserve."

U.S. Ambassador Leonard Unger Speaks at Luncheon in Bangkok, Thailand

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, one of this Nation's closest friends and strongest allies is Thailand. Our Ambassador to that picturesque and independent country, the Honorable Leonard Unger, addressed the American Chamber of Commerce in Bangkok recently, and for the benefit of my colleagues I insert his address in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY U.S. AMBASSADOR LEONARD UNGER, AT AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LUNCHEON, BANGKOK, THAILAND, JANUARY 17, 1968

I appreciate this opportunity to meet with members of the American Chamber of Commerce in Thailand, and welcome the invitation to carry on the tradition of an annual appearance by the American Ambassador. Much of what I have to say today will relate to our relations, as Americans, with the Thais in whose country we are living as guests. While the record of Thai-American relations speaks for itself, generally, sight tends to be lost from time to time of certain basic realities which I would like to put in better perspective. I should state at the outset, that in addition to speaking as the President's personal representative to Thailand. I am expressing deep, personal convictions based upon experiences over the past ten years—first in Thailand, then in Laos, and more recently in Washington, where I dealt with many Southeast Asian matters, particularly the problem of Vietnam.

I

Vietnam, by almost any standard, is the most absorbing and complex issue in American political life today. The issue is whether the nations of Southeast Asia shall be able to set their own independent course and be free of subversive aggression. Thailand, therefore, also attaches extreme importance to the outcome of the Vietnamese struggle. Its determination equals that of the United States to bring about a final settlement in Vietnam which assures national freedom and fosters the return of peaceful order to Southeast Asian affairs.

The government of Thailand has made its position unmistakably clear. It has done this through active participation in collective defense arrangements under SEATO. Thailand has also enabled the U.S. to bring its air power to bear against North Vietnam and its infiltration into the South. Thailand has sent troops of its own to help defend South Vietnam, and it has taken firm measures to protect its own people against those assaulting not only South Vietnam and large sectors of Laos today, but Thailand itself.

Communist hostility toward Thailand is but one of many reflections of this nation's strategic importance in the total Southeast Asian picture. Ironic as it may seem, another measure of Thailand's key role in Southeast Asian events is this country's growing prominence in the American controversy over Vietnam.

In the cross fire of political battles over Vietnam, many Americans naturally want to examine our commitments elsewhere in the area, and to assess the dependability of those with whom we have aligned ourselves. I do not quarrel with the usefulness of responsible, free debate. I am seriously troubled, however, when I see certain facts about Thai-U.S. cooperation misread in ways that damage Thai-American interests, and encumber the Vietnam problem with negative and discouraging implications which do not actually exist.

The frequency of late of such distortion and misinformation has provided a new and disturbing experience for the Thai government and people. It is never pleasant to find one's country being criticized or subjected to hostile cross examination by foreigners. It is even less pleasant when they seem to question the validity of national policies, programs and institutions that have been carefully developed over the years for the express purpose of self-preservation. Having governed themselves for over 700 years, the Thai feel no need to adjust their way of doing things to meet foreign concepts of how things should be done. Moreover, having decided that defending Vietnam is in Thailand's own best interests, they do not want their actions interpreted—or misinterpreted—in lights cast by the clash of conflicting views over similar U.S. policies. Neither do they want it assumed that their fundamental policies are merely a response to the wishes of a large power. Understandably, they resent the bland assumption that the pattern of events in a neighboring state inevitably will be repeated in their own.

II

Nevertheless, perhaps largely because Thailand is known to have both communist guerrilla forces and U.S. military units in the country, it seems often to be assumed that American forces have been sent here to deal with the internal threat and are more or less covertly engaged in combat against insurgents in Thailand's rural areas. This of course is not the case. The only combat actions in which U.S. forces here participate are those well-publicized out-of-country operations directed against Vietnamese communist targets. U.S. military units in Thailand, other than those belonging to the Air Forces, are neither equipped nor organized for combat assignments. The Thai government has stated repeatedly that in suppression actions against the guerrillas, the only American help it wants or needs is that given Thai military and security forces their own means of dealing with the problem.

Combat operations by Thai-based units of the U.S. Air Force are carried out against North Vietnam by our fighter-bomber aircraft, and against Viet Cong concentrations in South Vietnam by B–52 bombers, and have entailed the assignment to Thailand of about thirty-three thousand U.S. Air Force personnel. The Air Force units require in turn, from other U.S. military services here, myriad forms of logistical support in which some seven thousand troops are engaged. There are roughly three thousand additional U.S. military personnel in Thailand serving with the military assistance program, working on engineering and military research projects, and in SEATO.

Let me add, if I may, a footnote to what I hope will end misguided speculation about U.S. involvement in guerrilla warfare here. A year ago, Ambassador Martin confirmed for you that unarmed U.S. Air Force helicopters were on assignment in the Northeast. As Ambassador Martin emphasized, this was a temporary, non-combat measure, taken at a time when added mobility was of critical importance to Thai authorities organizing their own resources to blunt an escalating insurgent threat. Accordingly, in January of 1967, after the Royal Thai Government had completed the transitional training required for field operation of its own newly acquired force of forty-nine troop-carrying helicopters, the U.S. helicopters were withdrawn from Thailand. They were replaced in the field by these Thai helicopters, furnished by the U.S., which Thai authorities are using with increasing effectiveness. Additional helicopters have been provided, including ten to the Thai National Police, and more will become available to the armed forces and police as Thai pilots and mechanics complete training courses and can make use of these aircraft.

The lesson here, I think, is two-fold: First, the nature of American assistance to Thai counter-insurgency programs does not lead toward direct American involvement in those operations. On the other hand, we must not become so transfixed by our Vietnam experiences that we lose our capacity here to take decisive, practical steps in providing the training and equipment with which the Thai government itself can bring the insurgency under control, and in due course eliminate it.

III

We will continue to hear dire predictions, that Thailand inevitably will go the way of Vietnam, and that sooner or later Americans will be fighting communist insurgents here. In fact, Thailand resembles Vietnam only in that it is another intended victim of the same communist effort to expand its domination by using the technique of the "war of national liberation." Violence and killing in Thailand by communist terrorists, most of them trained outside Thailand, does not express grass roots political sentiment.

Thailand's people are united in a rapidly developing nation seeking to work out its political and economic destiny with care and forethought. Land ownership is primarily in the hands of those who work the soil. There is no tendency to split along religious lines, since virtually all Thai are Buddhists. Minorities are for the most part being assimilated and woven into the life of the country. One could cite many other factors working in Thailand's favor—its sense of self confidence developed over centuries of managing its own affairs—its able leadership, competent civil service, and armed forces showing their mettle today in Vietnam—its economic growth rate running around eight percent per annum—its capacity to organize and carry out rural security and development programs—and the social and economic mobility of Thai life.

Furthermore, Thailand's well-educated, skilled and enterprising young people do not migrate to other countries except in rare instances. Among the hundreds who annually go abroad for long periods to further their education or professional experience, all but a few are drawn back by loyalty and family ties and by their country's ample economic opportunities. I think it is fair to say, incidentally, that in large measure these have been created by Thailand's heavy emphasis upon private initiative and enterprise.

Thailand is also unique in that the continuity of its life and institutions has never been broken by colonial experiences. There has never been any need here for a national independence movement aimed at dislodging colonial rulers. Communist bands do not find in Thailand, therefore, as they did in Vietnam, any real opportunity to generate loyalty to a revolutionary struggle, or to identify themselves with compelling patriotic causes.

Above all, there flows from Thai attitudes toward the person of His Majesty the King and the institution of the monarchy a sense of national unity and continuity so strong that it extends into the remotest villages. To the citizens of Thailand, the King's full endorsement of efforts to counter the guerrilla threat is a buttress against subversive attemps to undermine the government's authority. In Thailand, as the communists have discovered even in relatively unprotected rural areas, the task of marshaling popular support for anti-government causes is difficult and unrewarding.

IV

In the Northeast, for example, in a poor area encompassing more than ten million people, where several years of subversive groundwork has been followed by two years of intensive terrorism and recruitment drives, the number of armed insurgents remains below two thousand. Reliable intelligence indicates that considerably more than a thousand of them have been trained outside Thailand in Communist China, in North Vietnam, and Pathet Lao territory.

At present, the mission of the insurgents, almost all of whom are full time fighters, assassins and political activists, is simple. Their mission is to break the links between Thailand's government and villagers, and to then replace the government's authority with their own. While there are isolated villages where this mission has been accomplished for a few hours, there is no point in Thailand upon which the insurgents have thus far been able to impose more than temporary control.

To see the present situation in fair perspective, however, one must look back to 1966. During that year, the level of communist violence increased markedly over 1965, a rise consistent with the insurgent campaign predicted by Peking in 1965. Communist operations reached a high point toward the end of 1966. In January of last year, the number of armed encounters rose as the Thai government's counter actions developed momentum. By March 1967 the insurgents had adopted the tactic of avoiding contact with government forces, and the number of monthly armed encounters dropped by two-thirds. The rate of forced village propaganda meetings has declined even more dramatically during the past year. Assassinations have shown a slight but steady decline and now are at a lower rate than at any time over the past two years.

A prime explanation of these trends, in my opinion, is the combination of armed pressures by Thai military and security forces and the expansion of Thai Government programs for the improvement of the villager's lot. The forces have chased the insurgents from past operational bases and forced them into other areas. This has broken or strained insurgent connections with established sources—often merely their own kinfolk—of food, intelligence and other forms of support. This has raised significantly the rate of defections and desertions, which reflect in general a lack of political motivation among those villagers recruited through intimidation or promise of material gains.

Given the Royal Thai Government's commitment of additional military and police forces to communist suppression work, its program to establish small, permanent security forces in threatened villages, and its growing attention to the aspirations and legitimate grievances of the villagers, I would expect insurgent efforts to organize the Thai countryside to meet with as little success in 1968 as they did in 1967.

They won't quit, however. Those who dominate the guerrilla ranks in Thailand are disciplined, well-trained, fully-indoctrinated insurgents. Thailand's northeast border provinces, where most of them are operating, or some of the other Thai border areas where there have been indications of additional outbreaks of insurgency, are too important to long-range communist plans to create a revolutionary base within this kingdom. More immediate objectives include protection for the flank of communist infiltration routes through Laos into South Vietnam; development of a capability for striking Thai military installations, including those being used to help in Vietnam; inducing the Thai government to question its policy of close alliance with the U.S.; and shaking U.S. faith in the stability of its ally.

V

The Thai government has developed an effective program to contain and compress rural insurgency. It has committed the requisite resources for this as well as for accelerating rural progress to make it increasingly difficult for subversive influences to take root and grow. Our two governments have agreed on how American economic and military assistance can best provide support to such programs. In fostering rural progress, the Thai government plans to continue to emphasize provincial roads and other communications links; expanding agricultural, public health, educational, and other governmental services in rural communities; assisting farmers' organizations; and developing water resources for human consumption and irrigation. Other projects are designed to establish local security forces in more and more of the endangered remote villages, to mobilize military and police forces for quick reaction to the outbreak of insurgent violence, and to modernize Thai military forces for defensive action against larger scale communist penetrations. The U.S. will assist these efforts with substantial levels of economic and military aid which last year totalled more than one hundred-ten million dollars.

In all our programs here, however, whether they fall within economic, military, or other categories (the Peace Corps, for example), there is an additional underlying theme, which must not be overlooked to get a true impression of what Americans are doing in Thailand. That theme is education in the broadest sense of the word. The emphasis upon teaching, technical training, and advisory activities in our assistance programs here is in keeping with Thailand's traditional practice of welcoming and importing advanced knowledge and new skills. Historically the Thais have sought to draw generously upon the experience and know-how of others to improve their own techniques so that they will be in a position to manage their own affairs with ever-increasing effectiveness.

In response to Thai requests, the U.S. has undertaken to provide large numbers of technical advisors, training instructors, professional consultants, and other specialists capable of imparting the special knowledge, competence and skills which Thialand wants in greater abundance. Those who can be classed as advisors, trainers, instructors and educators account for more than three quarters of the total USOM staff of Americans. A substantial proportion of U.S. assistance funds are allocated annually to the training and further education of Thai civilian and military specialists. Under the Participant Training Program administered by USOM since 1949, over five thousand Thais have gone abroad, to the U.S. and elsewhere, for advanced training. Additionally, many of the large scale Thai government projects which receive U.S. assistance are directly concerned with training. These include, for example, a program for training twelve thousand new members of the Thai National Police by the end of this year; the training for Accelerated Rural Development programs of technical personnel, over seven hundred of whom have completed basic courses, while fifteen hundred others are receiving on-the-job training in the provinces; the instruction of paramedics for rural public health services; educating village youths in basic vocational skills taught by instructors in mobile training units. These, to be sure, are but some of the ways in which Thailand obtains professional competence and technical skills to meet problems at home and keep pace with the outside world. By the way, as proof of the wisdom of the Thai Government's policy, I have been impressed with the large number of fields in which Americans and others were providing training here some years ago, when I was last in Thailand, but in which I now find Thai carrying on by themselves.

VI

To understand fully why Thailand and the U.S. have undertaken many of the wide range of projects which engage us here, one must first look outside Thailand—toward Vietnam and beyond—at Southeast Asia as a whole. Within this vast, potentially wealthy area live 250 million people. None of them would be beyond the ambitious, domineering embrace of communism if not adequate obstacles existed to Red Chinese and North Vietnamese expansionism. We must add to this reservoir of Asian manpower, a fertile land mass the size of Western Europe, vast sources, and a geographical position astride the air, sea and land routes joining the Pacific and Indian oceans.

U.S. policies toward the area take those strategic considerations into account, and above all the common determination among Southeast Asian states to preserve their national identities while advancing toward a more secure, stable and prosperous existence. U.S. policies in the individual nations of Southeast Asia are consistent with the basic American posture toward the area, but they vary from country to country, depending upon the capacity of each to maintain itself to its own satisfaction without outside help. The U.S. objective in these bilateral relations is an equal, progressive mutually advantageous partnership, such as we have long enjoyed with Thailand. Our partnership with Thailand has proven uniquely productive, both in bilateral terms and in the beneficial, steadying effect it has elsewhere in the area.

Thailand conducts its affairs on the basis of an independent, well-conceived set of policies which it has developed for itself toward the nations of this and all other areas of the world. On such basic matters, Thai and American positions are basically consistent. The effect of our alignment with each other, and with like-minded nations, is to give each of us greater influence than either nation could expect to exert in the absence of reinforcing policies and actions by the other.

Thailand, like America, is helping Vietnam in its own best interests. The United States is aiding Thailand for the same reason, and because it is our common firm belief that Vietnam is but one aspect of a much larger, potentially more formidable problem. Our efforts to solve and settle that problem depend ultimately upon people, both Thai and Americans, living and working in closer contact and in far greater numbers than ever before. This tests the capacity of Thai-American relations to withstand strains that our easy and cordial associations have not known before. I am fully convinced that the long term results from this period of intimate and broad Thai-American contacts will prove wholly positive.

National Primaries Needed To Nominate Presidential Candidates

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, for the last 15 years I have introduced legislation in the Congress calling for election reforms. Back in 1952, former Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, and I introduced a bill calling for national primaries for President and Vice President, and my current bill on this subject, H.R. 251, is pending in the House Administration Committee.

Columnist David Lawrence has written a very fine article calling for a national primary for our presidential candidates, which I believe deserves the attention of the Congress and the Nation, and I include it below in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NATIONAL PRIMARY WOULD BE BETTER

The political conspiracy in restraint of a free choice of presidential nominees by the national party conventions has reached a climax.

The American people today are being given a dramatic demonstration of how delegates are handpicked by small cliques of organization politicians in various states. They are attracted either by the promise of huge sums of private money for campaign expenses or by prospective rewards from the winning administration.

It is at times a contest between millionaires with large funds of their own or between aspirants who are supplied privately with the money needed to carry on the electioneering in a few states where primaries are held.

Only 11 states have presidential-preference primaries, and the results in these elections may or may not be a true reflection of nationwide opinion. But the would-be nominees evidently think the showing they make is bound to influence public opinion elsewhere.

The people would have a better chance to express themselves under a system whereby a single national primary would be held on the same day in all states. It could be stipulated by law that the parties whose nominees obtained the two highest totals would be eligible for the balloting on election day.

Today's nominating system is a kind of Gallup Poll. The assumption is that a sample taken in a few states is enough for the national convention of each party to consider in making a selection.

What, however, did the New Hampshire primary, for example, mean?

Sen. Eugene McCarthy's name was printed on the ballot, but President Johnson's name had to be written in. This is a complex problem, especially where there are voting machines.

Sen. Robert F. Kennedy of New York, who wasn't in the contest, has announced that he will enter certain state primaries but will stay out of others.

Former Vice President Richard Nixon polled the biggest vote of anybody. Gov. Nelson Rockefeller now indicates he wants to get into the presidential race against him. About all that last week's primary election did was to emphasize the weakness of the whole system of selecting delegates to a national convention.

How much do the people know at present about viewpoints of the contestants in the race, with the possible exception of the stand President Johnson has taken? Nixon speaks hopefully of how he might be able to end the war in Vietnam. Kennedy deplores many of the Johnson policies, and says he is motivated by a desire to discuss the issues rather than personalities. McCarthy is mobilizing the antiwar vote.

Actually, the American people don't really know what any of the candidates intend to do if elected. The President himself declares he will adhere to a firm line.

Kennedy says that he can do a better job in international as well as national affairs, and points to his experience when his brother was president.

McCarthy, of course, has had no executive background.

Nixon refers with pride to his eight years of intimate association with President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and, as vice president, he acquired an intimate knowledge of how the problems confronting a president are handled.

Rockefeller has for several years been the head of the government of a large state, but he hasn't as yet expressed himself on national issues.

If there were a nationwide primary, each candidate would have to explain fully his proposed policies or courses of action, and discuss them in far more detail than the vague and abstract statements being heard thus far.

At least the people of all the 50 states of the union would have a chance in a national primary to express their will by direct vote simultaneously. This would be the true voice of the people. The candidates would be chosen under a system of fair competition, without restraints imposed by two competing candidates acting together to block a third. For public opinion in America has long been opposed to monopoly, especially by political bosses.

Dedication of the Te Mamou Water System

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in mid-February I had the distinct pleasure of joining a number of my constituents at a most significant event for the Seventh District of Louisiana.

I refer to the dedication dinner for the Te Mamou Water System in Evangeline Parish, which now is bringing clean, fresh water to 142 rural families in the vicinity of the town of Ville Platte.

This project was undertaken with the assistance of a loan of $142,000 from the Farmers Home Administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It is an excellent demonstration of the results that can be accomplished by constructive teamwork between local leaders and the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the community facilities loan program of the Farmers Home Administration provides a substantial impact that is absolutely basic to the improvement of life in rural America. Modern water and sewer systems are essential elements for progress in the countryside.

I am most hopeful that other systems in Evangeline Parish, such as the Upper Pine and Point Blue projects, soon will move ahead with Farmers Home Administration support.

Howard Bertsch, Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, tells me that in calendar 1967, 1.2 million rural residents benefited from his agency's assistance in the construction of water and sewer facilities.

He reports that 1,146 loans and grants were made, totaling $212.1 million. Happily, this represented a substantial increase over 1966, when 825,000 people benefited from 960 projects financed with $184.5 million.

Because this program has such salutary effects on rural America, I hope that the Congress will continue to provide effective support to Secretary Freeman and Administrator Bertsch in the program to upgrade the quality of rural living through supervised credit.

Mr. Speaker, my warm congratulations to President Aaron Soileau and his associates on the board of the Te Mamou Water District, whose efforts achieved fruition with the recent dedication celebration.

Also deserving commendation are Louisiana Farmers Home Administration State Director Joe Rhodes and the members of his staff, who assisted in making this new system a reality. I refer particularly to Nat Thomas, chief of the community services program, District Supervisor Earl Hollier, and Evangeline Parish FHA Supervisor W. O. Carson.

Mr. Speaker, much of the unrest and turmoil in America results from untrained, undereducated and unprepared Americans flocking from the peace, ease, and security of rural America to our great urban centers. The migration leaves desolation in our rural areas and creates congestion and unrest in our once peaceful and beautiful cities. We must stop the movement and we can best do so by providing clean, pure water, sewerage facilities, fire protection, and recreational facilities to our rural areas—so that these areas may enjoy the blessings of our abundant resources and modern technology and provide for our rural citizens a full measure of America's achievements. What local citizens, in cooperation with Federal agencies, have accomplished for themselves and their community of Te Mamou is a shining example of self-help and cooperation between private citizens and our National Government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a news report of the dedication dinner published in the Ville Platte Gazette:

[From the Ville Platte (La.) Gazette, Feb. 15, 1968]

EDWARDS MEETS WITH TE MAMOU DISTRICT HEADS

Seventh District Congressman Edwin Edwards of Crowley was a guest of the Te Mamou Water District officials at an informal supper meeting Sunday evening held at the camp of attorney J. William Pucheu near Chicot Park.

The purpose of the meeting was to celebrate the completion of the Te Mamou Water System which is now furnishing water to 142 rural families in that community. An association loan of $142,000 was obtained from the Farmers Home Administration to install the water system.

Congressman Edwards commended the officials for their efforts in this project and assured the group that he would do everything in his power to see that funds are provided as soon as possible for other similar projects that are being planned for Evan-

geline parish. Among these are the Point Blue and Upper Pine projects.

Those attending were Mr. and Mrs. Aaron Soileau, Nathan Fontenot, Francis Foret, John N. Andrus, Ronald McCauley, Bill Pucheu, Vernon F. Meyer, Lindsey J. Aucoin, Nat W. Thomas, Earl G. Hollier, Clement Morein, W. O. Carson, Congressman Edwards, and Hosea Soileau.

Mr. Pucheu is the attorney for the System, and Vernon Meyer and Lindsey J. Aucoin are the engineers.

Nat W. Thomas is chief of the community services division in the State FHA office, and Earl G. Hollier is district FHA supervisor. W. O. Carson is the local parish supervisor.

Mr. and Mrs. Clement Morein donated to the District the land on which the Water Plant is located, about a mile west of Ville Platte.

Kilmer To Train Police Cadets

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the suggestions made in the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders was to recruit police officers from among the underprivileged. The Commission stated that "the need to develop better relations with minority group communities requires recruitment of police from these groups—groups handicapped by lack of educational opportunities and achievement." In line with this type of thinking, I was recently pleased to note that the Kilmer Job Corps Center in my district will be the scene of a program to train 200 Job Corpsmen as police officers under contract with the Police Athletic League. An article of March 5 in the Evening News states that "chiefs in 41 major cities have agreed to hire the young men as cadets or recruits, even if some modification of civil service rules is necessary." I have had continual testimony to the worth and effectiveness of the Kilmer operation, and I am proud to see that Kilmer once again is demonstrating itself to be in the forefront of the efforts being undertaken to solve our domestic problems.

At this point, I include these articles concerning this police training program in the RECORD:

NEW GHETTO PROGRAM: KILMER TO TRAIN POLICE CADETS

(By Douglas Eldridge) [1]

WASHINGTON.—A national program to train men from the ghettos as police cadets will be launched this month at the Kilmer Job Corps Center in Edison, N.J.

The new project, beginning with 200 trainees from all over the nation, was announced yesterday by William Kelly, national director of the Job Corps.

Known as the Job Corps Police Conference on PAL and Youth Activities and financed by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity. The initial one-year grant is expected to be $125,000.

DESIGNED TO REDUCE FRICTION

Kelly said the project is designed to relieve the shortage of manpower in the nation's police departments and to reduce friction between young Negroes and the police.

"We want to reach the youngsters who would lead the charge whenever there is disorder," said Kelly. "We will train the youngsters and send them back to the neighborhoods they left 6 to 9 months before.

"This may be one of the most dramatic things that has occurred in police-people relationships," added the Job Corps head.

Police cadet programs have already had some success in New York, Newark and other cities. And the President's Commission on Civil Disorders has called for special efforts to recruit and train young Negroes.

The police cadet center—expected to be in full swing by May and to serve 600 young men in the first year—will be operated by Federal Electric Corp., which runs the Kilmer Center for the OEO.

EXTENSIVE CURRICULUM

The cadets will receive 9 to 12 months of training in all aspects of police work—fingerprinting, traffic control, radio communication, first aid, photography and operations of courts and government.

Physical fitness, self defense, typing and driving courses will be offered, together with field trips and basic education.

Kelly said the national PAL conference will help screen the young men and place them afterward. Chiefs in 41 major cities have agreed to hire the young men as cadets or recruits, even if some modification of civil service rules is necessary.

About half the trainees will come from the present ranks of job corpsmen, and the rest will be recruited—mainly in big cities—by employment services and the PAL.

It will cost $5,100 to train each cadet who completes the program, compared with $6,700 for the typical Job Corps graduate.

PLANNED FOR 6 MONTHS

Kelly said the program has been planned for six months by the OEO and the national PAL conference, whose executive director is Capt. Harry Untereiner of the Weehawken, N.J. police.

A statement by the conference said police departments must take in more low-income, minority group members to dispel nonwhite hostility toward law enforcement.

"The time is now," said the conference, "for responsible police agencies to reverse the image presented to the citizens of the low income minority areas by police departments . . . properly trained young men, coming from the deprived areas, could make excellent police officers.

Kelly said it took a special appeal to Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York to obtain Lt. Dunning, he is one of the most decorated officers in the department's history.

Admission requirements for the new project will be higher than for the Job Corps. Prospective cadets must be at least 19, meet height and weight minimums, pass math and verbal achievement tests, and have no record of felonies.

TRAINEES TRANSFERRED

Job Corps officials also reported yesterday that all 224 trainees have now been transferred from the Liberty Park Center, which is closing in an economy move.

Most of the young men have been sent to other centers run by the National Park Service. The Liberty Park staff will all be gone by the end of the month, and the buildings will be maintained on standby.

Liberty Park, opened in January 1967, is one of 16 men's training centers shut by the Job Corps. The centers were rated on eight criteria, and the lowest ranking were dropped.

Figures disclosed by Kelly yesterday show that Liberty Park had particularly low ratings for operating costs, length of stay by trainees and reading gains.

The Job Corps has cut its male enrollment from 30,500 to 25,000, while maintaining women's enrollment at 9,800. No new male applicants have been accepted in two months, and there are now 12,000 on the waiting list.

[From Newsday, Mar. 5, 1968]

COP CLASS FOR JOB CORPS

(By Robert Hummerstone)

WASHINGTON.—A new Job Corps program designed to take underprivileged youths out of their slums, train them as policemen and send them back to patrol their home neighborhoods will start this spring at Camp Kilmer, N.J., it was announced yesterday.

Jack Birkenstock, director of police-community relations for the Job Corps, said that the first class this spring will include 180 of the Job Corps' "cream of the crop," youths who have been in the corps at least two months. They will get 10 to 12 more months of academic and police training to turn them into professional officers ready to be hired by police departments, said Birkenstock, himself a former policeman.

The program, the first of its type in the Job Corps, is designed to provide jobs for corps graduates, fill the 3,653 vacancies in the nation's 30 largest police departments, and get more members of minority groups into police forces to help improve police-community relations.

Although race is not to be considered in choosing trainees, Birkenstock said he expected that a great many trainees would be Negroes, since Negroes comprise about 65 per cent of Job Corps members. William P. Kelly Jr., Job Corps director, said that an effort will be made to return graduates to their home areas if there are openings. If not, the graduates will be placed where jobs are available. Kelly said the program was an attempt to harness the potential leaders in slum areas.

The program aims to give Job Corps youths what most of them lack for acceptance by metropolitan police departments, the equivalent of a high school diploma and the correction of physical deficiencies such as bad eyesight and poor teeth. Although most police departments bar recruits with criminal records, Birkenstock said that the corps would accept an outstanding candidate if he had what was judged to be a minor misdemeanor in his past. But he predicted little need for such exceptions, since only about six per cent of Job Corps trainees have police records.

The trainees will wear uniforms and live apart from the other Job Corps members. They will be paid the standard Job Corps salary of $30 a month while training and live at the Job Corps center at Camp Kilmer. Birkenstock said it was estimated that it would cost $5,100 to train each man.

(Nassau and Suffolk police have made extensive efforts to recruit new Negro police candidates but with little success. Nassau police experimented with a mobile recruiting trailer and programs of tutoring for Negro police applicants who might have difficulty passing the test. One Suffolk police official commented that, despite an intensive community relations program, "they (Negroes) just aren't taking the (application) test."

[From the Press Intelligence, Inc., Washington, D.C., Feb. 28, 1968]

JOB CORPS TO TRAIN 200 AS POLICEMEN

The Job Corps is contracting with the Police Athletic League to train 200 top Corps enrollees as police officers, Job Corps Director William P. Kelly announced yesterday.

The training at Camp Kilmer, N.J., will begin in about six weeks and will last 10 months. A spokesman for the Job Corps said the 200 boys have not yet been chosen, but they will be required to meet standards commonly imposed for police recruits in order to be selected for the program.

These include minimum age of 19, minimum height of 5 feet 8 inches, a high

[1] Based on information obtained at OEO News Seminar.

school diploma or capacity to obtain an equivalent certification while in training, and a "clean" police record showing no felony convictions.

The spokesman said there are 90,000 police vacancies in the United States, and the Corps is expected to have no trouble placing successful trainees. He said the Washington and Baltimore police departments already had asked for a chance to recruit the trainees when the 10-month course was finished.

Commuter Airlines: A Growing Field

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most booming fields of aviation today is that of commuter, or scheduled air taxi service. As a complement to regional and trunkline service, air taxis provide a valuable service, not only to the individual passenger, but to the entire aviation industry as well.

The current issue of Air Transport World for March 1968, contains an article on the annual meeting of the commuter trade association, the Association of Commuter Airlines. I believe it is well we keep abreast of this important field of aviation, and include the article at this point in the RECORD:

GROWING BOOM HAS POWERFUL IMPACT ON ASSOCIATION OF COMMUTER AIRLINES

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

The growing boom in commuter airline and scheduled air taxi service is having a powerful impact on the affairs of the Association of Commuter Airlines, which held its largest and most enthusiastic annual meeting recently in Washington, D.C. with an attendance of 140 delegates.

The association, one of the two trade organizations representing the "third level carriers" was formed in January, 1964. Its aims: to help maintain high standards of safety and to promote recognition, as a true part of the U.S. airline network, of operators flying aircraft under 12,500 pounds in scheduled service.

Bankers, insurance people, manufacturers and representatives of both the Federal Aviation Administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board were on hand for the three-day Washington meeting. Delegates exchanged ideas in a panel series centering on current problems in financing, baggage handling and ticketing of interline passengers, and how current regulations really affect the commuter airlines.

Although the commuters still are classified as part of general aviation, those attending heard CAB member Whitney Gillilland outline impressive evidence of the board's recognition of the "small carrier potential." Gillilland noted, perhaps significantly, that the Civil Aeronautics Act as adopted in 1938 did not then create any classes of domestic air carriers, but it did authorize the Board to establish classes of airlines as the nature of the services performed by such air carriers shall require.

SEMINARS AND CLINICS UNDERWAY

A major policy development announced at the meeting was the association's decision to stage a continuing series of seminars this year dealing with all types of operations in which commuter airlines are involved. Also getting underway will be a series of clinics in various areas of technical proficiency, for chief pilots and maintenance heads.

The first seminar will take place this month through arrangement with the U.S. Post Office Department and will be concerned with the national air mail program as it affects commuters and scheduled air taxi operators. Mail increasingly is a big deal for these carriers, and the most recent FAA figures indicate that the mail pay to "third level" carriers will jump from about $180,000 during 1966 to something around $8 million this year.

The 1967 total for expediting the mail was approximately $3.6 million.

The air mail seminar's agenda shows clear recognition of the tremendous importance to the commuter carriers of doing a continuing good job through understanding of all facets of the mail-carrying operation. It will cover the following items:

(1) A brief review of the Post Office Department's needs and experiences to date on the utilization of air taxi type operations.

(2) The department's procurement procedures now in effect.

(3) The volume and types of services now being provided.

(4) Anticipated needs for these services in the foreseeable future.

(5) Development of plans for future utilization of these services.

(6) Discussion period during which the Post Office Department will seek comments and constructive suggestions from the commuter airline operator.

All mail carrying by commuter airlines currently is without subsidy and is conducted under negotiated term contracts based on bidding.

During the Washington meeting, officers and board members met to discuss new ways of putting over a five-point program designed to give greater recognition, prestige and security to the association's member airline companies.

This program calls for adoption of a distinctive name for the commuter industry, to be agreed upon and recognized by government agencies. (The CAB late last year refused to give official sanction to the term "third level air lines.") It looks forward to the imposition of *specific* regulations on commuters and scheduled air taxi operations by the CAB, which so far has ducked regulation of these carriers apart from general aviation.

Two other program points: compulsory liability insurance with a minimum liability of $75,000 a passenger for all commuters and scheduled air taxi operators, and the regular reporting of routes and traffic to the CAB by these carriers. The CAB already has proposed an amendment of Part 298 of its economic regulations so as to require *all* air taxi operators, scheduled and non-scheduled, to carry this amount of insurance and also to register annually. Registration would include filing of schedules, but not traffic reports.

Finally, the Association of Commuter Airlines will seek to work out some specific form of route protection *not* requiring the acquisition of a certificate of convenience and necessity, which normally calls for a minimum investment of $25,000.

Merrill Armour, executive director of the association, who is a former assistant general counsel and assistant chief examiner of the CAB, believes that the board has power to do this at present under its power to prevent "wasteful and destructive competition."

It was brought out by Gillilland and others attending the Washington annual meeting that although the CAB as of now refuses to regulate the commuters or recognize them as genuine small airlines rather than part of general aviation, its policy long has been one of strong encouragement. As long ago as 1952 it adopted Part 298, which reclassified small irregular air carriers as air taxi operators and permitted for the first time, the conducting by these of scheduled services within the then 48 contiguous states.

TWO STEPS OF CAB ENCOURAGEMENT

Two of the most important steps taken by the board since 1961 to encourage operators of small aircraft have been the extension of the air taxi regulation for an indefinite period and the provision of blanket authority to carry mail in markets not served by certificated trunk and regional carriers. Gillilland says:

"These steps can hardly be regarded as less than strong recognition on the part of the board of the potential of the small aircraft operators in our air transport system. Of hardly less significance were Board decisions to withdraw the limitation on scheduled service in the Caribbean area and in domestic markets served by certificated air carriers with small equipment."

After being petitioned last year by the Post Office Department, the Board established an expedited procedure applicable to the institution of mail service by air taxis, both scheduled and non-scheduled.

The good will and encouragement being offered to commuters by the trunks was underlined at the Washington meeting by the presence of such talent as W. J. Cotter and Gerald Larkey, interline sales chiefs respectively at TWA and Continental. As much as 60% to 80% of commuter passengers interline with trunks and regionals, the session was told.

Main thrust of the discussion focused on interline passenger handling—reservations, baggage, ticketing and how the trunks might help the commuters train personnel to better handle these vital functions. The importance of current listings in the Official Airline Guide QRE also was stressed. One commuter airline reported a 60% loss of traffic one month when its listing inadvertently was omitted from the OAG.

More than 50 commuter airlines and scheduled air taxis now have interline agreements with larger carriers. TWA's Cotter told them during his presentation:

"There is only one reason we sign an interline agreement and that is to make it easier to move by air. This is one of the reasons for the success of the air industry."

Cotter brought out that a great many of the commuter airlines do not at present have "two-way bilateral" interline agreements and therefore do not ticket on the scheduled carrier or check baggage through, the traffic flow in these cases being from the trunk to the commuter. He pointed out that commuters should adopt a uniform type ticket and have a standard baggage check ticket if they wished the traffic flow to become a two-way street.

During 1968, the following will serve as officers of the association: Terence O. Dennison of Apache Airlines, president; Karl P. Baldwin of Air Wisconsin, VP; Joseph C. Whitney of Executive Airlines, secretary; Paul G. Delman of Commuter Airlines, treasurer. The directors at large are Leo H. Layden of Yankee Airlines and George N. Bailey of Hub Airlines. In addition to being executive director Armour serves as the association's general counsel.

Urban Problems Must Be Solved by Community

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, across the country there is an increasing tendency to turn to Washington for solutions to problems—no matter what these problems are. But it is apparent to us, who have been studying the problems of the metropolitan areas, that only local initiative in the final analysis can solve the crises of our cities.

Consequently, it was with a great deal of interest that I read the remarks made by Allan Shivers, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in Memphis, Tenn.

Speaking before the Southern Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives, Mr. Shivers warned that without local leadership, communities will find themselves in trouble "no matter how many Federal gravy trains come in and unload."

I feel that appeals to local leaders for local action, such as was made the other night in Memphis, should not go unheeded.

The important feature of the national chamber's point of view is that they are providing assistance to business and other community groups on how better coordinated community action can be organized. The national chamber recently unveiled a program called "Forward America," which is based on 8 years' experience in working with communities to organize effective action involving groups, ranging from business to labor to civil rights.

The national chamber has translated that experience into concrete suggestions on how effective local action can be organized to solve problems.

Mr. Shivers has thrown out a real challenge to local community leaders and I commend his remarks for your serious consideration. His speech in Memphis follows:

YOU'RE THE DOCTOR

(By Allan Shivers, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States)

The benefits of living in a free and wealthy country like ours in these advanced times are obtained mostly by community effort.

We crowd up and live by systems so that machines can serve us better. We fit ourselves into close time schedules and work in space parcelled out by the square foot.

We can't go our individual ways as freely as we once did if we want to live modernly. We must operate within regular orbits and share our conveniences with others. It takes a lot of steady demand to maintain a supermarket or an expressway or a television station.

There isn't much action any more out at the kind of country crossroad where Americans once gathered to "fire the shot heard round the world". It's what happens in communities that counts now.

Here is where progress is filtered down to us in practical forms. All the new ideas and methods and products of advancing technology don't mean much to us until they hit our towns.

Not until the new knowledge is taught in our schools can our children share it.

And perhaps not until some confessed, desperate criminal is turned loose in our community on a flimsy technical rule imposed by the United States Supreme Court, do we realize how far we have been carried by the new ideas of social justice.

Because we do so much community living, that's where the troubles of our times have concentrated. It's why you Chamber Executives are knee-deep in problems.

The question of where to draw the line between law and order, on the one hand, and free speech, on the other—an issue that we thought was solved when the American form of government was agreed upon—is now being fought out in your streets. Treason and incitement to riot are being preached openly and the demagogues dare your community to interfere.

Your disadvantaged people are being overfed on political promises until they become unduly expectant and sometimes riotous.

Strikes against the public welfare, against the soundness of our economic system and the value of our savings, even against the most vital community services, plague one city after another. Worse yet, there isn't any remedy in sight because Washington is not lifting a finger to reform the one-sided administration of labor law.

Instead of getting the kind of help you need from Washington to deal with your problems, you are being encouraged to shove them aside for federal treatment. There's a new 297-page catalogue called, "The Vice President's Handbook for Local Officials," listing hundreds of ways the federal bureaucrats are able and anxious to do your town over.

We're an urban people, a nation of communities—and we're cheating ourselves if we don't do everything possible to see that our own community is well organized, expertly presided over, and fully up-to-date. The quality of local leadership is of the utmost importance, not only because of what it can do to improve living conditions, but also because we depend on strong, independent local leaders to stop the systemizing process where it is, and where it belongs. It's one thing to be a nation of communities. It would be something far different to be the communities of a nation, all thrown together into bureaucratic molds under central supervision.

What good would our home towns be to us then?

Each city's problems need deep and careful diagnosis, as you with your involvements probably know better than anyone else. You have made the studies. You know what's wrong. You are busy with those leaders of your community who are willing to work for improvements. Your problem is, you need more help, with more people involved.

No city which has had a riot is saying that it did everything possible to prevent it. Detroit thought it had done enough, but now it knows better. Wherever there was trouble last summer, a lot more is being found to do now to reduce the chances of its happening again.

If the full local treatment could be applied somewhere; if it were possible to produce the ideal; we would see every group and every center of influence in the community pulling together wholeheartedly in a program of action worked out by mutual agreement. There would be no waste of resources. No facilities would be overlooked. Everybody with useful talents, ideas and enthusiasm would be pitching in to produce a brighter, happier and more prosperous community.

This is what the National Chamber is trying to promote with its *Forward America* process which our Board approved last month. It's a plan for solving local problems through the united efforts of all groups willing to cooperate within the community—business, labor, civil rights, religious, education, and all the rest. We don't think it is possible to get unanimity anywhere, but we do believe you can get results that will outshine all the demonstration and experimental cities that the planners in Washington are now dreaming about.

And what dreams they are! Some of the diagrams on which federal money is being spent look like plans for paradise reincarnated! The only trouble is that people don't want to live there, under the Socialistic type of management that would be in store for them. That's something to remember about the model cities program now making the rounds. What is your city going to look like when the federal people are through? Are your own particular top priority needs going to be taken care of, or will they be put aside in order to take advantage of available federal funds for other purposes, leaving your problem areas still further out of joint?

Most of what you are doing now seems to me to be on target.

I'm on difficult and dangerous ground in reaching out for examples from this platform, where there is so much to choose from. But I'll take just one type of problem—consolidating city and county governments. Much could be said about what Nashville, and also Miami and Dade County did sometime back, and now we see Jacksonville also moving into the Hall of Fame.

Those were great jobs, and so are the efforts others of you are making in that direction.

There is, of course, much more involved than city-county consolidations when it comes to defining and reaching out to encompass your whole community problem area. Regional cooperation may be necessary, and that, too, is happening in places I know about in Texas.

The Houston Chamber holds regular meetings, I believe, with 30 or more Chambers in that vicinity, and the Fort Worth Chamber has shown its ability to get action over a 9-county area.

If you can top this—and perhaps some of you can—I'd like to hear about your program. I'll talk about it the next time.

No matter how far we range, however, our cities will not be cured by treating just what appears on the surface, because some of them, even smaller ones, are aching deep inside. They need treatment in depth for basic people problems—hardcore poverty, lack of education and skills, lost hope—that underlie the surface blight.

The Charlotte Chamber has added a Human Relations Department to its staff. Are you doing anything to provide basic education and job training for those who need it, and are you looking out for Equal Employment Opportunity matters arising in your community?

Or do the Easter Egg Roll and Dollar Day projects leave you enough time for that?

Are you promoting internal economic growth as well as new smokestacks?

It's a new day in urban America.

Revolutionary events are taking place, both for good and evil.

The good is coming to those with strong local leadership, and the others are going to find themselves in trouble, no matter how many federal gravy trains come in and unload.

You're a professional mobilizer. Your experience, your credentials put you in a class far ahead of the patent medicine peddlers.

For whatever ails your community, you're the doctor. So treat your patient with concerns just as broad as the politician's, and also as deep as the moralist's, and as tall as tomorrow's dreams.

I wish every one of you good times.

Attwater Prairie Chicken Refuge

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, another of America's vanishing wildlife species, the Attwater prairie chicken, will be preserved if efforts underway near Columbus, Tex., are successful.

Here, on a 3,400-acre refuge in the Bernard Prairies, an international project has been launched to save the nearly extinct bird.

The World Wildlife Fund, the U.S. Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service, other States and Federal agencies, and the Colorado Soil and Water Conservation District of Texas are cooperating in developing the refuge to preserve the Att-

water prairie chicken for the enjoyment of future Americans.

A member of the grouse family and a near relative of the heath hen which formerly ranged in New England, the Attwater prairie chicken once flourished in the flat, tall grass coastal plains of Texas and Louisiana. Millions of the buff-colored birds once filled the air with their resonant booming and performed their strange, spectacular courtship dance. Now only about a thousand remain.

SCS conservationists provided soils data and land-capability maps. They also helped develop a conservation plan for the refuge to guide application of practices needed to improve food and cover for the wildlife, locate good sites for ponds, and protect the property from erosion.

The plan is now being put into effect, helping retain those haunting hollow notes at the World Wildlife Fund Attwater Prairie Chicken Refuge.

The Fate of American POW's in Vietnam

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the callous disregard by Hanoi for the humane standards of treatment of prisoners of war is a matter of paramount importance to the United States. The Pentagon has confirmed that as of March 9, 1968, there are 253 Americans known to be prisoners and an additional 835 thought to be prisoners but officially listed as missing in action.

The fate of Americans held prisoner in Vietnam was the subject of a trenchant article by Col. Bryce F. Denno, U.S. Army, retired. Writing in the February Air Force magazine, Colonel Denno, who is now director of instruction at the Military Assistance Institute in Arlington, Va., observed that Hanoi is refusing to recognize that our captured servicemen are in fact prisoners of war and entitled to the protections of the 1949 Geneva Conventions.

Colonel Denno draws a sound legal argument in pointing out that Hanoi's reservations to the Geneva Conventions can deny our pilots their protected status as prisoners of war only after their trial, in accordance with all the judicial guarantees which the Conventions provide, and after their conviction. Hanoi has never tried these men, but has arbitrarily denied them the status which they should enjoy as qualified prisoners of war.

Colonel Denno discusses also the infuriating double standard of prisoner-of-war treatment which exists in the Vietnam war.

On the one hand, we are recognizing as legitimate prisoners of war, captured Vietcong who habitually make military capital of concealing their identity as combatants, in flagrant violation of the Geneva Conventions. On the other hand, the enemy brands as war criminals our pilots who wear uniforms, fly plainly marked aircraft, and who attack legitimate military targets so well recognized as such that the enemy has deployed with maximum economy his aircraft forces to defend them.

A caption in one of the photographs accompanying Colonel Denno's article points out that the Communists have regarded the men captured by United States and Republic of Vietnam troops with great callousness, making no effort to try to regain them. "They must, therefore, consider our continuing efforts to have our men released as the height of sentimentality."

Americans in this war have pursued ceaselessly the repatriation efforts that have accompanied every war in which we have fought. We have provided financial assistance to released or escaped servicemen, in the last two wars, at least, in the form of per diem compensation for the period of their captivity.

My bill, H.R. 15545, which would provide up to $3 a day compensation is being considered by the Departments of Defense and State, and the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

I am apprised that reports on this bill can be expected fairly soon, which could pave the way for at least a modicum of after-the-fact compensation for those of our Americans who are undergoing the treatment described in the article by Colonel Denno.

I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

THE FATE OF AMERICAN POW'S IN VIETNAM

(By Col. Bryce F. Denno, U.S. Army, retired)

(The fate of the estimated 200 American prisoners of war, most of them pilots shot down over North Vietnam, held by the Communists is in grave doubt. The enemy refuses to abide by the Geneva Conventions and chooses to treat our pilots as "war criminals," using them as pawns in the political game they are playing to pressure the US into pulling out of Vietnam. But attempts are being made to establish their right to humane treatment, and, as the Communists become convinced of our determination, perhaps the prisoners will become less useful to them.)

In the fading days of World War II, my infantry battalion sped through disintegrating German defenses to recapture a dozen American airmen. As we gave them all the steak and beer they could manage, they described their reactions during captivity. "We never had a doubt," they said, "that the war would end in victory and that we'd eventually be freed." Never a doubt.

But there is probably grave doubt concerning their future in the minds of the estimated 200 American prisoners of war, most of them airmen, who today languish in prison camps of North Vietnam or Viet Cong-controlled South Vietnam. There is also doubt and anxiety among their relatives and friends here at home. For the enemy has deliberately chosen to ignore many explicit provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 regarding prisoners of war—Conventions which he signed and agreed to honor. At least three American prisoners have been executed in "reprisal"—expressly forbidden by the Conventions. Others have been tortured and murdered. Some appear to have been brainwashed in a manner reminiscent of Korea. The enemy has adamantly refused to repatriate seriously sick and wounded prisoners. He has denied prisoners the solace of packages or even mail from home. He has disdained replying to requests that neutral observers, such as members of the International Committee of the Red Cross, be permitted to inspect the prisoners, as the Geneva Conventions provide.

North Vietnam (as part of Vietnam) acceded to the Conventions on November 14, 1953. The National Liberation Front (Viet Cong) refuses to recognize the Conventions on the grounds that it was not a party to the deliberations that led to their formulation. However, since Hanoi controls the NLF, it is reasonably certain that the Viet Cong would follow practices concerning prisoners observed by North Vietnam. What specifically are key provisions of the Conventions, why are some of them difficult to apply in the Vietnamese War, how are they observed by participants in that war, and, especially, what appear to be future prospects for our prisoners of war?

THE FOUR GENEVA CONVENTIONS

There are four separate Conventions included in the Geneva Conventions of 1949. The First and Second deal with the treatment of the sick and wounded of the armed forces in the field and at sea. The Third Convention relates to the treatment of prisoners of war. The Fourth, inspired by the crimes against noncombatants perpetrated during World War II, deals with the "protection of civilian persons in time of war." As one renowned international jurist has explained in commenting on the Conventions, "Every person in enemy hands must have some status under international law: he is either a prisoner of war and as such, covered by the Third Convention, a civilian covered by the Fourth Convention, or, again, a member of the medical personnel of the armed forces who is covered by the First Convention. *There is no* intermediate status; nobody in enemy hands can be outside the law." (Italics in the original.)

There are twenty articles common to all Four Conventions. Of these, Article 2 specifies that the Conventions will apply in case of an armed conflict among those who have signed the Conventions even though a state of war may not have been recognized by one of them. Article 3 spells out certain minimum standards of treatment to be afforded prisoners taken in a war "not of an international character." This article is of special import in light of the position taken by North Vietnam and others that the conflict in South Vietnam is essentially a "civil war." Article 85 of the Third Convention has also figured prominently in the Vietnam War. It provides that "Prisoners of War prosecuted under the laws of the Detaining Powers for acts committed prior to capture shall retain, even if convicted, the benefits of the present Convention." Communist countries adhering to the Geneva Conventions (including the Democratic Republic of Vietnam) have entered reservations concerning this Article. These reservations, which constitute a focal point of dispute between the United States and the enemy, will be discussed later.

The Vietnam War represents the first significant "trial by combat" of the Geneva Conventions. When the Korean War erupted, only a handful of nations had ratified them. (The United States ratified in 1956.) True, the Conventions provided certain guidelines which participants in the Korean War recognized generally, but there had been no time to establish implementing machinery and procedures. Thus, there was little in the way of precedent established during Korea to assist in applying the Conventions to Vietnam. To compound the problem, Vietnam's war is an especially complex, ambiguous, and confusing conflict, from both a military and a political viewpoint.

To begin with, the Vietnam War is really two separate and totally dissimilar wars. In the North, the contest consists primarily of combat between American land- and sea-based aircraft and North Vietnamese air defense units. Republic of Vietnam aircraft and occasional enemy planes are also involved. This war is comparable to conventional wars of the past.

By contrast, the war in South Vietnam is a classic war of insurgency, in which both sides strive not only to gain the support of

the people but use the people as a primary instrument in waging the war. The French authority on wars of insurgency, David Galula, stresses the inevitability of civilian participation in such a war in these terms: ". . . every citizen, whatever his wish, is or will be directly involved in it [a war of insurgency] by the insurgent who needs him and cannot afford to let him remain neutral." The employment of civilians who are part-time soldiers by the NLF in Vietnam has blurred the distinction between civilians (subject to the Fourth Convention) and full-time soldiers of Viet Cong regular units and the People's Army of Vietnam (subject to the Third Convention). A vivid description of the ensuing problem in the field is indicated by this quotation from a publication of the Military Assistance Command in Vietnam (MACV): "The Prisoner of War Convention is difficult to apply when the enemy soldier, clad in black pajamas and a coolie hat, wraps his weapon in oil cloth, buries it in a rice paddy during the day, and becomes a soldier only at night."

A second aspect of the Vietnam War complicating application of the Conventions stems from the diametrically opposed views of the war held by participants. The United States portrays the war as a defense of an essentially separate state, South Vietnam. The United States and others are assisting in that defense at the request of the Republic. By contrast, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the NLF describe the war as a "civil war" with "agents of the United States" in the South who are resisting Vietnam's legally constituted government in Hanoi. According to Hanoi, participation by the United States in the war is "illegal" and our attacks on North Vietnam are "criminal." These divergent views influence fundamentally and inevitably the interpretations of the Convention as they apply in Vietnam.

EFFORTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL RED CROSS

The conflict in these interpretations surfaced in the summer of 1965 when the Vice President of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Jacques Freymond, sent a letter to the United States, the Republic of Vietnam, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and the National Liberation Front. In his letter, Freymond noted that hostilities north and south of the seventeenth parallel had reached such proportion that "there can be no doubt they constitute an armed conflict to which the regulations of humanitarian law as a whole should be applied." Remarking that all addresses were bound by the Geneva Conventions of 1949, he reminded them of their responsibilities. Further, he requested all parties to inform him as to what measures they planned to take in response to his letter. In reply, the United States and the Republic of Vietnam expressed their willingness and readiness to abide by the Conventions. As indicated previously, the NLF retorted that it did not consider itself bound by the Conventions since it had not participated in their formulation. Further, it explained that the Conventions contained provisions which "corresponded neither with its action [*sic*] nor with the organization of its armed forces." Nonetheless, it declared it was observing a "humane and charitable policy" toward prisoners falling into its hands.

Freymond's letter to North Vietnam opened a political and propaganda Pandora's box. "As all the world is aware," wrote Hanoi in response, "the United States government and its agents in Saigon are engaged in committing crimes in their war of aggression in Vietnam, undermining peace, violating the laws and customs of war, and perpetrating acts against humanity." Specifically, North Vietnam accused the United States of bombing indiscriminately in North Vietnam ". . . hospitals, schools, road transport stations, markets, villages, fishing vessels, churches, pagodas, etc., massacring large numbers of innocent civilians, and violating the Geneva Conventions of August 12, 1949, for the protection of the victims of war, as well as other rules of war." It dubbed these actions "acts of piracy." The pilots involved were "major criminals caught *in flagrante delicto* and liable for judgment in accordance with the laws of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. . . ." With regard to the war in South Vietnam, Hanoi accused the United States and "its agents in Saigon" of "undertaking a war of great atrocity, employing against the civilian population arms and methods of warfare which have for long been prohibited by international law."

Alarmed by Hanoi's threatening attitude toward our captured pilots, the United States quickly protested to the International Committee of the Red Cross. In turn, the Committee invited ". . . the attention of the government of North Vietnam to the provisions of the Convention relative to judicial proceedings which the Detaining Power may take against prisoners of war." The Committee was referring particularly to Article 85 of the Third Convention, described previously, which dealt with the protection to be afforded prisoners of war prosecuted for acts committed before their capture. In reply, Hanoi sent the International Committee a Declaration by the Red Cross of North Vietnam. This Declaration quoted Hanoi's reservation on Article 85: "The Democratic Republic of Vietnam will not allow prisoners of war pursued and condemned under principles set forth by the International Court of Nuremberg for war crimes and crimes against mankind to benefit from the protection of the present agreement." (It added that the American prisoners were being given "the most humane treatment.") In adamant terms, the Declaration announced Hanoi's intention to apply the quoted reservation to our captured pilots.

To date, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam has not deviated one inch from this basic position. It has made it unmistakably clear that, although our captured pilots will be treated humanely, ". . . they cannot, however, be considered as prisoners of war. The Democratic Republic of Vietnam is, in fact, of the opinion that the bombing attacks constitute crimes for which these prisoners will have to answer before the courts, and that the Third Geneva Convention [prisoners of war] is consequently not applicable to them. . . ."

In the summer of 1966, it appeared that Hanoi was preparing to follow through on its threat to try our captured flyers for war crimes. Some were paraded through the streets of Hanoi amidst the verbal abuse of spectators. The possibility that prisoners might be executed appeared very real. Then the whole matter was dropped as quickly as it had been raised. In early August, Ho Chi Minh announced his intention to continue to pursue a "humanitarian course" with the downed flyers. "No trial in view," he cabled in answer to a question on the subject.

This does not mean that the threat to our captured airmen has disappeared. It is raised automatically with every claim by Hanoi that our bombing in North Vietnam strikes nonmilitary targets. Further, it is apparent from analysis not only of Hanoi's statements but of propaganda emanating from Peking, Moscow, Budapest, and other Communist capitals that there is a concerted and deliberate effort to brand American fighting men in Vietnam as "war criminals."

THE AMERICAN POSITION

The American position concerning the status of our downed flyers has been presented in a comprehensive Memorandum to the International Committee of the Red Cross, dated July 13, 1966, and titled "Entitlement of American Military Personnel Held by North Vietnam to Treatment as Prisoners of War. Under the Geneva Convention of 1949 Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War." This closely reasoned paper asserts that there is a de facto war in Vietnam, one phase of which comprises combat between United States aircraft and North Vietnamese antiaircraft. It cites Article 2 (common to all four Conventions) which provides that the Third Convention will apply in an armed conflict between two or more of the contracting parties, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them. As uniformed members of the armed forces, the Memorandum contends, American military personnel in Vietnam qualify as prisoners of war under the Third Convention.

The Memorandum takes cognizance of the reservation to Article 85 of the Third Convention made by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, which denied benefit of the Convention to "war criminals." It states that this reservation does not apply to our captured pilots who, in restricting their bombing to military targets in North Vietnam, have only performed "recognized acts of warfare." Further, it points out that the reservation can deny our pilots their protected status as prisoners of war only after their trial "in accordance with all the judicial guarantees which the Convention provides" and after their conviction. The Memorandum challenges the contention "that military action by the United States is unjustified as a matter of law" as being "neither correct nor relevant." It concludes that "American prisoners of war in Vietnam are entitled to be treated as prisoners of war, and mere allegations of criminality cannot justify depriving them of such treatment."

The United States is in a strong legal position concerning its contention that our captured pilots cannot be deprived of their status as prisoners of war until after their trial and conviction as war criminals. There is an international war in progress in Vietnam, our pilots are uniformed members of our armed forces, and Hanoi's reservation to Article 85 of the Third Convention does not entitle the North Vietnamese to label them "war criminals" unless and until a proper trial has established that fact.

We are on weaker ground when countering enemy charges that we are hitting nonmilitary, as well as military targets. Every combat pilot recognizes the difficulty of confining his bombs to military targets near nonmilitary installations. For that matter, every ground fighter in South Vietnam knows the virtual impossibility of avoiding civilian casualties while fighting on a battlefield, usually selected by the enemy, which comprises villages and towns. In a press conference of December 31, 1966, President Johnson pointed out that "inevitably and almost invariably" casualties and loss of life among civilians result from bombing attacks against military targets. But we cannot, of course, expect Hanoi to accept (at least publicly) the genuineness of our expressed intentions to restrict our attacks to military targets. To the contrary, we can expect them to continue their propaganda that we are deliberately bombing nonmilitary targets. They are taking this propaganda stand not only to turn world opinion against us, but probably also in hopes of stopping the bombing.

The problem of our captured pilots in North Vietman has absorbed American attention because they represent the great majority of our prisoners of war and because of Hanoi's threats against them. However, dealing with prisoners of war in South Vietnam is a much more complicated legal matter, affecting not only the United States but other free world forces, the Republic of Vietnam, the NLF, and "volunteers" from North Vietnam. A major difficulty is to determine which elements among the NLF should be classed in the Geneva Convention categories of "members of the armed forces," "members of other militias and members of other volunteer corps, including those of organized re-

sistance movements," civilians, or as members in other categories, such as spies and saboteurs. This is a practical matter since the Conventions prescribe different minimum standards of treatment for different categories. And, of course, spies and saboteurs can be tried and punished.

In this dilemma, the United States has chosen to lean over backward. In the words of the U.S. Military Assistance Command in Vietnam, we are "extending prisoner-of-war treatment to all Viet Cong and to all members of regular North Vietnamese units, whether captured in combat or not, as long as they are not criminals, spies, saboteurs, or terrorists." While doing so, we have conceded that a Viet Cong seldom meets the conditions established by the Geneva Conventions entitling him to treatment as a member of an armed force. These conditions prescribe that members of "organized resistance movements," such as the Viet Cong, must (1) be "commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates," (2) have "a fixed distinctive sign recognizable at a distance," (3) carry arms "openly," and (4) conduct "their operations in accordance with the laws and customs of war."

DOUBLE STANDARD OF TREATMENT

Thus arises the ironic paradox concerning the double standard of treatment of prisoners of war in Vietnam. On the one hand, we are recognizing as legitimate prisoners of war captured Viet Cong who habitually make military capital of concealing their identity as combatants, in flagrant violation of the Geneva Conventions. On the other hand, the enemy brands as "war criminals" our pilots who wear uniforms, fly plainly marked aircraft, and who attack legitimate military targets so well recognized as such that the enemy has disposed, with maximum economy, his antiaircraft forces to defend them!

We make no bones, of course, over the fact that our scrupulous attention to the rights of enemy prisoners of war stems from more than humanitarian reasons, although this is one important consideration. It also stems from the urgent requirement that we offer the enemy no possible excuse to mistreat our prisoners by mistreating or neglecting his. The war in Vietnam, like many civil wars and like many wars in Asia, has witnessed displays of wanton savagery and cruelty on both sides. In 1965, "bearing in mind the many photographs which have appeared in the press showing ill-treatment of prisoners in South Vietnam," the International Committee of the Red Cross looked into the matter. As a result, it recommended that "authorities distribute copies of Geneva Conventions among armed forces and give troops liable to take prisoners instruction in conformity with the Conventions." It is at the troop level, of course, where prisoners are most often mistreated, frequently in the hot blood of combat, or to force them to divulge information of immediate tactical value.

The US and other free world forces in Vietnam and the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam have complied with this recommendation of the International Committee of the Red Cross. The Army of Vietnam, for instance, has issued instruction cards to its troops regarding the treatment of prisoners. Each soldier is supposed to carry the card on his person. The card enjoins the captors to "Treat him [the prisoner] humanely, protect him, do not mistreat, torture, or humiliate him. If the captive is a woman, treat her with all respect due her sex, and do not commit violation of chastity and virtue."

When the status of an enemy prisoner captured by US forces is in doubt, he goes before a tribunal. The members of the tribunal considered evidence provided by the capturing force outlining the circumstances of the prisoner's seizure. Was he in uniform, was he armed, was there a firefight in progress at the time? If the tribunal finds that the accused is a bona fide prisoner of war, he is declared as such. The armed forces of other friendly nations fighting in South Vietnam also have procedures for distinguishing prisoners of war from others who do not enjoy that status.

There are currently about 6,000 enemy prisoners of war—North Vietnamese and Viet Cong—housed in six prisoner-of-war camps in South Vietnam. This is exclusive of the thousands of enemy who have surrendered under the Chieu Hoi or "open-arms" program. The Army of Vietnam administers these prisoner-of-war camps. (There are also American advisory detachments at the camps.) This arrangement is in accord with the Geneva Conventions, which provide that prisoners of war taken by one nation may be transferred to another which is a party to the Conventions and is both willing and able to apply their provisions. Some sick and wounded enemy prisoners—again under the terms of the Conventions—have been delivered to North Vietnam at the Ben Hai River bridge at the eastern end of the Demilitarized Zone. North Vietnam has accepted these returnees—while denying any responsibility for their presence in South Vietnam or even recognizing any relationship with them.

ATTEMPTS TO EXCHANGE POW'S

We have, of course, attempted continuously to exchange prisoners of war with the enemy as we did when the Korean Armistice was declared. Typical of recent appeals for such an exchange was one issued last July from the White House. The White House statement also requested anew that the NLF and North Vietnam permit impartial inspection of prisoners they hold—as we permit inspection by neutrals of prisoners held by our side. Again, the plea was made for repatriation of our sick and wounded prisoners.

To date, such appeals have been ignored. This does not mean they will not continue, or that the plight of American POWs will not continue to receive high-level attention. In this connection, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara announced last September the formation of a Department of Defense Committee of Prisoner of War Policy chaired by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs). Its membership includes the military service Secretaries, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and others. Its aim, working with the State Department and other governmental agencies, is to ensure that our POWs are treated in accordance with the Geneva Conventions and to effect their final repatriation.

Prospects for this repatriation are not bright. True, the enemy has released some of our POWs in a trickle. To date (November 1967) seven US servicemen, two US civilians, and one Filipino woman have been freed by the NLF, along with some Vietnamese. Significantly, no officers, especially officer pilots captured in North Vietnam, have been released by the enemy.

There are at least two main factors militating against any major POW "deal" with the enemy similar to that which prompted Castro to give us custody of Cubans captured at the Bay of Pigs. First, and paramount, is the political factor that has inspired the enemy to brand our captured pilots as "war criminals." As indicated earlier, North Vietnam has striven mightily to convince the world that American entry into Vietnam's "civil war" is "illegal" and that the US bombing of North Vietnam is not only illegal but criminal. By its definition, Americans, especially our pilots bombing the North, are "war criminals." North Vietnam has made this pronouncement despite the lack of trials under appropriate safeguards, as provided by the Geneva Conventions. To the North Vietnamese, such trials are legal niceties which they ignore. In this connection, Communists rarely concern themselves overly with the legalities of a situation; they deem the political factor overriding. The fact that the fate of our prisoners of war is caught up in a long-held and apparently rigid North Vietnamese political position is the most pessimistic factor militating against their early release. It would be awkward, to say the least, for Hanoi to release men it had proclaimed before the world to be guilty of war crimes every bit as heinous as those revealed at Nuremberg.

The second factor which inspires pessimism concerning early release of our POWs is the leverage which they provide the enemy. This point requires no elaboration. We want our men back—badly. And the enemy knows it. In light of the callousness with which he has regarded the fate of his men who have fallen into our hands, he probably regards us as incredibly sentimental. He hopes to make political capital out of that "sentimentality."

Thus, hopes for early enemy action to release our POWs are dim. Of course, the enemy has his price for their release but that price may be much higher than we can afford to pay. Right now, the price would appear to be withdrawal from Vietnam. Perhaps, as our determination to continue the war in Vietnam becomes more evident to Hanoi, the leverage afforded by our POWs will appear less useful. At that time, the enemy may agree on a price within our political and moral means. For the sake of our fellow Americans behind enemy prison bars, let's hope so.

Another Hawaii Winner

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, like most people from Hawaii, I am proud of the special honor bestowed upon a 19-year-old girl from my State. She is Miss Carmelita Capilla of Kailua, who has been selected as one of the four Young American Medal winners awarded each year by the U.S. Government.

Hawaii is especially proud of Carmelita because she represents the best of the overlooked teenagers—those youngsters who put their time to good use but rarely turn up in newspaper stories or television features.

She also follows through on a tradition of winners for Hawaii, being the third Young American Medal winner for my State since Congress approved legislation in 1950 establishing the system for selecting outstanding youngsters for bravery and service each year. The honor of making the selections has been given to the U.S. Department of Justice.

Carmelita was nominated by Governor John Burns for her public service. During her final year at Kailua High School, she was a tireless volunteer worker at the Hawaii State Hospital for an 8-hour shift during nearly every day she was not in school, including holidays. For this devotion to serve other people—those in need—she won the hearts of the hundreds of elderly and helpless patients in the hospital.

One of her coworkers has said, "just the sound of Carmelita's heels on the corridor floor would lift the spirits of the patients."

We can be proud that youngsters such as she still find happiness in helping

others. Thank heavens, also, she has been recognized for this special charm and the hundreds of others who have been nominated should share in her honor.

Carmelita is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Leslie D. Capilla of 433 Kaimake Loop, Kailua, Hawaii. She is now studying at the West Valley Junior College at Saratoga, Calif.

I believe it is fitting that other Hawaii winners of the Young American Medal be named here also. Last year the winner was Drusilla Chiyono Akamine, who was 20 when she was singled out for her public service and presented with the medal.

Drusilla spent some 800 hours working as a volunteer for the Hawaii Association to Help Retarded Children in 1965, the year she completed her high school education and entered the University of Hawaii. She had begun working with retarded children 3 years earlier.

During a 6-week camp for retarded children in the summer of 1965, she worked each day at the camp, then returned to the association's office for additional work in the evening.

She planned weekly teen canteens for the retarded and arranged for various youth groups to host them. She organized a teen march which collected $5,000 for the association. She organized a teen group to inform the public of the problem of mental retardation. Under her direction, the group also obtained 11,000 names on a petition to the legislature for additional classes for the retarded. As a result, several classes were added.

In 1965, the Attorney General selected Kenneth Pilago Magallanes of Pearl City, Hawaii, for his display of bravery and rewarded him with a Young American Medal.

On the morning of February 21, 1963, according to the Attorney General, Kenneth, then 11, volunteered to descend into an abandoned cesspool to rescue a trapped infant, even though he was warned that the fumes in the cesspool could kill him.

Kenneth arrived at the scene of the near-tragedy with his mother and other neighbors who had gathered around the old cistern after the infant had fallen in through the loose cover and down 15 feet to the base of rotting branches and leaves.

The infant's father and several firemen and ambulance attendants tried in vain to squeeze through the narrow opening of the cesspool. Members of the highway crew were preparing to dig their way into the cesspool, at the grave risk of collapsing it, when Kenneth volunteered to squirm in. An ambulance attendant warned him flatly that the gas in the cesspool could kill him, but Kenneth replied, "I still want to go."

With a rope wrapped around his waist, Kenneth wriggled through the hole and was lowered to the helpless child. He grasped the child as firmly as he could, but as they were being lifted out, Kenneth lost consciousness and the infant slipped out of his arms.

Kenneth was lifted into the open air and revived with oxygen. Again he was warned of the danger, but insisted on going down into the cesspool a second time. This time he slipped a loop that firemen had prepared around the infant's body, and the two boys were hoisted to safety together.

These are outstanding achievements and Hawaii is proud of its young people.

Oliver Wendell Holmes Stamp

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1968, it was my pleasure to attend the ceremony dedicating the Oliver Wendell Holmes stamp in the east conference room of the U.S. Supreme Court.

As a lawyer and an admirer of Justice Holmes, this was a particularly inspiring event for me. The remarks of Timothy J. May, General Counsel of the Post Office Department, on this occasion are worthy of the attention of all of us. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. May's speech:

REMARKS OF TIMOTHY J. MAY, GENERAL COUNSEL, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, AT THE CEREMONY DEDICATING THE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES STAMP

Mr. Chief Justice, Associate Justices, Mr. Corcoran, President Morris, honored guests, and fellow members of the bar:

The postage stamp we are dedicating to Mr. Justice Holmes today is one of the highest honors this nation can confer. Oliver Wendell Holmes is only the sixth supreme court justice to be so honored.

The photograph of Justice Holmes that was selected as basis for the stamp was, I think, a very happy choice. For the character of the man comes through strikingly in this informal picture. Justice Holmes did not care for stilted, formal portraits. Such a painting of him hangs in the library of Harvard Law School. In that portrait, his face is frozen in dignity as he stands straight and tall, robed in pomp. Oliver Wendell Holmes looked at the portrait and said: "This isn't me, but it's a damn good thing for people to think it is."

I am particularly pleased to note that the denomination of the stamp is 15¢. The last lawyer who appeared on a stamp—one which, incidentally, I also dedicated—was the international jurist John Bassett Moore. Except for lawyers, and not too many of them, Moore is virtually unknown in this country. It was our hope to rescue this great American from undeserved obscurity by placing him on a stamp. The only trouble is that it's a $5.00 stamp. At that price I'm afraid that Judge Moore will remain unknown.

But a 15¢ stamp will have great currency; in fact, the way postage costs have been going up, we may shortly find that the Justice Holmes stamp will be just what you need to send a first class letter.

This stamp dedication today is not Justice Holmes' first contact with the Post Office Department. In the Spring of 1919, a person unknown mailed a small package in the New York post office. It was addressed to Oliver Wendell Holmes—and it contained a bomb.

Fortunately it was intercepted, as were 15 similar bombs that were believed to have been mailed by anarchists. Justice Holmes took this threat on his life in stride, and he wrote to a friend: "If the senders knew how I think and feel perhaps they wouldn't have wanted to blow me up."

Justice Holmes, in turn, dropped a few bombs himself. His crisp and urbane opinions, his salty wit, helped to clear away the musty atmosphere of 19th century attitudes and introduce society into the 20th.

Perhaps no other jurist has put the English language to such grand purpose. This is not to suggest that Justice Holmes was a militant social reformer. He was not. He often remarked, perhaps with some asperity, that people who wanted to make drastic changes in society seldom inquired what the price would be.

He was not a liberal of the knee-jerk variety, but, rather, as Max Lerner has suggested, "He was a great spokesman of our Constitutional traditions because he was a great enough conservative to stretch the framework of the past to accommodate at least some of the needs of the present."

To the layman, Justice Holmes is regarded as the apostle of free speech, and to a considerable degree he was. But he had to be satisfied that this was not unbridled speech that violated a statute. In the light of events today, it is interesting to look backward on *Debs* v. *U.S.* in 1919. The times were similar; so were some of the actors on the stage.

Eugene V. Debs, an opponent of war, had made a speech in Canton, Ohio. He was arrested. The indictment charged that he had "incited and attempted to cause and incite insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny and refusal of duty in the military and naval forces of the United States." And that this was in violation of the Espionage Act, passed two years earlier. Debs was found guilty, sentenced to ten years imprisonment and took his appeal to the Supreme Court.

Justice Holmes wrote the opinion for the court that sustained conviction. The law was breeched, he wrote, the jury was correct. Debs, an old man who was president of the American Socialist Party, was imprisoned. Justice Holmes obeyed the letter of the law. Privately, he said: "I hope the President will pardon him . . ." Holmes, the great advocate of free speech, knew the limits of that freedom. It was where speech left off and conduct began.

Holmes probably sympathized with the aspirations of some of those who felt that mere speech was inadequate, and far too slow a means of redressing evils. But he believed it was equally important to preserve order; that that was government's first duty. For those who believed illegal action against the social order was necessary, Holmes believed they were entitled to the martyrdom of prison—it tested both the sincerity of their convictions and advertised their cause. If their cause was right and just, prison was a small price to pay; if their cause was foolish and doomed—then all the more reason why society was justified in protecting itself.

In the 50 years that he sat as a judge—20 on the Massachusetts Supreme Court, 30 on the Supreme Court of the United States—Oliver Wendell Holmes was a witness to one of the most turbulent periods of American society.

This was, of course, the rise of the labor union as a powerful force, a force which brought individual rights into conflict with property rights. Holmes and his brethren faced the task of having to draw the guidelines for capital and labor. Whether or not the picket line was legal, or the boycott or the yellow dog labor contract—these and many other aspects of militant labor-management relations were being tested in the courts.

Industry, also, was growing powerful and the question arose whether or not a trust was bad merely because it was big.

Further, in the first decades of this century, both the Congress and the Supreme Court were exerting, or attempting to exert, controls on matters that previously had been left more or less to the determination of the various states.

One of these federal interventions involved an effort to end child labor. Justice Holmes spoke out against this evil—but his was

a minority voice from the court. It seems incredible that as recently as 1918, the court would be unwilling to invoke the right of Congress to control interstate commerce as a deterrent to child labor. But that, in fact, was the majority attitude in a case that tested whether or not children under 14 could work in a North Carolina cotton mill.

Child labor, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right to vote—these were some of the momentous cases of the day upon which Justice Holmes left the impact of his opinions.

They called him The Great Dissenter. The fact is that, numerically, he was less prone to dissent than his fellow members on the court. From 1902 until his resignation in 1932, the Supreme Court rendered 5950 decisions. Justice Holmes dissented 173 times. Other justices dissented 1633 times, so proportionately he dissented less than his fellow justices.

But his dissents were in the grand manner and invariably contained a phrase or two that made headlines in the newspapers. The old gentleman had flair and style.

Despite a positivistic attitude toward law and an absolute insistence on rationalism, Holmes was paradoxically a romantic about such matters as patriotism and war.

It has become somewhat the vogue among *the academic* and liberal community, great admirers of Holmes, to ridicule patriotism and reverence for the flag as a dangerous form of chauvinism. It would be most instructive for them to reread Holmes' passionate commentary on the flag and what it symbolizes:

"The flag is but a bit of bunting to one who insists on prose. Yet thanks to Marshall and the men of his generation . . . its red is our life-blood, its stars our world, its blue our heaven. It owns our land. At will, it throws away our lives."

The least known aspect of Holmes' life is his experience as a soldier in the Army of the Potomac. It made a deep and lasting impression on him, and he constantly hearkened back to it for its lessons and purpose. He firmly believed that war had a spiritual value; that some wars were necessary. The speech in which he has most fully set forth his own beliefs is entitled "The Soldier's Faith." And these words about war seem most compelling for this nation at this time:

"To fight out a war, you must believe something and want something with all your might . . . More than that you must be willing to commit yourself to a course, perhaps a long and hard one, without being able to foresee exactly where you will come out."

His parting words, as he left Massachusetts to come to the Supreme Court, are cast in the language of battle:

"We will not falter. We will not fail. We will reach the earth works if we live, and if we fail we will leave our spirit in those who follow, and they will not turn back. All is ready. Bugler, blow the charge."

Holmes truly belongs to all Americans; he is part of the American tradition. Yet he will always have a special meaning for lawyers. By being a part of it he exalted our professional; and his life in the law is a constant reminder to all of us of the nobility and high purpose of our profession—and a measure of our failing. He saw the law as a road of high calling and high adventure, and as usual he was able to share his vision with us through the magic of his words:

"And what a profession it is! No doubt everything is interesting when it is understood and seen in connection with the rest of things. Every calling is great when greatly pursued. But what other gives such scope to realize the spontaneous energy of one's soul? In what other does one plunge so deep in the stream of life—so share its passions, its battles, its despair, its triumphs, both as witness and actor?"

The Unbalanced Payment Myths

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by the respected and knowledgeable oil editor, Mr. Ted Brooks of the Wichita, Kans., Eagle, entitled "The Unbalanced Payment Myths."

The article follows:

FROM THE OIL DESK: THE UNBALANCED PAYMENT MYTHS

(By Ted Brooks)

A number of unbalanced minds are working overtime on the unbalanced balance of payments problem. The outlook promises the restoration of neither. A solution is encumbered by the all too obvious fact that no one in the significant portion of the economy involved really wants balance of payments. There is entirely too much money to be made in unbalance.

If a solution is wanted, and it isn't, dozens are at hand. Some of these entail sacrifice, some are without virtue and some contain nothing but virtue. They hold in common one dominating characteristic: they are simply unacceptable to the people who manage the national economy. These people, who shuttle back and forth between key policy jobs in government and the super-industries according to the going price of influence, have the profitable conviction that what is good for them and their corporations is good for the country. No amount of want, privation and business distress in other segments of the population and economy can, unless it shakes their profits, shake their faith. This they fondly associate with a love of liberty, a respect for private enterprise and a decent regard for the gold standard.

If 500 corporations, dominating 80 per cent of the nation's productivity and 100 per cent of its business policies, manage to prosper, why worry about the 270,000-odd small businesses that account for a mere 20 per cent? In the oil industry about 20 supercorporations thus manage to double in size every seven years. This is extolled as clear evidence of the righteous wisdom with which they have schemed with government to halve the size of the small business segment of their industry. It has been done through connivance, which, though it has been exposed on gleeful occasions as outright money changing and job hawking, is normally effected through acceptable but none less culpable practices delicately know as "business statesmanship" and "responsible involvement in government."

The result is before us—a selectively planned economy that presents to those who will only take the trouble to look every criteria demanded by a corporate state, plus a hoodwinked small business sector and a bamboozled electorate.

Balance of payments, the corporations and their affiliated government agencies solemnly assert, is a goal to be devoutly hoped for and sought at any cost. Together with balance of trade, services, exchange, tourism and a venal foreign policy it ranks among the desirable conditions that insure easy access to world-wide power, commerce and growth. But, they caution, neither the profits of the corporations nor the power and prestige of their affiliated agencies must be risked.

These are qualifications that might make one wonder how the subject ever got to the point of discussion. They summarily rule out such practical and immediate antidotes as stringent and enforced curbs on foreign investments and significant cuts in foreign aid. The first is unthinkable because that is where the money is. The second is equated with leprosy because that is where more money is.

Most unspeakable of all is the subversive suggestion that balance would instantly be achieved by stopping the war in Vietnam.

The corporate state thus indignantly closes the door upon any consideration of policy changes or modifications that might quickly restore a balance of payments and divert the billions wasted and gambled abroad to the solution of mounting domestic problems. These are approaching emergency levels. But it may be predicted that until the stage of calamity is reached this will be obscured by a random prosperity that is misinterpreted as well-being.

One therefore seeks to find other avenues to correct the international deficit. Balance of trade is commonly a positive factor and it might be made more so. This door too has been closed by the same people for the same reasons. A great and undisclosed volume of imports results not from foreign competition as such but from domestic supercorporations who compete among themselves and extinguish lesser competitors at home by moving huge segments of their capital and equipment to earn profits and balances in foreign lands. Radios, TVs, watches, automobiles and thingabobs without number flood the markets. Free trade, which the old-fashioned capitalist corporation would oppose on principle, is profitably exploited by an organization large enough to provide its own capital needs anywhere in the world.

The importation of oil and oil products provides a typical example. In 1966 the net trade deficit amounted to $1.7 billion. Tanker transportation and foreign military purchases added another $500 million to boost the total to a minus $2.2 billion—by far the largest negative element in the trade balance. This is a commodity which could in large part be supplied at home at gallonage price increases still far below those of the general commodity index rise. It is a practical suggestion that has but an incidental relationship to either helping domestic producers or injuring supercorporations. It is not so much as considered because it endangers the profits of the only people whose voices are heard by an obedient Congress and a pliant administration.

So it is that with every door to really effective action blocked by political and profit interests, an unhappy administration is reduced to the preposterous extremity of treating with that most innocuous of payment balance factors—tourism. A government despairing of control or influence upon the supercorporations with which it shares its powers thus turns to its constituents to gravely remind them of their duties and the sacrifices they must make in the name of corporate tranquility.

Beholden here is at last the simple truth that balance of payments is incidental to infinitely larger problems. These include a balance of privilege, equity and justice and most of all a balance in minds that are teetering on the edge of a bedlam.

De Molay Week

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the young men who belong to the William Mason Saunders chapter of the Order of De Mo-

lay, many of whom reside in my congressional district, have requested that I include in the RECORD a proclamation by the Governor of Virginia for the observance of the week of March 18 as De Molay Week. Let me add my own best wishes for success to all members of the Order of De Molay. Certainly they will be better men and better citizens of our country for their association in this fine organization.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION OF DE MOLAY WEEK 1968

A character-building organization embracing two-and-one-half million young men throughout the free world, the International Order of De Molay celebrates this year its forty-ninth anniversary.

Under the sponsorship of the Masonic bodies of Virginia, De Molays in our own State are observing the week of March 18, 1968, as De Molay Week. I invite the people of Virginia, on this occasion, to salute the young men of the Order of De Molay for the example they offer the youth of our State and of the world.

MILLS E. GODWIN, Jr.,
Governor.

Questionnaire and Newsletter to South Dakota's Second District

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am this week mailing to South Dakota's Second District a questionnaire and accompanying explanatory newsletter.

I have asked my constituents to give me their opinions on a wide variety of subjects ranging from Vietnam to crime in the streets and am confident I will receive a comprehensive cross section of the views of people in my district. I anticipate a heavy response, judging from the number of replies received in the past.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD my questionnaire and newsletter as follows:

[Questionnaire]

Vietnam: Do you approve of the President's conduct of the war? Yes No

Which of the following policies would you favor regarding United States involvement in Vietnam? (a) Complete withdrawal (b) Pull back and maintain policing action (c) Halt bombing in North Vietnam (d) Take all action necessary to win.

Should the United States continue to trade with nations that are aiding North Vietnam? Yes No

Alliances: Would you cancel our mutual defense alliances all around the world? Yes No

Red China: Do you favor the admission of Red China to the UN? Yes No

Foreign aid: Do wou believe our foreign aid program should be: (a) Continued at same rate (b) Moderately reduced (c) Cut materially.

Taxes: Do you favor the Administration's proposed 10% tax increase? Yes No

Spending: Do you believe that federal spending on domestic programs should be reduced? Yes No

If government spending were cut, list in order of preference those programs you feel should be cut most heavily: Poverty War, Aid to Cities, Highway Beautification, Space Exploration, Foreign Aid, Education, Defense, Agriculture.

Imports: Should limited import quotas be imposed to protect agriculture, textiles, mining, and other industries? Yes No

Crime: In dealing with civil disorder, do you favor: (a) Stricter handling of rioters and demonstrators by police and the courts (b) More programs to improve slum areas (c) Federal assistance for local law enforcement.

Agriculture: Do you favor legislation which would strengthen the right of farmers to bargain collectively on prices of agricultural commodities? Yes No

Do you favor the proposed strategic grain reserve program? Yes No

Do you approve of federal cash subsidies to rural families if they agree to stay on the farm? Yes No

Travel tax: Do you support some restraint on foreign travel by Americans, including a travel tax? Yes No

Firearms: Do you favor federal control of the ownership and sale of firearms? Yes No

Poverty: In 1967 Congress appropriated $1.7 billion for the anti-poverty program. Should the program be: (a) Expanded — (b) Reduced — (c) Eliminated —

Incentive: Do you favor legislation providing tax incentives to employers for part of the cost of training unskilled? Yes No

Medicare: Do you think the present program is working well? Yes No

Civil rights: Do you support "open housing" legislation? Yes No

Credibility: Do you feel we are receiving accurate and reliable information on government activities? Yes No

[Newsletter]

MARCH 1968.

DEAR FRIEND: Am again seeking your advice on important questions confronting Congress through the medium of a questionnaire. To refresh your memory on some of these subjects will give you a brief résumé of the arguments, both pro and con, on the points which are covered in the questionnaire.

Vietnam: Overshadowing all else is the war in Southeast Asia. More than a half million men are committed to that theatre and more than 19,000 will never return. The wounded exceed the number in the Korean war. Doubt and fear pervade every home. There is much dissatisfaction with the manner in which the war is being conducted. There is unanimous agreement that the time has come for some soul searching reappraisals.

Some favor complete and immediate withdrawal. Opponents of this policy point out this means the loss of the entire southeast Asian continent and probably one by one the entire Pacific. They feel this would be the beginning of the end of all of our nation's defense alliances.

Some favor our pulling back and simply serving as a policing action. Recent Communist action has appeared to make this infeasible. Others would halt the bombing of the North as an inducement to bring them to the conference table. Opponents of this strategy contend this would only leave the way clear to move troops and supplies into the combat area.

Many feel we must return to a policy of firmness and take all action necessary to win. They contend the present policy is too costly in manpower and treasure; that if we did not go in to win, we should not have gone in at all. Opponents contend that any escalation is an act of aggression and could possibly trigger World War III.

Alliances: Our foreign policy is based on mutual defense alliances with most of the nations of the free world. In these alliances we have agreed to help the weaker nations build their defense against Communist aggression and have agreed that if they are attacked we will come to their aid—not fight their war for them—but help them help themselves. On the other hand, there are those who feel we cannot afford this load and should therefore cut off the alliances, withdraw our troops and equipment, and strongly fortify the United States.

Red China: One of the most bitter battles that has raged in the U.N. since 1950 has been over the admission of Red China. Our official position is in opposition. They will not accept a seat so long as Nationalist China remains in the U.N. The argument for seating them is that the Peking regime controls roughly one-fourth of the world's population, has been in power 18 years and is, in fact, the government of China.

Foreign aid: Since the foreign aid program was inaugurated in 1948 we have made available nearly $130 billion to 124 countries. The question is, should the program be continued at its present rate, moderately reduced, or materially cut? Proponents contend it promotes peace, security and stability abroad. Opponents ask, "Where do we get the money?" They point to scandals involving misconduct and graft, they point to inefficiency, and our attempt to do for others what they could and should do for themselves.

Firearms: Pending before Congress is an Administration proposal to prevent interstate mail order sales of firearms on the theory of better crime control. Opponents question its Constitutionality, contend it is an infringement on the rights of law-abiding gun owners, and that those desiring weapons would obtain them anyway through illegal means.

Taxes: The President has proposed a 10 percent surcharge on personal and corporate income taxes. Those favoring the surcharge argue that it is needed to pay for the Vietnam war, fight inflation, and keep interest rates down. Opponents contend that if the American people must tighten their belts, the government should do likewise by cutting spending one billion dollars for each billion-dollar increase in taxes.

Spending: In the present fiscal year expenditures will exceed $180 billion, and in the next fiscal year are expected to reach $186.1 billion. Non-defense spending was $68.4 billion in fiscal 1965, and under the 1969 budget will reach $106.3 billion. In the same period, defense spending jumped $30 billion, mainly because of the Vietnam war. The question is, can this country fight a major war and still escalate non-defense spending?

Imports: Free trade advocates feel that tariffs and quotas would result in new trade barriers being imposed by foreign nations. On the other hand, trade experts favoring greater protection for American industries say if many basic industries are to survive in this country, they must be permitted to compete on an equal basis with foreign imports. The $3.6 billion deficit in our "balance of payments" could be eliminated by placing import quotas on seven major industries including steel, automobiles, agriculture, and textiles. This problem has become especially serious with the recent flight of our gold reserves which many feel could get much worse before it improves.

Crime: Probably the most serious domestic problem confronting us is that of crime. It is frightening to realize that crime has risen 62% in the past six years, and no end is in sight. Softness on criminals, partially because of Supreme Court decisions curbing police power, undoubtedly contributes to the problem. Many well meaning people assume that society has failed the criminal, rather than the criminal failing society, and support basic reforms rather than tougher law enforcement.

Agriculture: In a recent message to Congress, the President called for a seven-point program including strengthening farmers' bargaining power, permanent extension of the 1965 Food and Agriculture Act, a three-

year continuation of the Food for Peace program, creation of a national food bank, and expanded low-interest credit for the small farmer. Opponents note that farm income and population have declined steadily under the present program, hardly justifying making it permanent at the present time.

Poverty: There is general agreement on the need for an effective program to help the poor, but there is disagreement as to whether or not the "war on poverty" program is the answer. President Johnson has asked for increased funds to expand the many OEO programs. Opponents feel that in too many instances these efforts have failed to meet the real need of the unemployed for permanent jobs, too much money has gone for inflated administrative expenses, and many programs have brought dismal results at enormous costs.

Incentive: One solution offered to meet the problem of unemployment is the so-called "Human Investment Act." It is based on the principle that the most effective job trainer is private enterprise. To encourage and finance such training, the Act would provide tax credits for businesses investing in upgrading workers' skills. It is opposed primarily by those who feel it would remove close government supervision and control.

South Dakota Briefs: There is still hope of developing a plan for industrial use of the Black Hills Ordnance Depot . . . Final hearings on the Oahe irrigation project will probably be scheduled after Easter recess . . . Construction of the lignite gasification pilot plant at Rapid City to begin this year . . . Major renovations of visitors' facilities at Mt. Rushmore planned . . . Bureau of Reclamation will begin this spring a detailed study of a proposal to divert water from Big Bend into Lower James River Valley . . . South Dakotans stand firmly opposed to a scheme of diverting Missouri river water into Texas . . . Efforts being made to utilize closed OEO facilities on Cheyenne River reservation . . . Site selection for Rapid City post office expected soon . . . Passage of bill to expand Badlands National Monument into former Gunnery Range area and resell land to former Indian owners expected soon.

With my kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

E. Y. BERRY.

Hanoi Nixes Peace Talks for Time Being

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, now, headlines herald the fact that Communist leaders in Hanoi have ruled out peace talks. The reason: Communist leaders believe U.S. presidential politics are working in its favor.

I fear that every candidate, within and without my own party, whose statements weaken our national commitment in this grave crisis is giving encouragement to the enemy to hang on. Such encouragement will be at the expense of the American serviceman.

Let it be clearly understood that I stand with our President, who yesterday called on the American people to unite behind our valiant efforts to help Vietnam remain free. He has my fullest support for the tremendous efforts he has made in handling this grave crisis, and in the determination he has shown in seeking an end to it.

With him I stand unequivocally in stating that the Communists are not going to have handed to them from Washington the victory they cannot win over our men on the battlefield.

As ever, in time of national peril, our people will unite. And they will not forget those who would strengthen the enemy's cause at the cost of American lives to further their own personal ambition.

BELIEVES U.S. POLITICS WORK IN ITS FAVOR—HANOI NIXES PEACE TALK FOR TIME BEING

LONDON, March 19.—North Vietnam, apparently confident the U.S. presidential campaign is working in its favor, was authoritatively reported today to be ruling out peace talks for the near future.

East European diplomatic sources with known contacts in Hanoi said hardliners in the regime of President Ho Chi Minh have recently dominated policy decisions in the communist capital.

They are now in undisputed control and reportedly more self-assured than ever, the sources said.

The sources indicated that Hanoi feels it cannot lose by waiting, and stands increasing chance of getting its way by merely continuing the status quo at least until late summer.

The sources said there has been less talk in Hanoi lately of peace talks, even if the U.S. halts its bombing of North Vietnam.

These sources, which in the past have proved well informed on Hanoi's changing moods and designs, said a new wave of confidence is evidently dominating the policy makers of North Vietnam.

Hanoi is said to be determined to continue the fighting—alternately stepping it up and slowing it down—but continuing to inflict U.S. casualties in hopes of putting additional pressure on U.S. public opinion.

How Charles Shuman Helps the Great Society

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the American Farm Bureau claims to be the best friend of the American farmer. However, it chooses the oddest methods of serving him.

It helps the farmer by using him as a front for maintaining tax exempt status, while it runs insurance companies, oil wells, tire marts, fertilizer plants, marketing co-ops—so-called—hotels, motels, and shopping centers in competition with taxpaying businesses.

It helps the farmer by keeping prices down, and by paying him with worthless stock. It represents him by imposing the ideas and policies of the national organization on local affiliates. It helps the farmer by lobbying for prices at 50 percent of parity and by supporting oil depletion allowance.

It also performs another service for the American farmer—it serves as unofficial interpreter of the Government's farm policies. Whenever a Government official makes a statement on farm policy, Charlie Shuman, AFBF president, and, incidentally, president of the National Food Conference, a hefty combine of food processors, helpfully provides his translation of those policies.

Ron Harley, in an article in the Des Moines, Iowa, Sunday Register, of March 10, 1968, demonstrates Mr. Shuman's expertise as an interpreter.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Harley's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

HOW CHARLIE SHUMAN HELPS THE GREAT SOCIETY

(By Ron Harley)

Most people know that Charlie Shuman is president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

What most people don't know is that Mr. Shuman also serves unofficially as an interpreter of the Great Society's farm policies.

When President Johnson makes a statement on farm policy, Mr. Shuman makes it his business to explain the meaning of that statement.

In a recent message to Congress, for example, Mr. Johnson called for permanent extension of the 1965 Agricultural Act.

Within hours, Mr. Shuman had prepared an interpretation.

"What this means," Mr. Shuman explained in a news release, "is that the Administration wants to continue to drive down farm prices and make farmers dependent on government subsidies . . ."

The President, in the same message, recommended establishing a "national food bank" for storing reserves of wheat, feed grains and soybeans.

Mr. Shuman, apparently fearing that some people might misunderstand the purpose of the food bank proposal, explained that it is "another scheme to hold down farm prices."

Over the years, Mr. Shuman has often provided the same kind of service for Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman.

In 1964, when Mr. Freeman was trying to get Congress to pass a new wheat bill, Mr. Shuman was busy explaining that the proposed wheat program was actually a "bread tax."

In 1962, Mr. Freeman went to Kansas City to dedicate the Agriculture Department's new data processing center there.

"This center," Mr. Freeman said at the dedication ceremony, "will be keeping records for all grain price-support operations in every county in the nation at a savings of $800,000 a year."

Mr. Shuman felt that further explanation was needed and, of course, he provided further explanation:

"Each farmer will be identified and classified in this huge bureaucratic set-up by a faceless punch card," he said. "As these cards flash through the machines they can dispense all sorts of interesting information about each farmer for the use of the political farm managers in Washington.

"Farmers will need only to know how to follow orders. And these orders will be electronically printed and mechanically dispatched by the machine in Kansas City."

Chances are, Mr. Freeman woud have never thought of describing the Kansas City operation in exactly those terms.

But if he was grateful to Mr. Shuman for shedding additional light on the subject, he did not say so publicly.

A Proclamation From Bayonne, N.J., to Wellington, New Zealand

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, last month 200 members of the 2d Marine

Division Association traveled to New Zealand to participate in ceremonies marking the 25th anniversary of the 2d Marine Division's arrival there during World War II.

New Zealand became a second home for the men of the famed Marine division, and many of the men ended up marrying New Zealand girls. The continuing friendship between the American people and the people of New Zealand was well demonstrated by the tumultuous welcome given President Johnson on his arrival in New Zealand last year.

Mr. Speaker, Frank R. Slivocka, an outstanding citizen of Bayonne, N.J., was one of the heroic veterans of the 2d Marines who went to New Zealand. He carried with him a proclamation expressing the friendship and good wishes of the people of Bayonne to the people of Wellington, New Zealand.

I include at this point a copy of the Bayonne proclamation:

Be it resolved and proclaimed by the mayor and the municipal council of the city of Bayonne, as follows:

"PROCLAMATION

"Whereas, The citizens of the City of Bayonne in the County of Hudson and State of New Jersey, United States of America, hold in high esteem the friendship of the people of New Zealand; and

"Whereas, The people of New Zealand have generously given hospitality, warmth and comfort to many of our citizens and men in the service of our country; and

"Whereas, This friendship has been especially bestowed by the people of New Zealand upon members of the United States Marine Corps, our country's proudest and finest fighting men; and

"Whereas, Many members of the Second Marine Division Association are, during the month of February, 1968, returning to New Zealand, the place of their World War II encampment; and

"Whereas, Frank R. Slivocka, a member of the said Second Marine Division Association and honored citizen of the City of Bayonne, is to revisit New Zealand, as aforesaid:

"Now, therefore, be it proclaimed That Frank R. Slivocka is hereby appointed as Ambassador from the City of Bayonne, and he is hereby directed to bring to the Honorable Sir Francis Kitts, Mayor, the Governing Body, and the people of the City of Wellington, New Zealand, this expression of friendship and good wishes on behalf of the people of the City of Bayonne.

The Ambassador's Congressional Courier on East-West Trade

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the second session of the 90th Congress, preoccupied as it is with grave problems confronting us at home and abroad, has been able to accord rather limited consideration to one urgent subject in the field of foreign policy.

This subject is East-West trade and its impact on peace and war, on the current objectives of U.S. policy, and on the entire structure of economic and political relations between the East and the West.

I was delighted, therefore, to find this subject receiving attention from a new publication written for the purpose of acquainting foreign diplomats and other interested parties with the U.S. Congress and the key issues considered by it.

The name of this monthly newsletter is the Ambassador's Congressional Courier. Its editor is one of our foremost distaff reporters in Washington, Esther Van Wagoner Tufty.

Because I believe that the lead article in the February 1968 issue of the Courier will prove of interest to all Members of Congress, I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point.

VIETNAM SLOWS DOWN EAST-WEST TRADE

East-West trade is a mere trickle of total world trade. Yet, belief in the value of free trade in creating international economic stability continues. The desirability of "trade bridges" between Communist and non-Communist nations is accepted by the majority of the Congress.

The "trickle" isn't apt immediately to spurt into a flow of commercial exchange because the Vietnam issue has made many members of the United States Congress interpret "trade bridges" as "trading with the enemy." It was no accident that President Johnson ignored East-West trade in his State of the Union message to Congress.

The Senate and House approved a 5-year extension of the Export-Import Bank and increased the limit on its lending authority from $9 billion to $13.5 billion. The conference report, ironing out the differences between the two versions, underscores the desirability of international financing with the restriction that loans not be made to nations furnishing military aid to North Vietnam.

The encouragement of East-West trade is involved . . . directly or indirectly . . . by such legislation as the "Food for Peace" Program (Public Law 480), the Mutual Security Act, the Battle Act, the Export Control Act, and the Foreign Assistance Act.

Is the East anxious to trade with the West?

Yes. Anxious to enlarge their imports from the West, especially capital equipment. But such trade is held back not only by United States export restrictions but also by the limited ability of the Eastern European countries to earn sufficient foreign exchange to pay for those imports which are available from the West.

What is the future of East-West trade?

The future is determined by Government policies of both East and West. For example, if Eastern Europe buys only goods to fill gaps in national production, then no significant expansion is possible. The prospect is brighter, however, if goods made more cheaply elsewhere are encouraged as imports, even if there's some output of the product at home.

Has the East-West trade policy been a success for the United States?

Senator J. William Fulbright (D-Arkansas), Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, contends it is "a proven success." He said in 1965. "Over recent years a number of Eastern European countries have become steadily more independent of the Soviet Union and have entered into increasingly friendly relations with the United States."

In 1967, the United States exported goods and services totaling $30.7 billion compared to $26.4 billion in imports. Nonetheless, in the total balance of payments, the United States was in the red at the end of the last year by $3.5 billion to $4 billion.

What is the extent of Soviet trade with the United States?

It rose by about $11 million during 1966, but still lagged behind Soviet trade with Canada, Argentina, and Cuba. Statistics on Soviet foreign trade reveal 66.5 per cent of all trade in 1966 was done with other Communist nations, but trade with the West was on the rise.

What changes in U.S. legislation would encourage the East to trade more with the West?

Possibly, (1) long term credits, (2) a "most favored nation" status, and (3) more industrial items included on the non-strategic list free of export controls.

The political and psychological benefits of East-West trade could be more important than the economic benefits. Professor Isaiah Frank of Johns Hopkins University contends "a willingness on the part of the United States to loosen up commercial relations with the East could conceivably serve as a prelude to negotiations on broader political issues." Trade discrimination is seen as harmful. Whenever the occasion presents itself, the Soviet Union calls for an end to trade discrimination and for "normalization" of trade relations with all countries. The Soviet Union values acceptance in the world arena.

COURIER QUERIES CHAIRMAN KELLY

The House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe is currently holding hearings on East-West trade. The Courier asked its Chairman, Edna F. Kelly (D-New York), two questions:

1. *Should the President be given more discretion in expanding trade between the U.S. and the Iron Curtain countries?*

Her answer: "This, essentially, was the recommendation of a public commission headed by Mr. J. Irwin Miller and assigned to study this subject. They felt that by having broader authority in this field, the President would be in a better position to use the leverage of trade in peaceful commodities to obtain concessions and to promote desirable political change in the Communist countries.

"Personally, I have some reservations on this score. We have at present some two dozen laws, administered by six major Government departments and agencies, which deal with East-West trade. Most of them were enacted years ago. We don't really know how effective these laws are in protecting our national interests, or how consistent they are with each other.

"For this reason, the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, is undertaking a thorough review of our laws, regulations and practices relating to East-West trade. As Chairman of the Subcommittees, I have the responsibility for conducting these hearings. And one of the questions I definitely want answered in these hearings is the one you asked: namely, should the Congress give the President any additional authority in this field?

"I may add that I am very much concerned about the rapid increase in trade between Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union on the one hand, and our allies in Western Europe on the other. In 1967, the volume of trade between our NATO allies and Eastern Europe went over the $7 billion mark. During the same year, U.S. exports to Communist countries amounted to less than $250 million. The difference here is tremendous—both in quantity and quality. Our NATO allies are moving ahead in trading with the Communist countries—perhaps too far and too fast. They are supplying the Communist countries with advanced technology. This can have very far-reaching ramifications. I certainly would not favor any relaxation of controls on modern industrial technology and strategic items. If anything, we may need to strengthen these controls."

2. *Would you exclude some Iron Curtain countries, and if so, why?*

"I don't think that we should treat all of those countries the same way. For example, I believe that our embargo on trade with Red

China, North Korea, North Vietnam and Cuba should be maintained. On the other hand, some of the Eastern European countries are beginning to liberalize their internal systems and to move gradually toward the West. In those cases, I feel that we ought to use our trade policy to reduce their dependence on Moscow and on some of their neighbors. We ought to have a flexible approach which would help to advance our national objectives, and to promote our national security."

Critics of Hangings in Rhodesia Denounced

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by James J. Kilpatrick appearing in the Washington Star last night.

I continue to be amazed at the constant effort by mature people and mature countries to destroy the country of Rhodesia, the latest tirade being directed at the Ian Smith government, because it had the audacity to execute some murdering criminals. It is constantly pointed out that the Queen had commuted the criminals' sentences to life imprisonment. Since the Unilateral Declaration of Independence, the Queen has no more authority over the internal affairs of Rhodesia than did the King of England have over the internal affairs of the United States of America after independence. In fact, the Queen did not have *this power* even before the Unilateral Declaration of Independence.

The leftwing press and the Commie-leaning liberals constantly refer to these murdering criminals as "freedom fighters," when, in fact, they were guilty of the most heinous crimes that man can perpetrate upon his fellow man.

The article follows:

CRITICS OF HANGINGS IN RHODESIA DENOUNCED

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Rhodesia has been suffering lately from a very bad press: The State Department denies a visa to Prime Minister Ian Smith. The Virginia House of Delegates shouts down a resolution of support for Rhodesia. Back in Salisbury, right-wing pressures toward apartheid grow more intense. Defying Queen, Pope, and world opinion, the Smith regime proceeds with the hanging of five "freedom fighters."

At the United Nations, the Afro-Asian bloc demands new measures against Rhodesia, more punitive than the present sanctions. A lead article in the prestigious American Journal of International Law defends the sanctions; the theory of the authors, one of them a Yale professor, is that Rhodesia has offended the "shared sensitivities" of her neighbors, and thus created an actionable threat to the peace. The fury is especially intense in England, where members of Commons denounce Ian Smith as "a murderer."

It is true enough that the Rhodesian government, struggling for survival in a hostile world, has taken some actions in recent months that American friends must regret. Laws relating to housing and to segregation of public parks are steps backward, not forward. The Smith government has not impeded the registration of black voters, but it has done little to encourage the African franchise; the number of registered blacks is half what it was three years ago.

But the current uproar, touched off by the five hangings, ought to be denounced as blatant hypocrisy on the part of most of those who are whooping it up. Macaulay once remarked that he knew of no spectacle so ridiculous as the British public in one of its periodical fits of morality. This current fit qualifies. And no spectacle in Africa is more contemptible than the criticism hurled at Rhodesia by despotic black regimes which are themselves guilty of bloody crimes and the repression of political freedoms.

It is said that the five condemned men were "freedom fighters." Let us see how they fought for freedom.

James Ndhlamini and Victor Mlambo were members of a terrorist group known as the Crocodile Gang. They threw a block of trees across a country road. When a white farmer named Oberholtzer came along, with his wife and small daughter in the car, they fell upon them with knives and stones. As he was dying at the steering wheel, they attempted to set the car on fire in an effort to kill the woman and child. This was a fight for freedom?

Duly Shadreck waylaid an elderly black man at midnight, killed him with an axe, and robbed him of seven shillings. Noble, was it not?

Francis Chimsoro Risa and Takauyare Jeremiah stole into a tribal hut where a sub-chief named Nedewedzo was sleeping with his wife. They tore off most of his head with a shotgun blast. It seems an odd exercise in self-determination.

For these brutal murders, the five defendants were brought to trial in the High Court of Rhodesia. They had the assistance of counsel. In each case, a judge and two "assessors," under the Rhodesian system, found them guilty without extenuating circumstance. The death sentences followed. These were sustained on appellate review.

Why the outcry? In terms of moral principle, those who deplore the death penalty may deplore its imposition anywhere. But as a matter of law, these punishments were peculiarly the business of Rhodesia. Pietistic Americans might restrain themselves long enough to acknowledge that 3,857 executions were carried out in their own United States between 1930 and 1966.

It is said that Rhodesia "defied the Queen." But the Queen in this affair was no more than a pretty figurehead; the clemency decree came from the Wilson government, which had no authority even under the pre-independence Rhodesian constitution of 1961, to exercise the prerogative of mercy. The incident was patently trumped up. It is a fair surmise that Wilson's object was to divert the British public from troubles at home by fabricating some vicarious outrage abroad.

One expects opportunism from the Communists and hypocrisy from the Afro-Asian bloc. One has learned to expect anything from Harold Wilson. But it is a sad commentary on the United States, which once also proclaimed its independence from the British crown, to see our own people join in the calamity howling against Rhodesia now heard across the land.

The "Pueblo": How Long, Mr. President?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 58th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

Vocational Education: Keystone to Solving Unrest in America's Cities

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, it was my privilege to address the Illinois Vocational Association in Chicago, Ill., to discuss the potential of vocational education in this country today.

As chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education here in the House, which is now hearing testimony on the Partnership for Learning and Earning Act of 1968, I cannot overemphasize the importance of readying our students for occupational challenges following high school.

The need is evident and overwhelming.

I submit, for the review of my colleagues, the text of my address to the Illinois Vocational Association, with the hope that we, as legislators, may be able to initiate the necessary measures in Congress to meet this challenge.

The text of my remarks follows:

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—KEYSTONE TO SOLVING UNREST IN AMERICA'S CITIES

(Remarks of the Honorable ROMAN C. PUCINSKI before the Illinois Vocational Association, Sherman House, Chicago, Ill., March 7, 1968)

As we assemble here this evening to discuss vocational education, there is a pall of fear sweeping across America—fear of another long hot summer with millions of Americans wondering how extensive the damage will be this time.

There isn't a commentator or analyst who doesn't remind us of the devastation to come.

We assemble here in the wake of the report issued by the National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders—better known as the Riot Commission.

Never before in the history of this nation—or for that matter, any nation—have a people undergone so intensive a process of self-analysis to determine what is wrong within our Republic; what is tearing this nation apart; are we, indeed, about to admit that free men cannot mold their own destiny.

There are no simple solutions, but this evening I should like to discuss with you some of my own observations on where this nation has gone wrong.

Last December, at the Convention of the American Vocational Association in Cleveland, I pointed out that by 1972 our nation will be in a trillion dollar economy and that the involvement of our nation in occupational training will approach $15 billion a year by 1980.

We are now expecting to hit an $850 billion Gross National Product by July 1 of this year. Yet only yesterday morning the very distinguished Superintendent of Public Instruction in the City of Cleveland, Dr. Briggs, testified before my Committee that 58% of out-of-school inner-city youth are unemployed.

Statistics after statistics tell us that in this eighth consecutive year of prosperity this nation continues to suffer almost 4,000,000 people unemployed and the largest single group of unemployed in this country are the young people.

I submit to you this evening that as this nation probes for an answer to rioting in the streets we take a sober look at the failure of American education.

It is ironic that many of you in this assembly as vocational educators have warned about this crisis for many years, but they didn't listen to you.

You assembled here tonight can play the most significant role in finding the answers for in your hands as vocational educators lies much of the solution.

Make no mistake—this phase of the twentieth century when America is at the crossroads for survival—belongs to you.

For in my honest judgment, the keystone to finding a solution to America's problems is a strong system of occupational training in our schools. Had the educational pedagogues listened to you twenty years ago—or even ten years ago—perhaps we could have avoided the domestic crises facing America today.

The tragedy of our time is that even at this late date the Riot Commission, too, has failed to listen to you.

Our national press has greeted with proud and enthusiastic coverage the President's Report on Civil Disorders. And rightly so, because it represents the thinking of a distinguished panel of public figures including the Governor of this State. The Report probes deeply into the cause of rioting in our streets and roams over the entire spectrum of human needs and emotions. But I submit to you tonight that the Report falls tragically short of its mark and to a great extent misses its glorious opportunity to make a truly significant contribution toward easing America's problems.

I have not heard the disappointment that must be voiced about this Report's failure to fully probe the role of education in setting the stage for civil disorder.

I was astounded to see that only a scanty portion of the four volumes of this Riot Report is devoted to education.

It is true the Report does treat some important issues—early childhood education, teacher training, compensatory education, and evaluation with seriousness.

But its recommendations essentially offer us just some more of the same old tired answers.

Those working on the Report have done some polite tinkering with the system and that is all. Even if all of the recommendations were accepted tomorrow, the schools in the ghetto areas of this country would remain unchanged—continuing to "turn off" thousands of disadvantaged youngsters—tolerating them until they reach the magic age of sixteen and then pushing them out into the ranks of the unemployed.

We have been reading a good deal about drop-outs, when in fact the failure of the educational system, particularly in ghetto areas of America, has literally pushed youngsters out of the educational process by failing to make education a meaningful experience for the disadvantaged.

The Riot Commission report places great faith in compensatory education. But look at Title I programs and you will find that most of them have failed. The findings of the National Advisory Council for Education of Disadvantaged Children and the Center for Urban Education in New York provide sad commentary.

Dr. Jeanne Chall, in her book, "Learning to Read: The Great Debate," tells us that the code-emphasis or phonics approach produces the best results in beginning reading. And the earlier it is taught the better. But how many of our Title I programs in reading teach phonics? From the evaluation results—which use reading test scores as their major criteria—obviously not many of our educators have even read Dr. Chall's book, let alone put into practice her suggestions.

In the few isolated instances where compensatory programs have succeeded, they have sprung from the creative imaginations of unusually capable principals—such as Dr. Marjorie Lerner, Principal of the Donough School in Chicago. What this means, according to Dr. Robert Dentler of the Center for Urban Education, is that school leadership is the deciding factor in the success of such a program. Yet, the Riot Report remains silent on the training and performance of school principals.

And the most important leader of all—the superintendent—rates only a recommendation that he spend more time in the ghetto.

This is not a bad idea—but first, we must teach our big-city superintendents how to look and listen, also how to be better managers, themselves.

With only a handful of exceptions, most big-city superintendents are having great difficulty. This is why it is estimated that the "mortality rate" among big city school superintendents is estimated at three years in each job.

They have cut themselves off from the community.

They are inaccessible to the isolated teacher out in the schools—young, inexperienced teachers like Herbert Kohl, author of the touching book, "36 Children," recounting his effort to succeed in a Harlem school despite lack of support from the bureaucracy.

Most big city superintendents are unable to cope with the mammoth administrative responsibilities confronting them—problems of budgets, collective bargaining, designing and maintaining buildings, developing curricula, and just plain day-to-day management.

An outstanding exception—and one who was recently praised editorially in the Washington Post—is Dr. Mark Shedd, Superintendent of Schools in Philadelphia. Dr. Shedd has surrounded himself with a group of *non-educators*, experts on city planning, business administration, city politics, and the community.

Unfortunately, most superintendents are recruited only from the ranks of professional educators. And schools of education have a monopoly on their training, when it is the schools of business administration that have the tools of systems analysis, cost-benefit analysis, programming-planning-budgeting, and technology—which educators are only beginning to utilize—and which are vital to the successful operation of any large enterprise.

The Riot Report talks about teacher training and retraining. Quite realistically, though, how do you actually go about retraining a teacher?

Professor Robert Rosenthal of Harvard University has conducted extensive research into what he calls the "self-fulfilling prophecy". His experiments show that when teachers hold high expectations for pupils, the student's IQ scores go up. But when they have low expectations for equally capable pupils, their IQ scores drop sharply.

So the real problem is one of changing teacher attitudes toward pupils—especially towards minority groups.

The educators have never really confronted this sensitive question. Yet it is a crucial one if we are to raise the self-image and aspiration levels of disadvantaged youngsters.

Another point in connection with teacher training. The Report says nothing about opening up the teacher certification ranks to innovative but uncertified individuals who hold bachelor's and even master's degrees and want to teach.

Every year our colleges and universities graduate thousands of bright young people who probably know more about reaching youngsters than many teachers with 25 years' experience.

And we have a wealth of talent among other groups, as well—mothers who would like to work a half day or businessmen, professional people, and technicians who would enjoy donating a few hours a week to the classroom.

Their wealth of experience in the "real world" would inject a breath of fresh air into the school curriculum. But state laws and union contracts prevent these capable, if uncertified, people from becoming teachers in our classrooms.

The real answer to the plight of American education lies in meaningful change. We have fiddled with the same old machinery too long. And the Riot Commission would have us hold on just a little while longer.

Like any organization, the schools have become inbred and unimaginative, because of lack of competition. And now the public has caught up with the education establishment; it is beginning to ask some damaging questions.

The main thrust of new ideas in the business world has come from having to compete in the free market place. Perhaps we should apply this principle to education.

Professor James Coleman of the Johns Hopkins University has suggested that we adopt a business strategy—payment on delivery. We might use this in education by rewarding the schools which successfully teach our children how to read and write—and no automatic increases for those which fail to do so.

Unfortunately, the Riot Report speaks all too briefly about a very promising concept—decentralization; with a greater emphasis on developing neighborhood schools. The Bundy Plan for decentralization in New York calls for a "reconnection to learning" between the community and educators.

I can think of no healthier prospect for improving American education today than a return to control by parents and laymen, with a greater autonomy for individual teachers in the classroom, instead of the bureaucrats in a downtown office.

We should not expect overnight success, but the initial pain of instituting such a plan is more than justified by the potential it offers for helping the schools become more relevant and responsive to community wishes and needs.

The Riot Report completely misses what really happens to the children, underneath all these layers of administrative strategies and new programs. It is all too easy for us to close our eyes to them. The teachers have unions and the NEA to speak for them. And parents have their PTA's.

But who speaks for the children?

A few rebels in the teaching profession—who are also serious and thoughtful critics of the schools—have tried.

John Holt, a teacher, has written *How Children Fail*, in which he says: "We encourage children to feel that the end and aim of all they do in school is nothing more than to get a good mark on a test, or to impress someone with what they know. We kill not only their curiosity, but their feeling that it is a good and admirable thing to be curious. . . . We encourage children to act stupidly, not only by scaring and confusing them, but by filling up their days with dull, repetitive tasks that make little or no claim on their attention or demands on their intelligence."

What then, does all of this mean for vocational educators?

What does it mean to those of you assembled here tonight?

A great deal.

The President has called for $2 billion to train 500,000 hard-core unemployed for jobs.

But our experience with MDTA and Job Corps convinces me that the price of human retrieval is fantastically high. And the chances of success are at best questionable.

The Report attempts to place all the blame of America's ills on what it calls "white racism".

In my humble judgment, such an indictment is an emotional outburst by those who have not probed deep enough into the problems—the real problems—of the disadvantaged.

I submit that the basic cause of this unrest is the failure of the school system and until we recognize that vocational training

can be the heartbeat of massive reforms, we will continue groping for answers.

Stewart Alsop, in his column for the Post Magazine a week ago interviewed a young man who is a product of the ghetto. Catfish Mayfield is his name, and after a frank discussion with Catfish on the real problems of the slums Mr. Alsop wrote:

"To many well-meaning, liberal-minded whites, the solution of the problem of Negro unemployment—which is the root cause of most Negro violence—is obvious: Find jobs for the hard-core unemployed, with the Federal Government acting as 'employer of last resort.' But it really is not that simple.

"The whole life-style of Catfish and his friends has nothing at all in common with the nine-to-five, early-to-bed-early-to-rise life-style of the white—and Negro—middle classes. It is not only acceptable, it is positively necessary, to have broken the laws in order to be admitted to the society to which Catfish and his friends belong. Most of the 'guys on the streets' are simply not interested in working eight hours a day for five days a week in dull, menial jobs. The fact is that a great many of Catfish's friends are already, or soon will be, psychologically unemployable.

"This is a phenomenon that liberal-minded politicians and commentators hesitate to discuss, for fear of being labeled racist and reactionary. But the psychological unemployability of a disproportionately high percentage of able-bodied young Negro men is a phenomenon that has been thoroughly demonstrated by this time.

"Last fall, what the Negroes call 'the white power structure' in Detroit scared by the riot, made a great effort to provide 23,000 jobs for Negroes, at decent wages. Only a minority stayed on the job for more than a few days or weeks. At the Chrysler Corporation, which hired 12,000 Negroes, the turnover was more than 90 percent.

"Negro civil-rights workers are themselves well aware of the phenomenon. Julius Hobson, a Negro activist and former head of CORE for the Washington area, describes a disappointing employment drive that he headed. He got the promise of hundreds of jobs from major firms in the area, and to deal with the problem of high turnover he organized something called a 'job wagon.' The newly employed Negroes would be awakened in the morning, fed coffee and doughnuts, and transported to their jobs by the 'job wagon.' It was no use—the turnover, Hobson recalls, was terrible.

" 'There's a psychological thing there,' he says. 'A man who's lived on his wits, sleeping till ten in the morning, on the hustle in the streets or the poolrooms—he figures a guy working eight hours a day for eighty bucks a week just isn't smart. If you just get a guy like that a job and turn him loose, you're wasting your time—he won't last a week. After thirty, maybe twenty-five, a man living on his wits reaches a point where he just won't hold a regular job. You've got to catch them young'."

It is obvious from this penetrating analysis that jobs in themselves are not enough.

It should be clearly apparent that in order to reach the youngster of the ghetto you must try to reach him with a program of education from the very earliest age that will teach him respect for his ability to work with his hands; to work with his mind; to work with his neighbors.

It is obvious that in order to get at the root cause of the problems in the ghetto youngsters must be taught values at the earliest stage of their life.

We have testimony before my Committee that most potential dropouts began to think of dropping out from school as early as the age of twelve. Obviously then, it is at this point that we must make education so thoroughly exciting and so thoroughly meaningful that this youngster will develop an inherent respect for the whole art of employment, and create a desire to be employed.

This, in my judgment, is the great challenge for you as vocational educators.

For within your imagination and your ability and your program lies the ingredients of making youngsters respect the fact that employment is a desirable commodity.

The most serious weaknesses in present job training programs is that they offer no preventive medicine.

They do not help us develop job skills to the one million youths who annually drop out of school before graduation. And it does not insure that we can save the 30 percent of our young Negro people between the ages of 16 and 22 who are unemployed.

If the Administration fails to see the needs of vocational education, so does the Riot Commission. It devotes only a few, short, paragraphs to vocational education, although the highest rates of dropouts and unemployed youths are found among disadvantaged Negroes.

The attitude of the Administration on this issue is crucial to the concerns of all Americans.

That's right—you've got to catch them young as Catfish Mayfield says.

And therefore, I would like to spend the remainder of my time on the proposed Partnership for Learning and Earning Act of 1968 which I introduced for the Administration with the clear cut understanding I expect to see the proposal substantially improved.

As an enthusiastic supporter of vocational education—and as Chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education in the House—I would like to be able to support this bill without reservation.

I would like to be able to say to my fellow Members: "Let's push hard for this legislation."

But in the best interests of not only the vocational education community, but also the nation's youth, I cannot accept the bill in its present form. In all candor, I find it difficult to lend support to a bill which provides only $15 million for the multitude of programs needed to develop more meaningful programs in vocational education; one that makes only passing reference to work-experience programs and completely omits residential skill centers.

I would find it difficult to work for passage of a bill which ignores the need to provide training in basic reading and computational skills as preparation for work.

And I am determined to remove from this legislation those provisions which restrict the ways in which local school districts can contract with private industries for vocational programs.

Let me elaborate on each of these points.

Like most other fields, vocational education is in a state of drastic change. It used to consist of a neat package of discrete tasks and skills taught to young people—how to operate a lathe or run a sewing machine or set type for a printing press.

But our economy has changed, and the complex demands of a technological era have brought new challenges to vocational educators.

Dr. Grant Venn, Associate Commissioner for Adult, Vocational, and Library Programs in the U.S. Office of Education, has said: "It is not possible—it is not even desirable—to separate education, especially education for the world of work, from the basic problem of preparing for work."

And Marvin J. Feldman of the Ford Foundation—which, incidentally, has made a sizable investment in vocational education research—notes that "Jobs now require more mental capability, fewer physical skills, a higher educational attainment at the entry level, and greater versatility or adaptability in the worker over his productive lifetime."

Hence, the domain of vocational education has expanded tremendously.

Preparation for the world of work—as well as for basic skills—is the major thrust. And vocational educators are going to have to make a major overhaul in their programs or be driven into obsolescence.

I might add that the population to be served by vocational education must also grow considerably. For we can no longer ignore the fact that while 60% of our young people terminate their education in high school, only 6 or 7% have traditionally been provided for in vocational programs.

This is why in Cleveland, Ohio—58% of out-of-school inner-city youth are unemployed. And we cannot ignore the fact that 50% of our high school graduates who enter college never finish. High School Vocational Education must be expanded into a broad program encompassing the needs of all of our youth.

It will mean, among other things, abolishing prohibitive entrance requirements—such as advanced math, physics, and chemistry—which have prevented many high school students from participating in career development programs.

Preparation for the world of work means learning to get along with all types of people. The vocational students should no longer be shut off in their own separate track where they can meet one another but no one else.

Preparation for the world of work means that we must begin working with student attitudes—especially among the disadvantaged. And we have to start early in their schooling, if we are to help students build strong self-images.

Professor Urie Bronfenbrenner of Cornell University—a specialist on child psychology and the family—recently told my Committee: "Neighborhood experiences available to children are extremely limited nowadays . . . Rarely can a child watch adults working at their trades."

The Advisory Council on Vocational Education—headed by Dr. Martin Essex—has recommended that occupational preparation begin in the elementary schools with a realistic picture of the world. This is especially important for children from fatherless homes—or from homes where parents are unemployed and working does not command high prestige.

And they must develop greater sensitivity to the enormous pressures operating on ghetto youths. In disadvantaged families, the older children often bear heavy burdens of child-rearing and family support. It is not unusual for ghetto youngsters to come to school famished.

Preparation for the world of work also means having the ability to read, to speak correctly and write clearly, and to perform at least basic computational skills.

But judging from the reading achievement scores in our cities, an astoundingly large number of our young people are deficient in this basic skill.

In Chicago, for example, more than two-thirds of the pupils at Marshall High School lag a year or more behind grade level in reading.

Despite this obvious problem, however, the Administration's Bill would provide no remedial programs in such skills.

Exploring the world of work should be an integral part of any vocational program. But as the Vocational Education Act of 1963 now reads, work-study programs serve only those pupils with financial need.

While the Administration's Bill makes a few minor amendments, it keeps the criterion of financial need still intact.

I have no objection to providing jobs for youngsters who need financial help, but the work experience should be extended to all students because it can have a powerful im-

pact on their training in vocational education. In this way, we can encourage students to "test out" a variety of work situations—under experienced teachers—before they leave school and make career decisions.

Residential skill centers are another example of an oversight in the Administration's program. Under the 1963 Act, no funds have ever been appropriated by Congress for the very important program.

Such schools are urgently needed in rural areas to provide remedial skills and other facilities which a small school cannot afford.

In urban areas they offer great potential for removing disadvantaged youths from debilitating environments and giving them a fresh start towards learning.

I would strongly urge that the residential skills centers become a priority in this session of Congress.

Nor am I unmindful that with more mothers becoming breadwinners, as well as breadmakers, home economics must be a major link with the world of work for women.

This evening I have been quite critical of the Administration's Bill for vocational education. This is because I want to see legislation passed which will have significant impact on the education of our young people.

However, I do not want to give you the impression that the entire bill is inadequate.

Indeed, Title I, which provides for Exemplary Programs in Vocational Education, meets a critical need if our schools are to grow and change in tune with a highly technological economy and diverse student population.

Truly meaningful innovation will require the close cooperation of every aspect of our economy and the bill properly permits close cooperation between education and private enterprise.

A particularly exemplary program of cooperation between the public schools and private industry is occurring in Cleveland. The General Electric Company had donated a large factory building to the schools. And they are preparing to open a Factory School—a job development and training center there.

Under one roof—in a building in the ghetto—they will offer paid employment, basic and remedial education, and training in job skills. The most important feature will be immediate employment in industry-sponsored production shops located at the center.

The Ohio Bell Telephone Company has also joined the program, and others will no doubt follow suit.

In Detroit, private industry is "adopting" schools in disadvantaged areas and developing their own training programs geared to the company's needs. The telephone company has adopted an entire high school and is training young people for jobs in its myriad operation.

I am hopeful that a great many similar projects for the disadvantaged will emerge from the exemplary programs funded under Title I.

Finally, I think we should be much more concerned than we have been about the ways we can feed innovations into the mainstream of vocational education. Unfortunately, educators are wedded to their old ways. Therefore, I hope that some of the demonstration money will be earmarked for developing dissemination techniques—ones that *really work*—to bring about change throughout the nation.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that our nation's commitment to vocational education must rise dramatically. Fifteen million dollars cannot possibly do the job. Nor can the present bill, until it has been amended—and Members of my Subcommittee and I are hard at work writing the language for those amendments.

We are in the throes of a technological revolution which has brought unparalleled growth and prosperity to our nation. We have a responsibility to equip all of our young people, so that they can share in this good fortune.

And that means a large national investment in vocational education—large enough to provide substantive, realistic support for the kinds of programs necessary to achieve our goals.

Christopher Morley once said that "there are three ingredients to the good life: learning, earning and yearning."

Your common concern as vocational educators bids you to examine the first two parts of the equation and leave the third to the poets and philosophers.

I hope that during your stay here at this Vocational Education Conference, you will study the Riot Commission Report and dedicate yourself toward finding solutions.

Some have estimated that we will need $32 billion to eliminate the causes of rioting in American streets.

I say, you as Vocational Educators, can provide an excellent start at a cost vastly smaller.

The Vocational Education Advisory Board has recommended an annual expenditure of $1.5 billion of Federal Aid to Vocational Education to serve more than eleven million American youngsters. This comes out to less than $150 a year per child.

I submit this is the biggest bargain we can offer this nation to help remove the cause of rioting from our streets.

Yes, my friends—this generation belongs to you as Vocational Educators. God grant the academic community will hear your plea and recognize the opportunity you offer.

Oil Shale and Multiple Mineral Development Act

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with many of my colleagues in sponsorship of the Oil Shale and Multiple Mineral Development Act, one of the most important pieces of legislation that will come before the 90th Congress.

This act is designed to protect the public interest in the multimillion-dollar treasure trove that underlies the public-owned shale oil lands in the Green River formation of Wyoming, Utah, and Colorado. Its potential value has been set at between $2.5 and $5 trillion—a figure that staggers the imagination.

Some 80 percent of this potential jackpot is in public lands, which are owned by the American people. It has been estimated that every person in the United States has a cash interest of $12,500 to $25,000 apiece in the proper development of the property.

These oil shale deposits contain the greatest known fossil fuel energy resource in the world, exceeding by many times over the entire known petroleum reserves in the United States.

A conservative estimate is that these lands would supply the United States with oil for 1,500 years, at our present consumption rate of 3,000,000,000 barrels a year.

Very little is actually known about these oil shale deposits, and I consider it a matter of vital public interest that reserve and development is conducted in a sensible and orderly manner.

We cannot afford to risk large-scale exploitation of this immense resource by a few oil companies at the expense of the American public.

This bill calls for an orderly, 10-year program of careful study and systematic development to insure competition, low-cost petroleum products, an adequate return to the Federal Government, and protection of the natural scenic beauty of the area.

We owe it to all living Americans, and to our descendants for generations to come, to make certain that this immense natural resource be put to the best use possible.

Salute to the U.S. Veterans Advisory Commission

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee in saluting the members of the U.S. Veterans Advisory Commission for the report filed on Monday. The 79 specific recommendations made by the Commission to Administrator of Veterans Affairs William J. Driver will, no doubt, serve as the basis for a comprehensive report to the President.

These devoted citizens gave of their time and effort in order to serve on this Commission. They have rendered an invaluable service to the Nation and to the veterans of all conflicts. Some 1,400 persons in 10 different hearings held all across our country appeared to give testimony. The long hours of work that it took to evaluate these recommendations have resulted in one of the most far-reaching and comprehensive studies it has ever been my privilege to read.

There is hardly a phase of veterans benefits that the Commission has not gone into extensively. However, I feel this is most fitting when you consider that the veteran population is an important and integral part of our society. The veteran population has now reached almost 26 million, and together with their dependents comprise almost 49 percent of the population of the United States.

In addition to their proposals for changes in the present system of veterans benefits, the Commission endorsed the proposals made by President Johnson on January 30 in his message to Congress and which in most instances are either pending before Congress or have been acted on by at least one of the bodies in Congress.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee views this comprehensive report as an outstanding example. It will provide the members of the committee and the Congress the background information for any legislation that may be relevant to veterans programs. I am sure that it will become a document of authority in the years to come.

Congressman Claude Pepper Introduces Legislation To Provide for Draft Exemption for Police

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the nature and underlying causes of crime in this country were recently the subject of 2 years of intensive investigation by a blue-ribbon panel appointed by the President. The nature and underlying causes of last summer's civil disorders were studied in depth by a second Presidential panel. I myself have introduced a bill which has received widespread support from my colleagues in both Houses, to establish a joint congressional committee to investigate crime. We have investigated, we have studied, we will study some more, and we will, with time and effort, control crime in this country. In the meantime, there are some things we have learned from experience and study, and it is imperative that we act on the basis of this knowledge. Strong State and local police forces are a major factor in controlling crime. This we know. It would follow that, at a time when the Nation's police forces are seriously undermanned, we cannot afford to lose police to the draft.

I am introducing at this time a bill to exempt the police from the draft. The President told us 2 years ago that the police are the frontline defense in the war against crime. This is no idle metaphor. Crime in this country is a serious war with heavy casualties, and a war—incidentally—with pretty cohesive national support. A Gallup poll this February indicated that the public views crime and lawlessness as the most important domestic problem facing the Nation. Almost a third—31 percent—said they were afraid to go out alone in their neighborhoods at night; among women and in the large cities, this figure jumps to about 40 percent. This is very serious. In the words of the recently published Riot Commission report:

> Nothing is more fundamental to the quality of life in any area than the sense of personal security of its residents, and nothing affects this more than crime.

The preliminary 1967 crime statistics have been released by the FBI, and they are ominously familiar: the same only more so. The volume of serious crime during 1967 increased 16 percent over 1966. Increases were sharpest in the cities, followed by the suburbs and the rural areas. Robbery registered the highest percentage gain—27 percent. Fifty-eight percent of these were armed robberies, a 30-percent increase over the year before. The only figure that went down was the police clearance percentage. Police cleared 23 percent of the major offenses reported, a 7-percent decrease from 1966.

The rate of crime increase in this country is truly appalling. Despite the talk about crime and the concern with crime, far from making headway we are losing ground fast. The preliminary 1967 total represents a 16-percent increase over 1966; the 1966 figure was 11 percent greater than the figure for 1965; 1965 represented a 6-percent increase over 1964. If this pattern continues, and there is no reason to think that it would not, the 1968 figure will be 21 percent greater than 1967, and the 1969 figure will be 26 percent greater than 1968.

The number of serious crimes committed in 1966 represents a 62-percent increase over 1960. The population during this same period increased only 9 percent. During this same period, the number of police employees per 1,000 population remained essentially unchanged. The 1966 increase from 1.9 to 2 police per 1,000 inhabitants represents the first change in this figure since 1960. In the words of the FBI:

> This increase in the rate is an encouraging note, but, realistically viewed, this small increase fades into insignificance in light of the rapidly rising crime rate and the ever-increasing number of calls for police service—both criminal and noncriminal.

This assessment of the situation is echoed in the recently released Riot Commission report:

> The number of police available to combat crime is rising much more slowly than the amount of crime. . . . In spite of significant improvements in police efficiency, it is clear that police will be unable to cope with their expanding workload unless there is a dramatic increase in the resources allocated by society to this task.

The President's Crime Commission reported the need for 50,000 additional men to fill positions authorized for 1967 alone. The 1967 edition of the International City Managers' Association's Municipal Year Book reports that 61 percent of 1,152 police departments in cities of 10,000 and over are below authorized strength. The extent to which some of our larger city departments are understaffed is alarming: Houston is 767 men below strength; Cleveland, 740; Detroit, 459; New York, 479; Baltimore, 391; New Orleans, 319; Philadelphia, 298; and Washington, 280. These cities can ill afford to lose any more men in the face of the dreaded long hot summer of 1968.

The police personnel picture is summed up by the Municipal Year Book in the following sentence:

> The police manpower situation in the United States is one of a short supply of qualified personnel at a time when competent personnel are much in demand.

In their opinion, the situation is not likely to improve. There is no prospect for an increase in qualified personnel; on the contrary, particularly in the big cities, the large number of men who returned from World War II to take jobs with police forces are now reaching retirement age; retirement accounted for the greatest personnel loss in cities with populations over 500,000. Retirement, according again to the Municipal Year Book, will result in the not distant future in the loss by the large cities of one-third of their experienced police personnel. The difficulty is compounded by the fact that a significant number of cities feel that their authorized strength is insufficient. Approximately 88 percent of the 1,131 cities reporting to the Municipal Year Book wanted an increase in their authorized strength.

The war in Vietnam is very important, but no more important than the war against crime in the United States. This is not a question of guns or butter; it is a question, unfortunately, of where we need the guns most. President Johnson has told Congress twice now, in two consecutive crime messages, that public order is the first business of Government. The Riot Commission has told us all the same thing:

> Preserving civil peace is the first responsibility of government. Unless the rule of law prevails, our society will lack not only order but also the environment essential to social and economic progress.

Both this administration and this Congress have recognized crime as a domestic problem of immense importance, and have committeed themselves to provide broad assistance to State and local governments for the purposes of crime control. As you know, the House last session passed a bill authorizing $75 million for State and local programs and projects to strengthen law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice. We passed a bill authorizing Federal funds for the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency. We must go one step further and indicate, by passage of legislation exempting police from the draft, that our commitment to law and order at home is equal to our overseas commitments.

It is not sufficient that, as is now the situation, local draft boards are given authority to exempt police at their discretion. Crime is a national problem, and draft exemption for all police must be a national policy. I urge that this legislation be passed.

Thank you.

Bronx Manufacturer Sells to Europe

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, L. & B. Products Corp., a small business in my district, has demonstrated that you do not have to be a corporate giant in order to cash in on the world export market. Last fall, the U.S. Department of Commerce sponsored an exhibition in Munich for American firms to display their products before potential buyers in West Germany. The exhibition featured tourism equipment, and the L. & B. Products Corp. introduced its line of display counters and stools to this new market.

The results were very gratifying. Mr. Leo Seifer, president of the company, has estimated that export sales of $200,000 will be made by his firm in the 12 months following the show as a direct result of its participation in the Munich trade fair. Exports mean jobs and profits—important for both business and workers. But exports also mean improvement in our international balance-of-payments position—important to the na-

tional economy and to the continued strength of the dollar.

Just last week, when President Johnson signed the Export-Import Bank Act; he said:

The soundness of the free world monetary system depends on our balance-of-payments position.

In hearings we held on that bill before the Banking and Currency Committee, it became abundantly clear that increased exports are a vital ingredient for reaching equilibrium in our international balance of payments. Accordingly, I am bringing to the attention of all Members this example of how even a small business can gain from exports. At the same time, I want to congratulate L. & B. Products Corp., for making a contribution to both the public and the private interest.

The Challenge of Freedom

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, a young girl in my district won the Voice of America contest sponsored by the Idaho Veterans of Foreign Wars. Her name is Carol Rockwell, of Grangeville.

The Idaho County Free Press reprinted Carol's speech, and I include the text of it in the RECORD at this point:

THE CHALLENGE OF FREEDOM

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is the full text of the speech by Carol Rockwell, Grangeville, which won the State VFW Voice of America contest last week in Boise.)

(By Carol Rockwell)

I am an American in High school. I have never seen a great war. I have never had to starve. From the time I was small, I have known that the richest and the strongest country in the world is my country. Millions of Americans before me have worked for what I have. They have planned, sacrificed, died for freedom. They have built America strong to protect freedom. They have gained freedom's benefits—things like wealth and educational advantages no other civilization has seen.

From the day I was born, all of this has been an accepted part of my life—So much so that I often find myself thinking I am an average citizen of the world. Because freedom is so ordinary for me, it is easy to take for granted.

There is so many things which can seem more important—individuality, self-fulfillment, making a living, living itself. Or, I can make freedom a much smaller thing than it is—merely an absence of obligation or responsibility. I can spend my life clamouring for all the rights America owes me because I was born free. I would probably not even have these ideas if it were not that I am truly free, but, it is hard to be impressed without actual experience and I have never known what it is like not to be free. The freedom that has been my way of life since I began to live challenges me to notice it, to value it, to make it grow and become better. Nothing forces me to meet this challenge, though it is the highest and most demanding of all.

My generation wants a challenge. The popularity of programs like the Peace Corps and VISTA demonstrates this. So do the professions and careers most of us choose. I think demonstrations and riots do too. But, maybe we don't want quite as powerful a challenge as Freedom offers. Freedom's challenge is to have a positive attitude. The theory behind our government by the people with freedom for everyone is that average human beings are not always trying to get away with whatever they can. They have high goals and they're interested in what is good for other people.

When the typical man is given the opportunity to make his laws, to plan his own life, not only will he do so intelligently and responsibly, but he will do it better than a great police state could. This is the theory behind our freedom and so, if America is to stay free, Americans must uphold traffic laws, litter laws, drinking laws. It is embarrassing to follow such little laws, but we are the free people, we see the reason for even the little laws. If we evade even these, our government is little more than a mockery.

Our challenge is to be moral in everything, from sex to honesty—in school, in business, in politics. How can we expect to be strong at other levels if we are weak in the most basic?

Our challenge is to love the United States, to be willing to give to her without having to.

If more Americans, a few years ago, had been givers when they were needed, or if they had merely been fair in business, there would be no need today for the Federal Anti-Poverty program, which means another tiny cut on American freedom.

Our challenge is to love God and be proud we love Him. This means more than intellectual discussion, it means more than going to church once in a while to get that "good feeling."

Freedom's challenge to me and to all Americans is to make ourselves strong and selfless. To give to America because we love her. To trust in God to make freedom a bigger thing than ever, every minute of our quiet, everyday lives.

This challenge is so big we don't like to talk about it. We don't want even to consider such a plain, unassuming thing a challenge. But it is there and I think we know it. It is a tremendous challenge, but this is what my generation wants.

Maybe we will be the Americans who meet freedom's challenge.

The Opera House of Thomaston

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to draw to the attention of the House a remarkable community project which is underway to restore the old opera house in Thomaston, Conn.

The opera house has long been in a state of disrepair yet it has always been recognized as unique in character and design. Its potential as a center for art and culture is tremendous.

Soon the old opera house will be ready for use again. Thomaston, under the leadership of First Selectman Patsy Piscopo, and drawing support from residents of many other surrounding communities, is working hard, raising money, and making preparations for the opening which is scheduled for May 17.

When the restoration is completed, the old opera house will provide one of the finest theatrical facilities in the Northeast, an area noted for the excellence of its summer stock companies. I congratulate Selectman Piscopo and citizens of Thomaston for their leadership. They have had the vision to save a treasure from the past for the enjoyment and enrichment of the future. For Thomaston, it will mean a new prominence as a center of art and culture.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert a brief history of the opera house and a description of how the work of restoration was conceived and undertaken. I think my colleagues in the House will find this an outstanding example of local initiative by concerned citizens moving ahead to solve a problem on their own for the lasting benefit of the general public.

THE OPERA HOUSE OF THOMASTON

The Thomaston Town Hall and Opera House was begun in 1883 and completed in 1885. The cost at that time was about $50,000. The land on which it stands was given to the town by Aaron Thomas, one of the sons of Seth Thomas. Seth Thomas was the founder of the now-famous Seth Thomas Clocks, which are still manufactured in this town.

The architect of the Opera House was R. B. Hill. The building committee consisted of F. E. Warner, A. P. Bradstreet, C. F. Williams and James W. White.

The Opera House has a wooden floor measuring about 60' x 60'. It has three sections of fixed seating (384) with four 45-foot longitudinal aisles four feet wide. The stage, equipped with lifts and other professional type of stage fixtures and accessories, measures 29' x 29' with a large fly loft, equipped with stage and auditorium light control panel. There are two dressing rooms on each side of this stage area. The entire auditorium side wall area is plaster on wood lath with damask wall covering. There are four exit doorways from the auditorium, two interior stairways, and two onto fire escapes. There is a seven-foot-wide standee-area with a manager's office and two lounges. There is a stairway situated north of the standee-area which leads to the balcony. The entrance to the auditorium area is situated on the Main Street side. The box office is just inside the Main Entrance. Large theatrical billboards are placed along the landings leading to the main floor.

The balcony, horse-shoe shaped with its exquisite decor, is situated over the rear third area of the second floor constituting the "third story." It has five small sections of fixed seating totaling 221 with four longitudinal aisles, two feet wide which connect into a four-foot-wide back aisle. There are two, three-foot-wide exit doors which exit onto a fire escape on the west side of the building.

The abandoned projection booth 16' x 12' x 9' is situated in rear center of the balcony.

One of the outstanding features of this historic opera house is its acoustics. Vocal sounds carry well up into the remote parts of the balcony section.

On February 15, 1967, an organizational meeting was held in the Court Room of the Town Hall for the purpose of forming a committee for the restoration of the Opera House, with Thomas Babbitt of Litchfield, Connecticut, as the architect. On May 1, 1967, a "Festival of Arts" Committee was formed to plan for a Festival to be held from September 10th to September 16th, 1967. The purpose of this committee was to raise money for the needed projects.

On May 31, 1967, a Special Town Meeting was held to pass an ordinance for the creation of The Opera House Committee.

The first activity to raise money was the auction held in one of the vacant stores. $400.00 was raised to defray the cost of

cleaning material and paint. This started the ball rolling.

On April 1, 1967 a "General Cleaning Day" was held. Various civic organizations, teenagers, and housewives brought their brooms and vacuum cleaners and worked from early morning until late in the day. With 75 people working they did an excellent job.

During the spring of 1967, a Thomaston Day was held in conjunction with the Waterbury Giants baseball team. A sizable sum was realized for the cause.

The "Festival of Arts" was held from September 10 to September 16, 1967, starting with a large parade. Organizations from all around the state participated, Firemen, Drum Corps, Drill Teams and Civic Organizations—the whole week was filled; Art Shows, Concerts, Drama Presentations, Variety Shows, Ballet, Teen-Age Dances and movies for children with TV personalities present.

Inmates of a Litchfield County Institution were asked to help in the work. In September 1967 work was started in earnest.

The complete Opera House was completely painted with fireproof paint. The damask wall covering was cleaned and fireproofed. Seats were re-upholstered. The Ladies and Men's Lounges were completely refurbished and new fixtures installed. New flooring laid in the foyer. All doors and exists were repaired and restored to the Fire Marshall's specifications. New electrical panel board was installed and new wiring placed in conduits to meet standards. Fire walls were installed where recommended.

Still to be completed but already started is the installation of the curtain, laying of the plush carpets from the entryway up the stairs into the foyer and down the aisles.

The opening program is scheduled for May 17, 1968 with the Stag Club, which was the last organization to use the facilities.

Response from the citizens of Thomaston in the present drive to raise money for the completion of the first step, the opening day, has been exceptional. The goal has almost been reached. With the continued support of the Town Administration and the citizens themselves, we shall soon be over the top and memories will be changed into realities.

Growing Concern of All Citizens

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the American Farm Bureau Federation shares the growing concern felt by all responsible citizens with regard to the perilous fiscal situation of our country.

During the past several weeks experts on the Farm Bureau staff have done a careful and exhaustive analysis of the 1969 Federal budget in an effort to find where reductions may be made. They have concluded that reductions in new spending authority of $7.3 billion which would be reflected in spending reductions of $5.9 billion are possible without undue curtailment of any essential Federal activity.

Without endorsing any specific recommendation of this Farm Bureau study, I wish to compliment this work and to share it with Members who are also interested in cutting expenditures.

I will include with my remarks a summary of the Farm Bureau recommendations. The more detailed and voluminous work on which this summary is based is available from the Farm Bureau or at my office.

The summary follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION RECOMMENDS CUTTING U.S. BUDGET BY $7.3 BILLION

Following action by the Board of Directors on March 6, the American Farm Bureau Federation has made specific recommendations to cut new spending authority in the Administration's budget for fiscal 1969 by more than $7.3 billion.

The budget, sent to Congress in late January, calls for new spending authority of $201.7 billion and expenditures of $186.1 billion for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968. Farm Bureau's recommendations for reductions, which cover 77 items in the budget, would result in total reduction of $7,344.9 million of new spending authority (see table on this page). Actual spending in fiscal 1969 would be cut by $5,973.1 million. The balance, the difference between the 1969 spending authority reductions and expenditure reductions, would be saved in future years.

The recommended cuts for 1969 are over $2 billion more than the $5.2 billion reduction in the fiscal 1968 budget recommended by Farm Bureau. Congress made reductions of about $3.5 billion in line with Farm Bureau's 1968 recommendations.

Included in the recommended reductions for 1969 are a number of cuts in the USDA budget. If Farm Bureau's recommendations for changes in the wheat and feed grains programs are adopted, expenditures could be reduced by an estimated $400 million in 1969—and by greater amounts in future years. Since new spending authority for price support and adjustment programs is voted two years after expenditures have been made, no reduction in new spending authority could be achieved in 1969.

One of the largest single recommendations for reduction calls for saving $800 million of the anticipated budget increase due to the government pay increase. Farm Bureau recommends that this amount could be saved by absorbing the cost of the increase through reduction of the total government work force.

Other major reductions were proposed in military research and development, military assistance, foreign aid, urban renewal, demonstration cities, and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

FARM BUREAU'S RECOMMENDED BUDGET REDUCTIONS

[Fiscal 1969. In millions of dollars]

	New spending authority	Expenditures
Military research and development	600.0	500.0
Military assistance	420.0	519.0
Military plant and equipment	100.0	75.0
Foreign aid	865.0	132.0
International Development Association	240.0	10.0
Space programs	200.0	200.0
ASCS salaries	15.3	12.0
Federal crop insurance	2.0	2.0
Price support and adjustment		400.0
Farmer Cooperative Service	.5	.5
Economic Research Service	1.2	1.2
Statistical Reporting Service	.8	1.0
Consumer protection	8.2	11.0
Rural community development	.5	.5
Corps of Army Engineers	155.0	155.0
Sewer grants	22.0	18.0
Mineral resources	2.5	.5
Fish flour development	3.3	2.9
Land and water conservation fund	30.0	70.0
Geological Survey	7.7	9.0
Supersonic transport	223.0	251.0
Highway beautification	85.0	51.0
Railroad Administration	5.4	6.7
Post Office	165.0	165.0
Environmental sciences	12.7	8.9
Bureau of Standards	5.4	3.0
Secretary of Transportation	5.4	6.5
Appalachian development	87.0	92.0
Economic development	20.7	32.2
Foreign investment controls	4.5	4.2
Low rent housing	59.0	55.0

FARM BUREAU'S RECOMMENDED BUDGET REDUCTIONS—Continued

[Fiscal 1969. In millions of dollars]

	New spending authority	Expenditures
Public Housing Administration	2.3	2.3
Neighborhood grants	10.0	17.0
Urban renewal	500.0	500.0
Urban planning grants	24.0	15.0
Metropolitan grants	10.0	3.0
Sewer and water grants	65.0	30.0
Metropolitan development expenses	2.5	2.5
Mass transit research	15.0	6.0
Demonstration cities	500.0	250.0
Urban and community training	6.8	6.0
Urban research	10.0	4.0
Housing Department salaries	7.4	7.4
District of Columbia subway	50.0	15.0
New housing	30.0	14.0
Food and Drug salaries	3.9	3.9
Health planning	55.0	32.0
Health manpower education	39.0	46.0
National Institutes of Health	48.0	32.0
Maternal health grants	62.0	46.0
Manpower development	28.0	14.0
New manpower program	4.6	2.3
Consumer interests	.4	.3
Equal Employment Commission	6.5	5.4
Office of Economic Opportunity	500.0	500.0
School lunch	25.0	25.0
Food stamps	20.0	15.0
Rehabilitation grants	62.0	62.0
Program for aging	7.5	13.2
New juvenile delinquency program	25.0	20.0
Elementary and secondary school aid	218.0	142.0
Teacher Corps	17.7	8.4
Improvement of handicapped	32.0	24.0
Civil rights education	15.0	13.3
Higher education	66.0	33.0
Foreign language training	3.6	9.9
National Science Foundation	20.0	24.0
Professions development	87.0	25.0
New vocational programs	15.0	7.0
Adult literacy program	12.0	41.0
Research and training	51.0	30.0
Office of Education salaries	8.6	7.1
Medical care	50.0	60.0
Internal Revenue Service	32.0	35.0
New crime program	50.0	29.0
Other pay increases	800.0	800.0
Contingency	400.0	200.0
Total reductions	7,344.9	5,973.1

Hungarian Independence Day Hailed

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, just 120 years ago, the people of Hungary rose up under the heroic leadership of Louis Kossuth to fight for their freedom from the oppressive Hapsburg Empire.

For a time it appeared that the inspired battle for independence would succeed. The Honved army opened a brilliant offensive in the spring of 1849 and virtually drove the Austrians from Hungary. On April 14, 1849, the Hungarian Parliament formally approved the dissolution of Hapsburg authority in Hungary and Kossuth became President.

But then the tide of victory turned against the Hungarians. As was to happen 107 years later in 1956, the might of Russia was unleashed against the forces of freedom and justice.

Czar Nicholas I of Russia was a leader of European reaction against the concepts of liberalism and nationalism; he sent a Russian army into Hungary. Although the fighting was intense, the end was certain from the beginning. The Hungarians capitulated on August 13. Kossuth and several other Hungarian leaders managed to escape. Former Hungarian Premier Batthyany, 13 Honved

generals, and hundreds of other leaders were executed.

Americans reacted bitterly when the revolution was crushed with the assistance of the Russian czar. Full expression of their individual sympathy for the Hungarian cause met Kossuth when he arrived in this country for a visit in December 1851. He received an extraordinary welcome in New York unmatched by anything since Lafayette's triumphal tour.

Official Washington received Kossuth with great enthusiasm. At a Washington banquet honoring Kossuth, Secretary of State Webster probably reflected the general sentiments of Americans when he declared:

We shall rejoice to see our American model upon the Lower Danube and on the mountains of Hungary . . . I limit my aspirations for Hungary, for the present, to that single and simple point, —Hungarian independence, Hungarian self-government, Hungarian control of Hungarian destinites.

Mr. Speaker, the Hungarian people have never recoiled from duty. For Hungarians, the search for autonomy has gone on for close to 1,000 years. It was a moment of unbelievable bravery when, on March 15, 1848, the Hungarians reached out to strike off the chains of Hapsburg slavery. It was perhaps even a greater moment on October 23, 1956, that terminated in a Russian bloodbath so savage as to defy description.

To Hungarians everywhere I salute the memory of their wonderful heritage. To my colleagues I commend the courage of a people who have been trapped in bondage, but have never yielded to it.

Backbone of the Military Services

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in calling attention of the Congress to the work of the Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the United States. The members of this organization come from that fine group who long have made up the backbone of the military services. It consists of active, reserve, and retired noncommissioned and petty officers of all branches of the services—and it is particularly interesting to note that of its total membership, approaching 30,000, more than 15,000 have served honorably in Vietnam.

This year's annual convention of the Non-Commissioned Officers Association will be held in San Antonio, Tex., April 24 to 26.

A recent letter to the association written by the Assistant Secretary of Defense expresses the appreciation of President Lyndon B. Johnson and will be of interest:

To the members of the NCO Association of the USA:

On the occasion of your General Annual Membership Meeting, I want to commend your Association for its patriotic efforts in behalf of a strong national defense.

Today our men and women in uniform are faced with grave responsibility for attaining peace with honor in a restive world. We are grateful for their strength and effectiveness. As members of the Armed Forces, you realize more than anyone else how much their selfless performance depends on the wholehearted support of the American people they are defending. I am confident the tangible expression of that support in your work here and during the months ahead will be of great encouragement to your comrades-in-arms.

The President greatly appreciates the support for U.S. policies in Vietnam as expressed in the resolution presented to the Association members. Such expressions are a source of encouragement to him in these difficult times.

On behalf of the President and speaking for the Department of Defense, I extend our best wishes for the success of your Annual Meeting.

Sincerely,

PHIL G. GOULDING.

It is interesting to note that within the past year there has been a significant growth in membership of the association. New chapters have been formed in Florida and these include two new chapters in the Pensacola area alone. The increase in membership is also demonstrated in the fact that within the same period of time, the Non-Commissioned Officers Association has tripled the number of chapters. There are now 135 chapters throughout the United States and in overseas areas.

An example of the association's patriotic interest is illustrated in the recent adoption of a resolution which confirms their wholehearted support and assurance of a vote of confidence in their Commander in Chief and their local commanders. This resolution also indicates the emphasis placed by the Non-Commissioned Officers Association on the need of national spirit and the importance of a unified effort.

The association seeks to improve the education and add to the information of its own members. Various services are offered, among which is the personal affairs division. This service is directed toward informing the noncommissioned officer of his Government benefits, give him an awareness of the limitations of those benefits, and assist him generally in all of his legitimate interests.

The ideals and efforts of the Non-Commissioned Officers Association are intended to lead to greater awareness and knowledge of current events. The organization constantly seeks to make its members more conscious of worthwhile military, civilian, and community projects. They seek greater participation of members in these projects on a voluntary basis, and they stress the importance of close cooperation and assistance for their officers in the performance of their duties.

An organization of this type which seeks to develop better citizens is a credit to the Nation and I am sure we all agree that these men, who seek to honor the flag instead of burning it, deserve our consideration.

It is well to keep in mind that their advice and counsel could be very useful in the consideration of legislation affecting enlisted men.

Vietnam Reappraisal: "We All Need To Do Our Part"

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that our overall policy in Vietnam is being made the subject of a full-scale reappraisal, not only here in Congress, but by many, many Americans in all walks of life.

There is no magic solution to our Vietnamese dilemma. There is no single step, or action, we could take that would at once end the conflict and produce meaningful negotiations out of which one could guarantee a result that would be commensurate with the investment in lives and treasure we have made, so far, in South Vietnam's future.

Nevertheless, there is a growing doubt—in which I share—that what we are attempting to do in this particularly complex and difficult war is worth its mounting price.

The President, through Secretary Rusk, has just gotten through saying that our policy in Vietnam is being "reviewed from A to Z," but from the President's subsequent statements and comments it would appear that, at best, that policy is being reviewed, say, only from A to B.

Since the spring of 1965, when this war—and the American commitment to it—began to take on a new shape, and to assume dimensions in depth far exceeding those possibly contemplated by Congress when it earlier passed the now-famous Tonkin Gulf resolution, I have been urging Congress to play its limited constitutional, but tremendously important, role in inquiring into, clarifying, evaluating and, insofar as it can, modifying foreign policy of the sort now being applied by us in Southeast Asia.

The questions so many of us are asking ourselves, now, about Vietnam are not easy ones for any proud or patriotic American to answer. But the questions have to be asked, and answers sought, and we should permit neither pride nor blind patriotism to induce us to continue to follow what may have become both an unwise and unnecessarily costly policy.

Until the day comes when, on this side of the Capitol, an appropriate committee of this House provides us with a focused forum within which this process can be carried forward, as, perhaps, by adoption of the Findley resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 508—which I cosponsored last year and which has now attracted a total of 140 cosponsors, we can only go on in our own individual ways to bring to each other's attention material and opinions that should actually be subjected to committee consideration.

One such item which has just come to my attention is the following editorial from the March issue of the publication known as Space/Aeronautics, which, under leave granted, is now set forth:

THE PRICE IS WRONG

Among those who have publicly questioned our current Vietnam policy, the leaders of

the aerospace community have been notable by their absence. Yet in many cases, silence cloaks serious and growing doubts as to whether this particular war is worth its mounting price.

There are good reasons why these doubts are not forcefully expressed. A generation of managers nurtured on the concept of "deterrence" is uncommonly aware of the strategic value of apparent national determination. Pragmatic to the core, aerospace managers see little point to criticism without solutions. Most important, it has always been considered politic for the industry to support the views of its major customers.

Certainly the industry must not do less than its best to provide the kind of weapon systems the government decides it needs. But aerospace engineers and managers, at whatever level, have the same right and the same duty as other citizens to question whether those weapons are being used the right way, in the right place, and at the right time.

There are some who feel that the military judgment in such matters should be supreme and beyond question. Among the military, however, there is an understandable bias toward military solutions. Moreover, as has been convincingly documented elsewhere, the military has from the very beginning of our Vietnam involvement made one wrong estimate of the situation after another. If it weren't for faulty military judgment, in fact, we might not be in the Vietnam box at all.

Under the circumstances, it's not surprising that the military wants a victory, however dearly won. But what the country needs is a solution. It cannot be, considering the geopolitical realities, a solution that denies a determined, disciplined enemy any gain for his costly effort. Yet it need not be total abandonment of Southeast Asia to his designs. It must be a solution that permits us to reallocate our resources—to restore cuts in our military and other research, to get the space program moving again, and to mount a vigorous attack on our decaying social environment.

If we draw back in South Vietnam, say to the coastal plain, must those nations who rely on us for protection grow faint of heart? Not necessarily. Our forces, weapons and tactics have been newly forged in the fires of Vietnam. Freed—at least in part—of the Vietnam millstone they should remain a credible deterrent to casual adventurism.

But as the USSR expands its military presence around the globe, we must realize, too, that the "limited war" ante is going up. Before playing the game next time we'd better be certain that there is a nation to defend and that the aggression is unambiguously external—or at least that the threat to our vital interests is as clear to our enemies as to ourselves.

Perhaps after we've learned how to make it possible for black and white people to live together here at home, we'll be better prepared for "nation-building" in Asia or elsewhere. Meanwhile, there are decisions too vital to human survival to be left to the professionals. We all need to do our part.

Humphrey Tux Is Flying High

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, while bankers from several nations were meeting with U.S. Treasury officials on the gold crisis last weekend, President Johnson told a businessmen's conference:

We must tighten our belts and adopt an austere program.

Within a matter of hours, at least one belt was being tightened—a seat belt on Vice President HUMPHREY's tuxedo. This morning's Washington Post reports:

HUMPHREY TUX IS FLYING HIGH

The Air Force flew a $2 million jet from Scranton, Pa., to Washington and back again Sunday night with an unusual passenger—Vice President Humphrey's tuxedo.

The Air Force came to Humphrey's aid again yesterday, this time to explain that the tux had been left behind in the rush to avoid poor weather conditions for the flight.

It also was explained that the Vice President's pilot made the rescue mission without his chief's knowledge so that Humphrey could be properly dressed at a St. Patrick's Day speech in Scranton.

Also picked up were some speech materials presumably used the next day in Minneapolis when Humphrey introduced President Johnson.

As a footnote to the administration's current talk of belt tightening, I quote the following comment from a letter just received from a North Dakota constituent:

Throughout my lifetime of 60 years, I have tightened my belt whenever the income did not meet the needs or desires of my family. I only wish those in charge of the spending in Washington would do the same. We of the lower income group haven't any notches left in our belts.

With the administration pushing for tax restrictions on U.S. travel abroad, this would seem to be a particularly good time to "ground" Mr. HUMPHREY's tuxedo.

Lithuanian Independence

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a resolution of the Lithuanian-American Committee and Lithuanian Americans of Greater Boston, commemorating the 50th anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania.

This resolution is very inspiring to me, since I am strongly committed to the cause of Lithuanian liberation and independence.

The Lithuanian people have a rich heritage of love of freedom and willingness to sacrifice themselves and their possessions to maintain and preserve it. Their history is marked by memorable sacrifices for their independence, autonomy and right to govern their own affairs.

The soil of their native land is drenched with the blood of Lithuanian patriots who fought and died to protect their freedoms and to liberate their nation and their people from the slavery and dictatorial control.

I welcome the opportunity to express my admiration of the brave, gallant Lithuanian people and their long, bloody struggle for freedom, personal liberty, and independence.

There are many people of Lithuanian blood in my district and State, and they stand out as loyal American citizens and supporters and defenders of the Nation in war and in peace.

Their presence here in our country has greatly enriched American institutions, because they have brought loyalty, morality, high cultural standards, and the spirit of warm friendship and cooperation to our country and to the many American communities in which they live.

I deplore the circumstances under which they were consigned to the control of the Soviet Union and Communist regimes, and I reaffirm my support for their cause of liberation and freedom, and urge our President, State Department, and Congress to continue to extend these people encouragement and support in their high aims to break the shackles of oppression and slavery imposed upon them by communism.

This Nation of ours can do no less than to express our complete sympathy with Lithuanian aims for self-determination, freedom, and justice, and I am proud to reaffirm my faith in the cause of Lithuania and the purpose of liberty-loving Americans to render Lithuania every possible counsel, support, and loyalty in achieving their aims of reinstating a free government in their beautiful land.

I urge that our State Department move along every possible line to help the brave, dauntless people of Lithuania to reestablish free institutions and again take their place among the nations of the free world, and I commend the leadership of the American Lithuanian people for their determination to continue this struggle for liberation and freedom for their country until it is won. Long live the spirit of free Lithuania. And may that proud nation and its loyal people soon find deliverance and freedom.

The resolution referred to above, follows:

RESOLUTION

On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania, we, the representatives of the Lithuanian community of Boston, Massachusetts, assembled at the John Hancock Hall in Boston on February 18, 1968 in order to:

Commemorate Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, proclaimed in Vilnius on February 16, 1918, whereby a sovereign Lithuanian state was restored which had antecedents in the Kingdom of Lithuania, established in 1251;

Honor the memory of the generations of Lithuanian freedom fighters who fought in 1812, 1831, 1863, 1905, 1918–20, and 1941–52 to defend Lithuania's national aspirations and values against foreign oppressors;

Recall with pride the political, cultural, economic, and social achievements of the Republic of Lithuania during the independence era of 1918–40;

And express our indignation over the interruption of Lithuania's sovereign functioning by the military occupation of our homeland by the Soviet Union on June 15, 1940, as a result of which national traditions and values were trammeled, the civil liberties of the people suppressed, and hundreds of thousands of people liquidated by Soviet genocidal practices.

Gravely concerned with the present plight of Soviet-occupied Lithuania and moved by a spirit of solidarity, we, the representatives

of the Lithuanian community of Boston, Massachusetts, do hereby protest Soviet Russia's aggression and the following crimes perpetrated by the Soviets in occupied Lithuania:

1. murder and deportations of more than 400,000 Lithuanian citizens to concentration camps in Siberia and other areas of Soviet Russia for slave labor;

2. yearly systematic deportations, under various guises, of Lithuanian youths to forced labor in Soviet Russia and their unlawful conscription into the Soviet Russian army;

3. colonization of Lithuania by the importation of Russians, most of whom are Communists or undesirables, who receive various privileges at the expense of the Lithuanian people;

4. pauperization of the Lithuanian people, conversion of once free farmers into forced laborers on state and collective farms, as well as the exploitation of workers;

5. persecution of religion, restriction of religious practices, closing of houses of worship;

6. distortion of Lithuanian culture by efforts to transform it into Soviet Russian culture, and continuous denial of creative freedom.

We demand that Soviet Russia immediately withdraw from Lithuania its armed forces, administrative apparatus, and colonists, letting the Lithuanian nation freely exercise its sovereign right to self-determination.

We support the efforts of the United States of America to discourage communist aggression wherever it may occur.

We request the Government of the United States of America to raise the issue of Lithuania in the United Nations and at international conferences, as well as to support our just requests for the condemnation of Soviet aggression in Lithuania and for the abolition of Soviet colonial rule there.

Legislation To Protect the Small Businessman

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, as the Federal Government has grown, so have the powers of the regulatory agencies. But just as power corrupts, the vast discretion left to the agencies in administering the laws has too often led to arbitrary decisions not in the public interest.

It is easy enough to say that the citizen can take his grievance into the courts. But the truth is that litigation costs are so great that the aggrieved party often accepts an unfair decision rather than fight it.

The massive Federal bureaucracy is simply wearing down the private citizen, and justice is denied in many instances.

I heard recently of a small company which fought an unfair decision all the way to the Supreme Court. After 3½ years of litigation, the company won its battle. However, the price for standing up for principle was $185,000 and the company went bankrupt. It was a rather hollow victory.

I am introducing a bill today which simply says that when civil action is brought against the Federal Government and the United States is not the prevailing party, the Government is liable for all fees and costs of the aggrieved party.

It is my hope that this bill will force the agencies to be absolutely certain their decisions are fair as well as to enable the businessman—the small businessman in particular—to deal more effectively with the Federal bureaucracy.

Dateline Washington

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1968, I extended remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which I included questions being asked approximately 8,200 of my constituents on vital issues facing the Nation.

At this time I should like to include in the RECORD my newsletter No. 2 which is being sent to the same group of constituents. It includes the tabulation of responses to my questionnaire and additional comments.

My newsletter follows:

DATELINE WASHINGTON—REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN ED ESHLEMAN

MAJOR LEGISLATION

The 90th Congress will be considering several areas of major domestic consequence as legislative activity continues this year. In this report, I shall try to give you a brief synopsis of some of the proposed laws and an evaluation of the Congressional mood about these issues. This summation is intended to inform you of what is now and what may happen.

Tax surcharge

The Administration's attempt to impose a tax increase has thus far met with stiff opposition in the Congress. The anti-tax mood is in large part a reaction to overwhelming constituent opinion from all parts of the nation. The Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, where this legislation is being considered, has blocked the surcharge proposals partially because he is known to believe that passage in the House of Representatives is presently impossible. Increased war costs and/or international monetary pressures could conceivably lead to higher taxes, but Congress will demand spending cuts in the Federal budget in return for any new tax.

Lawlessness

The ever-increasing wave of lawlessness has made effective legislation for dealing with this problem a major concern with the Congress. One of the keys to solution seems to be greater employment opportunities for now disadvantaged people. In plain words—JOBS. While every effort must be made to help people help themselves, it is necessary that the administration of justice be strengthened too. Both of these recommendations were stressed in the recent report of the Commission on Civil Disorders. In effect, they said that those who break the law must be held accountable for their crimes or the destruction they cause will negate any benefits of greater employment. Implementation of the entire program proposed by the "Riot Commission" is unlikely at the present time because Congressional cost estimates range far outside practical bounds. In addition, the Commission's reliance on the wornout Federal aid structure for financing urban programs is judged by many as unsound.

Balance of payments

The increased outflow of dollars to other nations and the subsequent drain of our gold stock is an economic problem that has reached crisis proportions. The travel tax has been offered as the means for dealing with the problem; yet many Congressional observers seem to feel that this is attacking a major problem with one of the most minor solutions available. Alternative suggestions ask for a more comprehensive program to stem the dollar outflow. Such a program would include elimination of domestic fiscal imbalances; realistic reductions in overseas military and economic programs; prevention from foreign dumping of low labor cost items on U.S. markets; seeing that exports exceed imports; collection of past debts owed us by other nations; and directing more of the profits made by American investments overseas back into this country.

Code of ethics

The case for an establishment of a Congressional Code of Ethics grew largely out of the Powell and Dodd decisions. Constitutionally, Congress has the power to discipline its own members, but guidelines are definitely needed. Already a Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has been established and there is a good chance that a specific code will be passed this session. Here too, public opinion has played a major role in influencing the favorable attitude of many legislators toward this type of self-regulation.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

The questionnaire, issued on the last edition of this newsletter, asked for your responses about many of the problems of the day. It was difficult, I know, to respond with "yes" and "no" answers to such complex and serious questions. However, the votes taken in the Congress must be reduced to those alternatives even though some good is excluded by a "no" vote and some bad may be included in a "yes" vote.

The choices you made on the Vietnam War seem to indicate a good deal of confusion and frustration about that conflict, which is understandable. Your opinions looked this way statistically:

(1) 66% believed that the United States has an obligation to prevent the Communist takeover of underdeveloped countries, 22% said no and 12% had no opinion.

(2) 55% of the respondents said they think they know why we are fighting there, 39% do not have a clear idea and there were 6% with no response.

(3) 63% of you did not approve of the President's handling of the war, 30% did approve and 7% had no opinion.

(4) 69% said a more definite effort toward military victory should be made, 21% did not agree and 10% expressed no preference.

(5) 45% thought that "hot pursuit" into nations like Cambodia would overextend the U.S. commitment while 40% thought it would not and 15% voiced no opinion.

(6) 76% of the respondents did not feel the Administration is telling all they should on the war, 12% believed that enough information was being received and 12% did not express themselves.

(7) 46% favored American action in a situation like Vietnam should one arise, 37% said no and 17% had no opinion.

The tax question showed a definite reluctance to accept the President's request for a 10% surcharge. Statistically it looked like this:

(1) 74% do not favor a tax increase at this time, 19% do and 7% had no preference.

(2) Of the people unfavorable toward new taxes, 62% would favor the tax hike if it was preceded by a cut in federal spending, 32%

still would not want new taxes and 6% gave no response.

(3) 71% of the respondents think we can maintain a healthy economy by cutting spending and keeping present tax levels, 12% are not so minded and 17% voiced no thought on the subject.

(4) 80% said that a spending ceiling on the Executive Branch should accompany any tax hike, 10% said it should not and 10% had no preference.

Of the other questions posed, some produced rather definite opinions in that high percentages one way or the other were registered. These were:

(1) 60% of those responding are disenchanted with the Federal farm price support programs. Only 15% supported these programs and a rather high 25% had no response.

(2) 81% voiced the opinion that labor unions should be curbed in their power to strike in instances where the public's vital interest is at stake.

(3) 63% said that the government should not be the primary contributor in helping the poor to help themselves.

(4) 65% of you did not believe the required gold reserve should be eliminated. It is interesting to note here that Congress voted just the opposite of your choice, but not with my support.

Some questions produced percentages that indicated that your combined opinions are more divergent. They were:

(1) 58% of you said that anti-draft demonstrators should not be immediately drafted, but 35% said they should. 54% thought that the courts were the best place to handle the anti-draft cases, whereas 34% were not in favor of court action.

(2) 52% of the respondents believed that the President's proposed health care for poor children was a good idea, and 38% were against the plan.

(3) It was a direct 44% to 44% split on the question of the Administration's $2.1 billion manpower proposal.

(4) 52% said that they did not support the travel tax and 40% were favorable toward this plan.

A Gold Mine in Your Backyard

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the second session of the 90th Congress is well along with its business, and once again, I find conditions in America's maritime industry becoming worse and worse while the administration fails to advance a real, aggressive, positive maritime program. Only a dynamic education program on Americans will move the administration to act in this vital industry, a point raised in an article by Page Groton, director of the Boilermakers Iron Shipbuilders Marine Council in the April issue of their publication, Reporter. I believe this is imperative reading for all Members of Congress, and I offer it for their information. The article follows:

A GOLD MINE IN YOUR BACKYARD

(By Page Groton, director, Boilermakers Iron Shipbuilders Marine Council)

In our continuing fight to revive our dying merchant marine and to secure work for American shipyards, we have been unable to penetrate the wall of public indifference and apathy. In my humble opinion, once we are able to penetrate this wall, and the public becomes aware of the Nation's plight, and the indisputable fact that while we might beat the Russians to the moon, the Russians will probably run us off of this continent by control of the seas, then and only then will we have sufficient support to force this Administration to enact meaningful legislation which will revive our merchant fleet.

Shipbuilding in the various parts of the country is simply taken for granted by the community without fully realizing the economic advantages which a thriving shipyard contributes to the economy of the area. To dramatically illustrate the direct economic value of the shipbuilding industry to a community, the Assistant Business Manager of Lodge 104, Jim O'Brien, came up with these eye-opening facts and figures concerning his home State of Washington. He pointed out that:

1. Last year, the private shipyards of the state employed an average of 9,200 men. Another 9,000 at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard raised the total to more than 18,000. This is exceeded, among the state's basic industries, only by aerospace, 85,300; forest products, 75,000; agriculture 70,500; and food processing, 28,100. It exceeds machinery, 13,900; nonferrous metals, 9,700; and fabricated metals, 7,500.

2. Each job in basic industry (manufacturing and agriculture) last year was supporting 2.49 jobs in secondary activities (trade, services, government, utilities, etc.). On this basis the 18,200 jobs in shipbuilding supported 45,300 other jobs, or a total of 63,500.

3. Each job, basic or secondary, supports 2.60 individuals. Thus the shipbuilding industry directly and indirectly supports a population of 165,000 (18,200×3.49×2.60).

4. The shipbuilding industry of the state produced goods valued at $218 million in 1963, according to an input-output study conducted by the University of Washington. In doing so it purchased $22.8 million of goods and services from other industries in the state and $47.9 million from industries elsewhere in the United States. Industries which benefited most directly were iron and steel ($4.0 million), business services ($3.0 million), and wholesale and retail trade ($2.6 million). All of the figures, of course, will have increased substantially since 1963.

It seems to me that the facts and figures supplied by Brother O'Brien lead to the following definite conclusions:

First, that the shipbuilding industry is a valuable national asset and has a tremendous economic impact on the State of Washington.

Secondly, that if the proposals to build American ships in foreign shipyards became the policy of this Administration, and all of the shipyard jobs and those in allied industries were wiped out, the State of Washington would be hard put to secure employment for these men.

To put it simply, in cities and towns where we have a thriving shipyard, the benefits to the economy of those areas are tremendous. I believe it is safe to say that the statistics which apply to the State of Washington, would, in large measure, apply to every other state in the United States having sizeable shipyard installations. Therefore, I would urge the members of our Shipyard Lodges to do everything possible to convey to the butcher, the baker and Mr. John Q. Public, the stake he has in a healthy thriving industry and urge his support in our effort to have meaningful legislation.

At this writing, there is no evidence that the White House, which promised a new policy and a program in 1965, is going to deliver.

Collectively we must continue to demand action reminding one and all that 1968 is an Election Year.

Poland's Communists Engage in Anti-Semitic Scapegoating To Suppress Freedom

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago a Warsaw theater was showing the classic play, "Dziady" by Poland's greatest poet, Adam Mickiewicz. It is a 19th century play with a 19th century theme, but it has a very timely note. At one point, a character reminds the Poles that they cannot rely on their Russian neighbor—"all they send us from Moscow is jackasses and fools."

Night after night this line in the play drew an ovation from the Polish audience. Predictably, the Soviet Government complained to its satellite. Predictably, the Polish Government ordered the closing of the play. The Polish Government's willingness to censor its national poet to placate its domineering Russian neighbor was itself a spark that ignited a long-smoldering ferment in the Warsaw community. Students, intellectuals, workers, were furious. Two students picketed and were arrested. Then in quick succession came clashes between students and police in Warsaw, Cracow, Poznan, and seven other Polish cities.

The government, alarmed by the first clashes, reexamined its position. It was not ready to take the independent course of Yugoslavia, Rumania, and hopefully, Czechoslovakia, to free itself of Russian domination and give its own people more freedom. Instead, it undertook repression. It resorted to the brute force of police clubs and fire hoses, and the more veiled but hardly less brutal technique of creating a scapegoat. It proclaimed that Zionists were responsible.

The Communists make much of their devotion to the principles and ideology of their leader, Lenin. This time they scarcely paid lipservice to Lenin's denunciation of anti-Semitism as the tool of corrupt and ignorant politicians. They adopted instead the advices of his hated adversary, the Russian czars, who time and again when confronted with a popular upsurge for freedom or for bread, incited pogroms against the Jews.

A scant 25,000 Jews remain in Poland in a total population of 31 million. Yet a number of Jewish officials in the Polish Government whose sons have been involved in the student demonstrations have been singled out and dismissed. The Government has made hypocritical disclaimers of anti-Semitism in such a way as to highlight its charge of Zionist leadership of the student revolt.

It is a cruel irony that the Polish Government is planning a celebration of Jewish heroism in the Warsaw ghetto uprising. As Dr. William A. Wexler, President of B'nai B'rith has said:

It is a cruel mockery of the Warsaw martyrs to use Jews as scapegoats in a campaign to suppress freedom.

The causes of the disturbances are not far to seek. They are rooted in a widespread popular discontent over Soviet domination of Polish foreign affairs and over the arbitrary suppression of intellectual and academic freedom.

History tells us that such movements for freedom may be temporarily slowed or diverted, but they cannot be destroyed. And history tells us also that a people mature enough to insist on freedom is too mature to succumb to the divisive technique of anti-Semitic scapegoating. We shall hope that the leaders of Poland have learned these lessons of history.

A Boost for Gold Industry

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel certain the recent decision of nations in the international gold pool will give a much needed boost to this country's gold mining industry.

The problems which have plagued our gold industry are numerous, but one of the most serious is the pressure exerted by the legally established price of gold at $35 an ounce. As you know, this price was set early in the 1930's.

Since then, the price of mining gold has increased just as the overhead and production costs of every other industry have increased. Yet the established price remains and, one after another, most of the gold mines in this country have been forced to close.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that this has not happened because the demand for gold has grown less. On the contrary, the demand for gold for commercial uses has increased steadily and for the last several years it has been far greater than our domestic production.

It is unfair to ask our gold producers to pay higher salaries; to implement modern and more expensive mining techniques; and to purchase more sophisticated machinery and yet to accept a product price which is more than 35 years old just as it would be unfair to impose similar restrictions on any other industry.

For several years I have urged that legislation be enacted which would remove our gold mining industry from the fatal restrictions which have been imposed. I am disappointed legislation I introduced calling for a subsidy which would encourage our gold industry and counter the dampening effect which the established gold price has had has not been approved by the Congress. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this failure to act on the part of the Congress contributed to the gold crisis which the world faced last week.

I was gratified by the decision made by gold pool nations during the past weekend because I believe it will have a tremendous impact upon the production of gold in the United States.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Treasury and other members of the international gold pool will no longer release their stocks of gold for commercial purposes. As a result, commercial and industrial users of gold will be able to make purchases directly from gold producers at a price determined by the commercial market.

This amounts to the establishment of a free market for gold used commercially, and it will, I feel certain, help to place our gold producers on an equal footing with other industries.

It is, of course, difficult to predict whether this action will provide the stimulus needed to revive our gold mining activity. As I have said before in this Chamber, a very large number of our gold mines have been abandoned because of the pressures previous policies have imposed. Surely, it will require a tremendous financial outlay to reactivate closed mines and to open new mines. It is difficult to predict whether the establishment of a free market will bring a commercial gold price level which will encourage the type of financial investment which we all know will be required to put our gold mining industry back on its feet. Only time can determine these things.

But the recent decision is certainly a step in the right direction. I am hopeful that it will provide the needed stimulus and that it will make it possible for the United States to take its place once again as a leading producer of gold in the world.

Congressman Porter Hardy, Jr., a Great American

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the news recently came to all of us that the Honorable PORTER HARDY is not a candidate to succeed himself in the House and intends to retire at the end of this session. Of course, all of us hope that he will change his mind and come back to Congress but whether or not he does, I cannot resist the opportunity to say a few words about him.

It has been my privilege to sit next to him on the House Armed Services Committee for years, and our offices in the Rayburn Building are just across the hall from each other. He and his wife and my wife and I are close personal friends so I have had a close and intimate association with this fine man through many years. From this base of knowledge and observation, I have no hesitation in saying that I have never known a finer man or a better Congressman than PORTER HARDY. He is the embodiment of integrity and has a mind as sharp as steel and a dedication to the welfare of America which is unexcelled. He has added to this a persistent doggedness and a great ability as an inquirer after the truth. The result has been the savings of billions of dollars for the taxpayers as an indication of his care and enthusiasm to destroy waste on the one hand, and on the other, the result has been the enactment of vital legislation particularly in the field of national defense and for our servicemen wherever they may be. He has established by his efforts, ability, and character a tremendous record of service for his country, and every American is deeply his debtor.

H.R. 15274

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to request my colleagues to join me in sponsoring and supporting my bill, H.R. 15274, which I introduced on February 8, 1968, to amend section 101(a) (27) (D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101) by inserting after the language "vocation of minister of a religious denomination" the language "or serving as a missionary, brother, nun, or sister of a religious denomination."

My bill if enacted would place any person of any religious denomination having a religious commitment such as missionaries, brothers, nuns, or sisters in the "special immigrant category," and they would then enjoy the same immigrant status as ministers of religious denominations who are now admitted to the United States outside of any numerical limitation.

At the present time, all nuns are now eligible for the third or sixth preference and labor certification is automatically granted, since the Secretary of Labor has determined that categories described in schedule A are in short supply in the United States. However, after July 1, 1968, in compliance with the Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965, all immigrants will compete on a worldwide basis for visa issuance and visa applications will be processed on a first-come, first-served international basis on a preference category.

This portion of the immigration laws which will be fully effective on July 1 of this year will adversely affect Irish nuns. Nuns, brothers, sisters, and missionaries will be required to compete with other countries which have built up long waiting lists; whereas ministers will continue to easily and expediently enter the country as special immigrants.

In an attempt to rectify the effects of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act on Irish, Italian and other immigrants, I have also introduced H.R. 6677 to restore the flexibility of the immigration laws' definition of a "skilled worker." The present laws discriminate against Irish, Italian and certain other immigrants since they do not possess the skills necessary to qualify for an automatic labor certification. Such a per-

son would be the agricultural worker, the farmer, the unskilled laborer, whose skills are not in great demand in this country.

I earnestly believe that all persons of a religious order enter the United States with a firm conviction to God and themselves to help other people. Nuns, brothers, sisters, and missionaries who are teachers, doctors, nurses, and who do charitable work will certainly be of great assistance to every person with whom they come in touch. Because of their selfless religious missions, I respectfully ask that my colleagues consider the necessity and the urgency of their entrance in the United States as "special immigrants." I also urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to press for immediate action on H.R. 15274 in order that persons with religious commitments may not be adversely affected by the new immigration laws after July 1, 1968.

The AFL-CIO Supports the Administration on Vietnam

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the support of the AFL–CIO for President Johnson's policies in Vietnam is well known to all of us in this body.

Delegates to the recent AFL–CIO convention approved a comprehensive and forthright statement of the organization's motivation for that support.

This resolution, I believe, deserves the careful perusal of every Member of Congress and of all Americans. For that reason, with permission, I place the AFL–CIO resolution, entitled "Vietnam—The Struggle for Peace, Freedom, and Social Reconstruction," in the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION NO. 179: VIETNAM—THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE, FREEDOM AND SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION

Americans are a peace-loving people. We harbor no imperialist or aggressive designs against any other nation. However, since we cherish freedom as much as we cherish peace, we have not hesitated to take up arms to defend our national security whenever it was endangered. We pursued this course in World War I when imperial Germany threatened to dominate Europe and in World War II when Hitler set out to conquer the continent and Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. For the same reason, the United States came to the defense of Greece, Turkey and Berlin, and fought against North Korean aggression aided and abetted by Moscow and Peking. To contain Soviet Communist expansion, we took the initiative in establishing NATO; to contain Chinese Communist expansion, we helped found SEATO and concluded bilaterial defense arrangements with Japan, Korea, the Philippines, the Republic of China, Thailand, Australia and New Zealand.

The same considerations of national security have motivated our country's policy of protecting South Viet Nam against a forcible conquest by North Viet Nam. Towards this end, President Eisenhower included South Viet Nam in the SEATO treaty which designated it as a "protocol state" entitled to U.S. assistance in the event of an armed attack. We limited our support of Saigon to non-military aid as long as the struggle involved only Communist guerrilla forces who, in violation of the Geneva accords, had stayed behind in South Viet Nam. President Kennedy increased the number of military advisers in South Viet Nam and took military action only after Hanoi resorted to major aggression and launched a full-scale war to annex South Viet Nam. On the eve of his assassination, November 1963, American military personnel in that country rose to 15,500. Since then, U.S. military engagement has been expanded in response to the increasing number of North Vietnamese forces which have come down to fight in the South. At least 20 North Vietnamese regiments, armed with the most modern Soviet weapons, have poured into South Viet Nam. This forced our country to take appropriate measures of defense, including the bombing of military targets in North Viet Nam. It is not the United States but Hanoi which has set the pace in steadily escalating the war.

Some maintain that the conflict in Viet Nam is a civil war and therefore, the United States has no right to intervene. In reality, that is no more a civil war than the Korean war was. In Viet Nam, as in Korea, one part of the divided country attempted—with massive Soviet and Chinese Community military support—to annex the other part by force and to impose its totalitarian regime on the people in the South. If Communist forces, aided by Ulbricht, were to rise in Berlin tomorrow, nobody would call it a civil war. Everybody would condemn such a move as an attempt by East Germany to take over the city and would call for the defense of Berlin by the Allied forces stationed there.

Others have asserted that the war being fought in Viet Nam is a genuine war of national liberation and that the Communists are fighting against colonialism and imperialism and for national independence. This argument is without foundation. Viet Nam gained its national independence in 1954 after the defeat of France. When the French left, colonialism ended there. The United States has no colonialist ambitions in South Viet Nam. Our country would gladly withdraw its forces the moment the South Vietnamese people would be assured of their right to determine freely their own future. Today, South Viet Nam is not controlled by any colonialist forces from whose rule Hanoi must liberate the people. Today, only Communist neo-colonialism threatens the independence and freedom of the South Vietnamese. It is against this threat that the people of South Viet Nam are defending themselves with the help of American, Australian, Korean, Filipino, Thailand and New Zealand forces.

Nor is the challenge we face in Viet Nam one of "national communism"—after the pattern of Tito. It has been said that since we have tolerated and even supported Tito, there is, no reason for our resorting to military action against Ho Ci Minh. This comparison is based on a misconception of Yugoslav and North Vietnamese policy. Although both regimes are Communist, their policy differs in a very vital respect. Tito abandoned his expansionist ambitions in 1948; he discontinued supporting the Greek Communist guerrillas and agreed to a peaceful settlement of the Trieste question. In addition, Tito broke with the Soviets and incurred the wrath of Stalin and his satellite regimes. On the other hand, Ho Chi Minh does have imperialist designs. He wants to conquer not only South Viet Nam but also Laos and Cambodia in order to fulfill his dream of a unified Communist Indochina. Furthermore, his plans for aggression have the unstinting support of Communist China and the Soviet Union which provides from 80–85 per cent of all foreign aid to North Vietnam.

These two most powerful Communist states are working hard for an American defeat in Viet Nam so as to weaken the prestige and power of the United States throughout the world. Such an American defeat would further their goal of Communist world domination. In this light, they both look upon Viet Nam as a testing ground for their so-called wars of national liberation which they expect to spread throughout the "Third World"—if the North Vietnamese were to win. Victory for Hanoi would certainly encourage Communist China to foment guerrilla warfare in Southeast Asia or even to launch direct military attacks against neighboring countries like Burma and India. Fearing that a U.S. withdrawal from Viet Nam would lead to such consequences, a growing number of Asian countries are supporting the American war effort. After visiting a number of Asian countries, Japanese Premier Eisaku Sato recently said that "until a durable and permanent peace" would be established, "the feeling of the neighboring countries was that they would want a continued American presence" in Viet Nam. In this connection it is significant that on November 16, 1967, the UN General Assembly rejected by a vote of 59–24, a Moscow proposed resolution for a complete American pull-out from Korea because it similarly realized that U.S. military presence in an area menaced by Communist aggression is vital to the security of peace and freedom.

Our country has never asked for unconditional surrender by Hanoi. We have never sought the destruction of North Viet Nam or the overthrow of Ho's regime. In Viet Nam, as in Korea, the United States seeks a return to the status quo before the Communist military aggression. Our government seeks only the end of aggression from the North—a halt in Hanoi's attempts to take over South Viet Nam by armed force. As long as North Viet Nam refuses to settle the conflict at the conference table, America is compelled to continue its military operations. While waging a vigorous and effective defense, our country has not expanded the war or resorted to weapons of mass destruction. For humanitarian and political reasons, the United States has acted with great restraint and waged only limited warfare. Thanks to the military efforts of the United States and her Allies, 67% of the 16 million people in South Viet Nam are now living free from control by the Viet Cong. A year ago, the proportion was only 55%; 17% are still under Viet Cong control and the rest live in contested areas.

Realizing that peace and freedom for South Viet Nam cannot be won by military means alone, the United States has pressed for the building of stable democratic institutions and for economic progress and social justice. Despite enormous difficulties caused by the war, representative government is making real headway and the growing free trade union movement in South Viet Nam enjoys the right to strike and the benefits of collective bargaining. In spite of savage Viet Cong terror, elections for a Constituent Assembly, for a senate and lower house, and hamlets and villages elections were held with a large turnout of voters; a constitution was adopted; a president and vice president have been elected. Nothing comparable has ever happened or can happen in North Viet Nam. The new Saigon government has stepped-up its program of land reform, eradication of corruption, increased military support for the pacification of villages and hamlets, greater help to the more than two million refugees, and better social welfare measures for war widows and orphans.

The AFL–CIO cannot emphasize too strongly that our government should intensify its support of an effective comprehensive campaign for improved living conditions, social reforms, and a more decent existence for the refugees. Towards this end, it is most urgent for the Saigon authorities and our own government to assure the Vietnamese Federation of Labor (CVT) the opportunity to par-

ticipate in these programs of social reconstruction. We reaffirm our solidarity with the CVT which has been doing admirable work in alleviating human misery, aiding the refugees, educating children and adults, and laying the foundations of a sound democratic society. The convention welcomes the Executive Council decision to intensify AFL–CIO efforts to help the CVT play a vital role in building a healthy and prosperous democracy. We urge our affiliates to provide generous assistance to the various constructive activities of the CVT.

From the very beginning of the armed conflict, the United States has endeavored to settle it through negotiations—by peaceful means. Our government has repeatedly offered to meet with Hanoi at the conference table and has welcomed the innumerable mediation efforts made by third parties such as U.N. Secretary General U Thant, the Vatican, and neutral governments. Time and again our country has sought to have the Vietnamese problem submitted to a reconvened Geneva Conference or the United Nations. But Hanoi has rejected all these proposals; so has the Soviet Union without whose agreement the Geneva Conference cannot be reconvened or a U.N. Security Council debate take place. With the backing of all Communist states, Hanoi continues to insist on complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from Viet Nam as a precondition for any peace talks. Our country cannot accept this Communist demand, since that would mean handing the people of South Viet Nam over to the Communist aggressors and opening the gates to Communist aggression throughout Southeast Asia.

There is no reason to believe that a cessation of U.S. bombing of North Vietnamese military targets would induce Hanoi to enter negotiations. Nevertheless, President Johnson has declared United States willingness to stop all such aerial and naval bombardment "when this will lead promptly to productive discussion." Also this offer has been rejected outright by Hanoi.

A major factor in the Communists' continued refusal to talk about a negotiated settlement is their hope that political opposition in the United States will force President Johnson to change his Vietnam policy or bring about his defeat in 1968. Hanoi makes a grave error in basing its strategy on noisy protest demonstrations in the United States. Obviously these rowdy demonstrators represent a tiny minority of the American people; they are a small sector even of those Americans who have misgivings about the war but want an orderly and rational debate on this grave issue. However, regardless of their differences, the American people, as a whole, do not want peace at the expense of freedom.

The AFL–CIO reaffirms its unequivocal support of President Johnson's policy in Viet Nam. We pledge the continued support of American labor for the President's efforts to halt Communist aggression in Asia, assure the Vietnamese people their right of self-determination, promote democracy, political stability, and economic prosperity in Southeast Asia, and bring the war in Viet Nam to a speedy and honorable end.

Viet Action Kills Oxon Hill Sailor

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr Speaker, BM3c. Ernest W. Wiglesworth, Jr., a young sailor from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his bravery and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

VIET ACTION KILLS OXON HILL SAILOR

OXON HILL, MD., March 18.—Boatswain's Mate 3c. Ernest W. Wiglesworth, Jr., a 21-year-old sailor, whose home was here, was killed in action off Vietnam, the Defense Department said today.

Boatswain's Mate Wiglesworth died last Thursday when his armored troop carrier was mined in waters off the buffer zone in Vietnam.

A native of North Carolina, he enlisted in the Navy in February, 1965, and received his basic training at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, Ill. He was stationed at Cheltenham Communications Base, Cheltenham, Md., and at Norfolk before he was sent to Vietnam.

His survivors include his wife, Mrs. Marjorie V. Wiglesworth, of Oxon Hill.

College Back-Our-Boys Benefit

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, many of the citizens of our Nation are disturbed by the activities of students on our college campuses around the country. The impression is given that none of them realize the seriousness of the war in Vietnam to the future the world, or the necessity to back their country in time of crisis.

A group of students at Nassau Community College, however, not only recognize their responsibilities but are doing something about them. They are organizing and running an affair to raise funds to support our servicemen in Vietnam. I commend them for their activities. The full details follow:

COLLEGE BACK-OUR-BOYS BENEFIT DANCE IS GAINING WIDE SUPPORT

A Nassau Community College back-our-boys dance to raise funds for servicemen in combat is swiftly attracting support throughout the county from fraternal, military and veterans organizations.

Sponsored by Gamma Tau Gamma, engineering honor society at the college, the idea first won extensive campus backing from student clubs, fraternities and sororities. Tickets at $1 and raffle books started selling rapidly across the campus to go for package items such as cigarettes, shoe polish, soap, toothpaste, bouillon cubes, and canned fruits. The list was made up by a group which know GI needs first-hand—veterans' organizations.

Other clubs offered to handle checking and refreshment chores at the dance, and one group, the Delta Sorority, even cancelled its own previously scheduled dance to devote its entire energy to the back-our-boys hop.

Then, through the initiative of student officers of Gamma Tau Gamma—President Paul Simon of Elmont, Vice-president Jerald Lane of Merrick and Dance Chairman Tom Saad of Valley Stream—letters of invitation went out to many county organizations. The note apparently touched a sensitive spot and offers of financial and program aid began pouring in.

The dance will be held Friday, March 22, at 8 p.m. in the Field House on the campus and an exciting and impressive program is shaping up, with several ceremonial honor guards set to pay tribute to a Medal of Honor winner.

Invited to attend is Medal of Honor winner Major Howard V. Lee, 34, of New York City, who was decorated October 25, 1967. A Marine, Maj. Lee, then a captain, went to the aid of a beleaguered platoon by helicopter on Aug. 8–9, 1966, saved his men from capture and dealt the enemy a defeat.

Guards of Honor will attend from several groups. Lt. Jg William Duschenchuk of Uniondale has arranged for a Knights of Columbus Guard. Major Alfred B. Darcy of Garden City has offered a Marine Corps Guard; Col. Bernard Saul, station commander of the Roslyn Air National Guard, has also promised an Honor Guard, as has Sgt. Major Charles Churchill, of the Hofstra University ROTC. The Pershing Rifles (also from Hofstra) will participate, and guards from the Maritime College at Fort Schuyler are also expected.

MC for the affair will be Lee Sommers, an announcer at WHLI. For entertainment, several rock 'n roll bands have offered their services. They include, so far, the MGM recording group "The Unluv'd," also "The V-P's," "The Innocent Children" of Elmont, and a local band called "A Taste of Honey."

The PTA of Union Free School District No. 8 has offered help in collecting package items.

Professor Andrew C. Kowalik of Massapequa, faculty advisor of the engineering society, was enthusiastic about the overwhelming support that the project is attracting, "but," he said, "though financial success of the event is important—because we do want to send tangible help to the troops on the firing line—still I feel that student involvement in this project is most important for it may boost service morale by showing the troops that there are, indeed, college students who are concerned."

Paul Simon stressed the fact that the benefit does not attempt to offer support or condemnation of the U.S. policy in Vietnam.

"Its sole purpose," he added, "is to provide a humanitarian outlet for the true feelings of a vast majority of college students. All too often today's college students are characterized by the actions of a small minority.

"We hope that this program will give testimony—not only at home but also at the front—to the fact that today's college students do care and deeply appreciate the situation of the men in Vietnam."

President Eisenhower Supports President Johnson

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one more qualified to speak on American involvement in Vietnam than Dwight D. Eisenhower, commander in chief of Allied forces in Europe during World War II, commander of NATO blocking Communist aggression in Western Europe, and President of the United States for 8 years.

The following article contains the most recent statement by General Eisenhower on our involvement in Vietnam. This article appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 16 and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and to the attention of every citizen of the United States:

UNITED STATES SEEMS ON RIGHT TRACK IN VIETNAM, EISENHOWER SAYS

Finding a solution to Vietnam is harder than it might be, former President Dwight D. Eisenhower says, because "I don't think the American people really feel inspired to do anything."

At a news conference near Indio, Calif., Eisenhower said yesterday the United States appeared to be "on the right track" in its conduct of the war.

"We are not trying to destroy North Vietnam," he said. "What we are trying to do is make it too expensive for North Vietnam to try to dominate South Vietnam."

Combat Pay for Korean GI's

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill directing the Secretary of Defense to extend special combat pay to the GI's in Korea who are engaged in armed conflict.

In January 1967, the House Committee on Armed Services, in its report on pay and allowances for the uniformed services, clearly defined conditions under which various benefits would be awarded. Three criteria were mentioned for the award of combat pay, which is extended to those who are exposed to the dangers and risks of hostile fire.

All of these conditions are now present in Korea, and compensation should be awarded accordingly.

On May 22, 1967, two U.S. soldiers were killed and 16 others were injured when a mine planted near their barracks exploded near the demilitarized zone. The year before, on November 2, 1966, six American soldiers were killed in an ambush south of the demilitarized zone. In both instances, the attackers of these Americans and their South Korean allies were troops from North Korea.

These are only a few examples of demand for combat action. During a week in August, 1967, five American soldiers were killed and five more were wounded when vehicles in which they were riding hit mines planted by the North Koreans. During a week in September 1967, the North Koreans sabotaged two trains in South Korea which were carrying American personnel and American material. An American soldier, standing guard duty along the demilitarized zone, was shot and killed from ambush by the North Koreans on February 12, 1967.

On January 29, 1967, a Department of Defense official said that there had been 31 Americans killed and 71 wounded since the end of hostilities in 1953.

I would suggest that the hostilities have not ended as long as Americans serving in South Korea continue to live under the guns of the North Koreans.

Korea is certainly a "hostile fire area." Men serving along the demilitarized zone and in other areas of Korea should receive the extra pay that is rightfully theirs. For these men, risking their lives, it is certainly a small token of our appreciation.

Toward Homeownership

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today, a distinguished group of Clevelanders appeared before the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee urging increased allocations for rehabilitation and critically needed central-city housing directed toward homeownership.

Mayor Carl B. Stokes, of Cleveland, presented an urgent and forceful plea which Congress cannot overlook. This plea was supported by Mr. G. J. Grabner, president of the Weatherhead Co. of Cleveland, who represents the business and industrial community. Mr. James I. Huston, president of the PATH Association of Cleveland, also submitted a statement in support of these urgent needs.

I direct the attention of the House to the following statement by Mayor Carl B. Stokes:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE CARL B. STOKES, MAYOR OF CLEVELAND

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am proud to be Cleveland's lead-off witness in presenting to you our city's strong support for the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. The legislation recommended by the President in his message "houses and cities" encompasses all the major proposals presented to your committee during the past year. In addition, it includes a number of new ideas put forth by several distinguished study groups. It is truly a distillation of the best thinking which could be assembled on how our cities can more effectively meet the crises they face.

President Johnson entitled the closing chapter of his message, "A sense of place and purpose" in describing what our cities must recapture if they are to survive the test of the terribly trying times they face. Cleveland is turning the corner and is, in fact, beginning to recapture such a sense of place and purpose. The presence of our group here today is evidence of the intense interest which our industrial and civic leadership has in the job of rebuilding our city.

This year, 1968, stands as a historic moment—when the Cleveland Metropolitan Area has declared that the time has come for action. We intend to see progress this year—in building new industrial and commercial areas, university and other community facilities and most vital of all—housing for our families and elderly who so desperately need a sense of decent place and productive purpose. We are ready and have made many commitments which are within our capability. Our determination and capacity to meet our obligations in urban renewal and housing was recognized just two weeks ago when Secretary Weaver released almost twelve and ¼ million dollars to get our redevelopment program back into high gear.

Perhaps the single most dramatic step taken to date was the willingness of 90% of or 33 councilmen to vote our new community development director a starting salary higher than the current salary received by the mayor. Such determination to get the tough job done has been matched many times over. But—we are only tooling up to really get going—to actually construct new houses and employment enterprises—to actually restore old neighborhoods and create new ones.

However, we must have the additional financial and technical assistance which can only come from the Federal Government.

1. Home-ownership assistance—including the funds for counseling new homeowners—is critically needed. In our Leeseville area we have land bought and paid for. It is an area where there should be individually owned homes. Give us the mortgage assistance payments and we can have low income homeowners in new houses within the next 12 months (title I, section 101).

2. Public housing—rehabilitation—some of our estates are over 30 years old—several are over 20 years old. They need to be updated—with new management services and facilities. I can tell you from personal experience how much this is needed—for I lived in one or our projects as a boy. It was needed then and it is needed even more now (title II, section 240).

3. Land contract loan insurance and owner occupant landlords—you cannot imagine how desperately we need this help. A major part of our urban renewal difficulties arises from the hundreds of land contract arrangements in our university—euclid and other code enforcement areas. Rescue for these poor exploited people who are denied an equity in their home and have a yoke of unending debt is a must (title III, section 305).

Small scale landlords could also be developed by mortgages guarantees for up to four family residences. This means more stability which we certainly need (title V, sec. 305).

4. Urban renewal and rehabilitation—increased authorization is needed if we are to get sufficient funds to proceed with our Cleveland State University projects. State funds are committed for operations but we must build the campus first. Unless we get these funds, thousands of our young people will be forced to forgo the opportunity to attend this university (title V, sec. 502).

To move our University-Euclid project to completion the city really needs authority to acquire, rehabilitate and sell or lease many more units than is now permitted under the law. The new provisions would remove a major obstacle and we could expedite our rehabilitation program immeasurably. We have a new nonprofit corporation set up specifically to conduct inspections and get owner-occupied dwellings into the rehabilitation loan and grant program quickly. But many of the structures owned by absentee landlords can only be handled by the city. We aim to do just that. (Title V. sec. 504).

Increasing the maximum limits for homeowner rehabilitation grants from $1,500 to $2,500 would also make a tremendous difference in the University-Euclid area. The current $1,500 maximum just is not enough to do even the minimum essential work such as roof, furnace, plumbing, and wiring replacement. This bill will make the difference between no rehabilitation and at least some rehabilitation for many of our residents.

Our Garden Valley and St. Vincent projects could be closed out under the new provisions since little land is left. Due to difficult terrain and development conditions we have been unable to sell the small remainder of land. We must do so before getting to other needed projects (title V. sec. 508).

5. Neighborhood development programs—Our Glenville, near West Side and Tremont areas have long recognized the need for beginning renewal efforts. The new concept of smaller scale development programs within neighborhoods which is contained in the bill is ideally suited for our needs. We can move expeditiously in these areas as soon as this new program is authorized (title V. sec. 501).

6. Model cities—We have been hard at work to develop a model cities program. The

largest problem we face is that many neighborhoods need and want the program and there hasn't been enough money to go around. We definitely need the additional help the legislation projects (title XI, sec. 1101).

Several distinguished members of our delegation, whom I shall introduce in just a few moments, are prepared to comment more specifically on various sections of the proposed legislation. They bring to this subject a wide array of experience and knowledge and I am confident that their remarks would be helpful in our deliberations. I will therefore limit my comments to a few general observations and will ask them to join me in answering questions you may have for us.

This set of bills, S. 3028 and 3029, together constitute a most challenging opportunity to at long last provide our urban communities around the country with the wherewithal to let all their residents achieve a decent home in a wholesome environment. Essentially, the bills provide three significant advances over existing legislation:

1. More realistic subsidies;
2. More construction;
3. More ways of developing and redeveloping neighborhoods, towns, and open lands.

SUBSIDIES

The wide range of new subsidies bring the cost of housing within reach of our citizens whose modest incomes now confine them to slums. It also takes the unprecedented step of helping lower income people fulfill a deep yearning for home ownership. I urge you to give our city dwellers the subsidies they need—just as farmers have received them for many years. Housing subsidies on city streets will yield crops of healthier children, happier parents and more peaceful feelings. These are as essential to the "domestic tranquility" of our country as the surplus crops we pay farmers not to grow or to store in silos.

CONSTRUCTION GOALS

The production of public housing and moderately priced private housing can and must be stepped up to the levels called for by the President. New land use methods, new construction technologies, improved planning techniques, accelerated financing procedures, better manpower utilization practices and elimination of other bottlenecks are all included in the provisions of this legislation. We have people who need jobs—land which can be put to better use—mortgage funds and guarantees—supplements and subsidies, etc. Now we must set our sights in "doing" instead of talking and lamenting. I urge you to give us the additional tools we so desperately need.

IMPROVED METHODS

Many "nuts and bolts" improvements are spread throughout the eleven titles of these bills. Tax incentives for private industry, a back-up property re-insurance program, metropolitan planning incentives, encouragement of open space and beautification efforts, widened mass transportation provisions, broadened research endeavors and many other important improvements are included in the bills. I urge each of you to support this legislation and hope you can be persuasive in encouraging your colleagues in the Senate to do likewise.

An impressive compilation of scholarly research, pragmatic field experiences and cross-sectional debate has been assembled by Governor Richard J. Hughes, President's National Advisory Panel on Insurance in Riot-Affected Areas; Governor Otto J. Kerner, Commission on Civil Disorder; Senator Paul Douglas, Commission on Urban Problems; Mr. Edgar Kaiser, President's Committees on Urban Housing.

These all have a recurrent theme, i.e., our cities simply must become not only safe and sanitary districts, but indeed become vital centers of happy living and profitable enterprise.

Which shall it be—the big build-up—or the big let-down? You have an awesome responsibility—for in your hands lies the fate of our neighborhoods. Without this legislation, none of us will be able to develop confidence in ourselves and our communities. I trust that you will accept our support and use it to spur you on to courageous action on behalf of all your fellow Americans who are watchfully awaiting the outcome of your deliberations here.

Thank you.

I should now like to introduce the other Clevelanders who flew down with me to present their views on this subject. You may be interested to know that this is the first of two trips to Washington which our community has organized. With the cooperation of our local industries, air transportation was made available. As you will note from your list, our group today represents the major business, industrial, financial and labor organizations. Next week another group of civic and community organizations will testify at the House of Representatives hearings.

We have a slogan in Cleveland which industry and commerce has developed which says "Brag a Little"—To do this though, we all must be ready to first "give a little." We urge you to give us "that little" so we can all "Brag a Little."

I further direct the attention of the House to the following statement by Mr. G. J. Grabner, president of the Weatherhead Co., of Cleveland:

STATEMENT OF G. J. GRABNER, PRESIDENT, THE WEATHERHEAD CO., CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. Chairman and Committee members, my name is George J. Grabner; I am President of the Weatherhead Company of Cleveland, Ohio. I am here today as a businessman who has a real interest in the housing problems as we know them in Cleveland.

In addition to my responsibilities to the Weatherhead Company, I am Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Greater Cleveland Growth Association, successor to the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce and Greater Cleveland Growth Board. I also serve as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Cleveland Development Foundation, a charitable enterprise that was organized in 1954 and sponsored by Cleveland industry to assist the community in providing housing for low income families.

The housing task which Mayor Carl B. Stokes has set for his Administration and for the Greater Cleveland community has the full support of our business, industrial and civic leadership.

Housing is everyone's problem.

It cannot be done alone.

It is a problem that cannot be resolved by unilateral and individual action by government, by business and industry, or by labor. In Cleveland we are building a cooperative effort to tackle our housing problems on a comprehensive basis. This means the development of new concepts—at a local level—to combine private efforts with state and local government to produce adequate public housing units, opportunity for home ownership, expanded programs to construct and rehabilitate private housing.

Each of these objectives reflect a feeling of urgency and the need for unified and cooperative action to help the people of our community. *We cannot accomplish these objectives without your help.*

The legislation now before this subcommittee will provide valuable new tools to deal with not only Cleveland's housing problems but with housing problems throughout the Nation. *We look to you*—this subcommittee—to continue its leadership, and action to formulate and to support legislation which will meet the changing needs of our urban communities.

The Federal government has provided the major push in trying to find solutions to our housing problems. As a result, the state and local governments have not been thrust into a position of having to provide any significant part of the subsidies required to relieve our housing problems until now. We urge that the Federal government continue to take on a leading responsibility in this area, and we are also urging state and local government to bear a significant share of the total load through effective public services and facilities, adequate regulatory machinery, tax incentives and exemptions.

The Federal government can participate by expanding and continuing to provide necessary help in many ways—through public housing, leased or owned; rent supplements; below-the-market interest loans; tax exemption and deduction; free services; and others.

A broadened public housing program must be the cornerstone of federal responsibility. Not nearly enough public housing has been built to house the families with low incomes who were caught in the housing collapse we experienced in Cleveland beginning in the late 1950's, which resulted in the development of the 221(d)(3).

I would like to echo a portion of the statement of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, made to the House Subcommittee on Housing, on the subject of public housing. What the Chamber said, in essence, was that families whose incomes are the very lowest and who have had the least potential for increasing their incomes are being largely ignored.

For example, many of the people who are receiving public assistance in Cuyahoga County cannot be housed in public housing units because we don't have enough—and these people can certainly not afford to reside in housing that is generally accepted as safe and sanitary.

Just this month, the Public Information Department of the Cuyahoga County Welfare Department indicated that there was a total of 75,829 people in Cuyahoga County in December of 1967, most of whom lived within the City of Cleveland on some form of public assistance. Broken down, it listed a total number of adults (27,536) and children (48.293) who are in the federal categories of assistance.

Section 203 of the proposed Bill authorizes increased expenditures for public housing.

It is badly needed.

I urge the Congress to approve this Section.

I urge you to move forward and increase appropriations for low-rent public housing.

The cost of constructing and maintaining privately developed housing in Cleveland has been climbing faster than the ability of the average family to pay these costs. A larger and ever-increasing segment of our working population is being priced out of the housing market. Many of these families are living in substandard units in Cleveland's falling housing market because private industry, using all of the programs presently available under the Housing Law, cannot supply these needs.

We in the Cleveland community have found that private investors can house those families who can pay from $150 to $175 per month in rent or mortgage payment. Using a yardstick where 25% of a family's income is used on housing, a family would have to be receiving an income of approximately $7,200 a year just to meet the minimal rental or mortgage structure to live in a new unit.

What this means to the potential home owner, or tenant, is most discouraging. If you cannot own your own home or live in housing facilities on less than an annual income of $7,200 per year—and if your income is too high to qualify for low-rent public housing or for rent supplements—then you cannot afford to provide your family with

housing that meets the minimum standards of health and decency (such as the standards used by the Federal Housing Administration under Section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act.)

For example, present projects sponsored by the Cleveland Development Foundation indicates that Section 221(d)(3), below market interest program, is inadequate to meet the needs of the inner city.

We can reduce the figure of $7,200 per year if the 221(d)(3) program is used and modified as proposed by this legislation—possibly to a level of $4,300. *This will close the gap between low-rent public housing and private financing.*

In Cleveland, we now have a small rehabilitation project underway using the 221(d)(3) formula. In addition to this subsidy, this project is also in an urban renewal area where a low re-use value exists. We are also proposing to use some public housing leasing. Even with these three advantages, it has taken additional subsidies from the private sector to make the project possible and economically feasible.

Two private foundations have underwritten social services, including relocation assistance and tenant assistance, and the business-sponsored Cleveland Development Foundation has provided more than $100,000 in seed money plus substantial time of a staff member and accompanying operating expenses.

I feel very strongly that the proposed Bill S3029—while it does not provide the local leadership and action necessary to get our public housing program expanded and going—offers hope for the middle and often forgotten segment of the housing market—people who are working and making their own way and who have been priced out of standard housing by the imbalance of housing costs.

Home ownership assistance, condominium and cooperative subsidies, and lower effective interest rates on rental housing are all critical needs in Cleveland. With these forms of assistance, we stand a chance to get housing built for many of the families with the most critical needs.

I urge your leadership.

Although there are undoubtedly technical changes necessary in some of the specific provisions of this proposed bill, I urge your support and your favorable action in principle on this important legislation.

These are inventive new programs. They will be a step forward in solving the housing problems of our nation's cities.

Thank you.

And, following is the statement by Mr. James I. Huston, president of PATH Association, of Cleveland, Ohio:

STATEMENT OF JAMES I. HUSTON, PRESIDENT OF PATH ASSOCIATION OF CLEVELAND, OHIO

HOUSING AND CITIES ACT

I want to tell you a little about our situation in Cleveland, and why we need the housing programs embodied in S. B. 3028 and S. B. 3029.

Eighteen months ago The Greater Cleveland Associated Foundation appointed a thirty man citizen's committee to study the housing problems of Greater Cleveland, to recommend solutions to those problems and ways they might be achieved. The Committee was called PATH—Plan of Action for Tomorrow's Housing.

The PATH Report (attached hereto) was made one year ago. The report was highly critical of the City administration, the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority, the business community, the building trade unions, the suburbs, and the public apathy. A broad based citizen housing organization, The PATH Association, was then formed to implement the recommendations of the Report. We now have about 600 members.

If made today, the PATH Report would be far different. It would show much improvement in Cleveland's housing situation over the past year. It would show a new City administration dedicated to meeting the housing needs of all its people. It would show a Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority with fresh resolve to carry out its obligations to low income families. It would show a business community now fully aware of Cleveland's housing crisis and willing to marshal its resources to cope with it. It would show building trade unions more willing to open membership so that decent housing can be created. It would show a citizenry now willing to assume a greater part of the financial burden of housing. It would show churches and other non-profit organizations moving forward diligently to sponsor housing for low income families.

But this new spirit, this forward movement in Cleveland, will come to nothing without the federal tools contemplated by the legislation before you.

Many bills have been introduced and many proposals made to this Committee over the past year. These vary in details as to method, or scope or priority. But they have many common principles, the most basic of which is that this Nation must take forceful and dramatic steps to realize its housing goal—"a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family". The legislation proposed by the President for the first time sets housing production targets for that goal. We regard such a programmed time-table for meeting the Nation's housing needs essential, and one of the most important positive aspects of the legislation.

We urge you to keep foremost the common principles of the various measures which have been presented to you. The details can and will be debated by professionals and technicians, and by this Committee. But the fact of multiple alternatives should not deter this Committee from selecting those alternatives which seem best suited to achieve the common principles.

There is a readiness in Cleveland and in the Nation as a whole on the part of local government, business, labor and the public generally to face squarely the housing needs of our people. Please do not let this moment go by. Please do not let this readiness subside.

Thank you for your attention to my remarks.

Edward Curtis—Jerseyan of the Week

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article about my dear friend, Edward Curtis, named Jerseyan of the Week by the Sunday Star Ledger. Mr. Curtis' career has been one of distinguished achievement and dedicated public service, and stands out as an inspiration to those who would work their way up to a full and rewarding life.

Ed Curtis has brought great credit to our community and our State, and is respected and admired by all who know him. It is my pleasure to join in paying him tribute.

The article follows:

A GOOD SKATE—JERSEY BELL'S PUBLIC AFFAIRS MAN

(By Nancy Razen)

Edward A. Curtis' title at New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. is vice president of public affairs.

It is a title that could apply as well to Curtis' activities outside of business hours. The handsome, sturdily-built executive, who celebrated his 40th year with the telephone company last week, rose through the ranks to the vice presidency. At the same time his devotion to various civic, governmental and educational endeavors has earned him—according to one admiring colleague—a reputation as "one of New Jersey's more outstanding citizens."

LEHIGH ALUMNUS

A graduate of Lehigh University—and one of that institution's hardest working fundraisers—Curtis worked his way through law school commuting from Atlantic City, where he managed the phone company office, to Philadelphia's Temple University four nights a week. He completed the degree by finishing his last year at South Jersey Law School, now a part of Rutgers.

Though he has never practiced law, Curtis finds the legal grounding "very helpful" in his current position.

"Public affairs," he explained the other day, "covers legislative responsibility on the federal and state levels as well as urban affairs.

"We analyze and review the thousands of bills that go through the State Legislature and through Congress every day to find out how they might involve the company, its employes, its pension plans.

Some people might call Curtis' department—with its 17 men in Trenton—a lobby group, Curtis added with a grin. "We call them representatives," he pointed out.

A BETTER JERSEY

When Curtis, who will retire June 1 at the mandatory age of 65, is not "lobbying" for the company, he is lobbying for a better state.

He is currently chairman of the State Capitol Development Commission which he spearheaded, and a member of the New Jersey Utilities Commission, the Regional Plan Association, the New Jersey Agriculture Society, and the American Institute of management.

"Ed Curtis is quite a guy," said Maplewood Mayor Edmund T. Hume, who has worked with him for seven years.

"He's active in so many endeavors throughout the state and he's one of its most distinguished citizens."

Curtis' interests, as well as his varied activities, set him apart from the run-of-the-mill executive.

"When you're born and raised on the banks of the Delaware," the Lambertville native laughed, "you do plenty of ice skating."

AVID SKATERS

In truth, a childhood bout with polio was as great an influence on Curtis' prowess at ice skating as the local topography. So was his marriage, in 1935, to the former Dorothy Cramer of Merchantville, an avid swimmer and skater.

Figure-skating, to the strains of waltzes or fox trots, is still one of the couple's favorite pastimes. And winter weekends away from their Short Hills home find them, invariably, on the canal ice of their "gentleman's farm" in New Hope, Pa.

Both were members of the Atlantic City Skating Club and the Philadelphia Skating Club and Humane Society. Curtis has also produced a number of amateur ice skating shows and served as chairman of the sanction committee for the United States Figure Skating Association.

New Hope also provides Curtis with an opportunity to grow tomatoes—he's contemplating strawberries this year—and cultivate a tulip bed that is his pride and joy.

His youthful interest in the Delaware River area has never flagged and one coworker claims, "Nobody knows the Delaware like he does."

HISTORY BUFFS

An historical interest in the locale is another preoccupation Ed and Dorothy Curtis share. They reportedly collaborated, some time ago, in restoring a Revolutionary home at Washington's Crossing.

"But my chief outside interest," Curtis insists—and his wife concurs—"Is Lehigh University."

He is a past president of the school's alumni association and current vice chairman of the board and a trustee. For the past ten years Curtis has been chairman of Lehigh's annual giving for which he raised close to $10 million. And Lehigh honored him with an honorary doctor of laws degree in 1962.

It is quite the other side of the coin from what Curtis himself admits should read something like a Horatio Alger story.

ACTIVE IN POLITICS

When he graduated from Lehigh, he related, he worked in the oil and heavy chemicals industry for a short time. Strictly by chance, while forming a Lambertville Chamber of Commerce, he was recommended to the telephone company. The recommendation started him as a clerk in the company's Trenton office and on his advancement through Camden district manager, Southern division manager and general commercial manager for the state that culminated in 1953 with his appointment as vice president of revenues and regulatory matters. Ten years later he was named vice president of public affairs.

The subject of retirement, on the other hand, is one Curtis does not appear to relish.

He has long been active in Hunterdon County Republican circles, he points out, and "I'm looking forward to a new life in my chosen field of government," he smiled.

Those who know him don't doubt for a moment that Ed Curtis' retirement will be an active one.

"He's the type of fellow to whom retirement comes hard," a colleague said. "But he'll find some activity."

Least worried of all is Mrs. Curtis.

"He'll love it," she said firmly. "He's just having trouble looking back."

Vietnam Policy Criticized

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an interesting editorial by John B. Campbell which appears in the March 1968 issue of Space/Aeronautics. His statement not only questions our Vietnam policy, but also concludes that if it were not for poor military judgment, this Nation might not be involved in Vietnam at all. This editorial is all the more significant because Space/Aeronautics is a publication which is geared to readers in the military-industrial complex.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial appears as follows:

THE PRICE IS WRONG

(By John B. Campbell)

Among those who have publicly questioned our current Vietnam policy, the leaders of the aerospace community have been notable by their absence. Yet in many cases, silence cloaks serious and growing doubts as to whether this particular war is worth its mounting price.

There are good reasons why these doubts are not forcefully expressed. A generation of managers nurtured on the concept of "deterrence" is uncommonly aware of the strategic value of apparent national determination. Pragmatic to the core, aerospace managers see little point to criticism without solutions. Most important, it has always been considered politic for the industry to support the views of its major customers.

Certainly the industry must not do less than its best to provide the kind of weapon systems the government decides it needs. But aerospace engineers and managers, at whatever level, have the same right and the same duty as other citizens to question whether those weapons are being used the right way, in the right place, and at the right time.

There are some who feel that the military judgment in such matters should be supreme and beyond question. Among the military, however, there is an understandable bias toward military solutions. Moreover, as has been convincingly documented elsewhere, the military has from the very beginning of our Vietnam involvement made one wrong estimate of the situation after another. If it weren't for faulty military judgment, in fact, we might not be in the Vietnam box at all.

Under the circumstances, it's not surprising that the military wants a victory, however dearly won. But what the country needs is a solution. It cannot be, considering the geopolitical realities, a solution that denies a determined, disciplined enemy any gain for his costly effort. Yet it need not be total abandonment of Southeast Asia to his designs. It must be a solution that permits us to reallocate our resources—to restore cuts in our military and other research, to get the space program moving again, and to mount a vigorous attack on our decaying social environment.

If we draw back in South Vietnam, say to the coastal plain, must those nations who rely on us for protection grow faint of heart? Not necessarily. Our forces, weapons and tactics have been newly forged in the fires of Vietnam. Freed—at least in part—of the Vietnam millstone, they should remain a credible deterrent to casual adventurism.

But as the USSR expands its military presence around the globe, we must realize, too, that the "limited war" ante is going up. Before playing the game next time, we'd better be certain that there is a nation to defend and that the aggression is unambiguously external—or at least that the threat to our vital interests is as clear to our enemies as to ourselves.

Perhaps after we've learned how to make it possible for black and white people to live together here at home, we'll be better prepared for "nation-building" in Asia or elsewhere. Meanwhile, there are decisions too vital to human survival to be left to the professionals. We all need to do our part.

Wisconsin Veterans Support Our Fighting Men in Vietnam

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have found that one of the best ways to find out what the people of the country are thinking about what we do here in Washington is to pay close attention to my mail. I have been gratified in recent months at the large amount of mail I have received expressing patriotic support for the President and this country's policy in Vietnam.

From Donald Barnier, commander of the Amvets post in South Milwaukee, Wis., come these statements:

We firmly believe that if everyone would get behind our government and support it that the war would be over much sooner. By protesting the war a person is only giving aid and comfort to the enemy and thus helping to prolong it. If we are going to fight communism, and this we must do, we are going to have to stop it from spreading in Viet-Nam or soon it will have engulfed the whole of Southeast Asia. Once Southeast Asia is conquered it will not be long before they will be after the rest of the world. I, personally, as a citizen of this great country of ours, cannot see how anyone could dissent against our government with the great history of freedom that we have behind us.

Albert F. Kasmiskie, commander of the VFW post in Watertown, Wis., wrote me this letter:

As former members of the Armed Forces who saw action in this nation's war, we are well acquainted with the realities of war. We fully understand the importance of morale-building influences that must come from home. It has been said that Rome's liberties were not auctioned off in a day, but were brought slowly, gradually, furtively and bit by bit. In this day of dissent and divisiveness, we are auctioning off our liberties . . . The time is long past for debating whether we should or should not be in Viet-Nam. What we need is the powerful, unifying influence emanating from the executive and legislative branches of our government to help heal the nation's wounds. What the servicemen in Southeast Asia need is the strong support of every American citizen. We, who have seen our comrades join the "democracy of the dead," wholeheartedly endorse the commitment in Viet-Nam and extend to all fighting men our support in their quest for victory.

It is letters like these that make us know that the American people are behind this Government and our fighting men in Vietnam.

Landmark Hearing

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, major steps have been taken to alleviate some of our mass transportation problems. However, we are faced with a melange of claims and counterclaims relating to the basic question: Should the airline industry be allowed to control access to, and the use of, general aviation facilities when the airlines and the general aviation industry are in conflict for the use of limited airspace and airport facilities. Currently involved is the case of Teterboro Airport in New Jersey and Republic Airport on Long Island, both in the Metropolitan New York vicinity.

The national impact of the decisions to be reached at the upcoming Civil Aeronautics Board hearings being held this week on the use of major airports by private planes is considered by those interested in the future of general aviation as a landmark. The Aircraft Owners

and Pilots Association, with a membership of 143,000, all vitally interested in private flying, and the National Aviation Trades Association, with a membership of 450 aviation service companies, have urged the Civil Aeronautics Board to preclude one major air carrier from having full control over any airport.

An excellent analysis of this problem appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, March 17. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of bringing this vital issue with *national implications* to the attention of my colleagues, I include this article by the aviation writer of the New York Times, Richard Haitch, in the RECORD.

PRIVATE FLYING: TETERBORO CLASH—CAB LANDMARK HEARING DUE TUESDAY ON PAN AM CONTROL OF TWO AIRPORTS

(By Richard Haitch)

Can an airline that seeks to prevent private planes from using the major airports be counted on to operate "reliever" airports in the interest of private fliers?

Should any airline be given control over a key private-flying facility when the two means of transportation are essentially in competition?

The issues thus drawn by representatives of private flying will be debated before the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington on Tuesday in what started out as a routine case and is now referred to by some private-aviation interests as a landmark. It involves routinely an application by Pan American World Airways for C.A.B. approval of the airline's leases to operate Teterboro Airport in New Jersey and Republic Airport at Farmingdale, L.I.

The lease at Teterboro was signed with the Port of New York Authority, the present operator, and that at Republic with Fairchild Hiller, an aviation manufacturer and supplier, which in turn has leased from the Farmingdale Company, the owner.

GIVEN 30-YEAR CONTROL

Both airports are designed for private-flying use, and both leases would give Pan Am full control over the fields for 30 years. The matter of the Republic lease could be academic, however, because Governor Rockefeller has proposed that the state buy the Long Island airport and develop a private-flying center there. Such a sale would terminate Pan Am's lease; the new center would be owned by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority and could be leased by it to someone else.

Pan Am says its proposed venture into private flying is both a business arrangement and an attempt to develop alternate airports that would ease congestion at the three major fields in the metropolitan area.

But Butler Aviation, operator of 12 aircraft service bases across the country, and the National Aviation Trades Association, representing a variety of businesses at airports, have raised the larger questions. Each, serving mainly private fliers, has asked the C.A.B. to disapprove both Pan Am leases as not in the public interest.

In its brief, Butler alludes to the fact that the airlines are involved in an apparent campaign to keep private fliers out of the busy metropolitan airports. The International Air Transport Association, for example—of which Pan Am is a member—is on record as favoring segregation of airline and private flying.

"If the board," Butler argues, "finds it consistent with the public interest for an airline to control the access to general-aviation [private-flying] facilities in the New York area, where the interests of these two groups are already in open conflict, it logically and legally follows that such control can not be denied in all major cities. Therefore the board's decision in this case will set the pattern for the entire nation."

IMPARTIAL OPERATION ASKED

Butler suggests that "some governmental agency or other impartial person" operate Teterboro and Republic.

"Pan American or any other airline," it contends, "would inevitably be motivated to develop and operate general-aviation facilities under their control in the manner best suited to the needs of air carriers, rather than general aviation."

The National Aviation Trade Association notes in its brief: "Certificated route air carriers, with their enormous financial resources, the advantage of mass purchasing power and all the other management and bargaining advantages which accrue to big business operations, would have another advantage which could conceivably be used to stifle the use of aircraft and to derogate the transportation flexibility of general aviation itself."

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, with 143,000 members in private flying, has urged the board to modify the Teterboro lease, so that Pan Am would not have control over the full airport but could build on part of it as a business investment. At Republic Airport, the association says it favors state operation but would accept Pan Am if the alternative were to close the field.

A major contention of Pan Am's opponents is that it plans to eliminate light, single-engine planes from the two fields and encourage traffic by heavier business transports, especially jets.

Last week Capt. O. J. Studeman, general manager of Pan Am's metropolitan airports division, denied in an interview that this was the airline's intent.

"Pan Am," he said, "is committed to operate both of these airports as public airports, and therefore could not and would not bar light planes from the airport . . . We have no plans whatsoever for the elimination of any type of general-aviation airplane."

But among the exhibits that opponents have filed with the C.A.B. are copies of memorandums from the files of Pan Am's senior vice president, Najeeb E. Halaby. One memorandum, dated March 23, 1966, and addressed to "N.E.H." and "A.P.A."—the latter, the initials of Alvin P. Adams, Pan Am vice president—reports on a planning study by Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton (TAMS).

The memorandum says in part: "An acceptable means of phasing out the light plane traffic at TEB [Teterboro] as TAMS projects, must be found in order to accommodate the projected build-up of heavier business aircraft traffic."

Another memorandum, dated Oct. 11, 1967, reporting on plans for Republic Airport, says in part: "As recognized in the Tri-State Committee report of March 1966, local flying will have to be carefully monitored and ultimately eliminated or restricted."

Both of these memorandums are signed "O.J.S."—the initials of Captain Studeman.

Make No Mistake, America Is Fighting for Us

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the February 26, 1968, issue of U.S. News & World Report carried an article by Mr. Bernard Levin, widely known writer and TV commentator in Britain, entitled "Make No Mistake, America Is Fighting for Us."

In the article, Mr. Levin gives his personal views on the presence and effectiveness of the American troops in Vietnam and demonstrates his own insight, and that of his countrymen, into the Communist strategy being employed there. Mr. Levin adds his thoughts on the gratitude which each of us who is free to live his own life should express to the American soldiers who make this possible.

The article follows:

MAKE NO MISTAKE, AMERICA IS FIGHTING FOR US

(By Bernard Levin)

I spent yesterday evening at the opera (Wagner, of course). You, I dare say, spent it helping your children with their homework, or watching television, or learning the piano, or reading a book.

A lot of Americans and South Vietnamese, however, spent it dying. Strange to relate (and I imagine that many of them would find it as strange as anyone), they spent it dying so that you can go on watching television, learning the piano, reading books and helping the children with their homework, and so that I can go on listening to Wagner.

I don't know about you, but I am grateful, and will now say why. A battle was launched in Vietnam on Tuesday, in which bands of North Vietnamese and Viet Cong swept through South Vietnamese towns, killing and pillaging, while others launched a major offensive against the American base at Khe Sanh.

It is not, I believe, too fanciful to describe the battle as potentially one of the major turning-points of civilization, and to think of General Westmoreland and his men in the way that, with the perspective of history to aid us, we think of Leonidas and the Spartans at Thermopylae, John Sobieski facing the Turks at the gates of Vienna, or Lord Dowding and Fighter Command in the Battle of Britain. For each of those battles changed the face of the world for the better; or rather, prevented others from changing it for the worse.

And so it may be at this moment in Vietnam. The war there is confused and horrible; its aims blurred, its methods savage, its cost in innocent blood uncountable.

But if it is lost, if the Americans finally get tired of doing the world's work for nothing but the world's abuse, if South Vietnam is left to its fate, then what will follow is not merely the piecemeal engulfing of the rest of South-East Asia. What will follow, as surely as Austria followed the Rhineland, and Czechoslovakia followed Austria, and Poland followed Czechoslovakia, and six years of world war followed Poland, is a nuclear confrontation on a global scale between the forces at present engaged in one tiny corner of the globe.

And that, in the end, is why my Wagner and your children are at stake this day in "a far-off country of which we know nothing." The Americans are not fighting the war there so that Saigon racketeers can grow fat on black market profits; indeed, they are only secondarily fighting it so that Saigon may stay free long enough for a society to grow up there that will be strong enough to dispense with the racketeers.

They are not even there because if they leave they will one day be digging gun emplacements in California, as the Australians will be digging them round Darwin.

They are there because they know that, where aggression is concerned, the appetite doth grow by what it feeds on; and because they therefore know that, however great the price of the war in Vietnam, it is still less than would be the price of the war we will all one day have to fight elsewhere if it is lost.

The Americans and the South Vietnamese are not alone in knowing this. The Australians and New Zealanders know it; the Thail-

anders know it; the South Koreans know it; the Filipinos know it. But in this country, it seems, we do not know it.

Well, it is time we did. And the battle now going on in Vietnam is as good a time to find out as we shall ever have. On this battle, the Communist forces have staked a great deal; for some time now they have been promising their increasingly disillusioned troops that one last push will see victory—if not military victory, then 'victory-by-coalition.'

The Communist strategy in Vietnam is to inflict such a major reverse on the Americans and South Vietnamese that they will be desperate to make peace even at the price of an agreement that gives the Communists a share in the Government of South Vietnam, with the full take-over following a few months later.

I do not think that the American resolve will crack. But a word of thanks and admiration from Britain may help to show America that her resolve is recognised for what it is—a resolve to hold the front for civilisation, by convincing those who would destroy it that they are not going to succeed in doing so.

I would prefer our thanks to come from our Government. Unfortunately, it won't. Nor will it even come from our Opposition. So it has to come from us—from those of us who recognise the connection between what the Americans are doing in South Vietnam and what we like to do with our evenings in Britain.

We are not, I believe, all that few. But few or many, let me now say on behalf of us all, to the Americans and South Vietnamese and their allies, even now fighting and dying in Vietnam:

"Our words may be useless, but they are all we have to offer. We understand why you are there, and know that your cause is ours too. And we thank you."

The Circus-Priest Quotes the Poet-Priest on the Joy of Being Irish

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday night I had the pleasure and the privilege to attend a St. Patrick's Day dinner at the Clover Club in Boston. St. Patrick's Day is the time when we all get together to celebrate the driving of the snakes from Ireland and the birth of religion in the Emerald Isle.

It is a very happy time—all troubles are forgotten as everyone joins in the festivities and celebrates the joy of being Irish.

The Reverend Father Edward S. Sullivan of the Star of the Sea Church in Squantum, Mass., gave the benediction that evening. He quoted a song of the ancient poet-priest of Ireland who understood what it meant to be Irish.

Father Sullivan is called the circus-priest because for part of the year, every year, he ministers to those wandering American nomads, the people of the circus. He is well known around the Boston area for his great love of God and of man.

The poem he quoted was certainly beautiful, but his own poetry was equally beautiful. I would like to have his prayer inserted in the RECORD so that we may all understand the joy of being Irish:

PRAYER OF REV. EDWARD S. SULLIVAN, STAR OF THE SEA CHURCH, SQUANTUM, MASS.

Here we seek God's blessing upon us, I would borrow a few words from an old Poet-Priest who sums up so graciously all we feel here tonight, of his ancestry he sang, as might we all—

"Are we not, in our blood, as old as the race whence we sprung?
In the cells of our hearts feel we not all its ebb and flow?
As old as the race is, is it not still forever young . . .
As the youngest of Celts in whose breast Erin's love is aglow?
The ties of our blood have been strained o'er thousands of years
And still are not Severed, how mighty soever the strain:
The chalice of time o'erflows with the streams of our tears—
Yet, just as the shamrocks, to bloom, need the cloud and the rain,
So the faith of our fathers, our hopes, and the love of our isle
Need the rain of the hearts that fell often from grief-clouded eyes to keep them in bloom.
Many voices are hushed while the great years sweep patiently by:
But the voice of our race shall live, sounding, down to the last:
For our blood is the bard of the song that shall never die."

—FATHER RYAN, 1886.

And now, dear Lord, we bow before Thy face to pause, and ask a humble Grace. So many wonder in their hearts why Irishmen seem set apart. Can they not use their sense to see that the Irish reflect your Trinity?

Saint Patrick taught us of Thy love—He taught us that all Thy souls are free—And that Truth is found in Equality.

A Trio here on earth we've had—Develara, Briscoe, Marconi—all Irish they. And in old Jamaica, Black Irish there prove in integration, no Irish Faker.

We've fought for love, we've fought for peace, and fought and prayed all hatred cease. Our virtues Lord, we could recite. But You've oft been told them, So why repeat.

The Toastmaster is stamping on my feet. The Time has come when we should eat. God bless us all. Amen.

Vietnam War Claims Two GI's and Marine

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Army Sp4c. Charles G. Rehberger, Army Sp4c. Gerald F. Wernsdorfer, and Marine Cpl. Charles T. Lee, three young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their bravery and honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

VIETNAM WAR CLAIMS TWO GI'S AND MARINE—ONE OF VICTIMS SAID HE WOULD BE PROUD TO DIE FOR THE UNITED STATES

Two Baltimore soldiers and a Beltsville marine have been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

They were:

Army Spec. 4 Charles G. Rehberger, son of Mr. and Mrs. Herndon Holcomb, of 7908 Gough street, Baltimore.

Army Spec. 4 Gerald F. Wernsdorfer, son of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Wernsdorfer, of 3430 Ravenwood avenue.

Marine Cpl. Charles T. Lee, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jack Lee, of 11340 Evans Trail road, Beltsville.

Specialist Rehberger, 20, a rifleman, was killed March 2 by enemy fire as he fought with an infantry unit that had gone to the aid of the surrounded marine base at Khe Sanh.

PROUD TO DIE

His mother said yesterday that her son, who had been drafted in November, 1967, "understood why he was fighting and told us that if he didn't return, he was proud to die for his country, even if there were some Americans who didn't understand the war."

A 1965 graduate of Kernwood High School, Essex, he had been on lacrosse and soccer teams while in high school and worked for Armco Steel Corporation for a year before he was drafted.

Survivors, besides Mr. and Mrs. Holcomb, include a total of seven brothers and sisters.

Funeral services will be at 10 A.M. Monday at the Holly Hills memorial gardens, Essex.

Specialist Wernsdorfer, an infantry medic, was killed while on a combat mission at Chu Lai March 11 when an enemy mine exploded near him. He was 20.

SPARED OF WORRY

Drafted in April, 1967, he had been fighting in Vietnam since October.

His mother said yesterday that he seldom discussed the war when he wrote home and "didn't want to worry us."

A 1965 graduate of Patterson Park High School, he was a member of the football team while in school.

After graduation, he worked for a time at the Fisher Body plant and for a distributor of beauticians' supplies before he was drafted.

Survivors, besides his parents, include two sisters, Mrs. Shirley Starun and Miss Kathy Wernsdorer, both of Baltimore, and three brothers, Ronald and Leonard Wernsdorfer, both of Baltimore, and John J. Wernsdorfer, of Jacobus, Pa.

DIED AT QUANG TRI

Corporal Lee, 21, was killed March 6 by a sniper's bullet near Gio Linh in Quang Tri province, according to his mother.

He had two more weeks to serve in Vietnam after seeing considerable combat duty near the border zone during his eleven months there.

Mrs. Lee said her son enlisted in the Marine Corps on September 28, 1966, while his family thought he was enrolling for his senior year at the University of Maryland.

His enlistment carried on a Marine Corps tradition in the family, Corporal Lee's father retired from the Corps in 1957 with the rank of major. He had served eighteen years.

"He was brought up in a Marine Corps family," his mother, a former WAVE, said yesterday. "He believed he had to do something to help in Vietnam."

STAR BASEBALLER

The young marine was majoring in education at the University of Maryland. He was graduated in 1964 from Thomas Jefferson High School in a suburb of Pittsburgh, where he was a standout in baseball, his mother said.

Besides his parents, he is survived by a sister, Jacqueline Lee, and a brother, Seaman Michael B. Lee, who recently finished a tour of Navy duty on the U.S.S. Oriskany off Vietnam.

Wisconsin Housewife Spurs Credit Bill

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, not long ago I introduced a bill in the House to help protect American consumers against erroneous, incomplete, and malicious

credit reports. The bill, H.R. 15627, currently is pending before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

The original impetus for this proposal came from a housewife in Greendale, Wis., whose family had been the victim of an erroneous credit report.

This woman, Mrs. Rita D. Collins, visited my office here in Washington to explain the problem and to suggest a possible remedy.

Because of her presentation, I initiated, through my staff, a study of the problems caused by mistaken and inaccurate credit reports. The findings confirmed the truth of Mrs. Collins' charges. Subsequently, after conferring with experts with the Library of Congress, the President's Council on Consumer Interests, and the legislative counsel's office, I introduced my proposal, H.R. 15627.

In my initial statements on the bill, I paid tribute to Mrs. Collins as an outstanding American citizen who has been willing to devote considerable time, effort, and money to a cause in which she strongly believes.

Her story demonstrates once again the ability of each individual in a democracy to make a contribution to the progress and welfare of his or her fellow citizens.

Both local newspapers, the morning Milwaukee Sentinel and the afternoon Milwaukee Journal, have devoted news stories to Mrs. Collins' effort. Because of the pertinency of these stories to my bill, I am pleased to insert those articles at this point in the RECORD and urge the attention of my colleagues to them:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Mar. 7, 1968]

COUPLE'S CREDIT WOE LEADS TO U.S. BILL

(By Nancy Dannheisser)

A large part of America's affluence today rests on credit. At the end of 1966 total consumer credit in the United States jumped to $95 billion, an increase of 8% over the previous year. It has been estimated that about 60% of the average American's net income goes to credit obligations.

Gaining credit and using it wisely has been a major problem among the poor. But credit problems also arise among the middle class buyers.

APPLIED FOR LOAN

Two years ago Mr. and Mrs. Billings J. Collins, of 7017 Dorchester la., Greendale, applied for a bank loan on their car. Collins is a teacher and his wife is a student social worker. Yet the bank turned them down, saying their credit record showed a judgment outstanding.

The credit report was mistaken. The judgment was against another Collins.

"We were never able to find out which agency was responsible for the recording," says Mrs. Collins. "And the burden was on us to disprove the report."

Reviving from the embarrassment of the experience, (the couple eventually borrowed from a credit union which gets reports from a different source), Mrs. Collins began doing research into the problem of erroneous credit ratings.

In two years she interviewed more than 1,000 persons and found many who had shared the problem. She also found that poor credit ratings also can stem from companies bent on revenge.

CAR REPAIR CASE

In one recent case a University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee professor took his nine month old car to an auto agency to have a light repaired. While doing the repair work, the mechanic knocked out another light, which he offered to fix free of charge.

At the end of the month the professor received a $7 bill for the second light and refused to pay it. Since then he has been harassed by phone, letter and telegram, and the agency is threatening to report him to a credit bureau. No existing law gives the man a chance to protect himself against such a report.

"In studying American government, you always learn about checks and balances. But there are no checks against the credit rating agency," says Mrs. Collins. "Finally I decided how simple it would be if a company was forced to furnish a copy of any information supplied against you."

Last September she journeyed to Washington, D.C., to present her proposal to Wisconsin congressmen. The result was a bill, introduced last month by Rep. Zablocki (D-Wis.), co-sponsored by Rep. Reuss (D-Wis.), aimed at protecting consumers from incorrect, incomplete or malicious credit reports.

In a fact sheet attached to the bill, Zablocki noted: "When consumers are refused credit for no apparent reason, their natural reaction is to attempt to find out why. In most cases it is all but impossible to do so because the credit bureaus and their customers have erected a wall of silence around their operations to protect them from lawsuits.

CAN'T SEE OWN

"Although for $25-$50 one can buy a credit bureau's services and get information on perhaps millions of other persons, an individual is never allowed to see his own credit report. The most any agency will do is accept a written complaint which may or may not be checked out."

Under Zablocki's bill a creditor must disclose the identity of the rating agency upon request from a credit applicant. And the rating agency must, upon request, disclose the contents of its report.

"Every American has the constitutional right to confront witnesses against him," says Zablocki.

The proposal affects only credit agencies which operate in interstate commerce or make use of the facilities of interstate commerce. Thus, inquiries among merchants in the same community are not covered.

"People who feel as I do should appeal to their congressmen," advises Mrs. Collins. "An agency gathering information responsibly should have no objection to furnishing a copy of their reports."

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Mar. 7, 1968]

CREDIT GOOF LEADS TO DISCLOSURE BILL

(By Mildred Freese)

Someone goofed two years ago and mistakenly gave a Greendale woman and her husband a bad credit rating.

If she has her way, there will soon be a credit disclosure law that will help prevent this. Mrs. Rita B. Collins, 7017 Dorchester la., a mother of six who refers to herself as "an everyday citizen," has been persistent.

"One voice can change things," she said Wednesday.

Two years ago a bank refused a car loan for Mrs. Collins and her husband, Billings, a junior high school teacher. The bank had received a financial rating from a credit agency which erroneously reported that the Collinses owed money to a trucking firm.

AGENCY PROTECTED

The bank, in keeping with the common practice, would not identify the credit agency or allow the Collinses to see the report. The Collinses got an affidavit from the trucking firm clearing them for the loan, but as far as they know the credit agency still may have the error in its files.

Mrs. Collins thought there should be a law requiring a credit agency to provide a copy of the credit report to the person involved.

Any mistakes could be corrected and additional information might change the credit report, she said.

For about a year, she talked about the need for such a law. At the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee where Mrs. Collins, 44, is a graduate student in social sciences, she talked with professors and "anybody who'd bend an ear."

GOES TO WASHINGTON

Last fall she went to Washington with a written proposal and presented it to various congressmen.

Last week a credit disclosure bill was introduced in congress by Rep. Clement J. Zablocki (D-Wis.). It was cosponsored by Rep. Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.) and three other congressmen.

"Thousands of Americans each year are caused embarrassment, inconvenience and financial loss because of mistaken or incomplete credit reporting," Zablocki said.

$1,000 PENALTY

The bill would require credit rating agencies to disclose the contents of a report to the person involved, if requested.

If it is an adverse report, the facts or allegations upon which the report is based must be explained.

It provides for a maximum penalty of $1,000 and one year's imprisonment.

The right to review a credit report and confront an agency has been discussed for some time by consumer protection specialists. "There ought to be a law," each has said. But Mrs. Collins did something.

She said she didn't think her visit to Washington and the letters she wrote to congressmen would have paid off had the idea been unique.

"It had to be the thought of many to have had results so soon," she said.

The bill still must pass congress and be signed into law.

"If you could say something so that people would write their congressmen and tell them that they want the law, it would help a lot," said Mrs. Collins, who speaks from experience.

From Moscow's Izvestia to Washington's Post

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, this coming July 14–20, 1968, Americans throughout the country will celebrate the 10th observance of Captive Nations Week. Since the congressional passage of the Captive Nations Week Resolution—Public Law 86–90—in 1959, the annual observance has expanded and is even officially maintained in 15 foreign countries. Because of the continued captivity of some 27 nations in the Red empire, notably in the Soviet Union itself, this coming 10th observance promises to be the most significant and successful one yet.

Preparations for this observance are now underway under the guidance of the National Captive Nations Committee. The President will soon be called upon by this committee to issue an early Captive Nations Week Proclamation, with emphasis placed on the 17 million captive North Vietnamese. One part of the preparation is the circulation of an illuminating article titled "From Moscow's Izvestia to Washington's Post," written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University. Published in the winter issue of

the Ukrainian Quarterly, an authoritative journal of East European and Asian affairs, the article is must reading for everyone interested in some challenging aspects of this growing movement. The article follows:

FROM MOSCOW'S IZVESTIA TO WASHINGTON'S POST

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

The 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, which was celebrated for a week up to November 7, 1967, disclosed a number of instructive items. There was the disclosure of Moscow's orbital missile, the firmness of its anti-American policy, particularly in Vietnam, the single-man ascent of Brezhnev, the continued concentration on capital and war goods as against consumer goods production, and the persistent attempt on the part of the Soviet Russian totalitarians to exercise their superior leadership over the world Comunist Party movement. As concerns the last, this would only be a political and ceremonial reaffirmation of the primary power position of the Russian center in the Soviet Union in relation to all other states in the Red Empire, including mainland China, and also in relation to the Communist Parties in the Free World.

But significant, too, were the comments and observations made of this "50th" by American commentators, journalists, and periodical writers. In fact, this aspect constituted the prime disclosure of the event. Without itemizing the popular magazines, such as Life and Look, and detailing their specific comments, it is sufficient here to point out that their uncritical handling and assessment of the facts provided Moscow with a billion dollar propaganda windfall. Their comments on "Russia's economic progress" these past fifty years, its mighty armed forces and space exploits, its slow evolution toward "capitalist" ways of thinking and doing and similar matters can all be taken as superficial and devoid of perspective and meaning. Reading some of these accounts, one would think that these accomplishments were effected without incalculable and irrational costs in lives and economic value, as though fifty years of Soviet Russian totalitarianism and imperio-colonialism were unblemished by genocide, concentration camps, man-made famine, the cruelest forms of oppression and continuous aggression.

Most important in this interesting episode was the almost complete neglect shown by our commentators and writers toward the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR. The average American reader of these popular magazines wouldn't think they even existed. On the basis of what was presented to him in these magazines and several newspapers, he couldn't possibly entertain the thought that there exists any such thing as Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism within the Soviet Union itself. Some of our writers haven't even a working awareness of the multi-national nature of the USSR, no less its empire-state character. To cite one example, a columnist refers to Red China and the USSR as "two very large nations," evidently completely ignorant of the fact that since 1963 the Red Chinese who can boast of a national entity, have been attacking Moscow on the Russian/captive non-Russian scale in the USSR.[1] In the same organ, another summarizes the event in this vein: "But the whole thrust of the celebrations was aimed at boosting Brezhnev's image as if it was felt that *the nation* needs a stronger voice than merely a collective one."[2]

[1] Richard Wilson, "Soviet Union Playing Long-Haul Power Game," *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., November 8, 1967.

[2] Bernard Gwertzman, "Curtain Falls Quietly on Soviet Jubilee," *The Evening Star*, November 8, 1967.

KNOW YOUR ENEMY

As this writer has constantly stressed, one of the most formidable weapons at the disposal of Moscow in the Cold War is the protracted ignorance of numerous opinion-makers in this country concerning the make-up, policies, and strategy and tactics of the Soviet Union, which is dominated by the Soviet Russian totalitarians. If fundamental concepts of state and nation, Russian and non-Russian, elude them, what worth can we impute to their interpretations and higher formulations? As I show in my current work, the ultimate responsibility for this general state of confusion and misinformation rests with our Government where similar misleading conceptions abound.[3] Time is short in getting to know your enemy—Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism—and it is our Government, not the universities and their time-lengths, that can achieve this in the shortest possible period.

In offsetting the untruths and fantasies built about the Russian Bolshevik "50th," Americans of Ukrainian ancestry can well take pride in their World Congress in New York during the week of November 12–19. The full-page ads in *The New York Times* related the essential story of Soviet Russian conquest and domination of Ukraine.[4] The demonstration in front of the United Nations building was most impressive and received TV, radio, and news coverage.[5] And the rally in Madison Square Garden, attended by some 13,000, was a tremendous highlight which preceded the march to the Soviet U.N. Mission.[6] The demonstration at the mission produced another highlight of the Congress.[7] On record, no other American group in this country equalled this massive protest against the fraudulence and pretensions of the Russian Bolshevik revolution.

Judging by reports from other sections of the country, the AP and UPI release on this mammoth demonstration were carried in local newspapers and over TV and radio media. In performing this feat, Americans of Ukrainian ancestry have, in effect, done their share at this time in pointing to the real enemy whose tentacles reach into places like Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, and Egypt. This powerful, yet from another viewpoint, fragile enemy is Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, which was given birth to by the Russian Bolshevik revolution.

However, the Congress and the demonstrations were far more positive than negative. The negation of the Russian Bolshevik "50th" was only one major aspect of this memorable event. More important and consequential was the positive affirmation of the continuous Ukrainian National Revolution and the launching of the patriotic, national "50ths," commencing with the 50th Anniversary of Ukraine's Independence on January 22, 1968. This will be followed by the Lithuanian "50th" in February and numerous others through the Latvian "50th" in November, all pointing to the present captivity of the non-Russian nations in the USSR. In short, all of this is interwoven with the whole captive nations thesis as set forth in the Congressional Captive Nations Week Resolution (Public Law 86–90) and as expounded by participating groups annually in the Captive Nations Week Observance.

[3] Lev E. Dobriansky, *The Vulnerable Russians*, Pageant Press, New York, 1967, pp. 454.

[4] "Ukrainian National Revolution vs. Russian Bolshevik Revolution!," *The New York Times*, November 16, 19, 1967.

[5] Ukrainians Protest Slavery," *Daily News*, New York, November 18, 1967.

[6] "Stepping Out for Freedom," *Sunday News*, New York, November 19, 1967.

[7] Police Repulse 2,000 Marchers at Soviet U.N. Mission," *The New York Times*, November 19, p. 1, 4; "Cops Break Up Charge on UN Soviet Mission," *Sunday News*, p. 21.

THE IZVESTIA ATTACK

What has been described in the preceding sections is only a further projection of the fundamental problem of U.S. policy toward the USSR. Controversy and debate over this problem have centered on the Captive Nations Week since its inception in July, 1959, its chief premise that the captive nations *in toto* are of paramount value to U.S. strategy and tactics in the Cold War. In the summer of 1967 a new episode developed in this continuing battle involving, as so often in the past, colonialist Moscow and a prominent American newspaper organ. The details of this outstanding episode begin with an attack against the Week and also this writer in Moscow's government newspaper *Izvestia* and extend to this day with an open challenge to the editors of *The Washington Post*. A familiarity with these details can enable one to see and appreciate the urgent need for a thorough U.S. review of its present policy toward the USSR.

It is highly significant that as in every preceding year since 1959, Moscow again decided to inveigh against Captive Nations Week. Sarcasm, vituperative bitterness, and sheer vehemence have consistently punctuated its attacks. Here are several samples of 1967 vintage under the caption "A Champion Cynic."[8] Manifesting some sardonic humor, the attack begins in this fashion: "In the United States of America, at Georgetown University, a world record has been established. It was established not by a runner or swimmer, not even by a spaghetti eater, but by Professor Lev Dobriansky, a big wheel in the American propaganda machinery and Chairman of the so-called National Committee on Captive Nations."

The attack assumes a more serious tone in the next paragraph. "The point is that the Washington rulers celebrate each year in July a propaganda spectacle called 'Captive Nations Week,' which sets people's 'teeth on edge.'" After talking about "the emigre scum," "capitalism" and the like, the frustrated writer interjects, "Usually, prominent government leaders of the U.S.A. shed a few tears, too." The commentary continues: "This time, the approach of the notorious 'Week' is being widely commented on by the American reactionary press. During the past years the 'Week' has been in crisis and passing without effect, the anti-Communists complain; it is necessary, from nice words on liberty to change to deeds. They even blame Washington for not showing a firm determination to support 'the peoples of the captive nations.' Something new is needed, they say." Although it cannot be denied that the Administrations since 1959 have feared a courageous implementation of the Resolution and thus have toned down the presidential proclamations, there is obviously much wishful thinking here about the Week being in crisis and the cry for something new. By all evidence, the Week has expanded in scope, both nationally and internationally, and constantly represents the new alternative to the threadbare policy pursued toward the USSR and the entire Red Empire.

Among other things mentioned in this attack is Vietnam, evidently a source of irritation to Moscow when properly brought into the captive nations context. "It is here," the attack continues, "that Professor Dobriansky established his record. It would be a record in stupidity if it was not a record in cynicism." Why? Because in "the center of attention of the 'Week,' Dobriansky has declared, referring to the wishes of the Washington leadership, there will be this year 'the disastrous condition of the 17 millions of enslaved North Vietnamese.'"[9] In truth, this was highlighted during the 1967 Week, and it

[8] *Izvestia*, July 7, 1967.

[9] Complete text of *Izvestia* article is quoted in *The Ukrainian Bulletin*, October 1–15, 1967, p. 85.

is encouraging to witness its effects in terms of wider discussion about invading North Vietnam, not by American troops but rather by South Vietnamese guerrillas and some regulars. North Vietnam is a captive nation, and its enslaved millions are the ultimate key to victory over the totalitarian Hanoi regime. They are also the key to a unified and independent Vietnam. Should all this come to pass, the 1967 Week would have accomplished its purpose, indeed.

THE POST ATTACK

Three days later, on July 10, the editors of *The Washington Post* also came forward with a blistering editorial attack against the Week and this writer. The striking parallel here causes one to lean toward the apt characterization of yesteryear "The Washington Pravda," which would have made for an even more attractive title. However, regardless of the vicious editorial against my person, I deem such a characterization unfair. The *Post* is more than its editors and owner, and although Senator McCarthy often relished using this characterization, he certainly didn't grasp the issue at hand in his time. Moreover, many reporters and others at the *Post* are at variance with the paper's editorial opinions, and surely the type of editorial produced here scarcely reflects well on those responsible for it. The *Post's* July 10, 1967 editorial is a classic in irresponsible and unenlightened journalism and deserves to be read in full. Here it is: [10]

CAPTIVE CONGRESSMEN

Captive Nations Week is almost upon us, and so it's time to pine again for Idel-Ural, Turkestan, White Ruthenia and—don't forget—good old Cossackia. These pseudo-states and others of better historical repute are listed in Congress' Captive Nations Resolution as having lost their "national independence" to the wicked Communists. "The people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence," in case you didn't know.

This fanciful cold-war rhetoric was issued by Congress in 1959 in a surge of hysterical anti-communism. Or rather, it was issued by ethnic manipulator Lev Dobriansky, father of the Captive Nations idea, and foisted by him upon a Congress sensitive to the presumed sentiments of Americans from now-Communist lands. Actually, many of these Americans, if not most of them, are insulted by being treated as hyphenated citizens. The annual Captive Nations charade might better be called Captive Congressmen Week.

Its aspect of ethnic discrimination is particularly offensive. For, it turns out, Russia is not among the Captive Nations. The reason for this strange omission is that Mr. Dobriansky's heart belongs to his ancestors' native Ukraine, and Ukrainian nationalism is nothing if not anti-Russian. This is, in our view, precisely the kind of old-country ethnic backbiting that has no place in a gambit designed to influence American policy.

To those who do not share faith that Captive Nations Week will crack the Kremlin, Mr. Dobriansky has prepared an insidious rebuttal. "High on the priority list in Red psycho-political warfare," he has written, "is the downgrading and eventual elimination of Captive Nations Week." The technique of attributing criticism to foreign manipulation is, unfortunately, typical.

To his credit, President Johnson has shown some embarrassment over the Resolution, which "authorizes and requests" him to proclaim Captive Nations Week annually. He has avoided specifying which countries are Captive Nations and has stressed instead American support for the "just aspirations" of peoples everywhere. Clearly, Mr. Johnson rejects the Resolution's tenet that "Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence." He believes, as most Americans do, that all available openings to East-West peace and stability should be explored.

Having had long experience with the *Post's* treatment of letters-to-the-editor, I had but one choice in the immediate situation. That was to send the editors a short letter establishing formally our exchange and at the same time offering a concrete challenge. Again on the basis of past experience with the ostensibly liberal minds in command of the paper, I anticipated correctly that neither my brief letter nor critical letters from others would be published in the pages of the *Post*. This turned out to be the case, but other avenues of publication were managed for the most essential letters of criticism. Reproduced here is my immediate letter, which is self-explanatory, and then we can proceed from it to a systematic evaluation of the *Post's* substantive opinions and the challenge it raises: [11]

Aside from its malicious overtones, your July 10 editorial on "Captive Congressmen" is so absurd, both logically and empirically, that I am fully convinced my forthcoming book on *The Vulnerable Russians* will be of enormous value to you. Scheduled for publication release this October as "An American Answer to the '50th'—The Fraudulent Russian Bolshevik Revolution," the work will not only place imperio-colonialist Moscow on notice that not all Americans, by a long shot, are fools as concerns its empire in the USSR itself, but it will also, I am sure, be a permanent answer to you and other segments of Moscow's-induced breed of Pavlovian dogs in our country.

Having had long experience with your letter-cutting and omitting techniques because of "want of space" and other convenient rationalizations—in itself scarcely a symbol of journalistic honesty—I offer here a simple, formal challenge which I raised publicly on July 15 at the Captive Nations Conference in the Mayflower Hotel. It is a challenge for you to receive some elementary education on Soviet-Russian imperio-colonialism. Simply, I challenge you to arrange a discussion meeting in the *Post's* auditorium, which would bring you face-to-face with living victims of Soviet-Russian imperio-colonialism from Idel-Ural, Turkestan, White Ruthenia, and Cossackia.

It doesn't require much courage to shield one's ignorance behind an editorial pen and continue to misinform your readers about the true nature of the USSR. Let us see how courageous you are in meeting these people—whom you think are ghosts without a national background of independence struggle—before the audience of the *Post's* personnel who, in this setting, would have the opportunity to gauge the level of their editors' understanding of this vital problem. Here, too, I am confident that quite a number of our citizens will be interested in your response to this challenge.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Professor, Georgetown University, Chairman, National Captive Nations Committee.

AN EDITORIAL OF IGNORANCE

Comparing the *Izvestia* article and the *Post* editorial, the reader by now is doubtless impressed by their similarities in tone, character, and content. The *Post* editorial might well have been written in Moscow except that the motivation of the Russian totalitarians would be one of circumspect distortion rather than blind ignorance. The editorial is, indeed, one of ignorance. A highly reputable organ run by Americans of Armenian ancestry, which was not given a hearing by the *Post's* editors, goes a bit further by saying, "The offending editorial is really not an editorial; it is a cartoon in the worst possible taste calculated to destroy an issue by the application of the great American belly-laugh." [12] It is also an insult to our legislators for, as *Hairenik* states further, the editorial "has caricatured not only their motivation in expressing their warm support of the common cause of the Captive Nations of the Soviet, but has in effect cavalierly scorned the sacred aspirations to be free (as *The Washington Post* is free) of 119,000,000 non-Russians who, today, in a classic syndrome of colonialism, are dominated by a minority of 96,000,000, the Russians of the Soviet Union."

Now, point by point, let's examine this editorial cartoon. First, brushing aside its silly sarcasms and belly-laughs, we meet at the outset a definitive statement that Idel-Ural, Turkestan, White Ruthenia, and "good old Cossackia" are pseudo-states which really shouldn't be listed in the Captive Nations Week Resolution. Mind you, this is the last word of precise knowledge from literary artisans who know there are no such animals in the human kingdom as "the wicked Communists." This first argument alone reveals how pathetically ignorant the editors are. Historically, each of these national entities staked out an independent state in the 1917–23 period. This isn't the place to teach them history, but if they would move their lazy minds, a quick reading of Idel-Ural and its revolution in 1917 would show the writers how foolish they really are. [13] Analytically, they also don't make sense. White Ruthenia is Byelorussia, a Republic-state in the USSR. Then, even if all four had never attained to statehood, they possess more national substance than can be found in most states of Africa; and the Resolution talks about captive nations, not states. The vital distinction between nation and state is obviously too heavy for our omniscient editors.

Regarding these national entities, the views expressed by the many who sent their letters to the *Post's* editors, only to have them liberally suppressed from publication, make for some choice reading. One, for example, after having cited the population of each of these entities, states, "In 1918, they were all proclaimed independent National Republics and were on the road to rebuilding their countries before being brutally destroyed by Russia in the name of "world Communism." [14] A young scholar at Columbia University, who has written *Marxism and Existentialism*, published by Doubleday, strikes a point in his suppressed letter: "Before becoming comic about Idel-Ural and Turkestan, it would be wise to remember that no more than two hundred years ago America was a tiny, backward nation whose struggle for national independence evoked a sarcastic smile on the faces of the 'sophisticates' of Britain and Europe. [15] Need more be said about the *Post's* sophisticates?"

Aside from the childish, personal slur, the second point made in the editorial is that the Resolution is "fanciful cold-war rhetoric" issued in "a surge of hysterical anti-communism." This interpretation is far removed from the facts. Anyone who knows the facts of the quiet and deliberative passage of the resolution in Congress, the explosion in Moscow, and Khrushchev's apoplectic harangues over this event, cannot but

[10] "Captive Congressmen," editorial, *The Washington Post*, July 10, 1967.

[11] Lev E. Dobriansky, "Letter to the Editor of *The Washington Post*," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 19, p. 25633.

[12] "The Washington Post: A Captive Organ," *The Hairenik Weekly*, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 19, p. 25634.

[13] "Anniversary of First Revolution, By Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 24, pp. 32266–32268.

[14] Walter Tutka, Letter-to-the-Editor, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 19, p. 25634.

[15] Walter Odajnyk, Letter-to-the-Editor, *The Ukrainian Bulletin*, October 1–15 1967, p. 88.

wonder where our editors hibernated at the time, and even since then. Theirs is a sad case of misplaced hysteria. As *Hairenik* accurately points out, "the *Post* apparently is unaware that since 1959 the Soviet Government has directed an intensive worldwide propaganda effort against the Captive Nations cause, for there is no doubt in the least that the Achilles heel of the Soviet is its captive world—and the Kremlin knows this."[16] Offering a concise historical background on Russian imperialism from the days of Muscovy, another suppressed letter stresses that "the idea of the Week has transcended our own leaders and promises to awaken countless other individuals and nations to the historical character of Russian imperio-colonialism."[17]

The *Post's* third point is clearly an argument of desperation, which it attempted to use during "the Shevchenko affair" in 1963–64. Because of the resolution, it holds that most Americans who come from now-Communist lands "are insulted by being treated as hyphenated citizens." This supposedly brilliant argument ignores completely the experiences these citizens have to offer for our benefit and security, the heavy participation of native Americans in the annual Week, and the mythical nature of the argument itself. As one letter pointedly states, "Yearly observances indicate that Americans from all walks of life participate in observances and express their support of the traditional American principles for freedom and independence of nations."[18] It then drives home the additional observation, "During the last Israel-Arab conflict, American Jews supported Israel 100%. I have not seen anything that stated or even implied that they were 'hyphenated' citizens. American Irish actively supported Ireland's struggle for independence, without being accused of 'hyphenated' citizenship or 'old-country ethnic backbiting.'" Evidently, the *Post* reserves its argument only for those who oppose the Russian colonialists.

Another suppressed letter dwells on this same point in this vein: "Only the *Post* could conjure up a 'hyphenated citizen.' Benjamin Franklin, one of this country's founding fathers, is credited with the view that anyone ashamed of his forebears could add little to our country. This would certainly discredit hyphenated citizenship, not to mention the editor's mythical non-ethnic origins."[19] The classic Coolidge statement on immigrants and Americanism could be thrown in for added measure.

Going from the absurd to the ridiculous, the *Post* now charges "ethnic discrimination" in the resolution because Russia is not mentioned and, with baseless reference to the writer, "Ukrainian nationalism is nothing if not anti-Russian." The conqueror of other nations is scarcely qualified for such listing, no more than a circle is a square. Also, to be anti-Russian imperio-colonialist does not mean being anti-Russian as concerns the Russian people at large, who have been captive in another sense for literally 500 years, namely to barbaric Russian institutions of tyranny, genocide, and imperialism. As another suppressed statement puts it, *"The Post,* consciously or not, upholds the foundation of the Russian empire, with all its ugly and inhuman features, including anti-Semitism. No wonder that in past years *The Post's* policy on the captive nations was praised by the Communist press within the Soviet-Union."[20] *Hairenik* again sums it up in good humor, "Let us here draw a smile. To list Russia as a Captive Nation would be to have listed England with India, Uganda, Kenya etc., etc., among the territories of the British Empire which were candidates for decolonialization!"[21]

In essence, Ukrainian nationalism is no different from American nationalism and scores of others that brought independence from a foreign, imperialist power and for the self-determination of people. One of the suppressed letters puts this cogently, "In the days when more African peoples have won their independence, to deny the right to freedom for Ukraine, Armenia . . . is a contradiction to the concept of universal freedom and justice which is talked about so much in the free world nowadays."[22] What the writer is unaware of is the fact that the *Post* operates on a double politico-moral standard.

The Post's further contention that this writer "has prepared an insidious rebuttal" on the downgrading of the Week and "attributing criticism to foreign manipulation" can be disposed of briefly. It is a figment of their own imagination. However, as the record well shows, it is interesting to observe how the Red totalitarians, the Kennans, *The Post,* and a few others have shared the same objective. And, finally, is adulation of the President's omission of the countries specified in the resolution and his ostensible rejection of the resolution's tenet that "Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence" is also largely inflated. From Eisenhower to the present, identical omissions have been made chiefly because of a fear of irritating the Bear and not knowing how to implement the resolution. As for the second item, it would be absorbing, to say the least, to see the President openly support *The Post's* statement at face value.

It may astound the editors to learn that we, too, are for a genuine "peaceful coexistence," not the present Russian ersatz type, and for openings to East-West peace and stability, but based on principle, truth, and expanded freedom, not blind and obscurantist impulses. As a suppressed letter states it, "We do not believe, however, that such an exploration should be on the account of the captive nations in tightening their captivity, but rather in supporting their right to freedom and self-determination."[23] As another suppressed one views it, "Peaceful coexistence may be a tempting policy—but if it means peace at any price, then it is certainly a prelude to war . . ."[24] And as a last suppressed one puts it, "The National Captive Nations Committee is in the forefront of a people-to-people program for peace and stability—much more so than the *Post*—for NCNC dares to mention the forgotten peoples—those in the USSR!"[25]

The reader has noticed my challenge to the editors of the *Post,* contained in my suppressed letter of July 17, 1967. "I challenge you," it read, "to arrange a discussion meeting in the *Post's* auditorium, which would bring you face-to-face with living victims of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism from Idel-Ural, Turkestan, White Ruthenia, and Cossackia. . . . Let us see how courageous you are in meeting those people—whom you think are ghosts without a national background of independence struggle—before the audience of the *Post's* personnel who, in this setting, would have the opportunity to gauge the level of their editors' understanding of this vital problem."[26]

THE OUTSTANDING CHALLENGE

In view of the *Post's* editorial, this, you will agree, is a most reasonable challenge. To this day, there hasn't been a whimper from the editors concerning it. Just stony silence. Meanwhile, able representatives of these national entities have stood ready to engage in such a constructive discussion. Their counterparts in the Soviet Union may be muted by Russian tyranny, but here no one will mute them, least of all the *Post's* editors. The challenge is outstanding.

The double standard of the *Post* should be recognized by all. When, for example, its editors sharply criticize the Greek Junta for curbing free speech and assert "That is hardly the behavior of a government prepared to let its opposition speak," the integrity of its words can be properly weighed on the scale of its own policy and behavior.[27] So, too, captive non-Russians in the USSR speak out at times and are arrested and confined to forced labor, and Americans who keep abreast of all this, also speak out in criticism of our Government's inept policy toward the USSR. By all means, let the opposition speak, but everywhere and not just those areas determined by double-standard judgments. In behalf of opposition speech, I repeat, the challenge still remains outstanding.

Pollution of Lake Michigan

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD an excellent resolution on pollution of Lake Michigan adopted by the Michigan United Conservation Clubs, one of the great conservation organizations of the Nation. This resolution speaks clearly and effectively for the preservation of Lake Michigan.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON POLLUTION OF LAKE MICHIGAN

Whereas, it is a demonstrated fact that the pollution of Lake Michigan is increasing at a rapidly accelerated rate which already has and will continue to reduce the beneficial uses of the lake and increase the hazard to health; and

Whereas, the major sources of this pollution are the rivers that empty into the lake and the municipalities, industries, commercial establishments and farmlands that border on the lake; and from dredgings, watercraft and alewives in the lake; and

Whereas, up to the present, public and private efforts to reduce the pollution of Lake Michigan and the streams that drain into it are not sufficient to restore the quality of Lake Michigan waters so that they shall be of maximum beneficial value; and

Whereas, it appears that the only effective means of alleviating the pollution of Lake Michigan is an immediate, concerted effort on the part of Federal, State and local units of government, including, strong enforcement penalties; and

Whereas, studies by professionals in the field of pollution abatement indicate that there are certain measures which, if initiated at once by the appropriate government agencies, would do much toward bringing about a solution to this problem:

Therefore be it resolved that the *Indiana Conservation Council,* the *Illinois Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs,* the *Wisconsin Wildlife Federation,* and the *Michigan United*

---

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 25634.

[17] Walter Pretka, Letter-to-the-Editor, daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 1, 1967, p. A3898.

[18] O. Szczudluk, Letter-to-the-Editor, daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 19, p. 25633.

[19] Vera A. Dowhan, Letter-to-the-Editor, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 15, p. 20019.

[20] Peregrinus, "The Washington Post and Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 19, p. 25633.

[21] Ibid., p. 25634.

[22] Walter Tutka, *op. cit.*, p. 25633.

[23] O. Szczudluk, *op. cit.*, p. 25633.

[24] Walter Odajnyk, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

[25] Vera A. Dowhan, *op. cit.*, p. 20019.

[26] Ibid., p. 25633.

[27] "The Right Direction," *Editorial, The Washington Post,* October 9, 1967.

Conservation Clubs jointly urge that the Federal, State and local governments embark now, before it is too late, on a vigorous and accelerated overall program to eliminate the further pollution of Lake Michigan; and

Be it further resolved to urge that such program shall include a careful consideration of the following recommended measures:

1. Abatement of the discharge of solids into the Lake Michigan system and filling by erosion.

2. Reduction in disposal of wastes high in oxygen demand and nutrients into Lake Michigan and its tributaries.

3. Curtailment of the use of persistent pesticides and the release of other poisons into the Lake Michigan watershed.

4. Steps to halt filling of shallow areas of the lake.

5. A firm control over thermal loading that will enable us to forecast the effects of various levels of heat loading on the waters and the climate.

6. Where possible, a monitoring system to detect and trace discharge of oils, chemicals and other contaminants to clean water.

7. Control of alewife die-off.

8. Agreement on means to prohibit industrial classification of waters in the Lake Michigan watershed.

Negro Schoolchildren

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the whole sorry record of neglect of education of our young Negro boys and girls in the District of Columbia public schools is effectively summed up in a column by William Raspberry in the Washington Post edition of March 20, 1968. There is no doubt in my mind that a similar column, with only the names and dates changed, could be written about most public school systems in the Nation in which Negroes are enrolled.

However, the situation is particularly inexcusable because Negroes number about 90 percent of the total public school enrollment in the District and almost as high a percentage in other grades. When nine out of 10 schoolchildren are being short changed the consequences can only be disastrous—and this in the capital of the Nation.

The harvest of bigotry, discrimination, and racism, disguised as administrative indifference and inertia, has done little to stir us as citizens or Members of Congress. Some of us might well spend less time denouncing Mississippi and Alabama and more time tending to problems in our own Northern communities.

Under unanimous consent I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

(By William Raspberry)

Many of the west-of-the-Park parents who are biting their nails in anxiety over what new boundaries the School Board will come up with see themselves as victims of a pushy Julius Hobson and an overzealous Judge Wright.

They are looking in the wrong direction. The true villains are their neighbors and predecessors in the nice part of town from whom they have inherited the problem of unequal education. A good many of them would just as soon pass it on to yet another generation.

Even before the public schools here were desegregated the white parents of affluence and influence had a chance to do something to improve the educational prospects of Negro children. They chose, instead, to do as little as they could get away with, while maintaining the status quo for their own children.

They knew—they must have known—that they were merely postponing the problem. But they knew, too, that if they could postpone it for long enough, their own children would no longer be in the public school system. This is how the problem got handed down from year to year, and this is why it has been inherited by the parents of the current school population.

Twenty years ago, for example, parents of pupils at the all-Negro Browne Junior High protested the fact that their children were getting only part-time instruction because for five of the previous six years Browne had been operating a double shift.

The response was to explain why nothing could be done to relieve the crowding at Browne.

Six months later, Browne parents came back with the suggestion that Eliot Junior High, then operating at about 80 per cent of capacity, be transferred to the Negro division. And again came the explanations why nothing could be done. None of the reasons given, incidentally, had the slightest reference to the needs of Browne school or its pupils.

The school administration refused to act, in fact, until Browne parents staged a boycott. The "solution" was to transfer two eight-room elementary school buildings (both about 40 years old and both operating below capacity) to the Negro division.

There were no science or economics classrooms, of course, and students in these courses were sent across Benning Road for half-day shifts at Browne's overloaded facilities.

But no matter. The arrangement made it possible to silence the Negro parents, while assuring the white ones that their children would continue to get full-time, full-scale education in the still more-than-adequate space at Eliot.

Or take 1949, when the local chapter of the American Federation of Teachers appealed to the School Board to transfer either Central or Roosevelt High School to the Negro division to ease the load on Cardozo.

Cardozo had been built in 1905 as the white Business High School, abandoned in 1931 as educationally inadequate and transferred to the Negro division in 1933.

By 1949, Cardozo was operating on triple shifts, at 172.7 per cent of capacity, while only one white high school was about 66 per cent of capacity.

Still, the Board of Education said no to the transfer proposal. Among the reasons cited:

White schools in the past had operated on multiple shifts.

Some 1400 white pupils would be displaced "to gain temporary advantage for Cardozo." Besides, the while pupils would lose their only swimming pool.

White students in Central's "home area" would be without any school of their own. (All Negro schools were citywide at the time.)

The superintendent's solution was to transfer 500 girls from Cardozo to the Park View Elementary School.

As in the Browne case, the responsibility was the superintendent's. But there can be little doubt his action—or inaction—was supported by the bulk of the white parents.

So it went, before desegregation and after. And so it continues now. White parents will agree on the need for quality education for all children, but almost always in terms that will leave their own advantage undiminished.

Now, as one observer puts it, they seem to be saying: "You can fill up our empty spaces, but leave our children in Wilson, Western, Gordon and Deal so they can graduate and get into a prestige college. After that we won't care."

How Would Our Boys in Vietnam Vote on April 2?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, during a primary election on April 2, 1968, citizens of the city of Madison, Wis., will be faced with the responsibility of deciding whether to support a resolution which opposes American military involvement in Vietnam. This "end the war" referendum, an issue of national concern, was approved by the Madison City Council for placement on the ballot following the receipt of a petition in favor of the referendum from nearly 20 percent of the city's eligible voters.

In compliance with State law, the city council was required to place the referendum question on the ballot. However, immediately following this authorization, the council voted unanimously in urging the citizens of Madison to vote against the antiwar resolution.

The resolution, as it will appear on the April election ballot, states:

It is the policy of the people of the City of Madison that there be an immediate cease fire and the withdrawal of United States troops from Vietnam, so that the Vietnamese people can determine their own destiny.

The actual campaign to place the referendum on the ballot involved an intensive effort on the part of several hundred persons who systematically canvassed the entire city with petitions. It has been publicly charged that some of the principal instigators of the referendum, including certain out-of-State students at the University of Wisconsin, were persons whose primary objectives were designed to promote dissension among the American people and to undermine the morale of our armed forces in Vietnam. Moreover, it is readily understood that many of those citizens who signed the referendum petitions were sincerely interested in bringing peace to Southeast Asia; however, their desire for ending the war has apparently been exploited by an active minority which does not have America's best interests at heart.

Several organizations have been devoting their full support to the anti-Vietnam war referendum including the Madison Citizens for a Vote on Vietnam and the Madison Veterans for Peace in Vietnam. I believe the following information concerning these two groups is worthy of consideration.

The Madison Citizens for a Vote on Vietnam—MCVV—whose headquarters is located at 206 King Street, Madison, has functioned as the principal group agitating for support of the referendum. Organizer of the referendum petition drive, the MCVV is a broadly based organization which credits itself for placing the antiwar resolution on the April ballot. The MCVV serves as the coordinating center in Madison for promoting the referendum as well as for disseminating voter information and antiwar literature. The group has published several pieces of printed literature, one of which

is a leaflet entitled "Vote Yes To End the War" containing a list of over 60 sponsors of the MCVV representing Madison businessmen, educators, professional people, and clergymen.

According to a letter sent to the newspaper of the Trotskyist-Communist Socialist Workers Party, the Militant, published in its February 26, 1968, issue, a MCVV sponsor openly urged readers to send needed contributions to the MCVV. The MCVV representative, Paul H. Hass, wrote that the MCVV is "now mounting a full-scale publicity and educational campaign against the war."

The chairman of the MCVV is Maurice Zeitlin, who is a sociology professor at the University of Wisconsin. Zeitlin an avid supporter of the Communist government of Cuba and has been affiliated with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, a notorious front organization for the Castro regime. He also has been an active participant in numerous anti-Vietnam war demonstrations in both California and Wisconsin. Zeitlin was listed as a sponsor of a testimonial dinner held on April 28, 1966, in New York City to celebrate both the 50th birthday of Communist Party national committeeman Herbert Aptheker and the second anniversary of the American Institute for Marxist Studies.

Among the sponsors of the Madison Citizens for a Vote on Vietnam is a well-known agitator in the peace movement, Frank Emspak, a University of Wisconsin graduate and son of a deceased member of the Communist Party. Emspak was the chairman of the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam—NCC—which functioned from its headquarters in Madison for over a year until its dissolution in December 1966. The NCC, whose steering committee included representatives of many subversive organizations, was the leading nationwide coordinator of the antiwar movement, and was responsible for staging a "peace" project called the International Days of Protest, on March 25 and 26, 1966. It is noteworthy that the NCC was formed in Washington, D.C., at the Assembly of Unrepresented People to Declare Peace, held on August 6–9, 1965. Toward the conclusion of the assembly's 4-day protest of our Government's policy in Southeast Asia, Emspak and several hundred other demonstrators were arrested for disorderly conduct as they forcibly attempted to invade the U.S. Capitol.

Emspak has been a stanch supporter of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America—DCA—the youth front of the Communist Party, U.S.A. In addition to having attended meetings of the DCA, Emspak joined with DCA in April 1966 as a coplaintiff in a suit filed in Federal court against the U.S. Attorney General in an attempt to restrain the Subversive Activities Control Board from conducting further proceedings in the case of the DCA. Emspak is a sponsor of a relatively new Communist-supported organization called the Tri-Continental Information Center whose program calls for subverting U.S. military and foreign policies which maintain the security of the free world.

The Madison Veterans for Peace in Vietnam has been an active supporter of the referendum. It has worked closely with the Madison Citizens for a Vote on Vietnam and publicly joined with members of MCVV on the occasion of the opening of MCVV's new headquarters on King Street in Madison on February 28, 1968. The Madison Veterans for Peace, located at 2924 Harvey Street, Apartment 5–G, Madison, is one of over 30 "Veterans for Peace" and "Veterans for Peace in Vietnam" groups located throughout the United States which are linked together as "joint sponsors" of a monthly tabloid newspaper published in Chicago entitled Veterans Stars and Stripes for Peace. According to this newspaper's February 1968 issue, the Madison Veterans for Peace "played a big role in getting an antiwar referendum on the ballot."

The publisher of Veterans Stars and Stripes for Peace is an organization headquartered in Chicago operating under the name of Veterans for Peace in Vietnam. The group maintains two mailing addresses, one located at 1608 West Madison Street, room 201, and the other at Post Office Box 4598. Founded in January 1966, the Chicago Veterans for Peace was organized by LeRoy Wolins who has received considerable publicity as a veteran of the Communist movement. Wolins was identified as a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and as a leader of the Chicago Veterans for Peace as late as February 16, 1967, during the testimony of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.

In 1957, when Wolins was employed as the administrative secretary of the Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship, a Communist-front organization, he traveled to Moscow without possessing a U.S. passport to attend the Communist Sixth World Youth Festival. Wolins himself recruited delegates for this festival through his office at the Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship. During an appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1960, Wolins invoked the fifth amendment when questioned whether he had received funds from a Soviet representative to generate interest in the world youth festival.

Two years later, Wolins again appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. On this second occasion, Wolins took refuge behind the fifth amendment when questioned about his affiliation with Translation World Publishers, a firm specializing in imported Communist literature which was charged with violating the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Wolins invoked the fifth amendment during both appearances before this congressional committee when he was asked about his membership in the Communist Party, U.S.A.

The oldest and largest of the groups which sponsor Veterans Stars & Stripes for Peace is the Veterans for Peace in Vietnam of Post Office Box 28, Old Chelsea Station, New York, N.Y. This organization was initially formed as the ad hoc committee of Veterans for Peace in Vietnam in New York City in November 1965.

The ad hoc committee of veterans, as well as its successor, has run numerous paid advertisements in nationally known newspapers. According to one of its ads which appeared in the New York Times of March 20, 1966, the names of well-known Communist Party leaders and functionaries were listed as supporters including Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and Herbert Aptheker, the party's principal theoretician. In the spring of 1966, the ad hoc committee of veterans became known as the Veterans for Peace in Vietnam. Both the New York and Chicago groups of the Veterans for Peace in Vietnam have participated in numerous antiwar demonstrations, some of which have been sponsored by the Communist-dominated Spring Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, and its successor, the National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam.

A study of the record leads to the conclusion that both the New York and Chicago Veterans for Peace in Vietnam are obvious operations of the Communist Party.

I think the above information is important, for, as Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI observed on February 10, 1966, before a House appropriations subcommittee:

> In furthering the aims and objectives of the international Communist conspiracy, the Communist Party, U.S.A. creates and utilizes Communist front organizations. In this manner the party attempts to conceal and disguise its activities and to lend a semblance of respectability to its operations.

Mr. Hoover further stated that:

> Through these fronts, the party conducts pressure and propaganda campaigns, disseminates Communist literature and propaganda, raises funds, recruits new members and insidiously exploits the masses and public opinion to further its revolutionary aims and purposes.

As for the referendum's proposal to withdraw our troops from Vietnam, I certainly agree with the position of the Madison City Council, which was unanimously opposed. In addition, many letters and published accounts from Vietnam indicate that our servicemen, with their very lives at stake, overwhelmingly support our defense of the Vietnamese people against Communist terror. Our boys are learning through frightful first-hand experience the truth of a basic Communist doctrine which has been recently documented by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in its report, "Communist Commitment to Force and Violence," and which can be procured by writing to the committee.

For those sincere and undecided voters of Madison, I believe this question should be given some consideration: "How would our boys in Vietnam vote on April 2?"

No Retreat for Israel

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following message has been prepared by the

Americans for the Security and Stability of Israel and in my judgment should be of extreme interest to all Americans who respect freedom and democracy.

Israel's survival as a nation should be of concern to all Americans, for Israel alone today stands as a bastion against Soviet expansion in the Middle East.

The case for Israel is expertly stated in the following message:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 5, 1968]

NO RETREAT FOR ISRAEL—MOSCOW-CAIRO AXIS MUST NOT PREVAIL

The Arabs in concert with the Soviet Union are loud in their demand that Israel should retreat to the armistice lines of 1949. Their cry finds an echo among some well-meaning but naive people in support of their stand. Realism and fairness require that right-minded Americans should make known their rejection of such an unwarranted claim.

RIGHT TO THE LAND

Israel has inalienable rights to the Eretz Yisroel territories she won in the war forced upon her by the Arabs and their Soviet Communist allies. Israel's rights are supported by history, geography, and by international sanction.

These territories were part of the mandated area which was placed under the authority of the League of Nations after the first World War. Britain, the League's Mandatory, administered Palestine under the charge of developing the Jewish National Home. The United States sanctioned the Mandate and its purpose by a special convention with Great Britain. The historical bond of the Jewish people with the Land of their forefathers, the Land of the Bible, was thus given international sanction. The U.N., by approving the restoration of the Jewish State, confirmed this bond.

There never was, in fact, an independent Arab State in Palestine.

NO CONQUEST BUT LIBERATION

The Israeli soldiers, forced into a war, entered the battle for the Land not as conquerors and occupiers, but as liberators. They liberated territories which had been forcibly occupied by Egypt and Jordan and they returned them to the rightful owner, the State of Israeli.

ARABS HAVE NO VALID CLAIM

Egypt and Jordan have no rights to the areas Israel wrested from their domination. These territories never rightfully belonged to them.

The west bank of the Jordan, including Old Jerusalem, was illegally occupied by the Jordanians in 1948. They annexed it by unilateral action after the armistice arrangement left them in occupation of the west bank area. It was never ceded to Jordan by Israel nor by any international authority.

Neither was the Gaza Strip Egypt's. This Strip was part of Palestine and included in the Mandate of the League of Nations to be part of the Jewish National Homeland. It was also occupied and held by Egypt under the armistice arrangement of 1949. *It was never incorporated into the State of Egypt. It was administered by Egypt as a separate territory.*

AGGRESSORS CANNOT BE APPEASED

For years, prior to June 5th, Israel was threatened with annihilation. Arabs, through radio and press, promised to destroy the men, women, and children of Israel. The Gulf of Akaba was closed to Israel's shipping by Egypt's armed blockade . . . *in itself an act of war.* Now Israel is urged by some to show "magnanimity" and give up the fruits of the victory she has won by the valor of her soldiers. It is maintained that the Arabs will then reciprocate and make peace with the Jewish State.

Experience has shown that such advice is induced by wishful thinking. Every attempt to appease aggressors proved to be an excursion into futility. Israel learned this lesson the hard way. All peace overtures to the Arabs have only emboldened them to greater acts of bloodshed and pillage.

INVITATION TO MURDER

The armistice lines were an open invitation to marauders and terrorist bands. Israel suffered many casualties from such murderous attacks during Israel's nineteen years of existence.

Israel's 1949 armistice lines were indefensible. Israel could have easily been cut into two or three areas by a sudden attack. Nasser and Hussein were about to launch such an attack. Only Israel's speedy victory saved the nation from disaster.

Israel dares not risk her safety and the lives of her people by returning to the exposed positions of the armistice borders. *No one has a moral right to encourage such an eventuality.*

ISRAELI'S ACCOMPLISHMENT

Soviet Russia formed the axis with Cairo for the sole purpose of achieving the old Russian imperialist ambition: to dominate the Middle East. Had Nasser, Hussein, and Syria been successful in their attack on Israel, the Soviets would have gained control of the Eastern Mediterranean and the gateways to Asia and Africa.

The vital interests of our allies and the U.S. herself would have been imperiled. Israel's victory averted the danger to the U.S. position in the Middle East.

Israel's victory saved the day for the Western democracies. As State Secretary Dean Rusk told Senator Thruston Morton: "It was a victory for the West." It was indeed a victory for the U.S.

ISRAEL MUST NOT BE WEAKENED

The Moscow-Cairo axis seeks Israel's retreat to the armistice lines in order to regain a position of strength to again attack Israel. They are already well advanced in arming for a fourth round of war.

SUPPORT FOR AN ALLY

The American people must not remain indifferent to the designs of the Moscow-Cairo axis against Israel. Justice and our national interest require that we stand by Israel and nourish her determination to retain her present strong and legitimate position.

Now that Israel's request for American planes and arms is under consideration, write to President Johnson, to your Senators and Congressmen urging that no pressure be applied on Israel to withdraw to the former artificial boundaries.

Urge your government to supply Israel, our friend and ally, with weapons for defense. Urge them to give Israel political support for the preservation of her birthright, security, and permanence.

Inserted by Americans for the Security and Stability of Israel, Samuel H. Wang, Organizing Chairman, 227 West 45 Street, New York, N.Y. 10036.

The 50th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, with respect to the 50th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, a private order is being submitted for the reprint publication of all statements and other insertions made by Members of the Senate prior to, during, and after the January 22, 1968, event, which was observed in the Senate on January 23, 1968.

If there is no objection from any Senator, his or her statement or insertion will be incorporated in the reprint brochure, which has been requested by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

SENATE—*Thursday, March 21, 1968*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, on the threshold of a new day, send us forth armed with Thy power, to overcome evil; if need be, to endure hardship, but in all things to serve Thee bravely, faithfully, joyfully; that, at the end of the day's labor, kneeling for Thy blessing, Thou mayest find no blot upon our shield.

Thou art the center and soul of every sphere, yet to each loving heart how near.

Renew our faith in Thy power and in the victory of Thy purposes. Here let us see again the vital and eternal things that are stronger than the noise of the world.

Quicken our love of America that we may see the shining glory of the Republic both as a heritage and a trust.

Open our eyes to see a glory in our common life with all its sordid failures, and in the aspirations of men for better things and for a fairer world, which, at last, must burn away every barrier to human brotherhood as Thy kingdom comes and Thy will is done in all the earth.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 20, 1968, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 10790) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public