alive unless prodded to do so by the billboard interests.

It is revealing that the billboard companies publicly proclaim, by full page advertisements and by Letters to the Editor, their support for the federal law (Seattle PI, June 8, 1965 and December 1, 1967). In their support they stand virtually alone, for we do not know of any national organization, historically associated with beautification, the preservation of natural beauty and the promotion of safe and scenic highway travel, that supports the federal law. That the billboard companies are virtually alone in their support of the federal law is evidence of a law which does little to control billboards.

Congress must be made to realize that the federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 is a fraud on the public expectations. The federal law must be repealed and the Congress must start all over again to prepare proper legislation. As it now stands highway beautification may be retarded for a decade or more. Orderly programs for this purpose cannot flower in the states in the face of the federal law. The Seattle Times said in an editorial on October 6, 1966:

"No law at all would be better than an act which is a mockery of all the noble words that have been uttered in Washington, D.C., about beautifying America's highways."

In the meantime the states had better hang onto the billboard control laws that they have, of which the Washington State "Highway Advertising Control Act of 1961" is the best in the land.

Teachers-in-Politics

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as a former professor, I wish to congratulate the National Education Association for sponsoring a Teachers-in-Politics Weekend beginning April 5, and to endorse the NEA's efforts to increase teacher participation in politics.

In a democracy, every informed citizen should play an active role in the political process. The increasing influence of every level of government on our daily lives makes citizen participation ever more essential in order to exercise effective popular control over a government sometimes insensitive to the people's needs. NEA encouragement of political activity by teachers—whose jobs involve them intimately in society's problems—is to be welcomed.

Moreover, because of the Federal Government's massive entry into aid to education in recent years, teachers have a duty to use their hard-won knowledge of education's strengths and weaknesses to work for continuing improvement in education policy.

Finally, greater teacher involvement in politics would certainly yield results beneficial to our youngsters. With so many students already deeply involved in politics, the wisdom and maturity of politically experienced teachers would, I believe, do much to steer student idealism into constructive, rather than destructive, channels.

I invite more teachers to run for public office, and I look forward to meeting more of my former colleagues in the halls of Congress in the not too distant future.

More Teachers Should Take Active Roles in Politics

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, this weekend has been designated by the National Education Association as Teachers-In-Politics Weekend.

Not only do I approve of teachers participating in politics, I strongly urge more teachers to take active roles and give constructive leadership in the political life of our Nation.

Teachers are equipped to give guidance to the community and they have a responsibility to generate and instill in our students an interest in our Government.

Great men in government, like President Lyndon Johnson and Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, are former teachers—as was former President Woodrow Wilson.

In my district, State Senator Albert Rodda is a product of of the educational community. He has proven himself many times to be a great asset to the California State Legislautre.

In Sacramento's Third Congressional District, I am always ready to assist teachers at all levels of education to promote better government through educational-political involvement.

A Tragic Action

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., takes from our Nation much of its pride and much of its integrity. Our image is tarnished for all to see. That the tragic action stems from a tradition of violence and prejudice—and history of man's inhumanity to man—is beyond question.

This Nation can ill afford the loss of its leaders possessing true greatness. Let us hope for all that another with the vision—the calm courage of Dr. King—emerges to lead the cause to which he gave his all.

Much progress has been made toward understanding and equality—much more must be made—with an ever-increasing sense of urgency and an understanding that human hopes and aspirations, legitimate in their objectives, cannot be held on leash. Dr. King preached nonviolence. Let us hope his dreams can be achieved by his methods. Failure would be a national tragedy, fully integrated in its destructive force.

The "Pueblo"—How Long, Mr. President?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 5, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 74th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, April 8, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me.—Psalm 23: 4.

Almighty God, Father of all men, stunned by the suddenness of tragedy and shocked by the fury of violence, we turn to Thee for help in this hour of our national need. May the spirit of wisdom guide us, the grace of understanding lead us, and the love of compassion direct us that we may find our way to the promised land of freedom for all, justice for all, peace for all, and finding the way give us courage to walk in it.

We pray that the comfort of Thy spirit may abide in the hearts of those who walk through the valley of the shadow of death. May Thy presence make them strong, give them courage, and hold them steadfast to good will even in the midst of ill will.

"Cure Thy children's warring madness,
Bend our pride to Thy control;
Shame our wanton, selfish gladness,
Rich in things and poor in soul,
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage
That we fail not man nor Thee."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 4, 1968, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5799. An act to amend the District of Columbia Uniform Gifts to Minors Act to provide that gifts to minors made under such act may be deposited in savings and loan associations and related institutions, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 16324. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2123. An act to provide for the control of the alewife, smelts and other fish and aquatic life in the waters of the Great Lakes which affect adversely the fish resources and ecological balance of the Great Lakes; and

S. 2658. An act to amend section 127 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to vehicle weight and width limitations on the Interstate System, in order to make certain increases in such limitations.

AMERICA HAS LOST ANOTHER BATTLE IN THE WAR AGAINST HATE

Mr. JACOBS. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, America has lost another battle in the war against hate.

Who killed this man of peace assassinated reason at a time when America needs reason more than anything else.

This fantastic act of hate has torn at the longing hope of all men of good will—black and white alike—who simply want to live together in peace as good neighbors.

The real minority in this country are those blacks and whites of hate and violence who do not want the rest of us to learn to live together in brotherhood.

Yet one with a bullet or one with a torch can, for a moment, defy a majority. And it is the duty of the true majority of blacks and whites to provide protection against those brutes of violence and the biracial voices of venom which inspire them.

Anyone who thinks that Martin Luther King lived and died only for blacks just does not understand the white man's stake in the peaceful revolution for civil rights.

Like Gandhi and Kennedy, Martin Luther King now belongs to the ages.

THE TRAGEDY AND THE CHALLENGE

Mr. ASHLEY. 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. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the assassin's bullet has struck again, as it has so often in our tormented land, this time claiming the life of a distinguished man whose dedication to the cause of human dignity won him esteem in every corner of the world.

So now we are without this gentle man who sought only to bring about, through peaceful means, a more fair and full life for his people and all people.

Our Nation grieves, not only for Dr. King, but for itself. And well it might. For the violence which he rejected and which took his life is abroad in every part of our land. It is a violence born of hatred and contempt for human kind and human aspiration; it strikes against men of high and low station and against innocent women and children.

It is this senseless animosity, this irrational hatred that tears at the very fabrics of our national life. Few are without blame. For if we do not share the hatred, and most of us do not, we accept it in our midst. We abhor the violence but we tolerate the animosity which feeds upon itself until the seeds of violence are sown.

Nor can we escape responsibility by trying to equate the character of this violence with the violence of the arson and pillage of last summer and recent days. This lawless destruction has its own identity, its own ingredients: bitterness, frustration, revenge, humiliation, hopelessness. It has resulted in contempt of property rights, yes, but it is not the product of contempt for human kind or human aspiration, at least not yet.

And herein lies the hope and the challenge which may well determine the fate of our Nation.

The task is twofold. We must have the courage to admit that Negro Americans have been deliberately and systematically denied the social justice and economic opportunity we proclaim as the birthright of all citizens of the United States, and we must act immediately—in this Congress—to bring about equality in education, housing, and job opportunities, and real improvement in the catalog of ills that oppresses the poor and racially disinherited in this land.

Even more difficult, perhaps, we must have the conscience and the heart to put aside suspicion and hostility, the insidious precursors of tragic violence, and make common cause—white and black together—toward that fellowship of man for which the human soul has yearned so long.

A MEDAL IN HONOR OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a speech by Dr. Martin Luther King at the Lincoln Memorial in 1963.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, not since November 22, 1963, has our Nation been so shocked by a senseless, a mindless, an insane assassination. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., symbol of peace and nonviolence and equality and brotherhood among men, has been taken from us by violence.

I first met Dr. King and heard his eloquence at a Freedom Now rally at Forbes Field in Pittsburgh. In later years and on many occasions I worked with him and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference on civil rights legislation. He became my friend.

I have often marveled at his eloquence, but particularly in August of 1963 at the Lincoln Memorial here in Washington. The march on Washington for jobs and freedom will live long in the memory of those who participated in it and those who saw so much of it on television. It was, perhaps, the single greatest demonstration of unity for justice that this Nation has seen.

Unquestionably the outstanding event that day was Dr. King's speech, "I Have a Dream." The text of that stirring and prophetic speech follows:

I HAVE A DREAM

(By Martin Luther King, Jr.)

I am happy to join with you today in what will go down in history as the greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our nation.

Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came as the great beacon light of hope for millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice. It came as the joyous daybreak to end the long night of their captivity.

But one hundred years later the Negro still is not free. One hundred years later, the life of the Negro is still badly crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination. One hundred years later, the Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity. One hundred years later, the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself an exile in his own land. So we have come here today to dramatize the shameful condition.

In a sense we've come to our Nation's Capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the mignificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, should be guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check, a check which has come back marked "Insufficient Funds." But we refuse to believe the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds to the great vaults of opportunity of this nation. So we have come to cash this check, a check that will give us upon demand, the riches of freedom and the security of justice. We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of now.

This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the transquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice. Now is the time to lift our nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood. Now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God's children.

It would be fatal for the nation to overlook the urgency of the moment. This sweltering summer of the Negro's legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn of freedom and equality. Nineteen sixty-three is not an end but a beginning. Those who hoped that the Negro needed to blow off steam and will now be content will have a rude awakening if the nation returns to business as usual. There will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until the Negro is guaranteed his citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our nation until the bright day of justice emerges.

But there is something I must say to my people who stand on the warm threshold

which leads them to the palace of justice. In the process of gaining our rightful place we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cut of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force.

The marvelous new militancy which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to a distrust of all white people, for many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny. They have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom. We cannot walk alone.

And as we walk we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back. There are those who are asking the devotees of civil rights: "When will you be satisfied?" We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities. We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro's basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one. We can never be satisfied as long as our children are stipped of their self-hood and robbed of their dignity by signs stating: "For Whites Only." We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro in Mississippi cannot vote and the Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote. No, no, we are not satisfied and we will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like the water and righteousness like a mightly stream.

I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations, some of you have come fresh from narrow jail cells, some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom left you battered by the storms of persecution and staggered by the winds of police brutality. You have been the veterans of creative suffering. Continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive.

Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to South Carolina, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities, knowing that somehow this situation can and will be changed. Let us not wallow in the valley of despiar.

I say to you today, my friends, even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal."

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the State of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice. I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day down in Alabama with its vicious racists, with its Governor having his lips dripping with the words of interpostion and nullification—one day right there in Alabama, little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.

I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain and the crooked places will be made straight, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.

This is our hope. This is the faith that I go back to the South with. With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope. With this faith we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. With this faith we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.

This will be the day when all of God's children will be able to sing with new meaning:

"My country 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing:
Land where my fathers died,
Land of the pilgrim's pride,
From every mountain-side
Let Freedom ring."

And if America is to be a great nation, this must become true. So, let freedom ring from the prodigious hill tops of New Hampshire. Let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York. Let freedom ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania. Let freedom ring from the snowcapped Rockies of Colorado. Let freedom ring from the curvaceous slopes of California. But not only that, let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia.

Let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee.

Let freedom ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi. From every mountainside, let freedom ring. And when we allow freedom to ring, when we let it ring from every village, from every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual: "Free at last! free at last! thank God almighty, we are free a last!"

Martin Luther King had a dream for America and as he said, it was "a dream deeply rooted in the American dream."

America should rededicate itself to Martin Luther King's dream. Violence does damage to that dream. As a symbol of that rededication, I am today introducing a bill which would direct the striking of a medal honoring this great American, Martin Luther King, Jr. and the presentation of this medal to his courageous widow.

The apostle of nonviolence has gone. What must we now do? I submit that this Congress must pass the civil rights bill, with the open housing amendment intact, as a memorial to Dr. Martin Luther King. We must not do this, however, because we have been intimidated, cowed, frightened, or out of expediency. We must do it because it is the right thing to do; we must do it because it is our responsibility to help make Dr. King's dream come true.

In Bob Dylan's words:

How many roads must a man walk down before he's called a man?
How many seas must a white dove sail before he sleeps in the sand?
How many times must the cannon balls fly before they're forever banned?
How many years can a mountain exist before it's washed in the sea?
How many years can some people exist before they're allowed to be free?
How many times can a man turn his head and pretend he just doesn't see?
How many times must a man look up before he can see the sky?
How many ears must one man have before he can hear people cry?
How many deaths will it take 'til he knows that too many people have died?

REASON

Mr. BRINKLEY. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the chaos in our land: where will it end? That is the question on almost every mature American's tongue. What can be done about it? What should be done about it? Of course, there are many deep-seated ills in our society which require patient and unrelenting treatment. A great host of our problems stem from a serious deficit of spiritual and moral values, the lack of parental training and influence, and a permissive and indulgent philosophy which is alien to the American spirit. Those who believe that many of our most pressing problems can be solved by legislation and money hope in vain.

But the immediate crisis calls for decisiveness and action. Wishful thinking and hesitation will solve nothing. In fact these weaknesses have contributed much to the present grave and ugly situation.

If governmental authorities do not consistently act with determination to keep order and respect, this entire country—consisting overwhelmingly of peace-loving, law-abiding citizens, black and white, rich and poor—will be subjected to more acute tension, intensified risks, and terrible harm.

The point has been reached when we must—we must for everyone's sake—meet recklessness with resolve, and lawlessness with authority. We must not avoid this responsibility; we must not abdicate this trust.

A permanent cure for the sickness which infects our Nation should be sought; but if emergency treatment calls for the use of a straitjacket, we must use it. The patient should not be allowed to harm himself and infect others because we are too tenderhearted to restrain, isolate, or treat him.

God give us the wisdom and the will to do our duty.

BE FIRM DURING PERIOD OF HYSTERIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it has been a turbulent weekend of tragedy and madness. I personally saw the results of much of it on Seventh Street in Washington last Saturday. One man stood in

front of a small shop which obviously had been broken into, looted, and burned. He must have taken me for a city official because he came to the side of the car and said:

I put 25 years into that business and worked hard and saved and paid my taxes—now everything I own is gone.

Hundreds of independent merchants, some white, some Negro, have been completely wiped out.

One clear lesson from the explosions in the cities last summer was that in order to suppress a riot, officers must be prepared to move quickly and firmly in the early stages before conditions get out of hand. Why was the Police Department in Washington so unprepared and so understaffed and so slow in getting reinforcements, so that for most of a day the Nation's Capital was in the hands of young hoodlums who burned and looted at will?

It appears that the police made little effort to stop looters or recover merchandise that were being carried out, and permitted felonies of violence to be committed in their presence without so much as firing a warning shot, thereby making a carnival out of the riot and a mockery out of law enforcement.

It is time for Congress to speak out and let Washington authorities know that we demand that the laws be enforced and that the Police Department protect the lives and property of innocent citizens, rather than coddle lawbreakers. There can be no compromise with law and order. The mad assassin of Dr. King must be apprehended and punished severely. Those in Washington who committed crimes of arson, breaking and entry, and grand larceny must be treated in the same manner. We must make certain that Washington is never again caught so unprepared to cope with rioting hoodlums.

Congress cannot turn a deaf ear to the needs of the ghettos, but we must take the profit out of rioting. In my opinion, it is a mistake to pass any social legislation, or to even consider it, unless and until law and order are restored in the cities of America.

In my opinion, it is a mistake to hold a joint session of Congress for the President to recommend such legislation unless and until this senseless rioting and burning and looting are stopped and I will vote against inviting the President to appear before a joint session.

We must let every American citizen know that Congress will not yield to blackmail and that Congress will not be stampeded into passing any legislation which has the earmarks of a payoff to violence.

By our firmness during this period of hysteria we must say to all citizens, white and Negro alike, that they cannot win by resorting to violence and lawlessness, that they must present their demands in a lawful American way.

THOUGHTS OF PARISHIONERS OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S CHURCH, BETHESDA, MD., ON DR. KING

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the tragic events of the last 4 days leave me with a sense of great agony—agony over the untimely and callous murder of a man who taught love; agony over the riotous plundering and looting which have taken place, ironically enough, in the name of this man who, throughout his life, deplored such activities; agony for the average American who does not understand why this is happening; agony for the businessman who has lost his life's savings to a band of marauders; agony for those who have been left without homes or food by the senseless plundering of the past weekend; agony for those who seem to believe that their frustrations can be overcome by violence.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard eulogies by the score from the high and the mighty of our Nation and abroad for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. I would like to share with you some timely thoughts put together by the parishioners of St. Bartholomew's Church in Bethesda. I am proud to say that St. Bartholomew's is my parish away from home. Their thoughts follow:

IN MEMORIAM—DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., 1929–68

This is My commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you. Greater love than this no one has, that one lay down his life for his friends.—John 15: 12, 13.

Heavenly Father, on the eve of Holy Week when we commemorate the sacrifice of the Innocent One for our redemption, look with mercy upon your people who mourn anew the shedding of innocent blood.

We thank You for Your servant, Martin Luther King, who dedicated his life to Your commandment of true Brotherhood.

May his faith that "We shall overcome" be an inspiration to us to believe more deeply that love of one another in Christ is the only way to bring peace and justice to the world.

Dear God, grant that we may not judge the whole movement for racial justice by the irresponsible acts of lawlessness taking place in many of our cities. Lord, help those taking the path of violence to see the injustice of their ways and the hindrance to understanding and respect among men.

Give us the grace to search our hearts and examine our conscience to determine how we have sinned against Your commandment to love one another.

OUR LITANY OF FORGIVENESS

When we fail to love, Forgive us, O Lord (Response)

When we choose hate over love,
For being too busy to get involved,
For remaining uncommitted,
For forgiving our own wrongs,
For not forgiving those of others,
For keeping silence when we should have spoken,
For what is in our hearts,
For what is not in our hearts,
For those we have excluded,
For failing to welcome a Negro into our neighborhood,
For exploiting those who serve us,
For our lack of concern for the poor,
For our own poverty of spirit,
For seeking only what is good for ourselves,
For our lack of interest in welfare laws,
For denying employment opportunities to our brothers,
For supporting social groups, country clubs and organizations that discriminate, Forgive us, O Lord
For not setting a Christ-like example for our children,
For not recognizing the dignity of all men,
For practicing charity only when it's easy,
For failure to learn more about our brothers,
For generalizing in our judgments against one group of people,
For thinking we are superior,
For thinking we have no problems,
For not using our talents to make a better world,
For rejecting You, O Lord, when we reject our brothers,
Forgive us, O Lord.

Grant to Your servant, Martin Luther King, Jr., Your eternal peace and love. Give to his family the consolation of knowing his work was not in vain. May they be assured of our prayers.

Eternal rest grant to him, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him. May he rest in peace.

REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. PRICE 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. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, an apostle of nonviolence, Dr. Martin Luther King, is the victim of a wanton act of violence. This cruel twist of irony will not be erased from our Nation's history, nor easily forgotten.

As in the tradition of his mentor, Mahatma Gandhi, who fell victim to the venom and hatred he worked so hard to extinguish, Dr. King has been denied seeing the fruition of his efforts. His personal tragedy is a national loss. We deeply mourn his death.

"I have a dream," he once said. That dream of racial harmony in America has been shattered temporarily by a cowardly assassin's bullet. But the vision of which Dr. King spoke will endure and will one day be fact. His legacy to this Nation will sustain its people in these trying times.

We must heed his plea for nonviolence, as we must follow President Johnson's call for national unity. It speaks ill of this Nation that Dr. King has been slain. But his martyred spirit will prevail.

U.S. COMMERCIAL AIRLIFT POLICY

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Airlift Subcommittee, House Committee on Armed Services, I was most interested in the recent talk given by the Honorable Robert H. Charles, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Installations and Logistics, before the Aero Club of Washington on March 26, 1968. In this speech, Mr. Charles, a highly respected and competent author-

ity in his field, discussed a subject of increasing concern to the airlines of this country.

The problem stated by Mr. Charles, for which an equitable solution has not yet been resolved, is to define our commercial airlift policy with due regard for our increased military airlift capability as the C–5's become available and our airlift demands decrease after the war in Vietnam ends. I am sure my colleagues will find this speech to be a clear enunciation of the issues that face us in the future.

I insert the text of Mr. Charles' speech in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT H. CHARLES

Today I would like to discuss a matter which will be of increasing concern to many of the airlines of this country—namely, our commercial airlift policy—as we approach the time, not too far hence, when six squadrons of C–5 aircraft have become operational and, hopefully, the war in Southeast Asia is over—to the time when our organic military airlift capacity will be far larger, and our airlift needs, in peacetime, may be considerably smaller, than they are today. I will not attempt to describe that policy, because it has not yet been established. I will, however, review some of the elements which must be considered in its formulation.

To put the matter in perspective, let me go back to the early part of this decade. In 1961, the organic strategic military transport fleet (excluding Tactical Air Command, Reserve and Air National Guard units) consisted of 38 squadrons containing 563 aircraft (C–124, C–133, C–118, C–121, and C–130). Now that all C–141's have been delivered, our organic strategic fleet consists of 27 squadrons containing 424 aircraft (C–141, C–130, C–133, and C–124). In 30 days under wartime conditions, it can move three times more cargo and people than the 1961 fleet. That capability will not increase until late next year, when the first squadron of C–5's is scheduled to become operational. But by March 1972, all 96 C–5's currently programmed will have been delivered, and at that time our strategic organic fleet will consist of 20 squadrons containing 320 aircraft (C–5's and C–141's only), and will have a 30-day wartime capability of 2⅓ times today's fleet. This represents a 7-fold increase since 1961. It is interesting to note that this more-than-doubling of capacity in the next 4 years will be accomplished with 24% fewer aircraft.

Now assume that the war in Vietnam is brought to a close, and no new comparable conflict erupts, at some time between now and March 1972. There will be a fall-off in military airlift activity. I do not, of course, predict a precise inversion of the build-up that has occurred as the war has escalated, but a look at the record may be instructive. In FY 1964, the last year before the Tonkin Bay incident, MAC airplanes carried 662 million ton miles of cargo and passengers, and the airlines carried 516 million ton miles at a price of $145 million. In FY 1967, MAC airplanes carried 1,943 million ton miles, and the airlines 2,185 million at a price of $575 million. The total ton miles rose from 1,178 million to 4,128 million.

It is obvious that the possible convergence of these two events—the C–5 and an end to the war—calls for a look at our commercial airlift policy. We should look at it now, when we have the time to do so deliberately, rather than wait for events to impose on us a policy which may be unwise.

Before doing so, however, let us again examine the situation at the beginning of this decade. Then the role of the Military Air Transport Service—appropriately so named for its then function—was essentially the same as the role of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, whose primary purpose was to augment MATS in the strategic airlift of personnel and materials between established airfields in well-developed areas outside of combat zones. This similarity of function was understandable, for two reasons. First, our national defense strategy was oriented toward general nuclear war—the concept of massive retaliation; there was little expectation of airlifting troops, equipment and supplies for conventional combat. It is significant that except for the C–133, which was designed to airlift missiles to and from SAC missile sites, the MATS fleet included many aircraft which were military versions of commercial aircraft.

This similarity between the roles of MATS and CRAF was of course largely responsible for the controversy which developed in the late 1950's concerning MATS' function. The 1958–59 study entitled "The Role of MATS in Peace and War," and the Presidentially Approved Courses of Action of February 9, 1960, specified, among other things, that MATS be equipped and operated to meet so-called "hard-core" requirements such as carriage of outsize equipment and munitions, and deployment of troops and their support to combat areas. MATS was told to reduce its fixed-route regularly-scheduled airline type operations consistent with the efficient peacetime use, including training, of the MATS airlift capacity.

Today, however, MATS' role is quite different, as appropriately reflected by its change of name to MAC—the Military Airlift Command. It is no longer a transport service; it is a combat force. This change resulted from changes in the two factors which caused the earlier similarity between MATS and CRAF. Our national defense stategy expanded to put more emphasis on limited war; and since the airlift capabilities needed to support limited war are far different from those needed for massive retaliation, revolutionary changes in the size and character of airlift forces were required.

The new strategy meant a new type of airlift operation, i.e., deployment and resupply of large numbers of combat troops and their support, including outsize equipment such as 50-ton main battle tanks, as close as possible to the area of combat. Military versions of commercial aircraft can move people and material between fixed, established and secure airports—the former MATS function—but specialized transports such as the C–5 are needed to carry troops and equipment to short semi-prepared runways in underdeveloped areas, and, if necessary, parachute or otherwise extract their loads without touching down. In sharp contrast to the MATS mission of the 1950's, the MAC mission today covers the entire airlift spectrum—long range, heavy lift and outsize capacity; and airdrop and airland delivery in all weather conditions on short semi-prepared forward area airstrips—and MAC performs that mission in support of combat forces anywhere in the world in emergencies, contingencies and war. This combat support activity is one which the aircraft of the civil carriers are not designed to perform, and much of which, because of its combat nature, the civil carriers should not perform. The parallelism between the military and civil air carriers is no longer a dominant feature of their relationship.

It is easy to be misled by the unusual circumstances of the present war. The build-up of our forces has been gradual enough to avoid the need for a massive, rapid deployment of combat forces by air, and we have enjoyed relatively little ground harassment at major Southeast Asia airfields and total freedom of the air. Both of these circumstances permitted the extensive use of civil carriers into Southeast Asia. We cannot depend on similar conditions in future contingencies. Planning must assume that a future contingency may require an immediate and massive response into a combat environment by the military airlift force alone.

This does not mean that the civil carriers will not continue to play an important role in MAC's future peacetime activities, particularly in the carriage of passengers and mail over established routes. JCS movement capability studies, which examine our ability to deploy and support forces under various conditions, show a continuing need for a capable and responsive CRAF to augment the military airlift capability in emergencies and in war.

Now let me look to the future, and to the role of the civil air carriers at that time.

Our future commercial airlift policy should be concerned, I think, with three major premises. First, in wartime we must get the maximum possible utilization out of our expensive assets, such as the C–5, each one of which, including support equipment and amortization of development expenses, will cost over $25 million. Second, in peacetime these assets must be used productively and economically. Third, in order to assure emergency and wartime airlift augmentation from the airlines by participation in the CRAF program, we must have an active participation by those airlines in our peacetime airlift business.

A number of factors continue, happily, to make possible the realization of this 3-cornered objective, including a reasonable accommodation between the latter two. These factors flow out of the first major premise concerning maximum wartime utilization, which may be as high as 15 hours per day by Air Force standards.

Probably the most sensible and economical way to obtain maximum utilization in wartime is to provide the active duty crews and other resources needed to sustain 10 hours per day with the crews operating under sustained wartime conditions, i.e., 7 days per week, and applying wartime aircrew, maintenance and safety criteria, and to achieve additional flying hours by using Reserve Associate Units which train with and operate aircraft of the active force rather than their own Reserve aircraft.

The Reserve Associate Unit, now being tested, is a natural corollary of the fact that modern aircraft are not only much more costly to acquire, but are even more productive. If a Reserve squadron is converted from flying C–124's, for example, to flying C–141's as an Associate Unit, and adds one hour per day to the C–141 squadron's utilization rate, it will produce almost 50% more airlift than with the C–124's flying 2½ times as many hours.

A second factor pertinent to our three-cornered objective is that the normal peacetime rate will be considerably less than the wartime rate. Simply reverting to a 5-day workweek reduces a 10-hour wartime rate to 5/7ths of 10 or to 7.14 hours per day. The application of normal aircrew, maintenance and safety criteria would further reduce it to about 6¼ hours. This figure, incidentally, is a product of dividing the total hours flown by the number of aircraft designated as "Unit Equipment," excluding, for example, aircraft in depot maintenance. A 6¼-hour utilization rate per "Unit Equipment" aircraft is the same as a 5-hour rate by the airline standard of dividing total hours flown by the total number of aircraft owned. As you all know, 5 hours per day is a very low utilization rate. There is not an airline in this country that would not quickly be in bankruptcy if it flew only 5 hours per day, or about half the average rate of the industry today.

Still another factor is that maintaining military airlift units ready for war or lesser emergencies requires that they be operated in non-emergency periods at a rate which will provide adequate and realistic training and operational experience in all phases of airlift. The aircraft used to accomplish this training generate valuable airlift for the

movement of peacetime resupply requirements; and because such training is required whether or not its by-product airlift is used, the cost of using that by-product is nothing. And modernization of the military strategic airlift force progresses, the airlift capability generated as a by-product of training will also increase. It would be improper not to use that airlift. In the interest of economy and common sense, if a required military payload can be transported in an aircraft which is on a training mission, at no additional cost, that payload should not be shipped by civil carrier. I see no justification, particularly in a growth industry like airline transportation, for "make work" programs.

The above has, of course, been known for a long time; but because wishful thinking is one of man's most persistent characteristics, we in the Air Force have continually emphasized and re-emphasized the following principles in discussing the role of the airlines in national defense:

1. CRAF participants must not rely on the revenue from military contracts as the principal means of paying for modern cargo aircraft, because military requirements alone will not support such purchases.

2. The amount of military business each carrier receives will depend on its success in expanding its civil business. Our goal is that military volume will not exceed 40% of a carrier's total volume; it is only the war which has prevented the implementation of this policy. And the policy makes sense. What expansion to meet military wartime needs is there if the bulk of a carrier's capability is already tied up in military work?

3. The Defense Department does not intend to increase the level of contracting with the civil airlines merely because the military organic capability increases.

The fact is that the Defense Department effort in the last 15 years to encourage the development of a modern civil cargo capability has achieved its objective. It has been a major catalyst of the current revolutionary growth in commercial air freight. This rambunctious baby is well out of the toddling pen. And it is now the commercial market which is, and should be, providing the incentive for the civil carriers to procure cargo-capable aircraft.

Now, of course, all of the above does not reflect what may be a very substantial element of military business in the future. Only about 1.5 billion ton miles, or 3% of total military business transported by civil carriers in FY 1967 was by air; 97% was by surface. But each decline in airlift cost brings with it a disproportionately large shift in the number of items which become air rather than surface eligible. This cost/air eligibility pyramid is so shallow that there exists the possibility, if not the probability, that the percentage of Army cargo moving by air in the next 5 years will increase by an order of magnitude; and I mean literally an order of magnitude, namely by ten times.

Thus, there is a tremendous as-yet-untapped potential in the carriage of military, as well as commercial cargo by civil air carriers; and this potential will be exploited in a disproportionately large amount by the extent to which cost per air-ton-mile can be reduced. Cost reduction is the path to this market.

On this subject of cost reduction, our objective must be to reduce the cost to the ultimate user. In this connection, in FY 1960, MAC spent $65 million to move 300 million ton miles of passengers and cargo—an average cost per ton mile actually moved of 21.5 cents. In FY 1967, MAC paid the airlines over $575 million for 2.5 billion 185 million ton nautical miles—at an average cost per ton mile actually moved of 22.9 cents.

I recognize that there are a number of reasons why this average cost in FY 1967 was higher than the average cost in FY 1960. For example, our use of one-way airline cargo capacity is much greater. The fact remains, however, that it was higher; and the significance is that the reduced rates for airlift resulting from the introduction of jet equipment have not as yet been reflected in the prices, per unit delivered, paid by the actual users of DOD airlift—the military department logistics systems. If commercial airlife is going to become increasingly competitive with other transportation modes, the reduced cost of airlift must be passed on to the users of that airlift—the service logisticians. Until we do so, the economic efficiencies of commercial airlift are illusory, not real. When we do so, we can reasonably anticipate substantially greater DOD use of airlift. The need for such action will be intensified as the airlines introduce still larger aircraft, with their correspondingly greater potential for unused capacity. I commend the problem to your careful attention, and to ours.

Let me summarize:

When initially established, the military strategic airlift force was equipped with commercial-type aircraft and was charged basically with a logistics support mission to conventional airfields. CRAF was established to augment this MATS capability. The airlift policy issued by the President in 1960 recognized this relationship and was designed to direct a share of DOD peacetime airlift requirements to civil air carriers commensurate with their share of wartime military airlift responsibilities.

Beginning in 1960, national defense strategy began a shift from almost sole reliance on "massive retaliation" to include a considerably greater limited war capability. The influence of this shift on MAC was revolutionary. Its emerging combat support mission came to include deployment of forces to and resupply of forces in the combat area, and it has been equipped with aircraft specifically designed for that mission. Clearly, the civil fleet is not capable of performing in direct combat support roles, nor can it be expected to acquire that capability.

The military airlift system must be fully trained and prepared for immediate response to military emergency and wartime airlift needs on a sustained basis. However, routine world-wide airlift remains an important MAC mission, and in performing that mission optimum use will be made of commercial airlift in peacetime consistent with the economical use of the capacity generated in exercising and training the military airlift force. Commercial aircraft will also be relied upon to augment military capabilities during emergency and wartime periods to the extent they can be effectively used.

Preference for DOD peacetime business will be given to air carriers who are committed to the CRAF program, who operate modern aircraft adaptable to defense needs, who receive a major portion of their revenues from commercial sources, and who operate most economically and efficiently. Although military requirements for commercial airlift are expected to be less in the post-Vietnam time period than at present, post-Vietnam procurement of commercial airlift can be substantial if economic comparisons shift to favor airlift for substantial volumes of cargo now moving by surface.

The impetus from the Defense Department in the 1950's and 1960's to encourage the development of a modern civil cargo capability is no longer required. The commercial demand for cargo airlift is growing rapidly today and is projected to grow even more rapidly in coming years. The air carriers will have a large fleet of CRAF-suitable modern jet cargo and convertible aircraft to accommodate this growing air cargo market. However, the characteristics being designed into these aircraft to achieve economy and efficiency in commercial use will limit their flexibility and usefulness in support of DOD strategic airlift requirements, but will encourage their use to perform channel services replacing military aircraft withdrawn for operation into the combat area.

Although the military airlift force is the heart of our strategic airlift capability, in closing, I should like to emphasize that we fully recognize the important contribution of civil air carriers to the national defense. We rely not only on their peacetime role but on their reservoir of capacity in emergencies and in war. And there should be enough military peacetime business to justify maintaining that reservoir, particularly as the cost per unit delivered to the user goes down.

Thank you.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

Mr. FRIEDEL. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I deplore the tragic, unforgivable assassination of one of the great Americans of our time. Martin Luther King believed in America and its promise. He knew and taught the power of peaceful change. He believed that change would come about through lawful and orderly process. He was taken from us by a violent, sick act. I call on all Americans of every color and creed to unite to prove Martin Luther King's faith was not misplaced.

THE RIOT

Mr. CABELL. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, the real loser in the wave of emotional hysteria that has swept this Nation following the wanton murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. is the responsible, law-abiding Negro he sought earnestly to reach and to inspire.

His theme was "nonviolence," yet we are today asked to memorialize him not in response to his basic principles but under threat of even more burning, looting, rioting, and sniping.

Caught in the middle are thousands of honorable Negro families who have preached honor, pride, love of our American heritage, deep religious faith, and the responsibilities of citizenship. It is they who feel the deepest sense of loss, for they recognize that everything they have worked for, all of these virtues in which they have put their trust could well go down the drain.

This week in Congress we are being asked once again to take steps toward social justice. Much of this pressure comes from those who sincerely feel a deep sense of personal guilt over the plight of the underprivileged and who suggest as atonement of that sense of guilt, concessions that could destroy all sense of individual responsibility. Along

with them are others who could care less about the late Dr. King or his ideals but who are using his murder as they used the cry "justice" to cover their own bestiality and contempt for law and order.

The manner in which we deal with this latter group may well be the difference between a democracy committed to cowardice and a nation of law ruled by brave men.

The group in the middle—the group most affected—is the responsible and law-abiding Negro who is proud of his race and, therefore, reluctant to stand against these militants but who will be inevitably classed with them and who faces the loss of the place he has earned on the side of law and order.

What does he lose? The very principles which mean the most to him: his love of country, his respect for the family as a unit, his willingness to submit to constituted authority and to acknowledge the rights of his fellow man, and his acceptance of the fact that a citizen can only enjoy the benefits of society when he makes a contribution to that society.

Much of this is obvious if we take the time to think it through. But today, in the wake of this senseless and deplorable murder, our decisions are being urged upon hysteria rather than upon normal clear thinking.

I hope that we can give less attentions to the Carmichaels, the Rap Browns, and the McKissicks and give more time and space in our newspapers and our television and radio programs to those who are constructive and most concerned.

I hope that we can correct any injustice to any minority group, but in so doing we must not violate the rights of any other group whether they be of a minority or a majority.

Above all, I hope that we can remain calm and responsive and by so doing rededicate ourselves to the preservation of the principles that have brought us so far in such a short time and which are so endangered in this great country today, to the principles which Martin Luther King himself espoused and for which he died.

Let us prove to all responsible, law-abiding citizens that their's has been and will continue to be the proper course.

ON THE MURDER OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

Mr. ECKHARDT. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, there has not been a time since the assassination of John F. Kennedy when so insignificant an assailant has done so much harm to the cause of humanity. I do not know whether, today, so soon after the tragic event, I can reach my hand across the great chasm of his grave to touch the hand of my black brother in sympathy. So I, a white man, shall talk to white men.

George Bernard Shaw wrote an essay called "Why Not Try Christianity?" Martin Luther King tried Christianity. Do you know, then, what his death means? It means that we must make the awesome effort necessary to make what Martin Luther King tried work. Think of the terrible implications of his death if we do not.

This means that we must write justice in our laws and love in our hearts. And we, being the strong majority, must keep our course toward racial justice, equality, and brotherhood through every violent storm that would blow us on any other course. This is easy to say, but it is not easy to do.

There are men of both races who would use the violence of lawlessness or the violence of law as the stiff bit and spur to force the gait and pace of our society. But a democratic society is an unruly steed. It cannot be so governed.

We must now accept the hard truth of the report of the Commission on Civil Disorders: that we are now paying a heavy debt incurred through many years of white injustice and heedlessness. We must wipe out the causes of riots and do it fast. A first small step should be the passage of the civil rights bill this week—yes with its open housing provision.

And this is only a first step. We must destroy every social and economic handhold by which segregation still clings to our schools and neighborhoods. And we cannot just make "deliberate speed." We must do it now.

THIS IS NO TIME TO CURTAIL POSTAL SERVICE TO THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Subcommittee on Post Office Appropriations reduced the Department's fiscal 1969 budget by $170 million.

During a meeting of the full committee on April 4, further crippling proposals were offered, including one which would reduce rural delivery service to 5 days a week. I was pleased to note, however, that the committee rejected this drastic proposal and other proposals which would have seriously curtailed essential services to the American public. Although efforts to reduce city and rural delivery to 5 days a week failed in the committee, it is anticipated that similar amendments will be offered from the House floor when the bill is up for consideration.

Today, we have 31,000 rural routes in the Nation, providing complete postal service to more than 36,000,000 people, 6 days each week, or roughly one-fifth of our Nation's population. The daily distance traveled by these dedicated employees is approximately 1.9 million miles.

During the past session of Congress, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service favorably reported the well-known pay rate bill, now Public Law 90–206. This bill, among other things, provided for a substantial postage rate increase in order to defray the cost of providing essential mail services to the American populace.

It is my feeling that this is no time to tell the American public, including the 36 million patrons of rural free delivery that we are going to eliminate all Saturday deliveries. Contrary to the thinking of some of our Members, all of our people are not enjoying the fruits and benefits of our society. Many of our rural patrons today, even in this affluent society, do not own automobiles, television sets, and so forth, and, consequently, are greatly dependent upon rural delivery for daily newspapers and other news media which is one of the paramount services afforded rural and suburban America 6 days each week.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the Members of the House will carefully weigh any proposals which would curtail postal service to the American public. There is no governmental service that directly touches the lives of so many of our citizens.

POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS AND POLITICS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing another bill to remove political consideration from the appointment of postmasters. My bill also repeals the requirement that a person, to be eligible for appointment as a postmaster, must have actually resided within the delivery area of a post office for at least 1 year.

On February 5, 1968, I sponsored a bill, H.R. 15090, that proposed to continue the present practice of appointing postmasters by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, but would have limited the area of selecting potential postmasters to career postal employees whose qualifications were confirmed on the basis of a noncompetitive examination.

During the initial hearings held by our Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on my bill and the 35 similar bills pending before our subcommittee, it became apparent to me that the appointing authority should rest with the Postmaster General, rather than with the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate. Extensive testimony during these hearings firmly convinced me that there was no way to remove political influence from appointments that are required to be initiated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, particularly when the confirmation by the Senate requires an expression of approval or disapproval by the Senators of the State in which the particular post office is located.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today places the appointing authority for postmasters at post offices of the first, second, and third classes with the Postmaster General. It requires that he make his selections from within the postal field service on the basis of noncompetitive examinations, in accordance with the provisions of law governing appointments within the competitive service. If there is no qualified employee serving under a career appointment in the postal field service available or willing to accept an appointment as postmaster, then the position of postmaster is required to be filled as a result of a competitive examination, in accordance with the provisions of law governing appointments in the competitive service.

My bill also requires that the appointee to the position of postmaster shall be given an opportunity to familiarize himself with the key postal functions relating to the receipt, dispatch, distribution, transportation, and delivery of mail.

As a further implementation to assist the Postmaster General in appointing as postmasters the most qualified career postal employees, section 2 of my bill will repeal the provisions of section 3312 of title 39, United States Code, requiring that, in order to be eligible for appointment as postmaster, the person must actually have resided within the delivery of the particular post office, or within the city or town where it is situated, for at least 1 year.

The head of any executive agency, whether it is the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, or the Secretary of Defense, has the authority to select people within the merit system, who are going to be the directors of their major offices. They can move their employees clear across the country or around the world, if they so desire.

I think the Postmaster General ought to have similar authority in choosing the postmasters of the large post offices without the residence restrictions now imposed by law. My bill will accomplish this by repealing the residence requirements for appointments of postmasters in the first-, second-, and third-class post offices.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that my new proposal will be acceptable to the members of the subcommittee.

WE CANNOT SETTLE PROBLEMS WITH A SNIPER'S BULLET

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, when will people learn that you cannot settle problems with a sniper's bullet?

Our Nation, in the last 4 years, has been staggered by a series of senseless, violent, tragic assassinations at great cost to the country.

The weak who feel strong and the cowardly who feel brave embracing a rifle, not only commit murder, but wound the essence of our democracy.

It sickens the heart of any man who loves freedom, who loves this Republic and the respect for the individual upon which it is founded. Men, who seek to preserve their ideas by killing those who oppose them, have no faith in this country, no faith in its laws, and no faith whatever in its people.

Of all the disturbing trends in our society during this deeply troubled time, the most alarming is the drive to violence, preached and practiced by those without the strength and determination to make their point within the framework of our democracy.

If we rely on guns to solve our differences, we must then clearly understand that we will only have peace when only one of us survives.

What many Americans fail to remember is that most progress in the field of civil rights was accomplished by nonviolent means. Violence and irrational confrontation only harm a cause.

In these times we must all move by reasoned judgment.

The American people are noted for rallying to a just cause.

There is no more just cause than equality for all our citizens. Let us all work peacefully, but diligently, for the removal of all discrimination barriers wherever they exist.

THE POLITICAL DROPOUT MUST BE THE CONCERN OF OUR SOCIETY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, just as the high school dropout is a concern of our society, so must be the political dropout. He is the person who is willing to let others worry about the problems facing our local, State, and National governments—reserving to himself only the privilege of complaining when things go awry. He is the person who feels one vote does not count, one individual's efforts cannot make an impression on the body politic. Basically, he is a person who does not know much about our political parties or about how our various levels of government operate and really does not care. He believes the opportunity for citizens participation is small and that government is a sort of private domain for politicians.

The truth is that today there is a great and growing opportunity for citizen involvement. Both political parties are eager to solicit the interest and help of citizens who share a concern for the future of our Nation.

Certainly good teachers, almost by definition, both know and care about our government.

I do not think that I am really disagreeing with the NEA teacher-in-politics program when I suggest that teachers, as such, have no more reason to be interested in government than any other citizen. In a democracy, every citizen has so much at stake in the proper operation of his government and the political parties that it is not possible to overstate it.

But, teachers do have a unique contribution to make to the governmental process. Certainly one of the fundamental responsibilities of government in our country is to provide for the education of all our children. This is not a simple task and nearly everyone now recognizes there is more to education than teaching reading, writing, and arithmetic. But the more we recognize the complexities of modern education, the more we require the assistance of professionals in the field to guide us in our effort to improve it.

There is no reason that educators should limit themselves to the role of consultants or only witnesses at legislative hearings. Their direct involvement in our political process will help our children and our Nation as a whole.

SALMON CAN MOVE THROUGH LARGE FLOOD PUMPS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, tests made cooperatively by Federal, State, and local agencies at Snohomish, Wash., have shown that young salmon can move through large flood pumps, which are a necessary part of land and water management in the coastal plains of the Pacific Northwest.

Eighty percent of the salmon fingerlings made the trip through a large flood pump during the tests without injury. Most injuries were of a mechanical type rather than from water turbulence. Smaller fish survived better than larger ones. Each lot of fish tested consisted of 100 coho salmon fingerlings averaging 4¼ inches long.

The results of the tests will help in planning for the safety of fish in future pump installations in this area.

The study was made at the French Creek Pumping Station, part of the French Creek watershed project. Cooperating were the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service; the U.S. Department of the Interior's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; Washington State's Department of Fisheries and Department of Game, and the French Creek Flood Control District.

The interagency pooling of experience, finances, equipment, manpower, and fish resources reduced the cost of the study to a fraction of what it would have been for a single agency. I commend these agencies on their cooperation.

ONE ACT OF LAWLESSNESS HAS LED TO MANY ACTS OF LAWLESSNESS

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every proper thinking American regrets very much the criminal and unfortunate conduct, which has been alluded to by some of my colleagues, which resulted in the death of Martin Luther King.

I am sure that at the same time we must all be equally—if not more—upset at the unlawful response which has been seen in so many places over this country on the part of those who would contend that they support the theory of nonviolence. What happened here in the Nation's Capital is not only a disgrace to those who brought it about, but it is a disgrace to our Nation.

The last report we had indicated that 757 fires had been set by arsonists here in our Nation's Capital. Here in this citadel of freedom, because of this response to an unfortunate incident, it has become necessary to dispatch 13,000 Federal troops.

I say it is time for people to remove themselves from an attitude of emotionalism and undertake to get down to some good, cold, hard thinking. I think it would be particularly unfortunate if Members of this body, under the threat—and, yes, under the emotionalism, if it actually exists, on the part of some of those who expressed it so eloquently—should place upon the books a monument of stupidity in a legislative forum just in order to respond to the maddening crowd. I hope this legislative body will be in keeping with that which the people of this country expect, as we go forward into consideration of our legislative activities in the next few days.

People throughout this country are concerned about lawlessness. No one who is a good American defends the shooting down of another human being. At the same time, those who condemned that act should condemn with equal fervor and the same impartiality the unlawful conduct on the part of others.

I hope reason will hold sway here in the next few weeks in this body rather than passion.

HEMISFAIR 1968

Mr. GONZALEZ. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I got back from one area of hope and, believe it or not, joy and gaiety. I invite all to come to San Antonio at their early convenience. We had a tremendously successful opening of HemisFair 1968 in San Antonio.

In a world with despair and conflict and trouble, it was most heartening to see all the diverse elements that make up our society in America getting together for a really successful opening of an event that symbolizes hope and cooperation and progress in the aspirations of a new continent.

So, Mr. Speaker, I express the gratitude of San Antonio that the Congress and this House have had faith in supporting this effort which has brought together nations from all over the world, from Latin America, and Canada, to San Antonio for HemisFair 1968. I renew the invitation to each and every one of you to come down to see us before October 6—and even after October 6.

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 2516

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish it to be clear and positive that I oppose H.R. 2516, a bill to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence, intimidation, and for other purposes, in most of its major particulars. I am confident that feeling is shared by the overwhelming majority of the American people. I feel the bill should go to conference, where hopefully, a better product can result. In its present form this bill is just another instance where the Federal Government would take additional jurisdiction over the lives of the people; a case where one more of the shrinking lists of rights guaranteed to the individual by the Constitution would be taken away.

Particularly, in its language relating to open housing would the passage of H.R. 2516 as now written prove to be a grave mistake and one of the worst injustices the House has ever committed. As proposed, its far-reaching provisions would ban alleged discrimination on racial and other grounds in the sale or rental of 75 percent of U.S. housing. It will involve builders, developers, brokers, apartment house owners, makers of real estate loans, and many owners of individual homes. Instead of banning discrimination, the language is in itself discriminatory in that it strips away constitutional rights of a very substantial majority of the people in the management and disposition of their own property.

That is not the whole story. The bill also proposes the surrender of responsibility. Under its terms, the head of a department of Government is granted almost unlimited powers. The Dirksen amendment changes this but little. The grant of power in large measure is still there. Surrender of congressional responsibility stands. The sentiments which will be expressed under the whip of last week's tragic events will cause that power to be enlarged. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that the departments of Government with their great sums of money and the very fine talents at their disposal, use to the utmost every possible interpretation of power that Congress grants to them. Every line, every phrase, every sentence of the bill will be used to the maximum extent possible to further bureaucratic design and intention. The language of the report will be stretched to the breaking point in the application of the law. The administrators will pick up sentences and paragraphs from speeches made on the floor of the House and Senate as a part of the legislative history and use this to enlarge their own powers in carrying out their personal concepts of the bill and their powers thereunder.

This bill strikes down one of the basic rights of every American citizen—the right of ownership over his private property. Rights which heretofore had rested secure in the Constitution would now hang on the sufferance of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Over this would stand the long shadow of the Department of Justice, always quick to intervene to enforce civil rights programs. By this bill the unquestioned right to use, enjoy, and dispose of what one has acquired through his own honest labor is converted into a doubtful privilege dependent upon the favor of Government. Every man's home becomes another prize within the gift of Government which may be bargained away for political advantage. Court suits and enforcement campaigns could be launched like Government poverty programs, where they will do the most political good.

Once the principle of Government control over private homes is established it will grow and expand, consuming whatever rights may remain on its way. The same zealous forces which are behind this bill will be behind its enforcement. There will be a constant pressure to cut down exceptions, tighten up exemptions, and reach out into new areas. Every protest demonstration will call forth a harsh new interpretation of the rules against the homeowner. Every riot will bring about a stringent revision of the regulations. Every close election will be the occasion for extending Government control still further.

In the end, even those whom this special legislation favors, will be among the losers. The homes they may acquire will be no more secure in their hands than they are in the hands of the present owners. The rights of the new owners will be clouded over by the shadow of government. The web of regulations and redtape, the threat of suits and investigations, the uncertainty of right and title, will fall also on the new tenants, and the taxes to sustain this harassment will have to be paid out of their pockets, too.

This bill purports to be based on high principles, but the only principle I can find in it is that the end justifies the means. It purports to give due protection to personal rights over mere property rights. Such a distinction between personal rights and property rights is wholly false and misleading. There is no real distinction between the two. All rights are personal. Property has no rights but people have rights in property and these are as personal as any other right.

Even the 14th amendment upon which this bill is allegedly based puts property on the same plane as life and liberty in the scale of basic rights protected by the Constitution. Thus the conflict is not between personal rights and property

rights as has been pretended. The real issue is whether the personal rights of some will be taken away in order to give new personal rights to others. In such a contest, it seems to me that the homeowner has the higher and better claim to protection.

It must be remembered that unlike previous civil rights bills, this bill is not directed against State and local governments which have the resources, limited though they may be in comparison to the Federal Government, to defend themselves. This bill is aimed at individual citizens and their private property. It is not States' rights which are endangered by this bill, but the rights of the people. It is not business or commerce which this bill regulates, but the lives of private citizens. I think this fact has been generally overlooked. This bill has been drawn solely from the point of view of the minority it is supposed to aid. Before it is voted on, it ought to be seriously examined from the point of view of the majority which it grieviously injures. When looked at from this standpoint, I think the unfairness and injustice of the bill will become so glaringly apparent that the House will overwhelmingly vote it down.

I am also seriously concerned about the firearms provisions of the civil disorders title. This language represents a hastily conceived and ill-prepared approach to the problem of overall firearms legislation. The police and enforcement problem involved in strengthening Federal controls in the use of firearms are far too complex for the summary and ambiguous treatment given in H.R. 2516. It is this ambiguous language which gives rise to serious concern about the use to which it could be put if it were to become law. I must consider it a bureaucrat's dream. It can be interpreted in almost any way that an enterprising administrator might deem desirable for his purposes. It could be used for persecution of the innocent just as well as it could for prosecution of the guilty.

Now I think all of us concur with the basic purpose of the amendment. But our fear is that some of the language pertaining to firearms could open a Pandora's box of unintended and serious consequence. We have before us a criminal situation predicated on vague, broad, and elastic terms. Its language poses a threat of prosecution for legitimate activities unfortunately and even unintentionally brought within its scope. Obviously, this could be a mockery of criminal law resulting from a statutory monstrosity.

There are many, many objections to the proposed language. In the discussion in the Senate, it was indicated that the language covers situations in which any kind of disorder is anticipated and includes any dealer who has not assumed due care in selling firearms to persons who incite riots or use firearms in disorders. Obviously, this covers the waterfront.

Under this, I wonder if we are to assume that both the man who purchases a weapon to defend his own household against destruction, looting, rape, or other violence, and the dealer who sells him the gun, could be hauled into court and punished if violence erupted in the neighborhood.

Please consider the danger and impracticability of phrases such as "or having reasons to know or intend" or "in any way or degree." I do not think the House should concur in or support vague and extremely loose wording which could make a completely innocent person criminally liable, with heavy penalties, and that is what could happen in this bill.

There is even a provision against teaching and demonstrating which would make any person who teaches marksmanship or hunter safety liable to prosecution. This could be true in a city like Orlando where good work has been done in an organized way to teach housewives marksmanship for their own protection. The result has been a very great drop in crime, particularly crime against women. Efforts such as these could run counter to the law and the consequences of enforcement could create a field day for the criminal who would not be so restricted.

The language of the present bill is far too dangerous to become law. It should be stricken in its entirety. The question of gun control legislation is proceeding in an orderly manner and this should be allowed to continue. In the meantime, the purposes of the gun control amendment can be properly served by strict enforcement of the present firearms acts, both National and State, and by a more realistic attitude toward crime control and provision at all levels of government.

Please remember that firearms control legislation already has been the subject of intensive consideration in the Congress. A number of bills are pending in both House and Senate. Hearings have been held and subcommittees have favorably reported bills in both branches of the Congress. The language used by the President earlier this year in discussing the subject would indicate that he recognizes that consideration is due for more moderate language than that hitherto proposed by the Department of Justice. Consequently, it would seem that the orderly processes of congressional study on this cannot in any sense be said to have broken down and there is now opportunity to obtain passage of a bill which is broad and complete and which will adequately serve the purposes which are desirable in gun control legislation. Certainly the subject should not be dealt with in a hasty and unintelligible manner.

These are only two of many questionable provisos in the bill.

To me, the most creditable part of the bill is riot control language which was included at the last moment. If enforced, this language will help to prevent a recurrence of last year's violence. Bills containing riot control provisions twice have been passed by the House and generally disregarded in the Senate.

Presumably, there is now sufficient interest in this legislation to help insure without tacking riot control language on to civil rights legislation. And, I do not think a bill which is bad as a whole should ride on the merits of one good section.

The bill will not satisfy the civil rights activists. They can never afford to be satisfied or they will lose their places of prominence in the movement. Its passage will inflict incredibly bad law upon the general public.

I strongly urge that my colleagues join me in voting against this legislation.

THE RIOTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I look around me in the Nation's Capital City with a sad and heavy heart. All of us are shocked by the fury of the violence which engulfed our Nation last week. We deplore murder and destruction at any level.

Yet I see arising from the tragic events of last week not an acceptance of responsibility in government and among the people but a demand for new programs and more benefits. It is time, Mr. Speaker, to say there must be no profit from riots. It is time for our Nation to hear about the acceptance of responsibility. That is what our country needs most. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been poured into programs to improve the lot of the people. The inhabitants of Washington live better than those of any other capital city in the world. They have greater advantages and more opportunities. Yet the headlines were filled last week with occurrences here and elsewhere which repudiate every principle for which America stands. The great efforts and the huge expenditures that have been made have been rewarded by burning and stealing and mob violence. And if it had not been stopped by force, the mob would have burned down the Capital City of the United States and very probably its Capital buildings.

Yes, this is a sad day for all of us but not a day for those of us here in the House to be shocked into a surrender of our responsibilities as legislators. It is a day for the Congress to face up to the truth about what is going on. What happened here would not have been tolerated anywhere else in the world. The rioters were not carrying on the work of Martin Luther King or venerating the principles credited to him. They were out to loot and destroy, and appeals to reason by their President or their leaders had no effect. It was the stern application of force in the face of lawlessness, and nothing else, that was respected. I hope this important lesson is not lost on the Nation today.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES IN WASHINGTON RIOT?

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn that the evidence now indicates that some of those participating in the looting, stealing, and destruction of property here in Washington and in cities throughout the Nation are employed by the Federal Government. Some of those participating in the arson and the rioting here are being supported by the taxpayers of the United States.

Anyone employed by the Federal Government who participates in violence is a reflection on the high ideals and dedicated service of the overwhelming majority in Federal service.

Any violation of the law by any person should be dealt with promptly. Law and order are essential to the preservation of democracy. It is inconceivable that anyone employed by the Federal Government should be for violence and opposed to law and order as represented by that Government for whom he works.

Mr. Speaker, I might remind my colleagues that we hear much about the fifth amendment to the Constitution and about those who plead the fifth, but the most important part of that amendment is the guarantee of property rights. If we are not safe in our own homes and in our businesses and if our property cannot be protected, we are in a state of anarchy.

Once rioting starts the only effective force, so far, we have found to effectively deal with violence and rioting is our police, National Guard, and Federal troops. Federal employees should be the very first to cooperate with these forces representing law and order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the time has arrived when we should begin to consider preventive measures. Today I am introducing a bill which would deal severely with those employed by the Federal Government who participate in arson, robbing, looting, and attacks on law enforcement officers.

An employee of the Federal Government is a representative of our Government and a representative of the U.S. flag. We must protect the high standards and splendid image of those in the Federal service. We cannot permit a few persons to tarnish the superb reputation of our excellent Federal employees.

The bill follows:

H.R. 16512

A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to impose prohibitions on the employment by the Federal Government or District of Columbia Government of persons convicted of engaging in riots and certain other activities involving violence and civil disorder, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after section 7311 the following new section:

"§ 7311A. Riots, violence, and civil disorder

"An individual may not accept or hold a position in the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia if convicted in a court of competent jurisdiction of murder, homicide, felonious assault, rioting, inciting to riot, looting, robbery, or arson during a period of emergency declared by competent authority due to civil disorder. An individual so convicted shall not be eligible for appointment to, or reinstatement in, any civilian position in the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia for the period of 3 years immediately following the date of his conviction.".

(b) The heading of subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, to read as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER II—LOYALTY, SECURITY, STRIKING, AND ACTIVITIES INVOLVING RIOTS, VIOLENCE, AND CIVIL DISORDER"

(c) The table of contents of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out—

"SUBCHAPTER II—LOYALTY, SECURITY, AND STRIKING

"7311. Loyalty and striking.
"7312. Employment and clearance; individuals removed for national security."

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"SUBCHAPTER II—LOYALTY, SECURITY, STRIKING, AND ACTIVITIES INVOLVING RIOTS, VIOLENCE, AND CIVIL DISORDER

"7311. Loyalty and striking.
"7311A. Riots, violence, and civil disorder.
"7312. Employment and clearance; individuals removed for national security.".

SHOULD DOVES IN FEDERAL WORK QUIT?

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the "surrender in Vietnam" petition circulating among Federal employees. The signers of this petition represent only a very small group; however, their action has received much attention in the national press.

David P. Mayer is a dedicated Federal career man. He served in World War II with the Army Air Corps. Following military service, he was with the Civil Service Commission for 3 years. Mr. Mayer began his career with the Veterans' Administration at Wood, Wis., in 1946. He has been a faithful VA employee for some 22 years, and is now a supervisory personnel management specialist with the VA central office here in Washington.

Mr. Mayer's letter to John Cramer renews my faith in the vast majority of our dedicated Federal employees. It is obvious from his remarks that he respects the office of the Presidency of the United States.

Since many of my colleagues may not have seen the article which appeared in the Washington Daily News on Monday, March 25, I would like to bring it to the attention of every Member of the Congress:

SHOULD DOVES IN FEDERAL WORK QUIT?

(By John Cramer)

Here is one man's idea of the case against those Federal employes who have organized that new protest movement against the Vietnam war.

It comes from a Veterans Administration official (voicing his own views, not those of VA) who writes:

"DEAR MR. CRAMER: This needs to be said about Federal employes who protest against the Vietnam war thru an organized effort:

"First, let it be known that every citizen has a right, as an individual, to express his opinions on matters of national policy and legislation.

"Second, let it be understood that the possession of rights carries with it obligations and responsibilities to exercise these rights wisely and judiciously.

"Thus, Federal employes who thru organized effort, whether it be by group demonstration, petition or other action, breach the obligation and responsibility inherent in their rights.

"Organized efforts opposing public policies have sanction when the actions are by groups outside the Federal employment, but when within the Federal employment, the practitioners violate a trust—the trust of the jurisdiction they were hired to serve.

"Federal employes have a responsibility to perform duties which provide public services and products. In the discharge of such duties they have an obligation to support and defend the public policies and objectives of their chief executive, the President of the United States.

"In this context, the principal engagement of Federal employes is to assist the chief executive in accomplishing the intent and purpose of his administration. This is a basic principle in employe and employer relationship, whether it be Government or industry.

"Therefore, accepting this principle, Federal employees who oppose the policies and objectives of their chief executive have a right to resign, and this they should do when they cannot support the responsible head they were hired to serve.

"Let it also be recognized that all Federal agencies, regardless of their operations and missions, are implicated in the Vietnam War, directly or indirectly as part of total government.

"The obligation to support the chief executive extends to all who are in his employ. It, of course, does not extend to the elected officials.

"The Federal employees who through organized action demonstrate opposition to their chief executive, give comfort and incentive to the enemy, and more so than organized efforts outside of Federal employment.

"On the other hand, there is no dispute about the right of Federal employees to engage in organized action on matters directly related to their welfare, status and rights as employees.

"An old axiom summarizes these thoughts: When you work for a man, help him to achieve his objective—when you can't do so, quit!"

DAVID P. MAYER.

NEED FOR PASSAGE OF SENATE VERSION OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. YATES. 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. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the world mourns the death of the Reverend Martin Luther King. In the words of Abraham Lincoln:

How weak and fruitless must be any word of mine which shall attempt to beguile us from the grief of a loss so overwhelming.

History will not forget, nor can America's conscience overlook that Martin Luther King lived and died to further America's great ideals. The world will consecrate his memory for his insight, his determination, and his courage in pene-

trating the fog of ignorance and of bigotry to see the promised land of freedom, equality, and justice in America.

Dr. King was a man of peace. His was a philosophy of nonviolence, and while it is true that violence frequently followed him, he would have been horrified by the rioting and the looting that erupted after he was killed. His would have been the first voice raised against such senseless actions for he knew such violence would hurt rather than help the cause to which he was devoted. In his speech during the march on Washington in 1963, he said:

> But there is something I must say to my people who stand on the warm threshold which leads them to the palace of justice. In the process of gaining our rightful place we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force.
>
> The marvelous new militancy which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to a distrust of all white people, for many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny. They have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom. We cannot walk alone.

We cannot walk alone. Yet, it is already apparent from the speeches that have taken place this morning that hard lines are being drawn. Some Members have pointed to the looting and the burning to declare that they will not be intimidated or blackmailed by such actions and that they will vote against the civil rights bill which will be considered this week. All of us oppose the criminal lawlessness that scarred our country during the past few days. It is vicious and destructive. It is the rule of anarchy, rather than the rule of law and order and it cannot be condoned. Nevertheless, it must be apparent that the type of approach advocated by such opponents of the bill plays into the hands of the rebels, the cynics, the rioters, and the looters, for they have been pounding their communities that change will not be made through the lawful processes of government. If the attitude of such Members is to prevail, what shall we tell the law-abiding citizens who have waited so long and so patiently for the changes which they have been led to expect would be made by the Congress—changes which will give them a share in the equal justice which is their American birthright.

Mr. Speaker, we are long past the time for action. This Wednesday the House is scheduled to consider the civil rights bill of 1968. We will have to decide whether to approve the Senate bill or send it to conference. I will vote for the Senate bill.

It will be contended by some that prudence dictates sending the bill to conference so that the House may lend its influence to shaping the bill. I say prudence calls for approving the Senate bill now. We must keep faith with the members of the community who have confidence in government and orderly procedure as being the best expression to reflect needed change. Passage of the bill will sustain that trust. Moreover, it will give the lie to the cynics, to the extremists, to the rioters and the advocates of violence, burning, and destruction. Finally, it will give tangible expression to our support for the ideals of the noble man to whose memory we pay tribute.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. has given the last full measure of his devotion to the people and to the country he loved. He is now a part of history and of eternity, never to be forgotten.

CONGRESS SHOULD LEAD ON A PROGRAM TO LIQUIDATE POVERTY

Mr. HAWKINS. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, this has been the saddest week in American race relations since the Civil War.

Dr. Martin Luther King represented the unfolding of a new period in American history which we must understand and learn to accept if we are to survive and continue our leadership role in world affairs.

It is regrettable that the fiendish assassination of Dr. King unleased a reign of terror and violence which we should in no way identify with the life and saintly doctrines of this disciple of the Gandhian philosophy of nonviolence.

Events of the past week have raised many questions. One in particular was often asked as buildings were burned and looting continued as an aftermath of Dr. King's assassination.

Do they not know they hurt their own cause?

Who are they?

They are not the whole of the Negro people but they represent a sizable number of citizens grown weary of patience and promises.

They are part of those this House voted against last week when it rejected the Senate amendments which would have provided more school aid, $25 million for Headstart programs, and $75 million for summer projects.

They are the young people of today and yesterday who were deprived of equal educational opportunities in segregated and inferior schools.

They are the children of garbage collectors and other low-income breadwinners unable to provide necessities of life for their families.

They are the school "pushouts" and job rejectees, the kids who live in crowded slums, and who fail to understand our fancy talk of inflation, the gold crisis, and a balanced budget, for life to them is a constant crisis of economic phenomena and fiscal deficit which they know only as poverty, unemployment, and deadend jobs.

They are the ones the appropriation committees found fancy jargon and superficial excuses to deny their needs while the taxing committees wept tears for those whose income is so substantial and complex they pay law firms to make out their returns.

That, then, is who they are. But what is their cause?

Precisely, therein, that they have a cause which differs from other Americans, lies most of the answer.

Their cause is deeply rooted in three and a half centuries of slavery and exclusion, the destruction of family ties and cultural heritage, a deceptive emancipation and reconstruction in which political and civil rights were virtually destroyed, the "separate but equal" doctrine which created separatism but never equal opportunities, and now a legal equality without enforcement and implementation. Their cause is America's failure to provide equal opportunities and justice to all its citizens.

Solutions to such age-old problems are never simple and cheap. But neither are they so complex and beyond our financial capacity as some would have us believe.

Upon this Congress, and State and local governments, rest the responsibility for that action which alone can convert the wrongs for which Dr. King and hundreds of others have labored in vain. It is the Congress, and not the President, which has failed to act, which has slashed appropriations for vital educational, manpower, housing, and antipoverty programs. It is the Congress, and specifically, this House, for example, which has bottled up in the Rules Committee the Senate-passed civil rights bill which grudgingly grants only a part of the rights already secured for almost all other Americans except the Negro—a bill which could not get passed originally except for an "antiriot" amendment and now can not get passed because those who sponsored this amendment will not vote for the bill.

Basically, the so-called Negro problem is not one which can be separated from the main concerns of the American society. The fate of the Negro is bound with that of every other American to whom economic security and national security are essential.

Just as the search for world peace has been interrupted by the racial disorders of the past few days, so the economic stability of our country is weakened when the garbage collectors in Memphis must strike for decent wages—and when 22 million Americans are cheated out of achieving their potential as good customers, productive employees, and professional technicians.

Economy or Vietnam is not the reason opponents of the administration fight against social legislation. These critics of Great Society programs would oppose domestic spending and liberal legislation under any condition. Thus, these same economy-minded, so-called protectors of the Public Treasury oppose civil rights and fair housing legislation which calls for relatively no spending, merely enforcement of basic constitutional rights.

But it is a mistake to believe freedom can be bought cheaply. A. Philip Randolph, respected Negro leader, has spelled out a "specific and factual course

of action" to liquidate poverty in America by 1975.

His "freedom budget" costing several hundred billion dollars over a period of 10 years attacks "all of the major causes of poverty—unemployment and underemployment, substandard pay, inadequate social insurance and welfare payments to those who cannot or should not be employed, bad housing, deficiencies in health services, education and training, and fiscal and monetary policies which tend to redistribute income regressively rather than progressively." This Congress might well turn its attention to adoption of such a budget. And the reasons are not difficult to find.

"The dark ghettos of America are a threat to the stability of our entire society," for as the psychologist, Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, says, "a minority"—alienated doubly by class and by race—"that is sick with despair can poison the wellsprings from which the majority, too, must drink."

The disorders are the product of despair and a sick mind but they also reflect in their cruelest way the frustration and hopelessness of most Negroes who while rejecting violence no longer accommodate to equivocation and procrastination. Essential then to improving race relations and moving forward is encouragement and tangible support to responsible leaders of those Negroes who though dissatisfied with conditions still believe in constructive action and sound change. And there is no better way of accomplishing this than prompt and decisive action in legislative bodies. Congress can and should lead the way.

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I live near the city of Memphis. It is the shopping city and more or less the playground for the people of the tristate area. It is a fine city, inhabited by fine people. While Memphis has its spokesmen in this House, and good spokesmen, I just want to say in behalf of that great city I know so well that its people do not condone what happened in Memphis, or in Washington, or in any other place over the weekend. They regret it as much as anyone. Their hearts are heavy.

The trouble all arose over a simple labor-management problem in Memphis, with the garbage workers on one side and the able Memphis city government on the other. If outside meddlers had stayed away and looked after their own business all of this would have never happened.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the remarks that have been made by some here about the death of Dr. King. It is very regrettable. But I think it is very unfortunate that more Members of the House—and I have listened rather attentively to all of them this morning—are not also deploring what happened over the country. Millions of dollars' worth of property has been burned, destroyed, and looted. Scores have been slain. Not a word has been uttered about the cruel treatment accorded them. Their lives were just as important to them as was Martin Luther King's to him. Our Nation has been made to look so very, very ugly to all of the world. But no one has mentioned these things, or deplored them.

A man who operates a business in this city called me the other morning. He was very nervous, pleading, and upset. He sounded as though he was in great distress and I am sure he was almost in tears. He said he had a pretty nice store when the area was struck by these so-called frustrated people. He said he had over $100,000 worth of merchandise in his store, and the looters did not leave as much as one little pocket handkerchief. He asked me what I could do to help him. Well, of course, there was nothing that I could do that would bring him immediate relief.

But there are people in the Government that could have helped him—people who go out of their way to ingratiate themselves with those responsible for the looting and rioting. There are others who are responsible for investigating, indicting, and prosecuting those who go about this Nation preaching black power, rebellion, and hate. But no move is made against the militant black power advocates.

I suggested to my distressed friend the names of some of these people of position and influence. I will not repeat them here, but I think you know who they are. They are these experts on and constant advocates of more and more so-called civil rights.

The responsibility lies with the leadership of our two principal political parties. If they do not stop this constant, foolish, and irresponsible bidding for minority votes they will soon destroy what is left of our once great country.

Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of other people in this city and other cities around the country who are looking to Washington for some genuine help and leadership. They have had enough of the political leadership and political legislation. They are sick of both. We can pass some more civil rights bills, as some have suggested this morning. But that is not what the country wants or needs. Right now they need law enforcement and respect for law more than anything else.

Why we have had a civil rights bill for almost every year since 1957. And the country is in much worse shape than it was before either was passed. There is less respect for law and order than ever before. There is more tension between the races than ever before. Oh, yes, we can pass another civil rights bill, and another and another, but such is not going to bring these people—who take charge in the street—to the point of respecting law and order and to the bar of justice where they belong.

I blame the courts very much for this. This thing of the justices authorizing and legalizing marches, which create tensions, is far beyond the free speech amendment to the Constitution. Their decisions are absurd. A Memphis judge had ordered that another King march should not go on after the first had resulted in a riot. I am sure if that march had come off Memphis might have been destroyed. But whether or not, the risk of such was too great. In spite of this "no march" order, Martin Luther King was quoted as saying he would march anyway. This thing of allowing people to take to the streets with a design to stir tensions among our people results in irresponsible conduct—in rioting, looting, wounding, and shooting. Mark you that every nation that has fallen to communism, to dictatorships and to any of the other "isms" that you and I, and the people of our Nation, do not agree with, started with marching and bombing in the streets. Remember that as we move through the next few weeks.

More civil rights bills will get us nowhere. Neither will mass marching in the streets. The rights bills have gained nothing. They have instead developed deeper cleavages between our people. The marches and threats of marches have resulted in innumerable deaths, damages in the multiplied millions of dollars, and an ugliness that leaves the entire world wondering what has happened to the character of these great, or once great, United States of America. And wonder they should.

A CALL FOR STRONG LEADERSHIP

Mr. MACHEN. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday morning, after the first night of looting, arson, and violence in Washington, I issued the statement:

> Never has it been more imperative than now for violence to be quashed before it tears apart our nation.

I called on the President to take direct action to restore law and order immediately to save lives and property and to prevent widespread outbreaks of violence and rioting.

This was predicated on his action a week ago involving the Vietnam war. We all remember how the President sacrificed his political future in order to remove the Vietnam war from politics so peace can be achieved. I have long been a supporter of the President's policies in Vietnam and I commend his courage in making a sacrifice on such a high order for peace. Logically it seemed to me, having removed the war from politics and thus free to act unfettered, the President also has the obligation to act in a similar manner to restore law and order to Washington and other American cities.

In a letter to President Johnson Friday afternoon I called on him to exert the strongest leadership now in this time of national peril. I said:

> I believe that in such an effort we must purge the extremists from both sides of this internal conflict in order to restore sanity and

sense to our society. I believe that the majority of American Negroes and whites will support the strongest exertion of leadership on your part to stem the tide of lawlessness we now see before us.

My statement of Friday, April 5, 1968, follows:

THE MACHEN REPORT

(By Congressman HERVEY G. MACHEN, of the Fifth District of Maryland)

The assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the widespread rioting that followed forbodes a summer of violence, disunity and conflict that will be a national tragedy on a scale far greater than Dr. King's or President Kennedy's deplorable deaths.

Senator Church of Idaho said succinctly: "We are steeped in violence. It is the curse of the land."

Will public officials at all levels of government have the strength to hold our nation together this summer? Will the vacuum created by Dr. King's assassination be filled by non-violent Negro leadership or will Black militancy and separatism surface at the top?

Never has it been more imperative than now for violence to be quashed before it tears apart our nation. Never has it been more imperative to stamp out permanently white backlash manifested in assassination and other acts of crime. The lines between black and white war parties must not be permitted to be drawn. Direct confrontation, regardless of which group it comes from, must be avoided to prevent further bloodshed.

The greatly disturbing trend by black and white extremists to militate in violent acts must stop for the safety of the vast majority of persons who want progressive solutions to racial and social problems, not regressive conflict and killing.

At the writing of this column, our President was attempting to achieve a moratorium on the conflict in Vietnam. I feel that it is appropriate to consider a similar action in this country at this point. The President should consider involving himself in serious discussions with all parties as a prelude to a nationwide effort for a summer of peace and not violence and anarchy. I feel that the potential for a summer of violence is so great that the President must take personal initiative in preventing such a disaster. Free now from politics, he can involve himself in unrelenting efforts for peace at home as much as peace overseas.

National initiative can provide, initially, a breathing spell for the public to comprehend what has occurred recently and all its implications. I feel that a period of restraint must be imposed on the public to prevent further violence. In this regard I believe it would be appropriate for Dr. King's successors to reconsider the proposed march in Washington this month, that it be withheld until such time as we know that a peaceful demonstration can be peaceful in all respects and on all sides.

Events of such international and national magnitude have been occurring so quickly and frequently during the past week that it is difficult to keep pace. We have seen the President sacrifice his political future in order to achieve peace in Vietnam. To achieve peace at home we must have the same high order of national leadership and concentration of effort because it will be fruitless to sacrifice a large portion of our national resources to bring democracy to Southeast Asia when our nation is threatened by growing anarchy. Our strength to meet our commitments in the world rests upon our strength to meet our commitments at home. We cannot have one without the other, and I believe that we must have both.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the first priority for this Nation is law and order. The extremists can challenge violently our society's laws and its law enforcement in the guise of civil rights, but they will be repelled and even repressed, if necessary, because no man is above our laws. And when our laws are challenged by rioting, looting, arson and violence, our society must marshall its forces and move immediately—not just quickly—to contain the challenge, to prevent its spreading, to arrest the violators and prosecute them to the fullest extent of the laws that we in Congress have given society to enforce. We must not shirk this duty.

It is my belief that the outbreak of looting and arson in Washington last weekend was not contained in time, that the administration did not move fast enough to bring in troops to meet the outbreak head on and to quash it. Thus, law and order was not restored as soon as it could have been restored and we have all seen the results on television and in the newspapers. In this regard our Government failed to meet its highest priorities. It is not a matter of the Congress enacting more and more civil rights legislation. If we enacted the pending civil rights bill tonight, do you think that would stop the violence now raging in our cities? I do not think so.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected newspaper columnists in our country, Mr. James Reston, of the New York Times, in yesterday's Times wrote a column that was entitled, "Washington: The Strangled Cry." I urge my colleagues to read this column and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

WASHINGTON: THE STRANGLED CRY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 6.—The nation is appalled by the murder of Martin Luther King, but it is not appalled by the conditions of his people. It grieves for the man, but not for his cause. This is the curse and tragedy of America.

At least the extremists have kept their promises. The white racists said they would kill King, and the black racists said they would burn us to the ground. And we will not hear again that strangled cry or the rolling Biblical cadences of that magnificent voice; and the smoke is drifting this weekend through the cherry blossoms by the Jefferson Memorial, and the rest of us have not kept our promises to the Negro people.

THE REAL CRIME

This is the real crime of which the assassination of Dr. King is but a hideous symbol. It will not be redeemed by the capture of the murderer. It can only be redeemed by the transformation of the lives of the Negro people, and even now America has not faced up to the cost of this historic debt.

When President Johnson's riot commission surveyed the results of the twenty major outbreaks of racial violence recently, it reached the conclusion that, despite all the turmoil and the efforts of many concerned citizens and officials, the main reaction in the ghettos of Los Angeles, Detroit, Cleveland, New York and the other trouble spots was that "nothing much changed—one way or the other."

THE BALANCED COSTS

When Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish social philosopher who has followed the Negro problem in America for forty years, came back here recently, he felt that a great deal had changed for the better, but concluded that we had greatly underestimated the scope of the Negro problem. It would take a revolution in white attitudes, and twenty years, and "trillions of dollars" to deal with it, he felt, and the cost of not dealing with it would in the long run be much more.

The revolution in the white attitudes is probably the main thing. Neither the Congress nor the Court will solve it. President Johnson may appeal to the conscience of the nation and get another civil rights bill passed, and that may help some, but it is not the answer.

For the problem is not that the Congress is unrepresentative of the American people on the question of jobs and open housing for Negroes, but that it is representative. It may even be ahead of the people. Even if the war in Vietnam ended this month, the chances of getting Congress in its present mood to transfer the war appropriations to the ghettos would be extremely remote, and the reasons are fairly clear.

Despite the progress of the last decade in Negro education, jobs and housing, the evidence is that a majority of the people are opposed to open housing and many other Negro demands for an equal and integrated society; and while Negro violence may produce concessions, it is rapidly reaching the point where it will produce fear and counterviolence that could reverse the trend toward a more compassionate society.

One of the many tragedies of Dr. King's death is that it has silenced the most eloquent Negro voice for nonviolent protest and tipped the balance toward the black nationalists who call for war and guns. Here the need is for the transformation of the attitudes of the young Negro militants and their hoodlum gangs. For there is a violent strain in the American people, and if the black arsonists carry the torch from the ghettos to the white communities, it will take more than troops to quell the bloody reaction.

At this critical point, therefore, the leaders of every community—all of them, black and white, labor and management, educational and religious—will have to mobilize to deal with their local situation, whatever it is. The revolution will not be contained by Federal or state officials and appropriations alone, or even by local mayors, and fortunately we now have the beginnings of a structure for doing just this through the Urban Coalition led by John Gardiner, the former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

FURTHER POLARIZATION

For this is not a problem of government alone, but of American attitudes and assumptions. There was an outcry from some quarters when the President's riot commission suggested that we were moving toward two separate nations, one white and the other black. But the fact is that for most white and black people in the North, this is already a fact, and violence on both sides will merely hasten the process.

The evidence is plain before our eyes. For violence, while it can destroy indifference, which is the curse of the moderate middle class, cannot choose. It destroys good as well as evil. Brute coercion and savage intolerance of the Negro must be destroyed, but they cannot be burned away by raging demons intoxicated with illusion.

A NEW PHOENIX TO BE BORN FROM THE FLAMES OF DISORDER

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the ancient pagans believed that the phoenix rose from the heart of

a fire. An essential article of this faith, however, was that in order for a phoenix to be born from the flames, there must be a phoenix committed to the flames.

During Friday and Saturday nights I spent a number of hours in the riot areas close to the fires burning in the heart of Washington. I believe that it is our job to work for the emergence of a new phoenix from the flames—a new spirit of confidence, compassion, and conviction. But while we work for this new phoenix, I want to bear witness to the old one that I saw in the very heart of the flames—a spirit of courage and determination and loyalty and compassion and pity.

I want to express my gratitude and my respect for the firemen whom I saw repeatedly risk their lives to save other men; for the police, whom I saw act with bravery and restraint in the capture of desperate and violent armed men; for the troops whom I saw operating an efficient and highly professional command post in the litter and chaos of a looted store; for the churchmen and the citizens whom I saw helping in a hundred ways in streets, police stations, and hospitals; for the meek, whom I saw standing by in silent acceptance, clutching the salvage of their meager possessions as their world went up in smoke.

But most of all, Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the great mass and majority of our people who stood fast in a moment of fear and passion, for all who were calm and loyal and cooperative in the face of a common danger, and for all those whose spirit endured in the flames and whose spirit will be reborn in a new city and a new nation.

A POLICY OF NONVIOLENCE, BUT YET ONE OF ACTION NEEDED

Mr. McCLORY. 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. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House and people throughout the Nation who today are mourning the assassination—the cruel death inflicted on Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, we realize that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was the champion of nonviolence in the civil rights movement in this Nation, and we respect that policy.

I believe we should recall, in addition, that he was an activist. While he advocated nonviolence, at the same time he worked diligently for rapid progress in securing civil rights.

I have received letters—as I am sure others have—suggesting that we should pass the 1968 civil rights bill as a memorial to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Others have suggested that we should defeat the civil rights bill in retribution to those who have resorted to violence following the death of Dr. King.

I believe it is incumbent upon us to reject both of these suggestions and to follow a policy of reason and logic, and in the exercise of our clear legislative prerogatives.

It is both tragic and ironic that during the hours when we mourned the passing of the champion of nonviolence that so much violence should have occurred

It should be added, however, that most of those who have been guilty of the looting and the violence are not the responsible citizens of the community. With very few exceptions, the Nation's Negro citizens, as well as the whites, deplore these actions.

If we would dedicate a true memorial today to the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., it would be to adopt and advocate a policy of nonviolence, but nevertheless one of action in the securing of equal rights for all citizens, regardless of their race or color.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' PAY BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, if nothing else, the events of this past weekend in the Nation's Capital have pointed up the need to instill more learning more respect for society and more discipline in innercity youngsters. I think this need is relevant to the need in Washington for a more flexible and more responsive educational system at the classroom level.

Tomorrow, the House will consider the District of Columbia teacher's salary bill, H.R. 16409. I will offer an amendment to this measure which would remove the current 5 percent maximum ratio of teacher aides to teachers, and would remove the present requirement that such aides possess a minimum education of at least 60 semester hours of college work. This amendment would bring the House version of the bill into line with the Senate-passed teacher salary bill.

My amendment has strong support of Commissioner Washington, the City Council, the District of Columbia Board of Education, the District of Columbia Education Association, and the District of Columbia Teachers Union.

Teachers of the District of Columbia public schools cannot meet all of the attention, discipline, and special needs with which the innercity child enters the classroom. Experience has shown that teacher aides alleviate some of these problems. In fact, the recently completed comprehensive study of the Washington, D.C., public schools, the Passow report, notes that where they have been utilized, the teacher aides have proven indispensable.

The teacher aide in the District of Columbia public schools serves a vital function. He supervises children in the classroom. He accepts responsibility for control of children on the playground and in the lunchroom. He is responsible for safe conduct on bus trips. He saves the college educated instructional staff from doing numerous nonprofessional energy-draining routine clerical chores such as keeping of health records, residence forms, library file cards, rollbooks, cumulative records. He collects money for insurance, and for trips. Using ditto and office machinery he duplicates materials for teachers and for the other professional staff. He secures needed supplies and materials in preparation for class, and operates the audiovisual equipment that makes possible team teaching with modern instructional methods. He assists in the recreational program and works with individual children or small groups. In essence, the teacher aide makes it possible for the District of Columbia teacher to concentrate on teaching.

It has been found that to be effective, the teacher aide does not need 60 hours of college—as is now required in the District of Columbia—but adequate training, a sense of responsibility and discipline, coupled with understanding of how to meet the needs of innercity children. In the past, we of the Congress have limited the numbers of teacher aides that may be employed in the District of Columbia school system. This was incredibly shortsighted. We limited the number of teacher aides to 5 percent of the teaching staff and we have said that teacher aides must have 60 credit hours of college.

The present inordinately high education requirements for teacher's aides ties the hands of this valuable program in the District's schools. According to the National Education Association, fully two-thirds of all the school systems using teacher aides require no more than a high school education, and 38 percent require only an elementary school education. We must remember that these are not professional educators, but paraprofessionals who perform strictly nonteaching duties.

Neither limitation is warranted; indeed, it is self-defeating. The numbers that can be employed under these restrictions are too few to make a dent in the problems confronting the schools of the innercity. Three hundred seventy-three teacher aides currently have to be spread among 7,471 teachers. This is simply not enough. Therefore, I urge your support of my amendment which would remove the present ratio limit and unrealistically high educational requirement from present law.

THE LATE DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King is a tragedy for America and for the world.

His voice is stilled, but not silenced. Death will not defeat him, nor conquer his ideals. Who can forget the witness

and testament of this great churchman? Who can forget the eloquence of his voice in Montgomery, in Birmingham, in Selma, in Washington, D.C., in Chicago and in Memphis, saying "We shall overcome" or "I have a dream" or "If a man has nothing worth dying for then he is not fit to live." Indeed, it is not the length but the quality of this Christian martyr's life that should be remembered; how well he lived his life is stated in his own words:

Say that I was a drum major for justice. Say that I was a drum major for peace. I was a drum major for righteousness.

He had a great vision, an America where all men are brothers, a world without violence or war.

His deep belief in nonviolence and his timeless words "We shall overcome" can best be honored by the House of Representatives this week through the passage of the civil rights bill and by the prompt enactment of major legislation and appropriations to implement the recommendations of the Riot Commission Report.

What we need above all, I think, in the United States, is a new national commitment to action, a new spirit. Dr. King once said of our own sick society:

America, you've strayed away. You've trampled over 19 million of your brethren. All men are created equal. Not some men. All men. America, rise up and come home.

I believe if we would truly honor Dr. King, we will see, in Mrs. Martin Luther King's words, "that my husband's work will be carried forward." We will see to it that his ideas of equality for all men in freedom will become a reality so that America can save its own soul and move forward with the spirit that has characterized our country but not always our actions since the days of the Revolution.

Lest we forget, Martin Luther King, in his moving letter written from the Birmingham jail on April 16, 1963, said:

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

I am sure that Members of Congress, and indeed all Americans, extend their deepest sympathy to Mrs. King and their children—Yolanda, Martin III, Dexter, and Bernice—and wish Godspeed to the Reverend Ralph Abernathy and the Reverend Andrew Young in carrying forward his great work, not alone for the United States but for all mankind.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the schedule of the remainder of this week.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inqury of the distinguished minority leader, the program for the week is exactly as announced last week.

Tomorrow we have the Treasury Department-Post Office Department appropriation bill, and District Day.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, the following bills are scheduled:

H.R. 2516, to provide penalties for interference with civil rights. Subject to action of Committee on Rules.

Following that:

H.R. 15189, maritime authorization bill;

Then House Concurrent Resolution 705, to assist veterans in obtaining suitable employment, and

H.R. 13738, travel expenses of Government employees.

That is the announcement that we made last week and I repeat at this time there is no change.

I said, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the Civil Rights Act:

After consulting with the distinguished minority leader and other Members on the minority side, I think Members should be advised that we all feel this matter should be brought to the floor and disposed of before we begin our Easter recess.

That same announcement holds.

HON. HAMILTON FISH, OF NEW YORK, RECEIVES THE FIRST WALTER CAMP FOUNDATION FOOTBALL AWARD

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished former colleague from New York, the Honorable Hamilton Fish, recently was the recipient of the first Walter Camp Foundation Football Award. As a former assistant coach at Yale, I am pleased that this award in the name of Yale's greatest football figure was bestowed upon a former Harvard player; this suggests that sportsmanship is by no means dead and that merit is recognized between New Haven and Cambridge. Furthermore, I am glad to commend to the attention of this body and to the Postmaster General the proposal of Colonel Fish for a U.S. stamp honoring Walter Camp and the all-American game of football. Perhaps it is too much to expect such a nonpartisan subject to grace our postage stamps in this election year, but it is an excellent suggestion. I am pleased to append the text of Col. Hamilton Fish's remarks in accepting the Walter Camp Award at Yale last January 20:

Words fail me to adequately express my gratitude and appreciation at receiving the Walter Camp Foundation's first football award. The presentation of this award to a former Harvard player is an act of the highest sportsmanship on the part of the Committee and I am sure will be welcomed and appreciated by many thousands of Harvard alumni, who not only are fond of the great American game of football, but who will be united in commending the friendly and generous spirit in which this award is presented.

As a long time admirer of Yale's Walter Camp, the instigator, organizer, master mind, and master spirit of the modern American game of football, who should be rightly known in history as Mr. Football, it is an added honor to receive this award from an organization formed in his name and in his honor and a double honor to receive it from Larry Kelley, one of Yale's greatest ends and one of the very few Ivy Leaguers who ever received the Heisman Football Award. I anticipate a great future for the Walter Camp Foundation and predict a constructive destiny for it and its achievements.

I take this occasion to suggest the propriety of having the Walter Camp Foundation, and I will be glad to join with them, to recommend immediately that the United States Government issue a football stamp in his honor. I happen to be an amateur stamp collector and I believe I have the best collection of football stamps from all over the world in existence. There are some 500 stamps and 50 more stadiums; 95% about soccer-football, and the rest about rugby. Isn't it time for our Post Office Department to issue one or more football stamps. We have already issued baseball and track stamps. It is not for me to suggest the design of the stamp or in any way interfere with the efforts of the Hall of Fame to secure a stamp, which I certainly approve of. But, I will be glad to go to Washington with any members of the Walter Camp Foundation and if necessary, show them the foreign football stamps. Whether it should be a photograph of Mr. Camp or a symbolic football stamp in his name, or in the name of the Walter Camp Foundation, is not for me to decide.

I also want to give the Yale friends of football a personal pledge. That I shall endeavor, as a former member of the Football Foundation Court of Honors for five or six years, which chooses the members annually, to have Larry Kelley, one of Yale's most famous ends, in the class with Hinkey, Shevlin and Kilpatrick, selected to the Hall of Fame as a matter of merit and justice. He and the celebrated Frank of Yale, are the only two who have won the Heisman Football Trophy and I am sorry to say that none have won it from Harvard. A man should be chosen mainly on his football record to the Hall of Fame and on that record, no Yale man deserves it more than Larry Kelley, who was running pass patterns successfully long before anyone else.

We learn from football to prepare for the competitive spirit of every walk of life. We learn from football when we are knocked down, to get up and fight all the harder, and that is the road to success.

I am deeply honored and will cherish this award more than any other. But I want to say in conclusion, to the younger generation, that football and football awards are temporary, and the main issue confronting all Americans is the preservation of those ideals and principles which we learned on the playing fields and in the colleges, in order to build a bigger, better, stronger and more prosperous America, and I give you the slogan, For God, For Freedom, and For the United States.

FOR ALL AMERICANS A TIME FOR RESTRAINT

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the country has been shaken by a terrible assassination. A leader has been killed. Appropriately, the country is in mourning. Inappropriately, the tragedy has spawned a wave of crime, arson, looting, civil disobedience, surpassing in tragic proportions the assassination of Dr. King.

For our Government, the time is for leadership; for all Americans, the time is for restraint; for the Negro, the time is for decision to destroy and rebel or to build and help create an environment in which men can seek to perfect all aspects of societal life.

Government, even with its hundreds of agencies, and money, even with its powerful persuasion, are powerless to do much without a total commitment from the people who seek to rise out of despair into a realm of equality. To participate in success requires a full devotion to it. It cannot be achieved through a double standard, one for the white man and one for the black man. Progress cannot be the reward for a people which has a double standard in its response to crime. Assassination, murder, looting, armed robbery, arson, and all the rest, must receive equal treatment in justice and punishment.

If violence in the streets becomes the preamble to social legislation, we are indeed looking down a long dark tunnel of trouble. If looting becomes an acceptable means of distribution, if arson becomes a step in urban renewal, if civil disobedience becomes a legislative lobby, from our own commonsense viewpoint, we can see an end of freedom as we know it and an end to liberty as we worship it. We can see an end to democracy as we have hoped and prayed for it. Worse than this, we can see an end to the brotherhood of man.

So now, Mr. Speaker, from the wretched work of the assassin's bullet, from the sinister swing of the looter's ax, and from the acrid ashes of the arsonist's torch, let us draw sober experience. Let us see in a new light the necessity to perfect our system of laws. Above all, in this task may we find the strength to reman clearheaded and free from emotional or political influence. Let us lead this Nation toward more universal opportunity and even greater achievement, but most of all toward a deeper understanding by its people of their own responsibilities.

VIOLENCE A KNIFE POISED AT HEART OF UNITED STATES: J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, all thoughtful Americans today are deeply concerned over the high incidence of crime, violence, and civil disorders in the United States. The Honorable John Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in an excellent article which appeared in the Sunday News, New York, N.Y., on March 24, discusses these serious problems with great penetration and illumination. I commend Mr. Hoover's article to my colleagues and wish to express my own great appreciation and thanks to Mr. Hoover for his tremendous contributions in the fight against crime and for his enlightened efforts to protect our civil rights.

VIOLENCE A KNIFE POISED AT HEART OF THE UNITED STATES: HOOVER

(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice)

Violence and the threat of violence—of many types—plague America today and cause fear, tension and extreme anxiety.

Violent riots have ripped major cities, bringing death, injury and destruction.

Surly and bitter demonstrators have clashed with police officers and, in one instance savagely assaulted the Pentagon.

A vitriolic and inflammatory Black Power demagogue urges Negroes to prepare military forces like the Vietcong.

A New Leftist student leader says: ". . . we need not determine here how to start an American resistance movement, it has already begun."

No wonder citizens are alarmed. No wonder Americans are asking: "Why violence?" "What does it mean?" "What can be done?"

These fears are aggravated by the highest crime rate in our national history (with crime growing more than eight times faster than population. Not only is crime increasing, urban, suburban and rural, but crimes of violence such as murder, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault are on a rapid rise, up 49% from 1960 to 1966).

Law enforcement has never been a more dangerous profession (in 1966, 57 police officers were killed in line of duty while assaults increased 13 percent over the previous year).

Never have firearms (of all types, including sub-machine guns and hand grenades) been more readily available.

Firearms are today playing a significant role in criminal violence and community disorder.

Juvenile misbehavior (including youthful gangs) is running at record levels.

Some areas of our cities are virtual jungles. People fear to venture out at night. Citizens are moving to other areas for safety reasons. There's no question but that the fear of violence is today "in the air," affecting the thinking and actions of countless Americans.

What's behind this violence? No easy answers can be given. As we all know, serious problems of poverty, unemployment, discrimination, ill health and poor housing are root causes of violence. Until these social, economic, political and racial problems are eliminated—and individuals can live with dignity—we will see much unrest, anxiety and violence. The best minds of America, both in government and private life, must pool their resources to eradicate these evils.

But also there is in America today a *rising spirit of disrespect for law and order* which bears a direct relationship to the violence we are experiencing.

TRAGIC DOCTRINE

Several factors can be identified in this increasing disrespect for the law. First is the concept of civil disobedience, a diabolical doctrine with tragic consequences for our society. Proponents of this theory assert that civil disobedience is justifiable if the acts are open, not violent, respectful of the rights of others, and have the purpose of focusing attention on significant moral issues of the day.

To some individuals imbued with zeal to correct abuses in society, the appeal of civil disobedience is great. They feel they are only "bending" the law, not breaking it—that their transgressions are only "minor" and "unimportant."

Suppose every individual or group which believed it had a righteous cause did the same! What would happen? Society would break down completely!

What starts out as "peaceful" acts of civil disobedience can quickly burgeon into open violence. Moreover, the concept of civil disobedience is highly contagious. If one group sees another achieving "favorable" results through illegal acts, it is tempted to do the same. Soon, the escalation of illegality leads to ugly incidents. On some occasions unscrupulous manipulators and hoodlums have seized control of these movements.

Another factor arises from what is called the student New Left movement. Actually, the student New Left is difficult to define. Campus-oriented, some of its adherents are beatniks, with sandals, long hair and tattered clothes. A few are hippies immersed in drugs. Others are sincere idealists, though badly misguided.

"We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment," one top New Leftist proclaimed. "We are actively organizing sedition," proclaimed another. The key New Leftist group is the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) which has chapters on many college campuses.

Student New Leftism bitterly detests American society and its democratic values. The heroes of the New Left are Castro, Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi Minh and Che Guevara. (One SDS leader said: "Che Guevara was always very close to me because he seemed to manifest in an almost perfect way what we in the SDS consider most important in a man or woman.") The New Left's mood is one of anarchism and nihilism. Its passion is to destroy, mock and defame our way of life.

New Leftists often transform themselves into jeering, frenzied, mobs. Visitors on campus, such as representatives of the military seeking to recruit students, may suddenly find themselves surrounded by a snarling crowd shouting obscenities and threats. They boo and hiss (even attempting to physically injure) ranking government officials who come to the campus to speak—emulating the infamous storm troopers of the Nazis. They believe in freedom of speech only for themselves. They urge civil disobedience, evasion of the draft and contempt for authority.

A motley crowd, yes, but in student New Leftism lies the seeds of incipient totalitarianism which has no respect for law and order.

A third factor is associated with the unfortunate development, very apparent in recent months, of what can be called racial power blocs, symbolized by terms such as "Black Power" or "White Power." When a Negro leader asserts "Go down and shoot somebody. You know who to shoot," he is doing a grave disservice to this country.

MOCKERY OF REASON

When a leader of the Ku Klux Klan, standing before a fiery cross and surrounded by guns and knives talks of "white supremacy," he is inciting violence. Such inflammatory remarks make a mockery of reason, intelligence and the rule of law.

At present, we are witnessing a tragic increase of racial acrimony, name calling and saber rattling. Impressionable young minds are affected by these demagogic outbursts. Honest, sincere efforts by groups and individuals to rectify racial injustice are being undermined. The fraternal cooperation of men and women of good will is hindered and thwarted. Extremists are seeking to gain dominance. This situation is fraught with peril. Fear breeds fear; violence creates counterviolence. Any type of power, black power or white power, exercised outside the scope of the law is a betrayal of our democratic institutions.

A final factor affecting the increase in dis-

respect for law and order is the growing injection into our society of ideological venom stemming primarily from the Communist Party, U.S.A. (loyal to the Soviet Union) and to its smaller rival, the Progressive Labor Party (PLP), a supporter of Red China.

Not since the depression of the 1930s has the Communist Party found more fertile fields of agitation. No wonder the party is deeply involved, for example, in the New Left student movement, chiefly through its youth front, the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs. Likewise, though being careful not to be overtly involved, the party welcomes the tactics of disruption encouraged by civil disobedience and Black Power.

Why? Because it is sincerely interested in improving our society? No. Rather, the party sees New Leftism, Black Power and civil disobedience as weapons which can be exploited to further a basic aim of Communism, namely the weakening in a democratic society of the citizen's faith in his government, his belief in law and order.

THE HIDDEN PURPOSE

The Communist Party and the Progressive Labor Party are ideologically committed to violence. A PLP leader said: "We will not be fully free until we smash this state completely and totally. We're going to have to kill a lot of these cops, a lot of the judges, and we'll have to go against the Army." No wonder they are gleeful about any individual or group which helps promote, knowingly, or unknowingly, their revolutionary aims.

"If destruction be our lot," said Abraham Lincoln more than 100 years ago, "we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time, or die by suicide."

The seeds of violence are abundant in America today. Whether they will bring future riots, bitter confrontations and ugly scars depends on what we as Americans do—now. At heart—despite past violence—America is not a lawless nation.

THE TIME IS NOW

Our history is the story of a people obedient to the law. That's why I believe we can do much to prevent violence, to increase respect for law and order. The time to start is today.

Respect the law. Encourage young people to respect the officer of the law. The officer is your protection. Don't speak to him derisively or condescendingly. Too often the word cop is used by citizens in a contemptuous style.

Support your law enforcement agency. Violence often arises when individuals mistrust the actions of local law enforcement.

A favorite tactic of abuse is to falsely charge the police with "brutality" or misconduct. No law enforcement agency feels itself above legitimate criticism, but wild and reckless charges of abuse only aggravate the situation.

Law enforcement agencies should be free from control by politically inspired civilian review boards and unhindered by plans whereby federal courts would take over departments and supervise their operations. Those who seek such plans desire not better enforcement but to harass, intimidate and destroy the agency's effectiveness.

Better control of firearms is both desirable and necessary. Mail-order firearm purchases should be banned, interstate transportation of firearms controlled and local registration of weapons required and enforced. In last summer's riots snipers became a major law enforcement problem.

Citizens should remember that vigilantism, even though the motives are sincere, is wrong. The handling of violence is a problem for the constituted authorities, not for the individual citizen. Great damage can be done by citizens' trying to organize patrols or attempting to enforce order.

Parents have a primary responsibility. All too often young people become involved in incidents of violence. Parents need to instill in their children respect for the law and law enforcement. They should set good examples themselves of observing the law. They need to know where their children are at night.

Citizens must be willing to fulfill the basic responsibilities of citizenship, such as furnishing pertinent data to officers of the law, serving as witnesses and jurors. Far too many citizens are shirking these duties. They fear personal involvement.

Violence is a major problem facing America—but it is not insurmountable. Here is our hope.

BURIAL OF REVEREND KING

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have sent the following wire to the Secretary of the Army:

Hon. STANLEY R. RESOR,
Secretary of the Army.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Although the family may still wish to proceed with burial of the body of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. as planned in Atlanta, Georgia, I nevertheless request and urge that you issue a directive that will permit burial at Arlington National Cemetery.

Burial with other fallen heroes of so many battles in the cause of justice and freedom would be highly fitting in respect to Rev. King. As Nobel Peace prize winner and as one who did so much to advance the American ideal of equality, permission for burial in this national shrine—whether burial occurs there or not—would be an appropriate, appreciated tribute to the memory of America's most respected, diligent, eloquent and courageous Negro leader.

PAUL FINDLEY,
Member of Congress.

JOINT LETTER ON CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday morning—several hours before the tragic shooting of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.—20 House Members agreed to the following joint letter to be distributed Monday, April 8, and made available to the press the same day:

Dear Colleague: We believe that the House should adopt the Senate-passed civil rights bill of 1968. On two previous occasions—in 1960 and in 1964—the House, without requesting a Conference, adopted significantly altered versions of House-approved civil rights bills.

We are convinced that this measure—approved in the Senate by 29 Republicans and 42 Democrats—is sound and just legislation. While we recognize that, like most complex bills, this bill is not perfect in every detail, it does seek to protect certain fundamental individual rights and assure equality of opportunity for all of our citizens. It is an affront to human dignity for any American to find that even though his bank balance is ample, his credit rating is good, and the character of his family is above reproach, he still cannot buy or rent better housing because his skin is not white.

Some questions have been raised regarding the various new sections incorporated in the Senate bill.

Title I, the anti-riot section, embraces areas covered in H.R. 421 and H.R. 2516 (protection of civil rights workers). Both bills passed the House in 1967. Republican members of the House Judiciary Committee expressed the view in Committee Reports on both that the two bills actually bear on the same problem, and, therefore, should be combined. The Senate has accepted this approach.

Titles II through VII, deal with the rights of American Indians. Our colleague, Ben Reifel of South Dakota, the only American Indian now serving in Congress, enthusiastically supports this Indian Bill of Rights as being long overdue.

Title X, regulates the use of firearms in connection with civil disorders. Senator Roman Hruska of Nebraska is the author of firearms legislation which has the endorsement of sportsmen's groups throughout the country. He voted for this civil rights bill in the Senate.

The key vote will be on a procedural question that will determine whether or not the House accepts the Senate bill without a Conference. If the bill goes to Conference, the best that can be said is that it faces an uncertain future. Once this bill goes to Conference, it must make its tortuous way through the Senate again *even though no changes in the Senate bill are made by the conferees*. There is grave danger that delay could defeat the bill.

There is no Republican policy position on this bill. It should be noted that Bill McCulloch, the ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee, intends to vote against sending the Senate bill to Conference. We know that a substantial number of Republicans intend to support that position. At this time, it appears that approximately 200 House members are prepared to vote for the Senate bill. The votes of additional Republicans and Democrats are obviously needed to pass this legislation.

Of course we share reservations of some of our colleagues with respect to the draftsmanship of the Senate bill and the parliamentary procedures being followed. But we also share the conviction that it is urgent for our nation that effective open housing legislation be passed this year. This matter of simple justice has been too long denied. Weighing all these considerations in the balance, we conclude that the civil rights bill should not be exposed to further unnecessary hazards.

We ask your help by voting and urging our colleagues to vote for the Senate bill without sending it to Conference.

Sincerely,

Ben Reifel, Edward G. Biester, Jr., Alexander Pirnie, William O. Cowger, Clark MacGregor, Albert H. Quie, John N. Erlenborn, Charles W. Whalen, Jr., Paul Findley, Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, Charles E. Goodell, F. Bradford Morse, William A. Steiger, Thomas S. Kleppe, Joseph M. McDade, Robert Taft, Jr., Howard W. Robison, John R. Dellenback, Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., Gilbert Gude.

DEAL WITH NORTH KOREA

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, I have just received a wire from Roy Annabel, the editorial director of the Tilton Publications, Inc., Rochelle, Ill., who publish two newspapers in my district. The substance of this wire is that he has information that has convinced him that the U.S. Government has made a deal with North Korea, offering to supply farm implements in exchange for the return of the captured U.S. spy ship the *Pueblo*, and its crew. He goes on in his wire to supply me with the following details:

That this transaction explicitly includes 20 trailer mowers purchased from the Avco New Idea Farm Implement Manufacturing Plant in Ohio and a like number of heavy-duty export crates from a lumber company that routinely supplies our forces in Vietnam, and that the shipments went aboard a railroad flatcar in the dead of night under directions of Government officials and arrived in Texas on March 14.

He goes on further to allege that a company spokesman who, for rather obvious reasons prefers to remain unidentified, contends that the implements left Texas for the Orient on March 16 and were a part of a deal for the return of the *Pueblo*, and are now in North Korea. This matter, as I have already indicated, is already in the public domain since it was published in one of these newspapers over the weekend. He has made fruitless attempts up to now to find out from our Department of Defense and from other governmental agencies as to the accuracy of this report. I think it is important that questions of this kind be answered, and I am calling on the State Department, on the Defense Contract Supply Agency and any other interested agency to affirm or to deny the truth of this report that this kind of deal has been made for the return of the *Pueblo*.

SALUTE TO MAYOR WASHINGTON

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. 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 Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I join with all those who mourn the tragic death of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Such a senseless act is condemned by all Americans and I join in the eulogies which have been given him.

My purpose in speaking today, however, is to pay my highest respects to Mayor Washington and his associates for their careful planning and their extremely well implemented plans to deal with the small minority who turned to crime and violence during these sad days. The policemen, and firemen, and the military deserve our thanks and gratitude for their exhaustive efforts and their devotion to duty during this crisis.

So, a salute to you, Mr. Mayor, and all your associates for a most commendable job during this difficult period.

IN SUPPORT OF LAW AND ORDERLY GOVERNMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that we will be hearing some recommendations tomorrow from the President on how to handle the problems in our city. I hope these are not a rehash of past recommendations which have not worked, and may have even contributed to the present disorder.

I see nothing to commend in the leadership which we have in the country today, but I am hopeful that the President will come up with some constructive suggestions.

Over the weekend, I received a pamphlet urging support of law and orderly government. It was prepared before the present disorders began, yet it is well reasoned and, I believe, worthy of consideration by the Members of the House. The pamphlet suggests stressing civil obedience to the law for a change; support for our police and court decisions that punish the criminal. I agree with the thought that a nation cannot survive without punishing those who break the law or endure without enforcing its laws.

The pamphlet is included at this point in the RECORD:

IN SUPPORT OF THE LAW AND AN ORDERLY GOVERNMENT

One of our Congressmen stated that he is bombarded by members of pressure groups who advocate civil disobedience and disruption of orderly government, but he hears very little on the subject of law and order from the law abiding citizens who make up the great majority of our population. Let us correct this. Those who have led disorderly demonstrations in many of our cities are now planning to disrupt our very seat of government.

You and I must notify our Congressmen, The President, and the Mayor of Washington of our concern, and ask that strong measures be taken to see that our Nation's Capital does not suffer the same fate meted out to other American cities in recent summers.

Let us get busy by telephone, telegraph and letter. Use your business and professional as well as your personal stationery.

To reach a Senator or Representative the address is very simply, using zip code 20510 for all Senators and 20515 for all Members of the House of Representatives: For example, Hon. Joel T. Broyhill, M.C., or Hon. William L. Scott, M.C., Washington, D.C. 20515; or Hon. William B. Spong, U.S. Senate, or Hon. Harry Flood Byrd, Jr., U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C., 20510.

(NOTE.—Substitute the names of your Congressman and Senator).

Letters should be personalized; however, here are some paragraphs that may suggest ideas following the opening salutation and prior to the request for appropriate action:

"It is high time that the rights of the law abiding majority be considered and that action be taken against all groups that do not abide by the law. The phrase 'non-violent civil disobedience' is a deceit and a fraud. Disobedience to civil law sets off chain reactions leading to riots, burnings, lootings, and even killing of law enforcement officers who attempt to restore order.

"Now our seat of Government itself is to be invaded by a minority group that has appointed itself to determine what legislation is to be passed. As has been the pattern in the past, there is the threat that if their demands are not met dire consequences will be the result. The elected representatives of all the people must follow orderly process of law and not legislate under threat of violence by a disruptive group that refuses to conform to the democratic process.

"If a group of trouble makers can dictate to Congress under threat of disrupting our Government, then we have indeed fallen into evil days.

"Let us stress Civil Obedience to the law for a change; support our police and demand that court decisions punish the criminal. No nation has ever devised a method of enforcing the law without punishing those who break the law. And no nation can long endure if it does not enforce its laws.

"Let us have appropriations for poverty and every other purpose on the basis of orderly determination of need by proper authority. Let us stop paying on the basis of threat of violence. Those who have made the Blackjack work for them are so drunk with success that they dare to use it against our very seat of Government. Now is the time to call a halt.

"How long are taxes of law abiding citizens to be used for appeasing those who threaten our security if we do not 'pay off'. Appeasement seldom works and it is not working now. As with blackmail, each 'pay off' leads to greater demands.

"The President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders rendered a report that goes to some length to make excuses for the riots in our cities, but unfortunately does not place the same emphasis on condemning the riots and those who foment them.

"Under the guise of 'Right of Assembly' minority groups have been permitted to assemble on public streets to block traffic, at entrances to buildings to prevent entrance of others and to disrupt whole communities with total disregard for the rights of others. Soft court decisions have sanctioned many abuses of the rights of the majority which in former years would have been swiftly dealt with.

"The law abiding citizens of the District of Columbia and those who work there must not be interfered with in the process of going to and from work and in the performance of their duties in Federal buildings.

"It appears now that the pattern to be followed in our Nation's Capital is the same as has been followed in other cities that have experienced 'hot summers'. Congress needs to act now to make it clear that those who attempt to cause disruption of our Government will be promptly and firmly dealt with."

LAW SHOULD BE FIRMLY ENFORCED TO PROTECT ALL LIVES AND PROPERTY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the hand that gunned down Martin Luther King served the world Communist cause well, and no other cause I know, bringing grief not only to one man's family and to millions of his followers but also tragedy to our country.

No matter how great the grief of the

Negro community, however, I think it should be emphatically stated that the overwhelming majority in this and other cities did not participate in any act of rioting or lawlessness or looting or burning. The overwhelming majority of the Negro community is no more represented by Stokely Carmichael and company than is the white community represented by the Ku Klux Klan.

Obviously no one can make a city or a country better by tearing it up or by burning it down. We would serve well the Negro community in this and other cities by a firm enforcement of the law, protecting their lives and their property, as I am convinced they would have city officials and Federal officials do.

Only within the framework of law, enforced firmly and without fear or favor, can the rights and liberties of all the people be made secure.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING AND THE DREAM OF A BETTER AMERICA

Mr. SCHWEIKER. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing my personal grief over the tragic assassination of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King.

The civil rights movement in the United States has lost its greatest pillar. Dr. King will go down in history as the father of the Negro revolution in America. The entire Nation is mourning a great American leader, one who taught all of us, white and black, the precept of nonviolence in achieving social progress.

This is a time for Americans of all races, religions and creed to pay respect to Dr. King as a man. It is even more important that we pay respect to the legacy of Dr. King's beliefs and leadership. The legacy of Dr. King is the faith that American can improve the lot of all of its citizens and can wipe out injustice wherever it exists. The legacy of Dr. King is the faith that a minority group can use the technique of nonviolence, derived from the teachings of Christ to achieve its aims of equality and justice for all.

Dr. King has fallen in battle, gunned down by an assassin who could not be reached by the lessons of nonviolence Dr. King preached. But this is no time to abandon the struggle to which Dr. King gave his life. It was not just a Negro struggle, but a struggle on the part of all Americans to achieve a better America, a more just America, an America where "equal opportunity" is a fact and not just a slogan.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, we must all, on the occasion of Dr. King's tragic death, rededicate ourselves to the ideals for which he lived and died. Dr. King "had a dream" of a better America, as he often preached. Dr. King has died, and it is up to us to see that the dream has not died with him.

CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS MEASURE SHOULD BE POSTPONED

Mr. WATSON. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the pleasure of testifying before the Rules Committee, at which time I urged them—and I hope some of my colleagues will find it possible to do likewise—to postpone consideration of any civil rights legislation until a calmer atmosphere can prevail, when we can discuss this matter in a calm and deliberate and intelligent fashion.

Second, I want to make this point: I hope we have not lost our sense of balance. Are we not concerned about the loss of lives and injuries to our policemen, firemen, servicemen, and other law-abiding citizens? Are we not concerned over the wanton destruction of property owned by our businessmen? While we lament the tragic assassination of one American, are we not mindful of the other Americans who lost their lives over this weekend? A young man right here in the District of Columbia, who was guilty of nothing more than stopping to get some gasoline, was killed right there. He was not a rioter or looter, but an innocent white man. There will not be any flags lowered in behalf of him and his little family, or other innocent victims who have lost their lives. There will not be a declared day of mourning, but so far as this Congressman is concerned, I extend my heartfelt sympathy to all the families of these innocent victims who have lost their lives over the past weekend.

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

Mr. WATSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman aware of the fact that the police have made the ridiculous and unbelievable determination that the death of the party to whom the gentleman referred was in no way related to the civil disobedience and assassination of Martin Luther King?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the press reported that he was beaten and stabbed by a group of Negroes during the course of the rioting here. These looters and rioters were not mourning the death of King, but as the Mayor of Washington said as he rode around, these rioters were not in an attitude of mourning, but they were laughing as they were looting and burning down stores.

The only point I want to make is that so far as one Congressman is concerned, I extend my heartfelt sympathy to all the families of those innocent Americans—policemen, firemen, and others—who loved life just as much as anybody, yet they seemed to be overlooked in current lamentations. That is my point.

APPLICANTS FOR PERMITS TO PARADE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OR ON U.S. PROPERTY SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO POST BOND TO COVER COSTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a companion bill to H.R. 13803, a much needed and sensible proposal now before the Committee on Public Works after its introduction by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

I hope that this body will take quick and favorable action on this bill in the best interests of all Americans.

The bill follows:

H.R. 13803

A bill to require applicants for permits to parade in the District of Columbia or on property of the United States to post a bond to cover certain costs of such parade

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no officer or employee of the United States or of the District of Columbia shall issue or sign any permit for a parade in the District of Columbia or on property of the United States if such officer or employee determines that such parade may cause property damage or disorder which would constitute a breach of the peace unless the person requesting such permit posts a bond in an amount determined by such officer or employee as will cover the estimated cost of—

(1) damage to property; and

(2) equipment and personnel needed to maintain order, excluding such equipment and personnel as are needed to route traffic and to protect those parading.

SEC. 2. (a) If the conditions of such permit are violated, the issuing officer or employee shall immediately revoke such permit, and the person to whom such permit was issued shall declare such parade at an end and shall actively cooperate in the dispersement of such parade.

(b) Failure by the person to whom such permit is issued to comply with the requirements of subsection (a) shall result in forfeiture of the total amount of the bond.

SEC. 3. The term "parade" includes march, demonstration, or other assemblage.

THE COST OF ERROR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the total cost to the American taxpayers of the gigantic TFX airplane mistake may never be fully known. The

TFX, renamed the F–111, has been so costly and so great an error that it is hard to believe.

Late last month, some 6 years after Robert McNamara first planned the project, the first six F–111's went into combat. And within a week, two of them, costing $6 million each, were scrambled wreckage on the ground.

This is the plane McNamara said should be built by a company in President Johnson's home State even though the top military experts all said another company should do the job.

Then the years dragged on as billions of dollars were put into the design and early production and testing. Design changes were made one after another until the weight of the plane became a serious problem.

It was supposed to serve both the Air Force and the Navy. But the Navy version of the plane was so heavy that it could not take off from an aircraft carrier.

Congress began to balk at approving more spending requests on the project 3 years ago. But the Pentagon continuously sought more funds on the assurance that problems could be solved.

Then, just a few days ago, on the same day the first F–111 was lost in Asia, a committee of the other body refused to approve any more money at all for the Navy's plane. The committee said the Navy should go ahead and design an entirely new aircraft system.

The Navy had asked for more than a half billion dollars for the fiscal year alone, just for development of its version of the F–111. This gives a clue as to how much has been squandered on the project over the past several years.

The F–111 plane was supposed to provide the basis for the entire Navy's system of air defense against Soviet aircraft and missiles during the 1970's. The Air Force version was supposed to be just as important to the U.S. military capability.

Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of the TFX controversy the Pentagon gave no attention to the many critics of the programs: critics in Congress, in the press, or elsewhere.

Now today it appears we are seeing the same kind of thing happening with regard to the growing strength of the Russian Navy.

U.S. naval leaders, and many Congressmen, are very concerned. For example, the chief of U.S. naval operations in the European area says Soviet naval advances in the 1960's have been "electrifying."

And yet the Secretary of the Navy, Paul Ignatius, said recently—on the same day the first F–111 crashed in Asia—that Russia does not appear to be trying to gain naval superiority over the United States. He said Russia is only trying to win political and psychological advantages, and he thinks it is unlikely that they are building enough amphibious warfare ability to support military action at a long distance.

He said we are favored by geographical advantages, and by our greater know-how and experience in naval affairs. But this is a highly dangerous viewpoint.

Our policy people have consistently been surprised by Russian military and space accomplishments, from the first orbiting of sputnik in 1957 to the sinking of an Israel destroyer by advanced Russian-built naval missiles in 1967.

We have learned that it is no good to depend on U.S. know-how being superior, or to rely on the Russians to be only interested in political and psychological gains.

The TFX scandal should be seen as a hard lesson—that military planning decisions by civilian policy people, when they are opposed by top military experts, do not always work.

Political and psychological gains are turned into hard military gains. That is what the cold war is all about. And even though some people in Washington seem to think the cold war is over, the Russians and their dependent puppet governments are still very much in the fight.

THE RIOTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as smoke was billowing over Washington as a result of the riots this past weekend, I sat in my office contemplating the future of this great Nation. Troops were on the streets outside my window. A machinegun was set up on the steps of the Capitol and my secretaries had been sent home early because of the possible assault on the Capitol.

What are we coming to? Martin Luther King is dead and whoever shot him must be found and convicted. But in the meantime, a vacuum has been created in the civil rights movement and it looks like Stokely Carmichael is moving into that void. This is not a very encouraging sign. So whatever we thought of Martin Luther King, the assassin's bullet only made matters worse.

In this atmosphere of violence, riots, looting, and burning, charged with emotions, we are being asked to legislate. People are saying that now we must pass the civil rights bill with its open housing provisions, the gun laws, completely rebuild our cities. And we are told that it must be done now—without proper consideration, without amendment, without proper debate. Just pass it and get the riots stopped. But what happens then? Where does it stop? Must we pass a new law everytime there is a riot?

Reasonable men are being stripped of all reason in their zeal to offer a balm in exchange for peace and quiet.

Maybe I am unreasonable, but I am not willing to legislate with a gun at my head; I am not willing to yield to those who would take the law into their own hands; I am not willing to admit that a handful of scum can dictate the policies of this Government and tell the Congress which laws to pass and which laws not to pass. I get my back up when I feel this kind of illegal pressure being applied.

Soon the President will address a joint session of the Congress. Presumably he will ask for billions of dollars "to make everything right." But I think he might start by calling for law and order in the streets of this Nation. Until we have respect for the law, nothing is going to be "right."

What we need now, more than hastily passed, ill conceived legislation, is understanding, reason, responsibility, law enforcement, respect for the law, and above all, prayer.

WE MOURN THE DEATH OF A GREAT AMERICAN, MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. COHELAN. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, we mourn the needless death of a great American, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and we pray that his death will not be in vain. Others have talked of his deeds and his words, I, instead, would like to talk about his dream.

Genesis states that:

> He (Jacob) dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven; and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it.

Like Jacob, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., had a dream, and the ladder he set upon this earth led to hope, to peace and to dignity for a people and a country he loved; and the realization of this dream for him was to secure the blessing of liberty and equality for ourselves and our posterity which the U.S. Constitution so boldly promised when our Nation was born.

It is a measure of Dr. King's success that this dream, slowly and tremulously, gives promise of becoming a reality.

I leave to others to enumerate Dr. King's successes, his failures, his background and his now stilled promise for the future. Let me note, instead, this great man's dignity and integrity, his steadfast refusal to be drawn into extremes of any kind and his adherence to his principles. For it is far more difficult to move softy, to speak quietly than it is to strike out with quickness and to shout a slogan. Unfortunately, the history of civilization too often shows the latter method being employed.

Walt Whitman wrote:

> In this broad earth of ours,
> Amid the measureless grossness and the slag,
> Enclosed and safe, within its central heart,
> Nestles the seed perfection.

Martin Luther King believed that the seed perfection existed—many of us believe that the seed exists. He believed that the seed contained the germination of a world of equality, a world where men are not judged by their race or their religion, but solely on "the content of their character."

I mourn the passing of this great and good man and I share the sentiments of a constituent who sent me a wire which reads: "I have not been so ashamed of my country since 1963."

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

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, the untimely and violent death of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King is a source of great sorrow to me, as I imagine it is to all Americans of good will.

Dr. King was an eloquent and forceful voice for justice in this country. More than a leader of his race, he was a great American working to turn the American dream into reality.

Recognizing that Dr. King's purpose in life was not to serve a special interest or a single group, but rather to serve the America that he loved, the appropriate memorial to this great man will be the establishment of justice and the provision of truly equal opportunity throughout America.

Dr. King worked and died for this goal. In his life he took us closer to its realization. In his death we must not lose sight of the nonviolent means that were his byword. It is an unholy response to his death to permit his enemies—violence, lawlessness, and disrespect for the lives and properties of others—to emerge in the wake of this tragedy.

AND DEATH SHALL HAVE NO DOMINION

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, over generosity and nobility of spirit, death need have no dominion. Though the assassin has deprived us yet again of one of our finest leaders, we need not permit him the other victory of destroying the significance of a great man's life and message. Martin Luther King's message and actions were positive ones; they spoke of what could be, if we but willed it; they appealed to the very best in the human spirit; and they affirmed life, rather than denied it.

His greatest accomplishment is that he inspired the hope and confidence of the poor and outcast in a better world and a more generous future; he demonstrated for all how the forces of hate and indifference can be blunted by the weapon of love. His greatest tribute to his Government and its people was his unshakable faith that it and we would respond positively to the demonstrable misery of the unfortunate and to the promptings of conscience. In so doing he gave us credit for a deeper devotion to principle and for a greater wisdom than it might always appear we deserve—and yet the choice is still ours to prove that this trust was not misplaced.

The difference between Dr. King and some others who share his pain over the injustices of our society is the difference between light and darkness, between hope and futility. He knew as well as anyone the sicknesses which beset us, and he was as determined as anyone that they should end. But he chose to treat the sickness not kill the patient. He ministered to reconciliation, not division and he chose to talk about the imperishability of the American dream, not the bankruptcy of the American soul. Just as important as the vision he articulated of a future of brotherhood, were the methods he adopted to achieve this goal. He was a man of action, as well as idealism, and did not chose to sit on the sidelines of life waiting for virtue to triumph; rather, he actively fought for his goals, but he did so by employing nonviolent tactics. To the forces of hate, he counterposed the force of love; to the forces of destructive action, he counterposed the force of creative action; to the voices of despair, he sang of hope, and to the merchants of death he offered his body, but never his principle and never his spirit. It was for such men as Martin Luther King that Stephen Spender wrote his great poem: "I Think Continually of Those Who Were Truly Great," which ends with these lines:

The names of those who in their lives fought for life,
Who wore at their hearts the fire's center.
Born of the sun they traveled a short while toward the sun,
And left the vivid air signed with their honor.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. BOLAND. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the bullet that snuffed out the life of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., has silenced this Nation's most eloquent and persuasive spokesman for civil rights.

Working with black and white people alike, Dr. King did more to advance the cause of civil rights than any other Negro in the history of the United States. His achievements in this cause range all the way from the integration of lunch counters in small southern towns to the razing of slums in giant Northern cities. His profound and abiding faith in the doctrine of nonviolence, a doctrine scorned by others, has dramatized the plight of his race and has led to most of the major breakthroughs in civil rights legislation. His reasoned plea for Government assistance has led to most of the major Federal and State programs now helping Negroes to rise up out of poverty. His selfless dedication to the cause of equal rights, equal justice and equal opportunity has inspired people throughout the United States to seek these goals more vigorously.

Yet what are the achievements of his detractors—the Stokely Carmichaels and H. Rap Browns?

They have succeeded in little more than exacerbating racial tensions, harming the cause for which Dr. King sacrificed his life rather than helping it.

The tumult that erupted in our major cities just after his death is a blot on his memory. The Negroes now roaming our streets in a blind fury, sacking buildings and leaving them in flames, are the very people who hooted at Dr. King and branded him as an Uncle Tom. Their actions are just as mindless and just as reprehensible as the act of the assassin who took Dr. King's life.

Dr. King, if he were alive today, would be repulsed by the smoking ruins left as a memorial to him by the very people he advised against violence.

The Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, the Springfield (Mass.) Union, and the Washington Daily News have published editorials outlining the significance of Dr. King's death and the urban chaos that followed it. With permission I would like to put these editorials in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, Apr. 5, 1968]

DR. KING

Violence, whether it is the work of a lone assassin or a group or an army of men, casts its burden on guilty and innocent alike.

The death by violence of the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. spreads an ugly scar of guilt across this land—on the warped mind which triggered the fatal shot on millions of decent Americans who were indirect targets of this callous assault on human dignity.

It may be unfair that this is so. But such is the nature of an evil abroad today in America that the bell tolls for all. Each man must, indeed, be his "brother's keeper."

Dr. King actively took this task upon himself. He was one of the prime movers for civil rights and social justice, refusing to seek the shelter of the sidelines.

This conviction led to his return to Memphis where last week rioters gained control of a protest march led by Dr. King. This conviction led also to his death which might, however, have occurred in any other racially divided city.

Dr. King, a Negro who grew up in the South, was naturally dedicated to the cause of freedom for members of his race. He was equally dedicated to freedom for humanity. In this broader context, for example, he was an outspoken critic of the war in Vietnam.

His views were not always popular. Even within the civil rights movement, he became increasingly a target for militants who contended nonviolence no longer brought results. But Dr. King refused to yield to this militant minority, white or black—convinced that the Christian precepts of nonviolence are still applicable today.

Dr. King brought distinction to his race and personal honors for himself, climaxed by the Nobel Peace Prize award in 1964. This, however, is not the real meaning of the powerful voice—often impassioned and often eloquent—which he raised in America.

The tragedy of his death is a personal tragedy. But it is, more than that, a nationwide tragedy that such a thing can happen here in America. The reaction to his death must not stop at shock and sadness. It must be translated into action, beginning in Congress and channeling back to local government. They can provide the legislative and moral weapons to end racial strife.

Those who heard Dr. King's words and recognized his wisdom, those who deplore "man's inhumanity to man" in any form, must now prove that they can act on his message and cast out the evil which imperils and debases this country.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Apr. 5, 1968]

I HAVE A DREAM

"I have a dream. . . ." The words rolled in sonorous tones from the Lincoln Memorial across a sea of faces, black and white, in the climax of the march on Washington four years ago.

One result of that historic event was Congress' passage of history's greatest single piece of civil-rights legislation. Another was the emergence of the speaker, Dr. Martin Luther King, as the country's most eloquent and effective advocate of racial equality in racial harmony.

Dr. King's cool courage kept the peace many times as his "civil disobedience" piled up results in better treatment for Negroes in facilities ranging from busses to voting booths.

Yet, for all the successes of this persuasive disciple of nonviolence and the respect he won from black and white alike, his tragic death by a depraved violent hand was not unusual evidence that bitter hatred still stalks this troubled land. The era of the torch, the rioter, the looter and the sniper arrived anyway because the response he got was not enough. This led a presidential commission to conclude that integration was in deep danger of total failure.

But that was a warning, not a fact. If Dr. King's murder brings the outpouring of indignation and sympathy it richly deserves, it will prove Negro progress within the American mainstream is still the majority's goal. The best hope is that his rivals, the militant Black Power separatists, will think more highly of his methods now.

But the real message of this Memphis martyrdom is to white America. Everyone who has turned his back on the Negro's plight, or put off doing what he could and should do about it, had an indirect hand in Dr. King's death. For these are the people who can make the dream come true—by changing the tortured lives that Dr. King risked his own life to improve.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 8, 1968]

WHILE WASHINGTON BURNED

If the authorities persist in viewing these riots primarily in terms of black vs. white, this certainly threatens to be another long, hot summer.

Here last week, as in Detroit last year, officialdom hestitated to take charge when a relatively small band of young, black hoodlums sacked and burned large sections of the capital. Troops to reinforce beleagured police were available within a few minutes ride. When they finally arrived the looting was stopped. But the call was delayed for fatal hours while the criminal gangs, believing themselves immune from restraint, spread destruction.

If there was any good reason for this delay, beyond a hand-wringing lack of decision in high places, it must have been fear that this was a general Negro uprising in resentment against the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King.

Any such idea is a gross libel on predominantly Negro Washington and on Negro citizens generally. It is evidence of a lingering unconscious race prejudice to which even some Negro spokesmen are not immune—an assumption that a black skin somehow sets a person apart as different in kind from his white neighbors.

Mugged, the Negro bleeds. Burned out, he is homeless. While officialdom fiddled, our citizens, white and black alike, were denied the equal protection of the law to which all citizens should feel entitled.

The mobsters couldn't have cared less about Dr. King, alive or dead. They violated every decency for which he stood, seizing upon his death as an excuse to steal and destroy. Those of Dr. King's race who sincerely mourned him weren't out screaming in the streets. They were in church, if they dared to leave their homes.

No one denies gross injustices continue to exist and that Negro slum dwellers are the outstanding victims. But every bit of destruction lessens the resources available for reform by just that much. The millions in property losses in one day in Washington are the equivalent of thousands of school teachers, hundreds of homes.

The prime civil right of any citizen, black or white, is security in his life and property. Until this right can be established, the chance of eradicating the slums is dim.

The only way to stop a riot is by superior force, promptly applied, regardless of the cause for which law breakers feign to be rioting.

This is a hard lesson which, as experience here indicates, is yet to be learned.

WHICH WAY DO THEY GO

Mr. McCARTHY. 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. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Martin Luther King under such tragic circumstances raises the question of who is going to fill the vacuum created by his death. As an apostle of nonviolence, he never gave up faith in America. He renounced the extremism of a Stokely Carmichael or a Rap Brown. So we are poised, it seems to me, at this tragic hour at a point of, where is America going to go; where are those who adhered to Martin Luther King and his philosophy going to go? Are they going to go the route that he recommended and which he fought for so zealously against the extremists? Or are they going to follow those like Stokely Carmichael who said that the black people should arm themselves?

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this question is not going to be answered by black men; it is going to be answered by white men, and I think it is going to be answered by the men and women in this Chamber, possibly this week.

LEADERSHIP PROCLAIMS "WE SHALL OVERCOME"

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Nero fiddled while Rome burned. L. B. J. announces "We shall overcome," while the Nation's Capital burns.

What kind of a leader have the American people in the White House?

The Nation's Capital has been burned and sacked; the criminal element given freedom to trample the rights of all law-abiding citizens; and what did the President do? He met with provokers of the revolution and proclaimed again, "We shall overcome." Overcome what?

Does anyone recall the President of the United States taking to television and appealing for law and order—using his entrusted position to calm the passions of primitive peoples and opportunists? Why the 20-hour delay before calling troops into the District?

Do we have a President of all people or a commander in chief of the revolution in the White House?

Mr. Speaker, the text of the Friday, April 5, 1968, address at the White House follows:

"WE SHALL OVERCOME:" JOHNSON

Once again, the heart of America is heavy—the spirit of America weeps—for a tragedy that denies the very meaning of our land.

The life of a man who symbolized the freedom and faith of America has been taken. But it is the fiber and fabric of the republic that is tested.

If we are to have the America we mean to have, all men—of all races, all regions, all religions—must stand their ground to deny violence its victory in this sorrowful time and all times to come.

Last evening, after receiving the terrible news of Dr. King's death, my heart went out to his people—especially to the young Americans who, I know, must wonder if they are to be denied a fullness of life because of the color of their skin. I called leaders of the Negro community and asked them to meet with me today at the White House. We have been meeting together here this morning.

No words of ours—no words of mine—can fill the void of the eloquent voice that has been stilled.

But this I deeply believe.

The dream of Martin Luther King has not died with him.

Men who are white—men who are black—must and will join together now as never in the past to let all the forces of division know that America shall not be ruled by the bullet but only by the ballot of free and just men.

In these years, we have moved toward opening the way of hope and opportunity and justice.

We have rolled away some of the stones—of inaction, of indifference, of injustice.

The work we have begun is not done.

But, together a nation united, a nation caring, a nation concerned—together, we shall overcome.

TEACHERS IN POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, who among us here has not again and again urged our constituents to take a more active interest and play a more active role in the workings of Government? I am pleased to note that schoolteachers across the country are taking us at our word.

Under the guidance of the National Education Association, the past 3 days were devoted to a teachers-in-politics weekend.

There are few groups better informed or more knowledgeable about National, State, and community affairs than our schoolteachers. Those who abstain from participating in partisan politics outside the classroom, in effect have denied the country of their extensive talents.

I wholeheartedly concur with Mary

Brooks, Republican National Committee assistant chairman, who wrote in the January 1968 issue of Teacher-Citizen:

Government, which is an extension of politics, affects and to some extent regulates our daily lives. All of us are "in politics" whether we want to be or not. A fast changing world situation demands that we take an informed active part in the political ideas that shape it.

Obviously, partisan classroom politics by teachers would be both dangerous and inappropriate. A good, strong country depends upon government determined and balanced by a strong two-party system. The teacher can do much to augment that system by developing student interest in politics.

The encouragement by NEA's Citizenship Committee of teacher participation in the country's political affairs is an important project in the creation of a more responsible citizenry and a better government.

LEST WE FORGET

Mr. RANDALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, because of the stirring events of the past weekend there are some equally important events which we may have lost sight of. Reference was made a few moments ago to the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, which most unfortunately has been all but forgotten.

Equally important and almost unnoticed has been the return of the island of Iwo Jima to the Japanese. Perhaps this was provided for by the 1951 peace treaty. I am asking my staff to research this point. It is very strange and most unusual none of us in the Congress were afforded any opportunity for debate. Perhaps our body under the Constitution has no lawful prerogative to debate the issue. Certainly the other body under the Constitution has the right of advice and consent on treaties, and thereby should have been consulted.

So far as I know, the State Department acted independent of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hearts of all those veterans of World War II who served in the Pacific Theater of operations were saddened by the news that the Bonin Islands would be returned to Japan. I am persuaded they not only experience a feeling of sadness but a cool anger that these islands, for which we paid so high a price in blood, should now be handed back to Japan.

For the most part, these veterans of the Pacific war are Christians. They have forgiven Japan for the ignomy of Pearl Harbor. Yet none of them will forget the bloody defense of these islands by our Pacific enemy in World War II and the extremely high cost paid in lives of our bravest men.

I rise in protest today against the "business as usual" attitude of the State Department and the unconcern of others in the executive branch who acquiesced so easily and almost without announcement because of what they call pressures from the Japanese.

All of us prefer friendly relations with the Japanese. But some place along the line we are going to have to drive down a stake and say we have gone "this far" and no further irrespective of the maintenance of friendship or good fellowship. I say this because the control of these islands is to be desired above all other considerations. The peace of mind furnished as an outer perimeter of defense by the islands as an outpost for the security of our West is paramount. It far transcends any small dividends from so-called good fellowship.

Now the question arises, what can we do, if anything, to repair this great loss? It seems this whole thing may have been put across under the terms of the 1951 Treaty of San Francisco. It is certain there was little or no discussion or public debate. Perhaps all that is left that can be done will be for the spirit of those brave men who gave their lives there to haunt those who so easily gave up our possession of this most important and valuable piece of real estate for which we paid such a high price, not in dollars and cents, but in lives of our brave fighting men.

It may be we have already lost our former status over Iwo. Yet it may not be too late to negotiate with the Japanese to maintain a lease for a military base of some kind on the island at the very least. We must continue to fight even at this late date for the right to land our planes. We must insist the flag of our great country continues to fly on Mount Suribachi as an eternal memorial to those marines and others who paid the supreme price for Iwo Jima, just as we are reminded every night of that same sacrifice as we look across the Potomac River to the Marine Memorial in Arlington.

Surely a lesson can be gained by this giveaway. The lesson is we must stand firm; must be adamant; must not deal and we must not yield on another piece of real estate equally important and that is the Ryukyu Islands, particularly Okinawa. I was on Okinawa early in January of this year. Our top military men there told us then they were already getting pressures coming from the Japanese to return Okinawa. It was not my lot to be on Iwo Jima during World War II. Yet on June 10, 1945, the day General Buckner was killed, I was on an LST just off Okinawa. I know something of the cost paid in lives for that island. The loss of Iwo must stand as a lesson. Whatever it takes, we must stand fast against giving up Okinawa. We shall not, we cannot, we must not relinquish these islands in the name of good fellowship or whatever other convenient cloak the State Department may want to provide as the excuse.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I am not sure I agree with him that we have all forgotten about the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, and I know the gentleman spoke that in parentheses, but I certainly want to compliment the gentleman on what he says about the return of the Bonins. I agree with him thoroughly about the now very evident pearl of the orient, the Ryukyus. I have said so in the past.

This is not something that is divisive, or even should be under discussion.

I would also like to point out, and I believe my distinguished colleague from Missouri would agree with me that, gone unheralded in this weekend of trouble, chaos, insurrection, and rioting, has also been the fact that we have liberated the valiant marines at Khesanh. And I believe this should be a red-letter day in the military history of America. I know we are all very thankful that those valiant marines there, some five or six thousand of them, have been relieved by the 1st Airborne Cavalry Division, and all credit to them.

And, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, along with my colleague from Missouri, I hope everybody else will feel joy at the liberation of this very key point in the defense of the demilitarized zone.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful for the contribution of my colleague from Missouri. I agree with him completely and associate myself with the remarks he made that regardless of the tragic events which have absorbed us here in the last few days we must not lose sight of important world events that are transpiring.

Again, let me repeat, Iwo must be a lesson to us. We cannot, we must not, and we shall not let the same thing happen with Okinawa.

THE LATE DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, as an American, I was appalled and shamed by the tragic assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. His senseless death is a blight upon the entire Nation.

Dr. King was an apostle of reason, an advocate for humanity. He believed that a person should be judged as an individual, not by color, race, or creed. He led his people forward seeking those human rights so long denied them. He was a man who sought peace and justice through the democratic process. Now, an assassin, who did not hold these values, has struck him down.

Dr. King's death will make it harder to create a just society. His leadership will be sorely missed by all Americans of good will. He sought to break the age-old bonds of racial prejudice that hobble this Nation. He fought to bridge the gap that separates blacks from whites. He loved his people, but even more he loved the democratic process. So let the evil forces that brought about his death, Mr. Speaker, not deceive themselves into thinking that they have slowed or reversed the revolution for human rights in America. Dr. King's murder will be a milestone in an irreversible movement. The killer only made this task more painful for America. I mourn for Dr. King and for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better way to carry on Dr. King's work, no clearer process for the Congress to follow, than to act and act decisively in passing the Civil Rights Act now pending

in the House. I urge my colleagues in the House to support this measure, as I intend to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

[Mr. RODINO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KORNEGAY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for this week on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. PETTIS), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PRYOR), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ADDABBO, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. RODINO, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. VANIK, for 30 minutes, on April 9.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. DICKINSON.
Mr. FINDLEY.
Mr. WINN.
Mr. QUILLEN in four instances
Mr. KLEPPE.
Mr. BUCHANAN in two instances.
Mr. ADAIR.
Mr. DENNEY in three instances.
Mr. TEAGUE of California.
Mr. BROTZMAN.
Mr. SCHERLE.
Mr. ASHBROOK.
Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.
Mr. MESKILL.
Mr. REIFEL.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.
Mr. OTTINGER.
Mr. RESNICK.
Mr. FRASER in three instances.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in two instances.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
Mr. HOLLAND.
Mr. DENT in two instances.
Mr. PEPPER in two instances.
Mr. MAHON.
Mr. WOLFF in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in six instances.
Mr. PODELL.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. BOLAND in two instances.
Mr. BROWN of California in two instances.
Mr. SIKES in six instances.
Mr. NIX.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2123. An act to provide for the control of the alewife, smelts and other fish and aquatic life in the waters of the Great Lakes which affect adversely the fish resources and ecological balance of the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2658. An act to amend section 127 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to vehicle weight and width limitations on the Interstate System, in order to make certain increases in such limitations; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 11816. An act to provide compensation for law enforcement officers not employed by the United States killed or injured while apprehending persons suspected of committing Federal crimes, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 9, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 16409. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to provide salary increases for teachers and school officers in the District of Columbia public schools, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. TAFT, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WHALEN):

H.R. 16507. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and operate a National Museum and Repository of Negro History and Culture at or near Wilberforce, Ohio; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUTTON (for himself, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. HARRISON):

H.R. 16508. A bill to provide a comprehensive national manpower policy, to improve the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, to authorize a community service employment program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 16509. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 16510. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 16511. A bill to designate the hospital authorized to be constructed at Fort Jackson, S.C., as the John J. Riley Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 16512. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to impose prohibitions on the employment by the Federal Government or District of Columbia Government of persons convicted of engaging in riots and certain other activities involving violence and civil disorder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 16513. A bill to provide for the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities by the producers thereof and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 16514. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to provide for loans to public bodies which upon sale by the Farmers Home Administration shall bear taxable interest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 16515. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to provide that annual contributions to public housing agencies thereunder may include payment of the cost of services (including social, health, and safety programs) for families in low-rent projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16516. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 16517. A bill to provide security measures for banks and other financial institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16518. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for the manufacture, advertisement for introduction, or introduction into interstate commerce of motor vehicle master keys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16519. A bill to authorize the Bureau of Prisons to assist State and local governments in the improvement of their correctional systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 16520. A bill to enable baby chicks, started pullet, laying hen, and table egg producers to consistently provide an adequate supply of these commodities to meet the needs of consumers, to stabilize, maintain, and develop orderly marketing conditions at prices reasonable to the consumers and pro-

ducers, and to promote and expand the use and consumption of such commodities and products thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 16521. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Negro History and Culture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 16522. A bill to establish a commission to investigate the causes and effects of strikes in the newspaper industry and to recommend improved procedures for preventing and settling such strikes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 16523. A bill to amend section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 to require that radios be capable of receiving both AM and FM broadcasts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 16524. A bill to provide for the appointment of postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts):

H.R. 16525. A bill to authorize a project for flood control and related purposes for the lower Charles River, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 16526. A bill providing for the designation of the Garibaldi-Meucci Museum, Staten Island, N.Y., as a national historic landmark; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

329. By Mr. HALPERN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to the promotion of the development of the fishing industry and the American fishing fleet to aid in solving the problems of hunger and malnutrition in the world; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

330. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to the declaration of the Garibaldi-Meucci Memorial Museum as a national historical landmark; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 16527. A bill for the relief of John Benedict Chiu (also known as Chen-Tien Chiu) and his wife Theresa Chiu (also known as Theresa Hsiao-Wen Chiu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16528. A bill for the relief of Tony I-Tson Soo and his wife, Adelaide Y. Tsao Soo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16529. A bill for the relief of Agostino D'Ascoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16530. A bill for the relief of Francesco Loporto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 16531. A bill to authorize Thomas W. Shands and Flanders Thompson to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Lee County, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 16532. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to present a gold medal to the widow of Martin Luther King, Jr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 16533. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to present a gold medal to the widow of Martin Luther King, Jr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE—*Monday, April 8, 1968*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, D.D., minister, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of us all, we come to Thee for help and guidance in a tragic hour. We stand in the need of prayer as we recall the tragic events of the past few days.

Our thoughts and prayers are in the interest of the family of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. Be with them in their bereavement. Be near in comfort, especially to Mrs. King and her children.

Our Nation is shocked by the violent death which came to this Christian disciple of the doctrine of nonviolence. We bow in this moment of memorial prayer in recognition of his powerful influence, his needed example, and his effective teaching and preaching which ring in our ears louder after his death.

We pray for strength as we try to repair the physical and spiritual damage that has come to our cities and lives erroneously expressing violence as a memory of his death. Provide through us for the needs and help of the victims of these sad days.

We give Thee thanks for our President, Vice President, the Members of this Senate and other national and local leaders for their untiring efforts and leadership during these critical times. Bless them with inner strength, peace and guidance. Bring peace, O God, to our Nation and our world as we repent of the guilt that is on each of us for the way we have failed each other and Thee in so many ways. Give us light in darkness that the evil of these days will be defeated at the personal altar of sacrifice and dedication of every citizen in our dream of a land of freedom and equal justice. We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 5, 1968, be dispensed with.

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

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESSS

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.

CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1057 as well as the next two bills.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2015) to amend section 11-1902, District of Columbia Code, relating to the duties of the coroner of the District of Columbia which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "nature," insert "and examine and report thereon"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 2015

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11-1902 of the District of Columbia Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 11-1902. Inquests; exceptions; jury

"(a) The coroner shall take custody of the body of each person found dead in the District when the manner and cause of death is not already known as accidental or in the course of nature, and examine and report thereon, and, except as provided by subsections (b) and (c), shall hold an inquest concerning the death of such person: *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed to require the jury of inquest to view, or to be sworn in over, the body of the decedent.

"(b) The coroner may not summon or hold a jury of inquest over the body of a deceased person where it is known that the deceased came to his death by suicide, accident, mischance, or natural causes; except that where it is not known that the deceased came to his death by suicide the coroner may summon a jury.

"(c) The coroner shall not be required to

summon or hold a jury of inquest over the body of a deceased person in any case in which a United States commissioner for the District of Columbia or a judge of a court of competent jurisdiction has ordered any person held for action by the grand jury or a court for causing the death of a person, or in which any person has been indicted for causing the death of a person.

"(d) A coroner's jury shall consist of six persons."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1076), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 2015 is to amend the law relating to the duties of the corner of the District of Columbia. The Judiciary Subcommittee held a hearing on S. 2015 on March 8, 1968.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Under present law, the coroner is required to "hold an inquest over the body" of each person found dead in the District when the manner and cause of death is not already known to be accidental or from natural causes. The changes proposed by S. 2015 would dispense with the statutory requirement "to hold an inquest over the body", or swearing over the body, by the jurors. The committee believes that the ceremony of swearing the jurors over the body of a deceased is antiquated and serves no useful purpose. The bill simplifies the procedure to require that the coroner "shall take custody of the body" and hold an inquest in the same cases in which the statute presently requires inquests to be held.

The object of a coroner's inquest is to obtain information as to whether death was caused by some criminal act and to obtain evidence to prevent the escape of the guilty person, as well as to furnish the foundation for a criminal prosecution in case death is shown to be felonious.

On occasion, in some cases involving deaths, the U.S. attorney's office has, prior to action by the coroner, found it necessary to present the cases to the grand jury in order to complete extradition proceedings to the District for persons who fled to other jurisdictions. In other cases, the defendant has, prior to any inquest, been arraigned in the District of Columbia court of general sessions and ordered held for action by the grand jury. In each of these cases, existing law requires that a coroner's inquest be held.

In cases where a U.S. commissioner or a judge has ordered a person held for action of the grand jury, or in a case where the person has been indicted for causing the death, an inquest would serve no useful purpose since the criminal process has been instituted and probable cause to charge homicide has been judicially established. Paragraph (c) of the bill dispenses with the requirement for an inquest in all such cases where probable cause has been established. In this respect, the committee believes the bill dispenses with unnecessary hearings and results in greater efficiency and economy.

AMENDMENT

The committee agreed to amend the bill as suggested by the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. This amendment would clarify that the coroner is required to do something beyond merely taking "custody of the body"; it would require him to examine the body and prepare a medical report of his findings. The report of his findings may be extremely valuable in the preparation of homicide cases for trial, especially in those cases where an inquest by a jury has been dispensed with.

CONCLUSION

Your committee recommends approval of S. 2015 as amended by the committee.

POLICE MUTUAL AID

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2496) to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into and renew reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia with the local governments in the Washington metropolitan area was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "governmental" strike out "units" and insert "unit"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "employees," strike out "of the District together with all necessary equipment, in the event of an emergency resulting from the existence of a state of war, internal disorder, or fire, flood, epidemic, or other public disaster" and insert "together with all necessary equipment, in event of war, internal disorder, fire, flood, epidemic, or other public disorder which threatens or has occurred"; and at the top of page 3, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. The Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall be responsible for directing the activities of all policemen and other officers and agents coming into the District pursuant to any such reciprocal agreement, and the Commissioner is empowered to authorize all policemen and other officers and agents from outside the District to enforce the laws applicable in the District to the same extent as if they were duly authorized officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia.

So as to make the bill read:

S. 2496

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioner of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized in his discretion to enter into and to renew reciprocal agreements, for such period as he deems advisable, with any county, municipality, or other governmental unit in the States of Maryland and Virginia, in order to establish and carry into effect a plan to provide mutual aid, through the furnishing of policemen and other agents and together with all necessary equipment, in the event of war, internal disorder, fire, flood, epidemic, or other public disorder which threatens or has occurred.

SEC. 2. The District of Columbia shall not enter into any such agreement unless the agreement provides that each of the parties to such agreement shall (1) waive any and all claims against all the other parties thereto which may arise out of their activities outside their respective jurisdictions under such agreement; (2) indemnify and save harmless the other parties to such agreement from all claims by third parties for property damage or personal injury which may arise out of the activities of the other parties to such agreement outside their respective jurisdictions under such agreement.

SEC. 3. The policemen and other officers, agents, and employee of the District, when acting hereunder or under other lawful authority beyond the territorial limits of the District, shall have all of the pension, relief, disability, workmen's compensation, and other benefits enjoyed by them while performing their respective duties within the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. The Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall be responsible for directing the activities of all policemen and other officers and agents coming into the District pursuant to any such reciprocal agreement, and the Commissioner is empowered to authorize all policemen and other officers and agents from outside the District to enforce the laws applicable in the District to the same extent as if they were duly authorized officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I rise to comment briefly on my bill, S. 2496. In recent years, the local jurisdictions which compose the Washington metropolitan area have been confronted with many urban problems that are regional in nature. It was for this reason that the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments was formed. The Council of Governments is a voluntary association of the area's 15 major local governments.

The Public Safety Policy Committee of the Council of Governments is concerned with the coordination of police, fire, civil defense, traffic safety and codes and regulations related thereto on a regional basis.

On September 29, 1967, the membership of the Public Safety Policy Committee voted unanimously to urge Congress and the State legislature in Maryland and Virginia to adopt enabling legislation which would allow the local governments of our region to enter into police mutual aid agreements.

This type of legislation was first suggested by the Regional Police Chiefs' Committee, which advises the Council of Governments on police matters. The police committee is composed of the chiefs of police from all area local governments in addition to representatives from the FBI, the Secret Service and the Capitol Police, the Park Police, the airport police and the military police.

The Police Chief's committee has expressed concern on many occasions over the fact that while crime and civil disorder often affect more than one jurisdiction in our area, a police officer cannot render emergency assistance beyond the boundaries of his own jurisdiction.

To resolve this difficultly, Mr. President, I introduced S. 2496 to pave the way for an agreement which would eliminate jurisdictional restrictions incumbent upon area law enforcement officers in emergency situations.

S. 2496 authorizes the new Mayor of the District of Columbia to enter into and renew reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia with the other local governments in the Washington metropolitan area.

At his discretion, and for such periods as he deems advisable, the mayor would be permitted to enter into reciprocal agreements with any county, municipality, or other governmental units in the States of Maryland and Virginia for this purpose.

The agreements would allow the District and surrounding jurisdictions to establish and carry into effect a plan to provide mutual aid, through the furnishing of policemen and other agents and employees of the District, together with all necessary equipment in the event of an emergency resulting from the existence of a state of war, internal disorder, or fire, flood, epidemic, or other public disaster.

The legislation would indemnify officers responding to requests for emergency assistance from claims from third parties and would assure that while working outside their own jurisdictions, they would still be covered by all of the pension, relief, disability workmen's compensation and other benefits they enjoy while performing their respective duties within the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, Congress and the State Legislatures of Maryland and Virginia several years ago approved a bill permitting the development of reciprocal agreements for mutual firefighting aid by the local area governments.

Passage of S. 2496 is essential if our local police forces are to meet adequately the growing interjurisdictional challenges to the life and property of our area's citizens. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to follow the lead of the Senate District Committee, and act early and favorably on S. 2496.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1077), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 2496 is to authorize the District of Columbia government to enter into reciprocal agreements with governmental units in Maryland and Virginia to provide police mutual aid when emergencies threaten or occur.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

In recent years, the local jurisdictions which compose the Washington metropolitan area have been confronted with many problems that are regional in nature. Because the metropolitan area comprises parts of two States and the District of Columbia, large numbers of area residents travel back and forth across boundary lines every day, and may be as concerned with, and affected by, what happens in the District of Columbia as they are with events in surrounding communities.

Emergencies such as epidemics, floods, fires, riots, or other internal disorders may affect more than the immediate area of the disaster or may create a sudden temporary need for additional police protection for the people in the affected area. However, police officers cannot now render emergency assistance beyond the boundaries of their own jurisdiction. Your committee believes that the public interest requires that there be some relaxation of the traditional boundary restrictions when actual or impending disaster threatens the public safety anywhere in the area.

BACKGROUND

S. 2496 is patterned after the act approved August 14, 1950 (64 Stat. 441), as amended (78 Stat. 585; D.C. Code, sec. 4–414), entitled "An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes."

Congress has also authorized the District of Columbia to enter into interstate civil defense compacts (68 Stat. 59). These compacts are intended to provide mutual aid among the States in meeting an emergency or disaster from enemy attack, including sabotage and subversive acts. Pursuant to that act, the District of Columbia entered into compacts with the States of Virginia and Maryland in June 1954.

Some of the contingencies which S. 2496 is designed to cover fall within the area of the agreements reached pursuant to the civil defense legislation. However, those agreements authorized under that act do not, like those contemplated under the authority of S. 2496, provide for emergencies caused by internal disorder. Moreover, the act authorizes agreements between State governments, including the District of Columbia, whereas the present bill provides for agreements between the District Commissioner and county, municipal and other governmental units of the adjacent States.

The committee has been informed that police mutual aid agreements cutting across State lines already exist in some locations throughout the country. Information received from the International Association of Chiefs of Police indicates that there are arrangements for police mutual aid between Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans.; between Rock Island, Ill., and Davenport, Iowa; and between Bristol, Va., and Bristol, Tenn.

The Virginia Legislature approved legislation in its 1968 session that would enable county and municipal governments including those in the northern Virginia portion of the Washington metropolitan area, to enter into police mutual aid agreements with other jurisdictions. The Maryland Legislature considered but did not give final approval to a similar bill in the legislative session recently concluded.

HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on the Judiciary held a hearing on S. 2496 on March 8, 1968. The bill received the support of the Department of Justice, the District of Columbia government, and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The first section of the bill authorizes the Commissioner of the District of Columbia at his discretion to enter into reciprocal agreements with county, municipal, or other governmental units in Maryland and Virginia for the purpose of establishing and carrying out plans to provide mutual aid, through the furnishing of policemen and other employees, and necessary equipment, in the event of an emergency resulting from war, internal disorder, fire, flood, epidemic, or other public disaster. The committee amended this section to permit appropriate measures to be taken in anticipation of such emergencies as it would cover. The committee believes that a mutual aid plan for riot control, for example, should go into effect when as assemblage gathers or is expected to gather under circumstances which could foreseeably result in internal disorder.

Section 2 provides that the District enter no agreements unless the parties to the proposed agreement waive claims against all other parties arising from their activities beyond their respective jurisdictions, and indemnify the aiding parties against third-party claims.

Section 3 provides that District employees acting outside the District pursuant to agreements made under the authority of the bill shall have all the benefits they enjoy while performing their duties within the District.

The committee amended the bill to add section 4. This section provides that the Commissioner shall be in command of all policemen and other officers and agents coming into the District pursuant to reciprocal agreements, and that the Commissioner may vest in police officers from outside the District the same power and authority as is exercised by members of the Metropolitan Police force.

AMENDMENTS

Amendments to permit the taking of action in anticipation of emergencies and to empower policemen from outside the District to exercise police authority when called into the District of Columbia have been discussed in the previous paragraphs.

The committee also approved two technical amendments. One is to make clear that the plans to be undertaken by reciprocal agreements will concern policemen and other employees of the various governmental units concerned, as well as of the District of Columbia. The other amendment is a language correction.

CONCLUSION

Your committee believes S. 2496 will help to fill a need for mutual cooperation between local law enforcement agencies for dealing with emergencies in the Washington metropolitan area that might otherwise lead to chaos. The committee recommends the prompt passage of S. 2496.

UNIFORM GIFTS TO MINORS ACT

The bill (H.R. 5799) to amend the District of Columbia Uniform Gifts to Minors Act to provide that gifts to minors made under such act may be deposited in savings and loan associations and related institutions, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1075), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 5799 is to amend the District of Columbia Uniform Gifts to Minors Act so as to provide that monetary gifts to minors in the District may be deposited in savings and loan associations, credit unions, and related institutions, as well as in banks.

BACKGROUND

In its present form, the District of Columbia Uniform Gifts to Minors Act (79 Stat. 744; title 21, sec. 3, District of Columbia Code) provides that a gift of money to a minor may be deposited in a bank, for credit to an account in the name of the donor or other adult, or a bank with trust powers, as custodian of that monetary gift for the minor. In that act, the term "bank" is defined as "a person or association of persons carrying on the business of banking, whether incorporated or not, in the District of Columbia." The present law does not include homestead or building associations, building and loan associations, savings and loan associations, or Federal credit unions as eligible depositories of monetary gifts to minors.

The committee is aware of no reason why such financial institutions should not be eligible depositories for such gifts, and believes that for such transactions, these institutions should be placed on a par with banks. One of the purposes of such associations and credit unions is to encourage and promote savings and thrift, and the committee believes it appropriate that they be per-

mitted to accept deposits of such monetary gifts.

H.R. 5799 passed the House of Representatives on June 26, 1967.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

H.R. 5799 solves the problem referred to above by substituting the term "financial institution" for the word "bank" throughout the Uniform Gifts to Minors Act.

In addition, "financial institution" is then defined in these amendments to include "any bank, homestead or building association, local savings and loan association, Federal savings and loan association, or Federal credit union, having an office in the District of Columbia." This language is felt by all parties concerned to embody a correct solution to this situation.

HEARING

At a public hearing conducted by the Judiciary Subcommittee on March 8, 1968, testimony favoring the enactment of this proposed legislation was submitted by spokesmen for the District of Columbia Government, the District of Columbia Credit Union League, and the District of Columbia Savings and Loan League, Inc. In addition, your committee was advised that the bill has the endorsement of the Washington Bar Association. No opposition to the passage of the bill was expressed.

CONCLUSION

The committee is advised that the laws governing gifts to minors in at least 40 of the States now permit such monetary gifts to be deposited in trust in other standard financial institutions as well as in banks. In your committee's view, this same latitude of authority, as is provided in H.R. 5799, should be made a part of the District of Columbia Uniform Gifts to Minors Act.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

A TIME OF CRISIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we live in the most troublous period in the history of the Republic, and we have perhaps passed through the most significant 7 days of our lives. We must consider, I believe, three major problems at this time, so that we can keep our views in perspective.

The first is the question of urban unrest, which is now so prevalent throughout our land.

I would express the hope that the House very shortly—I recognize the fact that that is its responsibility—would pass the civil rights bill passed by the Senate several weeks ago. I would hope, also, that the Senate, in its appropriate committee, would report the equal opportunities employment bill, which has been under consideration for more than a year.

I am glad to note that the Committee on the Judiciary has reported the safe streets bill, but I understand that because of a time limitation to allow various points of view to be annotated, it will not be and could not be brought up until after the Easter recess.

Mr. President, I recognize that laws and appropriations alone are not the answer in the field of urban unrest. I believe that part of the answer lies in a greater participation on the part of private industry in facing up to this problem which confronts all of us. I feel, also, that a greater degree of responsibility on the part of our citizens is mandatory. I feel, also, that there must be a respect for law and order on the part of all of us, and it is my belief that this is vitally necessary if we are to regain our self-respect.

The second factor of importance is the question of Vietnam. I would hope that, in view of the President's speech on Sunday a week ago, and on the basis of events since then, all of us, regardless of our personal views, would give him our full support in his endeavors to bring about an end to that barbaric conflict.

So far as the holding of the conference which may be in the offing is concerned, it really is immaterial where it will be held; but if I may express a personal wish, it would be my thought that inasmuch as this is an Asian problem, perhaps a good site would be Rangoon, in Burma, or Pnom Penh, in Cambodia.

The third factor is the instability of the dollar—and may I say that we cannot dissociate the urban unrest, Vietnam, or the last mentioned factor. I would hope that the House would pass the Senate-approved bill which imposes a 10-percent surcharge tax on income tax payments, a $10 billion reduction in the budget, and a $6 billion reduction in the field of expenditures; or, if this is not possible in conference, that the House would report a measure with a comparable degree of fiscal restraint.

All three momentous crises must be faced now and action must be taken, even though it will not provide overnight solutions. The measures recommended above will provide only a start, but a good and necessary start.

Mr. President, let all of us forget our own political futures, personal and partisan, and do what must be done for the common good and the survival of the Nation. All else is of little consequence. If the President can make the sacrifice which he has made, I believe Congress can join him in making the necessary sacrifices to see that this Nation is once again put on an even keel.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Montana are reechoed by those of us who sit on this side of the aisle.

This is our country. We can do with it as we wish. We can build it. We can make it a nation where all human beings who call themselves American citizens have an opportunity to make progress.

I earnestly congratulate the leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate for the manner in which he has spoken. Surely, all of us must demonstrate a respect for law and order. With the freedom we have as American citizens goes a greater responsibility to maintain the kind of human system that has been established in our country. Law and order must be respected, and the law must be enforced.

When I left here on Friday afternoon and saw my fellow citizens in battle uniform, ordered to maintain vigilance over this Capitol Building, with machineguns in the hands of some of them, it almost seemed like a nightmare; it almost seemed like some kind of motion picture set.

So it has happened. We need now to begin to assess the damages, and to demonstrate that those who break the law must pay the penalty; but also we need to take the long-range steps that my good friends, the Senator from Montana, has called for this morning. I join him in earnestly hoping that the House of Representatives will approve the civil rights bill, with the fair housing legislation, which we fashioned in this Chamber.

I earnestly hope that representatives of the American people and the American people themselves will demonstrate to the world that we are united behind the President as he now seeks an honorable and decent solution to the war in Vietnam. It matters not to me where the locale of any negotiations which take place might be.

Speaking as a Republican, I earnestly join the leader of the majority party with respect to what he said in connection with the problem of the American dollar. The Senate, thank God, has acted and it has acted in a bipartisan fashion. It has seen the danger and it has taken a forward step. I hope the House of Representatives approves the action of the Senate or, as the Senator said, that it will do the same thing in another legislative vehicle, if that is necessary.

At any rate, I wish to say, "MIKE MANSFIELD, you are a leader in this society, and I am glad to support you."

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Defense.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE FARM LOAN ACT AND THE FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1933, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to improve the capitalization of Federal Intermediate credit banks and production credit associations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report of the Commission on the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland Interconnection Power interruption of June 5, 1967, dated March 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Communications Satellite Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Corporation for the calendar year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the need for revision in policy regarding assessment of late charges on delinquent loan repayments, Veterans' Administration, dated April 3, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on maintenance of automatic data processing equipment in the Federal Government, dated April 3, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ANNUAL REPORT, DIVISION OF COAL MINE INSPECTION, BUREAU OF MINES

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Division of Coal Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines, for the calendar year January 1, 1967, through December 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF SECTION 313 OF THE ACT APPROVED OCTOBER 27, 1965 (79 STAT. 1073)

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 313 of the act approved October 27, 1965 (79 Stat. 1073); with an accompanying paper; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports on the Commission's work during the past year, entitled "Annual Report to Congress for 1967" and its supplement, "Fundamental Nuclear Energy Research—1967," dated January 1968 (with accompanying reports); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

Resolutions adopted by the municipal council of the city of Newark, N.J., praying for the enactment of legislation relating to imports on certain goods; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Latvian Association, of Detroit, Mich., relating to the 50th anniversaries of the independence of the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCOTT (for Mr. DIRKSEN), from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 7909. An act for the relief of Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., of New York, N.Y. (Rept. No. 1084).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 2434. An act for the relief of Nora Austin Hendrickson (Rept. No. 1085).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the existing compensation system for motor vehicle accident losses, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1086).

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. SMATHERS:

S. 3289. A bill for the relief of Dr. Francisco A. Aviles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. LONG of Louisiana):

S. 3290. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as amended, to require that the label of drug containers, as dispensed to the patient, bears the established name of the drug dispensed; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. NELSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3291. A bill for the relief of Lieutenant Ching Chiu Liu, his wife, Shu Tze Liu, and their son, Pulvin Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 3292. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to improve the capitalization of Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKE:

S.J. Res. 159. Joint resolution designating January 15 of each year as "Martin Luther King Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BROOKE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 3290—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO COMPEL LABELING OF PRESCRIPTION DRUG CONTAINERS WITH GENERIC NAMES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill which would amend the pure food and drug laws, to make mandatory the identification on the label, by their general names, of the contents of each container of drugs sold to the ultimate consumer.

This is the second measure I have introduced to help modernize the Nation's drug laws. The necessity for this change became apparent during hearings I am conducting as chairman of the Monopoly Subcommittee investigating prescription drug prices.

A very distinguished authority and famous medical expert, Dr. Helen Taussig, who discovered that thalidomide caused phocomelia—infants born without fully developed limbs—testified to the importance of generic labeling.

She said on November 28, 1967, before the subcommittee:

> A bottle without a generic name is a dangerous custom since it means that a large amount of unlabeled medicine that has been withdrawn from the market may remain available, but also that, when medicines are taken by mistake, especially by children, the doctor may be at a loss to know what has been taken.
>
> Although common sense calls for a change in this custom, a concerted effort by the medical profession will be necessary to effect such a change.

Dr. Taussig went on to say:

> It is necessary to know the generic name, because if it is produced under 50 different trade names, (it) is very hard to know whether you may not be changing to exactly the very same product you have had before.

She stated that during the thalidomide tragedy 50 to 100 different brands of the drug were on the market and that identification of all of them was impossible. As a matter of fact, Dr. Taussig stated that in Brazil, where a number of deformed children were born, tragic confusion reigned. Drug investigators state that thalidomide was not being sold in the country, when in fact, it was being sold under five different trade names.

Dr. Taussig said that this tragedy could occur again, especially in view of the number of potent drugs which are being developed and sold today.

She told the committee that she felt that "pharmaceutical firms would derive certain benefits in having the generic name on the bottles." She said that it would prevent a less scrupulous company from marketing a product which did not contain the essential ingredient and giving the product such a closely similar name that people believe it is the same product.

She illustrated this with an example of two drugs called Softnon and Softenil. The confusion was compounded since one compound contained thalidomide, but the question remained as to which one.

Authorities in the field also believe that the appearance of the generic name on the label would prevent the less scrupulous company from learning the makeup of a formula, then manufacturing the drug, and selling it under a different name. This also occurred in the case of thalidomide.

Representatives of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, testifying on November 21, 1967, gave unqualified support to generic labeling.

I asked Mr. Lloyd Cutler, special counsel for the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association:

Senator NELSON. We had testimony yesterday from Dr. Helen Taussig. She testified the same way some other expert witnesses we have had respecting the labeling of bottles that go to the patients from the pharmacist. . . . She testified, as have some other witnesses, that she thought it was very important that the bottle that goes to the patient from the pharmacist have on the label the generic name of the product—excepting, of course, where a doctor has specific reasons for insisting that the generic name not be on the bottle.

Does the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association endorse that idea?

Mr. CUTLER. That is the recommendation as I understand it of the American Medical Association, and the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association supports that proposal. The PMA also thinks that the manufacturing sources should be identified and the brand name when there is one in addition to the generic name.

Senator NELSON. You have no objection to the appearance of the generic name.

Mr. CUTLER. No sir.

Dr. Margaret M. McCarron, F.A.C.P., associate clinical professor of medicine, University of Southern California School of Medicine, and assistant medical director and chairman of the therapeutic committee, Los Angeles County General Hospital, Los Angeles, Calif., testified to the need for generic labeling on June 29, 1967.

Page 585 of the hearings record is clear:

Dr. McCARRON. I would like to insert here that we have had problems when our prescriptions were not labeled by generic name. A very good example of this is hydrochlorothiazide, which is a diuretic agent that is in wide use. This drug is made by three drug companies, Hydrodiuril for Merck, Oretic from Abbott, and Esidrix from Ciba.

Because of our system of bidding, and the size of our hospital, we may have three brands of this drug in the hospital at the same time. Patients go to various clinics, and there are several conditions in which the patient would have edema, for which this type of drug would be used. The doctor in the medical clinic would order Esidrix. I am not sure of these colors. I think Esidrix is yellow.

Then the patient would go to another clinic and the doctor there would see a little edema and would give her Oretic or hydrochlorothiazide. The patient might end up with three bottles labeled with different names of drugs that were of different colors. The patient obviously thinks they are three different drugs and takes all of them. We have had patients admitted to the hospital with low potassium levels and with digitalis intoxication and all kinds of things that result from the fact that they have taken an overdose of this medicine—hydrochlorothiazide.

Now, we are trying to obviate this: one, by using generic names and having our pharmacist print the generic name on the label, so that the patient can at least see that, although the tablet colors are different, and the sizes are different, the drug is the same drug.

We have also instituted a computer method, which isn't fully operational at this date. What we would like to do is have a computer record of all the medicine that has been dispensed, and present that to the doctor when the patient comes in to the clinic. The computer record would also include any adverse drug reactions that the patient has had or any known allergies, so that every physician, every time the patient is seen, has a record of the drug therapy, and any complications to it.

Mr. GORDON. Dr. McCarron, you heard Dr. Cluff's statement before, did you not?

Dr. McCARRON. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Now, wouldn't you say that the example you just gave us about Esidrix, hydrocholorthiazide, and the other one, is a good example of how the use of brand names induces overmedication?

Dr. McCARRON. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Thank you.

Dr. McCARRON. Well, these errors, and they are errors that shouldn't occur, are errors that do occur in a very large hospital where many doctors are taking care of a patient and a patient goes to various clinics.

We are trying to set up an administrative method to decrease that, but we have an added problem in that the names of the drug are not the same and the colors are not the same, and the patient gets confused. However, the patient could pick up some of these errors himself, if he knew what he was taking.

Senator NELSON. It is also a problem of confusion to the physician?

Dr. McCARRON. Yes.

Senator NELSON. Does he necessarily know all of the brand names?

Dr. McCARRON. No; and the generic names have helped us tremendously this way.

The conversion to the new system was relatively easy because of the small number of items stocked in the pharmacy and the availability of the drug formulary. A pharmacist without prior training in computer techniques was able to type 500 labels in 1 day after 1 week's experience with the method. If the number of drugs available was not limited, a significant portion of her time would have been spent in nonproductive work inquiring the code name of the drug from the computer, with the hope that the computer had been programed for the item.

A pharmacist from St. Louis, Mo., wrote me recently:

If I were to introduce legislation requiring prescription labels to cite the name of the drug content, you will be doing more for the pharmacy and the consumer than any single piece of legislation in my memory as a pharmacist.

A letter from a Milwaukee constituent points out the need for this measure:

I was so happy to see your concern with the drug industry operation. I am particularly interested in drug treatment and knowledge of its consequences from misuse. I realize that in this day of miracle drugs we are all happy for the experiment that might save a dying member of our family but I feel we must watch the everyday use of miracle drugs. My son is allergic and we found thru testing he was allergic to common dust pollens etc. Because of this sensitivity I became concerned with drug sensitivity. He is subject to strep throat so he is given antibiotics often. Our doctor recently was away and I went to family doctor and he prescribed antibiotic Rhondomycin. That night he had terrible hallucinations—no fever. He had lingering ear noise for months. There is no proof this came from drug since he did come down with chicken pox but pediatrician said he would not have given my son that drug since he felt the hospital had not tested it enough under hospital supervision . . . Now, I had forgotten to tell our family doctor about the drug and this year he had throat trouble and as I was filling prescription saw Rhondomycin and I stopped filling same.

My plea is that Wisconsin as in Iowa, California and many other states should have the name of drug on every perscription filled. Has there ever been any legislation in this behalf? . . . I make this plea for allergic mothers who see newspaper articles identifying possible drug reaction complications and not be sure what drug their children are taking. I also make this plea for the elderly who are careless at times with their drug use. My father-in-law changes doctors often and he is diabetic. He often will get new diabetic medication as he complains that the old one isn't working he also gets new deuritics for his heart. As he is older we often check to see what he is taking but he has so many bottles it is difficult to determine if he accidentally is taking two deuritics and two diabetic pills at same time. If the common name was on bottle it would be easier for him and others to identify this and when we read of some new pill that should not be taken with certain deuritics or diabetic pills we can check easily. Let's Lobby for Drug Labeling on all Prescriptions . . . Save lives of the allergic and the elderly . . . .

Mr. President, the requirement of such a simple change in the laws is too elementary to belabor with repeated arguments.

An eminent pediatrician supports the change. The Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association endorses the change. The American Medical Association supports the idea, as do pharmacists and consumers.

There is a wealth of support for the change.

The Congress should speedily enact this necessary legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3290) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, to require that the label of drug containers, as dispensed to the patient, bears the established name of the drug dispensed, introduced by Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. LONG of Louisiana), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 3292—AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT AND THE FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1933

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to improve the capitalization of Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point a short explanation of the bill, together with a letter from the Farm Credit Administration requesting its introduction and further explaining it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill

will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3292) to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to improve the capitalization of Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the explanation and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHORT EXPLANATION

FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANK AMENDMENTS

Sec. 1(a) The debt-to-capital ratio of the 12 FICBs, which limits the amount of debentures and similar obligations the FICBs may issue to obtain loan funds, would be increased to 20 to 1 (from 12 to 1).

Sec. 1(b) Each FICB would be permitted to issue participation certificates, in addition to those issued as patronage refunds, for purchase by financing institutions (other than PCAs) that are entitled to receive participation certificates from the bank as patronage refunds.

Sec. 1(c) Amounts in the reserve account of an FICB that are allocated to PCAs may be adjusted to reestablish the amount owned by each association in proportion to its patronage during the immediately preceding three fiscal years, if and when similar adjustment is made with respect to class B stock of the bank owned by PCAs as was authorized in 1965.

PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATION AMENDMENTS

Sec. 2(a) As may be authorized under FCA rules and regulations, a PCA could be permitted to cancel or retire class B stock, either upon payment of a loan or to apply the proceeds in partial or final payment of a loan, and in other circumstances.

Sec. 2(b) Subject to FCA rules and regulations, a PCA may issue its capital notes for sale to borrowers and others but such notes, together with other liabilities of the association, may not exceed ten times the capital and surplus of the association.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1968.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a proposed bill "To amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to improve the capitalization of Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations, and for other purposes." The proposed bill consists of five amendments to existing law, three of which will be discussed later as Federal intermediate credit bank amendments and two as production credit association amendments. The major proposal is to provide that the statutory debt-to-capital limitation on the Federal intermediate credit banks, which determines the amount of debentures they may market to obtain loan funds, shall be 20 to 1 instead of 12 to 1. The present limitation (12 to 1) is unnecessarily conservative and too restrictive if the credit banks are to continue to meet the increasing demands for agricultural financing without calling on the Government for more capital and while returning within a reasonable time the Government capital they now have. There also are amendments which would enlarge the amount of capital for the credit banks obtainable from other sources, i.e., production credit associations and other institutions that are financed by the credit banks. Before describing the proposed amendments in more detail, it may be helpful to have some background information on the banks and associations involved and how they operate.

INFORMATION ON FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANKS AND PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATIONS

The Federal intermediate credit banks, one in each of the 12 farm credit districts into which the 50 States and Puerto Rico are divided, were established in 1923. They were organized and operate under title II of the Federal Farm Loan Act as added by the Agricultural Credits Acts of 1923 and since amended. Their primary function is to discount for, or purchase from, production credit associations and other financing institutions, with their indorsement, notes representing loans made by them to farmers and ranchers; and to make loans and advances to such associations and other financing institutions to enable them to make or carry loans for any agricultural purpose. Loans made to farmers or ranchers may be used as collateral for loans and advances from the credit banks. There now are about 118 other financing institutions, being served by the Federal intermediate credit banks but approximately 95 percent of the discounting and lending by such banks is for production credit associations.

The Federal intermediate credit banks obtain funds for such discounting and lending by selling their consolidated debentures in the public securities market. These debentures, for which loans made to farmers or ranchers are pledged as collateral, are the joint and several obligations of the 12 credit banks and are not obligations of the United States. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $4.2 billion of such debentures were issued and the total amount outstanding at the end of the year was $3.3 billion.

Throughout the country there are 459 production credit associations, with the number in the 12 farm credit districts varying from 22 to 65. The associations are chartered by the Farm Credit Administration and operate under the provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended. Each association has a prescribed territory, usually ranging from one or more counties up to as much as one State or more, within which it makes loans to farmers and ranchers. Loan maturities usually are not more than a year but loans may be made for terms up to seven years. During fiscal 1967, the volume of this lending, with loan funds furnished by the Federal intermediate credit bank in each of the 12 districts, totaled $5.1 billion. Out of a total membership of 548,279 at the end of that year, there were 322,700 borrowing members of the associations with $3.7 billion of loans outstanding.

Further information about the banks and associations will be given in describing the specific amendments that relate to them.

FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANK AMENDMENTS

Section 1(a). As noted in the third preceding paragraph, to obtain funds with which to finance production credit associations and other institutions in making loans to farmers and ranchers, the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks sell their consolidated collateral trust debentures in the public securities market. Under existing law (12 U.S.C. 1041 (Supp. II, 1967)), there is a limitation "That the aggregate amount of the outstanding debentures and similar obligations issued by the Federal intermediate credit banks shall not exceed twelve times the surplus and paid-in capital of all such banks." The proposed amendment is to substitute "twenty" for "twelve" in the quoted provision so that the permissible debt-to-capital ratio would be 20 to 1 instead of 12 to 1. The need and justification for this is explained in what now follows.

When the debt-to-capital ratio of the credit banks is close to 12 to 1, and loans and discounts are increasing rapidly, the banks can continue to operate within that ratio only if additional capital is paid in. The ratio as of June 30, 1967, was 11.35 to 1, but this was reduced to 10.78 to 1, after earnings for the year were distributed. Based on the latest estimates available, the ratio will reach the present 12 to 1 legal maximum in May or June 1968.

If more capital must be put into the credit banks in order to permit increased lending under the present 12 to 1 limitation, there now are two general sources for such additional capital. First, out of a revolving fund available for that purpose in the Treasury of the United States, the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration may subscribe to capital stock of the banks in such amount as he determines is needed to meet the credit needs of a bank or banks (12 U.S.C. 1061(a)(1)). Second, each Federal intermediate credit bank, with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, may also require the production credit associations in its district to purchase capital stock of the bank in order to provide capital to meet the credit needs of the bank (12 U.S.C. 1061(a)(2) (Supp. II, 1967)). It would be contrary to the programs now being developed by the banks for the return of their Government capital within a reasonable time, if more Government capital were put into the banks in order to meet increasing credit needs under the 12 to 1 debt-to-capital limitation. As part of their Government capital retirement programs, the banks do expect to call on the production credit associations to purchase additional capital stock of the banks. However, it is not deemed feasible for the associations to do this in an amount that would both permit the return of Government capital and support increasing credit needs under the 12 to 1 debt-to-capital limitation now applicable. This is why it is proposed that the debt-to-capital limitation be changed to 20 to 1. Such a change is necessary if the Federal intermediate credit banks are to continue to meet the increasing credit needs they are intended to serve, while at the same time returning Government capital, and looking to the associations, within their capacity, to provide additional capital instead of calling for more Government capital. It is not only deemed necessary but is also deemed amply justified by the financial strength of the credit banks, supporting which, as hereafter explained, there is also the financial strength of the associations.

Before a Federal intermediate credit bank could suffer any loss on its financing of the production credit associations in its district, which represents about 95 percent of its financing, it would be necessary that one or more of the associations become insolvent. However, this is well guarded against because the liabilities of each association, including its liability to the credit bank, may not exceed ten times the paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus of the association (12 U.S.C. 1032). Overall the associations are currently operating within about a 7 to 1 debt-to-capital limitation. Their losses in the 33 years of their existence since 1933 have amounted to only .08 of one percent of the total cash advanced to farmers and ranchers. This has not resulted in any loss to the credit banks, which have sustained no losses on any of their loans or discounts made since 1933, when the associations came into being. Taking into account losses suffered from their organization in 1923, the net losses of the credit banks in 44 years of operation have amounted to approximately $1 for each $9,000 of credit extended.

Today the likelihood of losses by the credit banks on their loans and discounts for the associations is even further reduced. As a protection for their capital and surplus, the associations have accumulated reserves for losses totaling $86.5 million, or 2.4 percent of total loans outstanding on June 30,

1967. Further, the associations in the different districts, within the past few years, have adopted either loss sharing or participation loan agreements, or both, in connection with their loans. While these agreements for the different districts are in varying terms, the general effect is that certain losses by one association are made up by contributions from the other associations. In this manner, the collective financial strength of the associations in a district serves to insulate the credit bank from losses on its loans or discounts for the associations. The debentures issued by the Federal intermediate credit banks, therefore, are not only supported by a like amount of farmers' notes and the financial strength of the banks themselves, but also, to a considerable extent, by the financial strength of the associations. With due recognition of this, there is considered to be ample justification for the proposed amendment so far as concerns the financial stability of the Federal intermediate credit banks and the debentures issued by them.

Section 1(b). Under existing law (12 U.S.C. 1072(b)), participation certificates are issued in payment of patronage refunds to financing institutions other than production credit associations that use the services of the Federal intermediate credit bank. In the case of production credit associations, patronage refunds are paid in capital stock and such associations have in the past been required and may again be required to purchase additional capital stock in the bank. The present amendment is to permit other financing institutions to also purchase participation certificates of the bank in addition to those that they receive as patronage refunds. This would provide the credit banks with an additional source of capital.

Section 1(c). Under a 1965 amendment (12 U.S.C. 1061(a)(2) (Supp. II, 1967)), the relative amounts of class B stock in a Federal intermediate credit bank owned by production credit associations may be adjusted to reestablish the amount of such class B stock owned by each association in proportion to the average indebtedness (loans and discounts) of each association to the bank during the immediately preceding three fiscal years. If and when this is done, the present amendment would authorize amounts in the reserve account that are allocated to production credit associations to be reestablished in substantially the same proportion as the holdings of class B stock.

PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATION AMENDMENTS

Section 2(a). Each borrower from a production credit association is required to own, at the time the loan is made, class B stock of the association in an amount equal to $5 per $100 or fraction thereof of the amount of the loan (12 U.S.C. 1131g). Class B stock entitles a holder to vote (one vote per holder) and may be purchased only by farmer borrowers from the association and individuals eligible to become borrowers; and within two years after a holder of class B stock has ceased to be a borrower from the association, such class B stock must be exchanged for nonvoting class A stock of the association which may be purchased and held by investors (12 U.S.C. 1131e). The present amendment concerns a provision in the law (12 U.S.C. 1131g) that the class B stock of a production credit association owned by a borrower from the association "shall not be cancelled or retired upon payment of the loan." Immediately after the quoted words would now be added "or otherwise, except as may be authorized under rules and regulations prescribed or approved by the Farm Credit Administration,". This would make it possible to authorize retirement of the stock upon payment of the loan, as may sometimes be in the best interest of both the borrower and the association. The amendment would also permit retirement of the stock for application of the proceeds in partial or final payment of the loan and in other circumstances as authorized under the rules and regulations.

Section 2(b). Production credit associations are specifically authorized to borrow from, and rediscount paper with Federal intermediate credit banks. Except with the approval of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration (12 U.S.C. 1131h, second sentence), such associations may not borrow from or rediscount paper with any other bank or agency. It has not been considered within their authority to borrow from investors generally as by the sale of capital notes. The proposed amendment would specifically authorize a production credit association to issue its capital notes for sale to borrowers and others. This new authority would be subject to rules and regulations prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration, and the capital notes outstanding at any one time, together with other liabilities of the association, may not exceed ten times the capital and surplus of the association.

* * * * *

In addition to the draft of proposed bill there is enclosed herewith a copy of those sections of the Acts of Congress proposed to be amended on which is indicated the changes that would be made by the proposed bill.

This submission is as directed by the Federal Farm Credit Board and early consideration and enactment of the proposed bill is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of the proposed bill from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Very truly yours,

R. B. TOOTELL,
Governor.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 129) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the existing compensation system for motor vehicle accident losses, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FASCIST GREECE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, 21 years ago, President Harry S. Truman made the decision to commit our military might and our economic resources to save Greece from the serious threat of a Communist takeover. He asked the Congress to aid Greece to preserve a "way of life based upon the will of the majority and distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion and freedom from political oppression." His historic action which came to be known as the Truman doctrine resulted in the defeat of the Communist-led insurrection and the establishment of a democratic government in Greece. Since that time, the United States has paid almost $4 billion of American taxpayers' money for economic and military assistance to Greece to help enable that nation to remain a bastion of freedom and democracy.

Greece is no longer free. On April 21, 1967, a small group of Fascist army officers seized power in Greece, the cradle of democracy, and established a military junta which has ever since ruled by decree. They have destroyed free institutions, abolished representative government, prevented free elections, established control over press and radio, put an end to all guarantees of individual liberty, throttled freedom of speech, imposed a handpicked administration on the Greek Orthodox Church, and begun a reign of terror against political dissenters. Forthwith from that time to this they have imprisoned more than 6,000 men and women without trial.

Unfortunately, the colonels and other officers who perpetrated this have been trained by American military missions and weapons they used were supplied by the United States.

Mr. President, if instead of rightwing generals and colonels, a ragtag group of leftwing extremists and Communists had staked a coup d'etat and established a Communist government, or quasi-Communist government, in Greece, it would be interesting to note whether we would have taken action—military or otherwise—to restore democracy to that land. The fact that we have not done so is remarkable in light of the Truman doctrine which was invoked to justify intervention in the Greek civil war 21 years ago, and which is frequently cited as a justification for our intervention in the civil war in Vietnam.

Unfortunately, our almost total involvement in the civil war in Vietnam which President Johnson has turned into an American air and ground war has obscured the tragic events in Greece. However, the destruction of democratic government in that land by Fascist military officers nearly a year ago should no longer be ignored.

I have continually urged our Government to maintain an arm's-length relationship with the illegal government now ruling in Athens, and in particular to refrain from extending any form of military or economic assistance to it until the ruling junta gives firm guar-

antees that constitutional government and free and honest elections will be reinstituted and as quickly as possible. In any event, before any aid whatever is forthcoming from us.

We must not permit ourselves to be drawn by degrees into so-called normalized relations with what is plainly an illegitimate regime. Most Greeks still look to the United States as their best hope for a return to freedom. If we are not to disappoint this hope, we must exert our influence to the utmost to restore freedom to Athens, the birthplace and cradle of democracy.

Mr. President, I recently received a very thoughtful letter from Rev. Wilson Ridenour of the Reily Presbyterian Church in Oxford, Ohio. Reverend Ridenour clearly and concisely sets forth the paradox of our total involvement in Vietnam and our total noninvolvement in Greece. I ask unanimous consent to have his letter printed in the RECORD.

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

REILY PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Oxford, Ohio, April 2, 1968.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: Frequently I rejoice at some statement of yours and admire you very much for saying it, and I want you to know it.

The events of the past few days seem to show that you have been right all the time about the war in Vietnam, and that with your opposition to the war you have helped make history.

I am especially grateful for what you said about the military dictatorship in Greece. The administration appeared to be ready to start World War III for the freedom and liberty of the South Vietnamese, but has no trouble getting along with a bunch of Nazis in Greece. Indeed, it is hardly too much to say, if the United States can find a military dictator anywhere in the world, we will make a beloved ally out of him for the defense of the "free world".

Very truly yours,

WILSON RIDENOUR.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, many of us are receiving in the mail this morning a message which I have been advised was written by Dr. Martin Luther King during the last week of March. It is a message that symbolically seems to come to us from the coffin this morning. It is a message which at least gives us an insight into the thinking of this great American, now an historic American martyr, concerning the race problem as he saw it at the time he wrote it.

The message is an appeal that Dr. Martin Luther King wrote, for funds to be of assistance to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in connection with the march planned for Washington, D.C.

It reads as follows:

DEAR FRIEND: Our national government is playing Russian roulette with riots; it gambles with another summer of disaster. Not a single basic social cause of riots has been corrected. Though ample resources are available they are squandered substantially on war. However, the inhumanity and irresponsibility of Congress and the Administration are not a reflection of popular attitudes—legislation to abolish slums and end all unemployment has been endorsed by a wide majority of the American people in reputable polls. Yet, these positive proposals, like the recommendations of the President's Commission will be filed away to gather dust if the people do not generate relentless pressure on Congress.

It was obdurate government callousness to misery that first stoked the flames of rage and frustration. With unemployment a scourge in Negro ghettos, the government still tinkers with trivial half-hearted measures—refuses still to become an "employer of last resort". It asks the business community to solve the problem as though its past failures qualified it for future success. In the halls of Congress Negro lives are too cheap to justify resolute measures; it is easier to speculate in blood and do nothing.

SCLC cannot wait; it cannot watch as the only systematic response to riots are feverish military preparations for repression. It cannot sit in appalled silence and then deplore the holocaust when tragedy strikes.

We cannot condone either violence or the equivalent evil of passivity.

We intend, before the summer comes, to initiate a "last chance" project to arouse the American conscience toward constructive democratic change.

We intend to channelize the smoldering rage of the Negro and white poor in an effective militant movement in Washington and elsewhere. A pilgrimage of the poor will gather in Washington from the slums and the rural starvation regions of the nation. We will go there, we will demand to be heard, and we will stay until America responds. If this means forcible repression of our movement we will confront it, for we have done this before. If this means scorn or ridicule, we will embrace it, for that is what America's poor now receive. If it means jail, we accept it willingly, for the millions of poor already are imprisoned by exploitation and discrimination. We will in this way fashion a confrontation unique in drama but *firm in discipline* to wrest from government fundamental measures to end the long agony of the hard core poor. A prosperous society can afford it; a moral society cannot afford to do without it.

We are taking action after sober reflection. We have learned from bitter experience that our government does not correct a race problem until it is confronted directly and dramatically.

SCLC had to precipitate a Birmingham to open public accommodations; it had to march against brutality in Selma before the constitutional right to vote was buttressed by federal statutes. There was a thunderous chorus that sought to discourage us when we initiated direct action in Birmingham and Selma. Yet, today our accomplishments in these cities, and reforms that radiated from them are hailed with pride in all circles.

The nation has been warned by the President's Commission that our society faces catastrophic division in an approaching doomsday if the country does not act. We have, through this non-violent action, an opportunity to avoid a national disaster and to create a new spirit of harmony.

Please send the maximum contribution in this crisis year that your circumstances permit. While we are engaged in our Washington project we will also be continuing our far-flung work in voter registration, citizenship education and other activities. We can, together, write another luminous moral chapter in American history. All of us are on trial in this troubled hour, but time still permits us to meet the future with a clear conscience. Please mail your check *today* to fill tomorrow with optimism and hope.

With warmest good wishes,

MARTIN LUTHER KING, Jr.

Mr. President, I think it is particularly fitting that, in these solemn hours as we grieve this fallen American, we take note of the thoughts that he was thinking and the pleas he was making shortly before his death.

On Friday, April 5, 1968, the New York Times printed a remarkable story about statements Rev. Martin Luther King made to some 2,000 supporters at a rally the night before his murder. If language spoken can ever be an indication of a premonition then Martin Luther King's speech at least leaves no room for doubt that he was prepared to meet his God. The New York Times story reports that in the course of his speech he said:

Like anybody I would like to live a long life and longevity has its place. But I am not concerned about that now. I just want to do God's will.

And He's allowed me to go up to the mountain. And I've looked over, and I have seen the promised land. I may not get there with you, but I want you to know tonight that we as a people will get to the promised land.

So I'm happy tonight. I'm not worried about anything. I'm not fearing any man. Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord.

Mr. President, such a believer in God was Martin Luther King.

Mr. President, his faith, his cause, his teachings, his leadership have not died with his body but will live on through eternity. It is for us the living to right the wrongs he so valiantly sacrificed himself to overcome.

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. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A TRAGIC AND TRYING PERIOD FOR OUR COUNTRY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the events of the past few days have saddened, shocked, distressed, angered, and torn the Nation. This is a tragic and trying period for the United States.

The assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King was a dastardly act that shocked all men of good will. Dr. King was a distinguished American. His cause was honorable and just. He dedicated himself to it with a dignity that won the respect of the Nation. The country will be poorer for the loss it has suffered.

How much poorer we are has already been revealed across the country. The riots, the looting, the arson, the death, and destruction will mark this period as one of the darkest in American history.

There are reasons and causes for what has been happening in the past few days across the country. But they are no excuse for the violence and terror, the death, and destruction. They are no excuse for the breakdown in law and order that is basic to all that the United States stands for and all that Dr. Martin Luther King stood and marched for.

So let us make no bones about it. While we continue to seek and move toward the solutions to the basic problems, we must come to grips immediately with the immediate problems. Law and order, and respect for them, must be restored,

promptly and efficiently, in every city in this country. All of the resources of the Government must be applied to regain and keep control.

From my own observations and activities in Washington and throughout Maryland in recent weeks, it is clear to me that several areas require priority attention:

First. A major, all-out campaign against crime must be undertaken. The crime figures in the United States were rising at an alarming rate long before the developments of the past few days.

The tool that will permit government on all levels to launch an anticrime crusade is here in the Congress. It is the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act. It is designed to make the resources of the Federal Government available to local governments across the land in the fight against crime. It would result in more local policemen, better trained and prepared to cope with law and dissorder. The Safe Streets and Crime Control Act must become law this year.

Second. One feature of this legislation is of paramount importance. It involves gun controls. The Safe Streets and Crime Control Act must include strong and effective provisions to prohibit the mail-order sale of all firearms and the over-the counter sale of handguns to the out-of-State resident.

The assassination of Dr. King has brutally dramatized the need for controls on the sale of weapons that lead to violence. It is a cruel irony that just hours before Dr. King was shot, the Senate Judiciary Committee rejected the gun control legislation the country so desperately needs. The committee has now partly reversed its earlier action.

It is my hope that my colleagues in the Senate will give this matter the most careful consideration and realize that now, more than ever before, action is needed.

Effective gun control legislation would not restrict constitutional rights nor apply hardships or difficulties on qualified private citizens who may desire to possess firearms for legitimate and law-abiding reasons.

But it seems clear that the easy availability of firearms to persons who should not have them is a major contributing factor to the crime problem today and to such senseless tragedies as the slaying of Dr. King. Strong and effective gun control legislation is essential.

Third. Another feature of the Safe Streets Act that is of paramount importance is the manner of funding. The legislation should provide for direct funding to local and regional governments. The campaign against crime, to be effective, must be conducted on the local and regional levels. Crime begins as a matter of local concern and it should be attacked as a matter of local responsibility. Funding to the States would delay and reduce the effectiveness of this responsibility.

Fourth. Congress has moved purposefully in the area of civil rights, but the job is not completed. The Senate has passed a strong civil rights bill in this session. It would protect the civil rights of all Americans, and provide penalties for all who interfere with those rights. It would go far toward preventing the kind of outburst we have seen in the past few days. It would assist all decent and responsible citizens and it would crack down on all who act irresponsibly. The House must act promptly to approve the Senate bill.

Fifth. It is imperative that the Government crack down with all the responsible authority at its command against the troublemakers and the rabble rousers who stir the hate and the ferment and the violence. I was shocked, distressed and angered by the total disregard for law and order shown by the looters, arsonists, and rioters in Washington and Baltimore. It is clear from published and broadcast accounts of their activities and statements that Stokely Carmichael and others like him were directly responsible for the violence and disorder in Washington and other cities across the land.

On Saturday, I sent a telegram to Attorney General Ramsey Clark demanding the immediate arrest of Mr. Carmichael on the appropriate charges of inciting to riot. He and other militants who have clearly demonstrated their disrespect for the law should be arrested, prosecuted and punished to the full extent of the law. They must know that law and order still prevail in this country, and that there is no room in Maryland, in this city, anyplace else in the country, for people who act as they do. There is room only for responsibility and respect for the law.

Along the same line, it seems to me that Federal officials may have waited too long before ordering Army troops to duty on Washington's streets and, perhaps, in other cities as well. Delay in coping with disorder is disastrous. There should be no doubt of the Government's responsibility. At the first indications of difficulty, the proper forces of the Government, under the appropriate authority, must move swiftly and smoothly. Again, law and order are the first responsibility.

Sixth. Effective liaison and coordination must be maintained between all units of government, on all levels. Three weeks ago, I met with Mayor Walter Washington and Public Safety Director Patrick Murphy to discuss this situation with regard to the District of Columbia. Our meeting was prompted by concern expressed to me by citizens of suburban Maryland. They wanted to know what the city was preparing to do about Dr. King's planned march on Washington this month. They wanted to know how the suburbs would be affected. Mr. William Greenhalgh, president of the Montgomery County Council, and Mrs. Gladys Spellman, chairman of the Prince Georges County Commissioners, asked me to arrange the meeting with the mayor, and they accompanied me to it. So did Gen. George Gelston, commanding officer of the Maryland National Guard.

It was distressing to learn at that meeting that effective coordination between the city and the local and State governments in Maryland had not been arranged satisfactorily. As a result of our meeting, plans were immediately begun to establish that coordination. That type of action should be one of the first orders of business when a major and controversial activity is planned for a large metropolitan area like this one.

Seventh. With regard to local coordination, there is another piece of legislation pending in Congress this year that must be enacted. It is a bill to provide for mutual police aid agreements between Washington and the surrounding suburban jurisdictions. During the events of the past weekend, the District of Columbia Fire Department was unable to handle all of the blazes that erupted across the city. Fire units from Montgomery and Prince Georges counties, and from suburban Virginia, responded and performed admirably under the most difficult conditions. As the sponsor of the legislation that would permit the same type of mutual aid by law enforcement officers, I strongly urge its enactment.

Eighth. One of the great and lasting tragedies that results from the disastrous events of recent days is the ruin of hundreds of business enterprises. Most of them are small businesses, owned and operated by individuals who depended on them for their livelihoods. Those proprietors are white and Negro. But the color distinction does not matter. The losses they have suffered know no color differences.

The problem is compounded by the difficulties these people have experienced in obtaining adequate insurance coverage for their business establishments. Many of them were grossly underinsured, or not insured at all. Others paid exorbitant premiums. Insurance companies simply refused to provide insurance, or provided it most reluctantly, because these businesses were in poor sections of the cities.

Many of these businessmen will need immediate relief. The Government should move quickly to provide assistance to them through the Small Business Administration or other appropriate agencies, in the form of emergency low-interest loans. The Government has a clear obligation in this area, to help rebuild the shattered economy of the torn urban communities. If legislation is needed, it will have my full support.

As a longer range approach, the Congress should enact pending legislation that would authorize the Government to establish insurance programs for businessmen who can not otherwise obtain adequate coverage because of the crime problems.

Mr. President, these are some of the immediate and pressing problems facing the country. It is imperative that the Congress and the executive branch act promptly on them. Above all, a theme that goes to the very heart of our way of life must be restored. It is the theme of law and order. There can be no substitute for it, and no dilly-dallying about it. Law and order must prevail in this country, and all who act or think to the contrary must be dealt with to the full extent of the law. We can not afford less.

NEW DRAFT POLICIES UNDERSCORE NEED FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REVISIONS OF SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, last year, in extending selective service legislation for another 4 years, the Congress undertook revisions which were intended to remove inequities in its application. However, recent changes in the administration of this act clearly demonstrate that, given the existing legislative framework, the draft system continues to fall far short of this goal.

At the heart of the deficiencies is the method by which those who will be called upon to serve are selected from their fellows. The recent administration change of policy with regards to deferments clearly demonstrates the Congress has as yet failed to supply an appropriate answer to the basic and searching question, "Who serves when not all serve?"

The action of the National Security Council, chaired by President Johnson, in recommending a new policy removing draft deferments for most graduate students and many skilled workers is certain to result in a raid on America's pool of highly trained manpower—a raid with repercussions that will continue to be felt for years to come.

In his telegram to all State directors relaying the advice received from the National Security Council, General Hershey reemphasized that the present and longstanding practice of calling the oldest eligibles first was to remain in effect. It is the combination of these two administrative decisions that has produced a serious situation of yet unknown dimensions which is potentially dangerous to the national interest.

It is clear that steps must be taken to nip the crisis in the bud. The administration has the authority presently available to begin to correct this situation. The administration should act immediately. The opportunity also should be seized to enhance the overall equity of the system.

Focusing on the first part of the decision—the removal of draft deferments for all graduate students except medical and dental students, and deferments based on "essential activities" or "critical occupations"—the preliminary figures are shocking.

Information available indicates that those who will have to leave graduate school, those who would otherwise have gone on to graduate school, and those who are finishing advanced study and likely would have gone into pursuits previously defined as critical, would total around 200,000. Add to this the number of men who were deferred based on occupation and now likely will be dropped from that category, and the total reaches approximately 300,000 young men who are directly affected.

Present estimates are that, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, the requirements for the draft will be in the neighborhood of 300,000 men. With callups done on a regional basis, and with local boards proceeding on the basis of drafting the oldest eligibles first, virtually all of those called to military service this year in many areas will be from the graduate school and skilled critical employment categories. If uniformly implemented, the new policies will have several immediate and unfortunate results.

First, instead of remaining in or moving into positions in industry, research, business and the academic world, a disproportionate number of our highly skilled men will be diverted on a wholesale basis to the military services. Because of the nature of military needs, most of these men will serve in capacities in which the benefit derived from their years of specialized training will be minimal. Trained minds—and skilled people—are a national resource. They are in a very real sense our Nation's most vital resource. The result of inducting these men under the present policy will in many cases be like building an expensive factory and then locking its doors for 2 years. There will be no return on the investment, which we must recognize as both a public as well as a private one. Deterioration will set in because of lack of maintenance, and many parts will be lost.

Second, the effect on the graduate schools throughout the country—if the present indications are correct—will be devastating. Many educators estimate that graduate school enrollment will be cut by 50 percent. The Office of Education—speaking for the administration—says the reduction will be nearer 30 percent. Even using the lower figure, the loss—both immediate and future—is considerable. Graduate schools will have to cut back programs carefully developed over many years; many will have to eliminate whole departments; graduate schools presently in the developmental stage may be forced to dismantle and disband. The overall quality of graduate education may drop as colleges and universities lower their minimum entry requirements to try to keep their graduate schools afloat.

The quality of undergraduate education will suffer as well, due to the loss of a significant portion of graduate students who act as instructors and tutors for undergraduates. And in addition to the immediate disruption of academic organizations these results will have far-reaching consequences in terms of the number and quality of educated men that will be available to the Nation, both in government and the private sector, for years to come.

Third, Defense Department officials have expressed concern about the prospective deluge of primarily college-educated and highly skilled inductees, pointing out that these older men are less trainable in the skills and discipline required of field soldiers than younger age groups.

There is no simple solution to this problem. Nor is there general agreement on the solutions available as was made clear in the debate on the draft law extension last year. The administration's policies recognize that there is an inherent potential injustice in a system wherein higher education or specialized training can be used to delay—or completely avoid—the draft. But corrective action that will result in the disruption and inequity I have described is hardly a good solution.

There are several actions that can be taken by the administration which do not depend on legislation. The President presently has the power to adjust both the order and priority of calls. He can invoke procedures which if followed, can result in greater equity while insuring a much more effective utilization of our national resources.

Beyond the possibilities of administrative action, the need is becoming ever more clear for immediate legislative steps to make the Selective Service System less disruptive to the lives and plans of our youth. The system can be made costly to the national security and welfare, while still assuring that the needs of the military are met. The combination of the suggestions I now present reinforces the need for the Congress to address itself to a comprehensive overhaul of the system by which the requirements for military manpower of our Nation are to be met.

I recommend immediate administrative remedies for the situation created by the new policies, as follows:

First, graduate students who are drafted should be allowed to finish the term or quarter in which they are engaged at the time of their call; workers in critical or special occupations previously deferred should have a grace period within which to complete an orderly transition from their job to the military.

Second. The oldest-first call should be modified to assure the selection of a mix of ages of those inducted, so that no one age group is unduly depleted. This could be done by allocating monthly requirements among broad groups of eligibles in proportion to the number of eligibles in each group.

Third. A first step should be made to delineate a time zone, uniform for all eligibles, during which an eligible is available for call, and following expiration of which he may not be again subject to call unless the pool of manpower in the callup zone has been exhausted. This might be accomplished in the following manner: First, all eligibles must remain in a prime draft-availability zone for the period of 1 year. This should be designated on a fiscal-year basis, to comply more closely with the school year; secondly, the prime zone would be the first fiscal year in which the eligible's 19th birthday occurs. For those who have benefited from a deferment, the prime zone is the first fiscal year following expiration of the deferment, and the status of the eligible would remain the same as it was when the deferment was granted—except for supervening hardship; and, third, by adjusting the rules governing the numbers of eligibles selected from each general age group, the chances of being called in each succeeding year of eligibility could be balanced.

The first step recommended above, for the administration to clarify its policy on drafting graduate students once they have started a term, should be taken immediately. As it stands now, a man no longer eligible for deferment who has not yet been reclassified or received his draft call has no assurance that he will not be drafted before he can finish the term if he tries to get in another semester or quarter. While in some cases he

could probably delay induction through appealing his reclassification, this usually proves disruptive to the individual as well as to the system. It places a premium on those who either hire a lawyer or get other outside assistance or counsel. For this reason, draft boards should immediately be instructed to delay induction dates for current enrolled graduate students until the end of their terms.

Two advantages would result from the recommendations relating to selection of eligibles. First, the absolute number of the educated and skilled inducted would be reduced, and the induction of those taken would be spaced over a period of time. The adverse impact on the individuals as a group, the graduate schools, and our economy and society from the wholesale depletion of these age groups would be diminished.

Second, the military services would receive a mix of eligibles from the various age groups, thereby reducing the problems foreseen in training the type of soldier for which there is the greatest need.

Unquestionably, there are potential inequities to be found in these proposals. But I believe they are far less onerous than the adverse consequences that will certainly result from the present policy.

In any case, time is a critical factor if constructive steps are to be taken. In the absence of almost immediate action, callup of these educated and skilled categories will begin under the new policies. Another change in policy—even a corrective one—after callups have begun would work yet other inequities. And the sooner the graduate schools can plan on a less drastic reduction in enrollment, the better they will be able to adjust programs and minimize the adverse effects.

As I indicated earlier, these are only interim proposals. They are intended to reduce the adverse effects of what I feel to be an ill-conceived change in policy. In no way do they mitigate the need for the thorough overhaul of our selective service legislation advocated by me and many of my colleagues in the Senate during the last session of the Congress.

In the legislative area, I recommend that the Congress immediately consider extending authority to the executive to institute a system of random selection of those who must serve, based on uniformly applied national standards. The problems raised by these new regulations make it quite clear that, in a situation wherein not all eligibles are called upon to serve, and wherein selections on the basis of qualifications for military service are inappropriate, the choice of those who will serve already contains a great element of chance, particularly in the absence of uniform national criteria. The random selection mechanism, employed in conjunction with the selection priorities proposed above, would further improve the system, and make it more equitable than it was even prior to the new policy change.

There is no gainsaying that one of the thorniest problems involved in any reconsideration of selective service policy is whether deferments should be given for either graduate or undergraduate study during a period when the United States is involved in a shooting war. I believe there is validity to the contention that selective service policies have given an advantage to the individual from an economic and social background that allows him to continue his studies or enter specialized training. This is an inequity that has become more apparent—and crucial—with our growing involvement in Vietnam and the increased manpower requirements and risks that regrettably go with it. The deferment issue can be—and is—argued with considerable reason on both sides.

On the one hand, there are those who say that the reason many men enter university, go on to graduate schools, or acquire critical skills is specifically to avoid the draft. While this would be true in selected individual cases, I refuse to believe that the best young minds in America have embarked on a wholesale attempt to avoid serving their country. To do so would be a long step toward writing off the future of our society which I—for one—am not ready to take.

On the other side, it can be persuasively argued that the best interests of the country are served by allowing those with the ability to delay military service, even indefinitely, because of the heightened contribution they will make through education and development of their particular abilities. Were ours a society which provided an equal opportunity to all to obtain a higher education, I could more easily subscribe to this latter view.

In the plainest language, I do not believe blanket deferment of men to allow them to study for any significant period of time after completion of secondary school is or can be justified at a time when their less fortunate contemporaries are required to serve their country in combat, at the possible cost of their lives.

It would be obviously contrary to the national interest to precipitously do away with undergraduate deferments, if to do so would wipe out a large portion of a university generation. A step such as that would have an effect equally disastrous as the recent administration measures which I have criticized here. I, therefore, believe that, at the heart of any revision, must be a review of our Selective Service priorities so legislation can be formulated which will be flexible enough to do substantial equity in this era of rapidly changing military manpower requirements. However, any new policy should establish a formula which would make undergraduates available to be included in the mix of those called when exposure of draftees to actual combat exceeds a certain level.

In taking up the question of a broad revision of selective service policies, Congress must direct its attention to the possibility of an eventual all-volunteer Military Establishment. There is no question that this is a controversial concept. I have some reservations about a democracy moving entirely away from the tradition of the citizen-soldier that has historically served our country so well. I do not think we should take any step which would reduce the sensitivity of the American people to the consequences of a decision by their elected Representatives to commit our Nation to war.

I do believe, however, that the voluntary concept, or a variation of it which would make provision for manpower mobilization in a time of national emergency, should be given the fullest consideration.

I intend to press, in this session of Congress, for thorough revision of our Selective Service laws. I am not convinced that these efforts will be successful, even considering the large number of Senators and Representatives who agree with this need. It is difficult enough in any year to get the Congress to act on such a controversial matter, absent a compelling circumstance such as the expiration of the basic law. This reluctance is multiplied in an election year.

But the need is no less compelling, in view of the continuing injustice of the present system. Congress must squarely face the basic question posed by the President's Commission on the Selective Service: "Who serves when not all serve?" This is a question which the Congress cannot continue to avoid or evade when Americans called by their fellow citizens to serve are suffering injury or dying in combat. I urge my colleagues to join in an effort to insure the Congress does not avoid this responsibility.

SECRETARY DEAN RUSK TESTIFIED IN FAVOR OF SENATE RATIFICATION OF GENOCIDE CONVENTION IN 1950

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on January 23, 1950, the then Deputy Under Secretary of State Dean Rusk testified in favor of Senate Ratification of the Genocide Convention.

I believe that Secretary Rusk's statement of 18 years ago is equally pertinent and even more persuasive today:

> It is an inescapable fact that other nations of the world expect the United States to assert moral leadership in international affairs. The United States has a record of humanitarian diplomacy, beginning with the early days of the Republic when President John Quincy Adams expressed the public sympathies of the American people with the Greeks in their struggle for independence from Turkish rule. The United States Government has remonstrated more than once with other governments regarding their persecution of the Jews: with Rumania in 1902 and with Tsarist Russia in 1891 and 1904 . . .
>
> It is a familiar role, therefore, for the United States to take the lead in raising moral standards of international society. And prevailing international conditions make it imperative that the United States continue to play this role.

I urge the Senate to heed these timeless words of Secretary Rusk. I urge the Senate to ratify the Conventions of Genocide, Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Freedom of Association.

FARMERS IN THE SQUEEZE

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, many articles have appeared in magazines and other publications recently which have often been viciously antifarmer in nature. These reports attempt to give the impression that the American farmer today is financially well off. This all comes at a time when the prices farmers receive for most commod-

ities are lower than they were 20 years ago and when farm debt has risen from about $24 billion in 1960 to $49 billion today.

It was refreshing to read in the April 4 issue of the Washington Evening Star, a column by Sylvia Porter, a noted economist, which accurately and effectively portrays the true economic situation of the farmer today.

Mr. President, this article, "Farmers Again in Squeeze," is one I hope and pray every American would read and I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

FARMERS AGAIN IN SQUEEZE

(By Sylvia Porter)

At a recent town meeting of a small New England village, residents voted to exempt the village's four dairy farmers from personal property tax on their livestock, although other types of stock in trade are taxable in this village. The reason the farmers got the break, it was explained, was that while the costs of feed grains, farm machinery, fertilizer and farm labor are rising steeply, the farmer is just about alone among businessmen in not being able to raise the prices of the products he sells.

"The exemption will save me $60 a year," commented one young farmer, "hardly enough to make the cost squeeze less painful."

You can multiply this cost-squeeze complaint by the more than 1 million small farmers throughout the United States, who are today threatened with economic extinction, although you probably won't find many examples of special concessions by townsfolk to help their pinched neighbors.

FARMERS GET LESS

Although we, as consumers, are paying 20 percent more for the food we buy than we paid two decades ago, the farmers who produce the food are getting 6 percent less for their efforts. Meanwhile, the costs of supplies and equipment the farmers must buy have leaped 30 percent.

Today, the farmer gets only 5½ cents of your after-tax $1 for his products, one-half of the share he got as recently as 1947.

Last year alone, the U.S. farmer was hit by a $1.5 billion farm-price drop. Today, per capita disposable income for U.S. farmers averages only $1,692, about 60 percent of the income for other Americans.

As a result, the flight from small farms—usually to big, congested cities—has been relentless. Since 1935, the number of U.S. farms has dropped from 6.8 million to under 3.1 million, the lowest number since 1875. In 1967, 600,000 Americans left their farms.

FACTS ARE BRUTAL

These are the brutal facts behind the new round of threats by the National Farmers Organization to withhold key food products to force up prices they receive.

These also are the facts behind a new proposal to establish a National Agricultural Relations Board at the federal level to serve U.S. farmers in the same way the National Labor Relations Board serves other U.S. workers, or to give farmers a new way to unionize on a national scale.

And these are the facts behind the President's call to Congress for more food-price supports, collective bargaining for farmers and the creation of a "National Food Bank" for surpluses which would help support prices to farmers.

The revolution on the farm is speeding up. The end is not foreseeable.

Here are examples of the amounts farmers get for each food $1 you spend:

Farmer's share of $1 spent

Item:	Cents
Corn flakes	7
Sandwich cookies	9
Whole wheat bread	11
Canned corn	12
White bread	15
Frozen peas	15
Fresh spinach	24
Potatoes	25
Sugar	38
Fresh milk	50
Eggs, Grade A large	57
Beef, choice	58

SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY'S STATEMENT REGARDING ANTI-SEMITISM BY POLAND'S COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am sure that all Americans have felt great distress about the attacks by the Communist government of Poland on leading public figures of the Jewish faith in that country.

I think the eloquent expression of concern by my distinguished colleague, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY of New York, deserves the attention of the Nation. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY

Over the past weeks, the news from Eastern Europe has told of a new desire for freedom of expression and dissent among the youth of Czechoslovakia and Poland. The new generation wants an end to censorship, a university that is responsive to their needs, and other reforms.

In Czechoslovakia, the government seems to be heeding the new voices. But in Poland, the demand for lives of truth and dignity has been met with the cruel lies of anti-Semitism. The Jewish population there numbers barely 30,000 today—the remnant of a once-flourishing community that was decimated by these same forces of bigotry less than a generation ago. Yet some of the leaders of government try to explain away the expression of new hopes and new dreams with the old myths of a Zionist conspiracy. Old hatreds are enlisted in the regime's effort to preserve its monopoly of power. Government officials and distinguished teachers are dismissed from their posts, and reviled as enemies of the nation.

These policies should be condemned by all who value liberty and oppose the evils of racism and prejudice. Before the passions that have been unleashed lead to catastrophe for the Jews of Poland, free men every where should protest the conduct of the Polish government by every available means. If we remain silent, we betray the cause of freedom in Poland and around the world.

THE WIDE WORLD OF ACOUSTICS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, one of the Seattle industries that is making notable contributions to marine science and technology and to naval defenses is Honeywell Inc.'s marine systems center.

A lead article in the March issue of Undersea Technology titled "The Wide World of Acoustics" and written by the able editor of this magazine, Mr. Larry L. Booda, describes this center and many of its programs under the direction of Dr. Theodor F. Hueter, Honeywell ordnance division vice president and manager of the center.

Honeywell is engaged both in Navy research and development programs and in a wide range of marine commercial applications.

The article also quotes Dr. Hueter as identifying six areas that need priority attention in marine technology, as: first, sources of electrical power for buoys, underwater beacons, and work stations using various forms of nuclear or chemical energy; second, materials protection to combat corrosion; third, underwater communications in the form of reliable acoustic links; fourth, precise navigation, localization and station-keeping; fifth, life support systems; and sixth, instrumentation for gathering, storage and selective transmission of data and capable of prolonged unattended operation.

Honeywell's research fleet also is described, and the magazine's cover depicts an acoustic rig on one of these vessels prominently displaying its home base—Seattle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the highly informative article "The Wide World of Acoustics" from the March issue of Undersea Technology be printed in the RECORD.

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

PROFILE—HONEYWELL MARINE SYSTEMS CENTER: THE WIDE WORLD OF ACOUSTICS

SEATTLE.—With its piers located a few minutes from salt water, Honeywell's Marine Systems Center here has the advantage of fresh water mooring on Salmon Bay. Within sight are the large and small locks that pass traffic from Puget Sound to Lake Washington via the six mile long ship canal. It may sound like a fish story, but it is true that the locks are opened to allow salmon to pass through the canal.

The center is one of many industrial sites along the canal, which is also home for thousands of private power and sail boats.

With its fleet of research vessels Honeywell is pursuing a broad spectrum of investigations in underwater sound phenomena. In the laboratory computers analyze the data obtained with the aim of helping the Navy in its never ending quest for ways to distinguish submarines from other underwater sound sources.

But the Center isn't limited to this facet of the below surface environment. In a companion plant at West Covina, Cal., the firm is producing a series of realistic simulators, or trainers, for antisubmarine warfare and underwater ordnance.

Nor is it limited to government programs. Acoustic systems have been applied to positioning of offshore drilling rigs and to remote control of valves to prevent blowouts of undersea oil wells. Another commercial application is the Sea Scanar, a target locating device used in commercial fishing, salvage, offshore construction and in oceanographic research.

Dr. Theodor F. Hueter, Honeywell ordnance division vice president and general manager of the Center, believes that the technology of the United States has been unbalanced. "If we were to spend $5 billion on innerspace, there might be some motivation," he told UST.

He noted that the President's Fiscal 1969 budget took cognizance of the need for ocean exploration, food from the sea and deep ocean

technology and is supporting the need with an expanding budget for marine science and technology. Dr. Hueter believes that the need for a spectacular to capture the public imagination will be partially fulfilled with the President's proposal for an expedition, and by the Navy's upcoming SeaLab III underwater living experiment.

By being part of a large, diversified corporation, the Center has established a study group to search for in-house capabilities that can be applied to offshore technology. An example is Honeywell's strength in fluidics for controls. This capability has already been applied to some offshore systems. Computers, too, have been integrated in marine systems. The study group itself is making use of a hybrid computer.

As for company interplay, Dr. Hueter states, "Internal communications is a second religion with us."

DATES FROM 1951

In November of 1951 Honeywell acquired Intervox in Seattle, which was placed under the ordnance division. As the Seattle Development Laboratory, the Center performed research for the Navy, including airborne radar. In marine acoustics it was determined that transducers would play a key part in successful development of systems. Accordingly, in 1965, a 47′ catamaran was added to the company fleet to do at-sea testing.

MK. 46 TORPEDO

Work in the large scale Mk. 46 program began with Honeywell as a component supplier to Aerojet-General Corp. Now Honeywell's Ordnance Division in Hopkins, Minn., is an alternate source. It calls on the Seattle and West Covina facilities and the firm's aerospace plants in Minneapolis and St. Petersburg, Fla., for various forebody subsystems. Afterbody components come from TRW and Clevite. Testing of completed torpedoes takes place at Keyport, Wash., a Navy facility located across Puget Sound from here.

The company is also furnishing improved transducers for the in-service Mk. 37 torpedo.

In torpedo and other Navy programs Dr. Hueter has emphasized integrated support of the fleet. Beginning problems with the ASROC ASW weapon, the personnel training problems arising from introduction into the fleet were solved through training devices to help produce men who could operate and maintain the equipment. Help is given during original installation in shipyards and during service life. "We have proved to the Navy that we do care about equipment after delivery to the fleet," he said.

"Simplification of maintenance is another major aim," he said, adding that more documentation is in order and that it should contain information from all sources. Thus by using documentation and simulators, "marriage of man and machine is accomplished," he averred.

Hueter, a pioneering scientist in transducer acoustics was formerly a research associate at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for six years and was manager of the acoustics department of Raytheon's Submarine Signal Division for three years before joining Honeywell in 1959.

In a speech last year at the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry, he identified six areas that need attention before ocean farming, mining and habitation can begin. They are:

Sources of electrical power for buoys, underwater beacons and work stations using various forms of nuclear or chemical energy.

Materials protection to combat corrosion.

Underwater communications in the form of reliable acoustic links.

Precise navigation, localization and stationkeeping.

Life support systems.

Instrumentation for gathering, storage and selective transmission of data and capable of prolonged unattended operation.

COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS

In a relatively short period the Center has entered a series of products and systems into the commercial market. One of the largest systems is the Acoustic Position Reference Systems (APRS), in one basic version and another modified for search and salvage.

APRS and the Automatic Station Keeping (ASK) system, are an outgrowth of the company's experience in developing the positioning system for the cancelled Mohole drilling project. The main application of APRS and ASK now is in offshore drilling. The first provides highly accurate information on a drilling vessel's location with respect to the wellhead and ASK maintains vessel station automatically through computer-generated signals to thruster motors.

Sea Scanar is a searchlight type sonar system resembling radar. Acoustic bursts set in a narrow beam are received back and converted into a scope trace. This writer witnessed the system in action during a cruise through the canal and Lake Union, which is part of the canal system. The trace showed the bottom from bank to bank. In addition it can detect single objects, a loosely scattered group of objects, a soft or muddy bottom, a hard object on the bottom and navigation channels.

Among other products are: the Precision Profiling Sonar, which is used as a survey tool (trenched pipelines, harbor topography), as a dredging tool and as a salvage tool; High Resolution Re-entry Sonar (wellheads); Wave Height Sensor; Heave Sensor.

HARP

That acronym stands for the company funded Honeywell Acoustic Research Project. The cover photograph shows the tripod-mount 1,600 lb. basic underwater element of the system being lowered from the *MV Response* for testing.

HARP is intended to answer many acoustic questions during a three year project which began in Jan. 1967. The test site, first entered last Nov. 28, is a huge, protected salt water labyrinth off Protection Island in the Strait of Juan de Fuca. The strait connects Puget Sound with the ocean.

The eight foot high unit, emplaced at 325 ft., sends signals to the *RV Neper*. They are analyzed to determine if there are consistent patterns in the sound scattering environment. These patterns would be programmed into future acoustic instruments.

In the absence of the ship the connection with the bottom rig is terminated on a submerged buoy. When the *Neper* returns, it spots the buoy with Sea Scanar.

Basically, the Navy wants to be able to penetrate the scattering layer of the ocean, beneath which submarines formerly were able to hide. The layer is caused by marine organisms, many of which have air bladders that cause distortion.

The tripod bottom units has one transmitter, three receivers and six control channels. It is connected by a multiconductor and a coaxial cable.

The number of channels can be expanded to 45 in the future. During the times the *Neper* is on station making the acoustic tests, standard sea water tests are made such as current, temperature, salinity and dissolved oxygen.

Beginning in December week-long measurements per month have been made in the spot where there is relatively little background noise.

MILITARY

In simulation Honeywell has now built and installed 12 ASW trainers, ranging up to $3 million in price, around the country. Complete crews of ships and aircraft are trained without the expense of going to sea.

The 14A2, an early attack trainer, provides a realistic environment for ships crews. It includes a conning station, plotting board, launcher control station and three color displays. A wide variety of simulations even include retaliation by a submarine. Time can be advanced during long searches, or steaming to an area.

The simulators are made at the West Covina facility. They are made to resemble ship or aircraft installations exactly, even to cables through the deck.

Honeywell has two contracts for furnishing obstacle avoidance sonars for the Deep Submergence Rescue Vehicle (DSRV) of the Navy, and a sonar tracking system to keep the mother ship on the surface in touch with the DSRV. They total $500,000.

TRANSDUCERS

The Center here is committed to the ceramic, or piezoelectric type of sound producers and receivers rather than magnetostrictive.

The frequency range covered by ceramics developed and produced here covers from below 100 Hz to 500 kHz. The ceramics have originated to some extent from research performed at Honeywell's corporate research center at Hopkins, Minn. Studies extend to acoustic properties of inactive materials, such as neoprene and polypropylene.

Much work has been done for the Navy on low frequency sources and the beam bending principle. This type of lead zirconate application can be operated up to 4,000 watts. Below 100 Hz the actual physical movements of the ceramics can be observed with a stroboscopic light.

Honeywell is aiming too at commercial fishing, seeking ways to locate shrimp and to spot fish in midwater areas.

In a related field the company is developing and supplying instrumentation for measurement of quality characteristics in water. Our system was installed in the Delaware River estuary in 1963. It was recently modified so that it could telemeter data back to shore. Other government agencies and industry, such as pulp and paper mills, are using similar systems.

The Honeywell fleet now numbers four research vessels. Most recent is the 81 ft. catamaran, *MV Ocean Twin*, aimed mainly at testing and evaluation of underwater ordnance equipment. In addition to the *Neper* and the *Response*, mentioned earlier, there is the *Impulse*, a 20 ft. by 36 ft barge acquired for developmental acoustic testing.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the tragic death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., will sadden men everywhere who cherish brotherhood and deplore violence. For a generation, his voice, perhaps more than any other, has represented the moral conscience of America. Now that voice has been stilled, but the things Dr. King stood for must not die. Let white Americans rededicate themselves to redress the grievances which he cried out against so eloquently for so long. And let all Americans, white and black, rededicate themselves to nonviolence. If the murder of Dr. King merely begets more violence, those who preach it and those who practice it will be callously betraying everything he lived for. Few of us can ever earn a Nobel Peace Prize, but all of us, each in our own lives can do something to advance the cause of peace and brotherhood.

A NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE AND PHARMACOLOGY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the Oceanographic Commission of Washington, the commis-

sioners adopted a resolution endorsing S. 2661, a bill I have introduced to establish a National Institute of Medicine and Pharmacology in the National Institutes of Health.

The bill is now pending in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. John M. Haydon, chairman of the commission, had written me that the resolution was being sent to me as indicative of the great interest that the commission has in marine medicine and its potentials for advancing the health and welfare of our citizens.

The commission includes faculty members of the University of Washington which has earned a wide reputation for its work in many fields of medicine, surgery and pharmacology, and which is admirably equipped to contribute to the development of marine medicine.

I ask unnaimous consent that the resolution of the Oceanographic Commission of the State of Washington, which it adopted on March 29, 1968, be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE OCEANOGRAPHIC COMMISSION OF WASHINGTON

Whereas, S. 2661 would amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology in the National Institute of Health; and

Whereas, this Bill would best enhance medical oceanography if the new Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology were to be located where there is a center of recognized combination of scientific attainment in marine science and medicine; and

Whereas, creation of this organization would be a pioneer program in education and would enhance and accelerate the growth of marine medicine research, which could achieve rapid developments in man's capacity to live with and extract from the sea;

Now, therefore be it resolved, that the Oceanographic Commission of Washington unanimously endorses S. 2661, and further requests that it be favorably reported out by the Senate Committee on Labor and Welfare and that the Bill be voted into legislation.

Signed this 29th Day of March 1968.

JOHN M. HAYDON,
Chairman.

AFTER THE LOST WEEKEND

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, in the aftermath of this past weekend, it is essential for all of us to see clearly what happened and to think about it with objectivity. There was disorder and destruction in the streets of American cities. But there was by no means anything resembling a Negro uprising. For every Negro who looted and burned, there were thousands—hundreds of thousands—who acted in a peacful and law-abiding manner. There were thousands who responsibly strove to restore order.

This was evident here in Washington these past few days. Black policemen worked side by side with white, black soldiers protected property and patrolled the streets alongside their white comrades in arms. It was evident in the massive traffic tieup of Friday, white driver and black side by side sharing their impatience and inconvenience. It was evident on the rooftops of integrated high-rise apartments in the Southwest where black tenants and white stood together discussing and deploring the violence.

There was cause for concern in the weekend's occurrences, but there was also reason for confidence. The fabric of Negro patriotism—the essential Negro faith in the institutions of democracy—more than amply demonstrated by the overwhelming majority of Negro citizens. They merit our continued cooperation in undiminished efforts to bring freedom, justice, and true equality to all citizens so that the tragedy of the past weekend will not occur again.

The lead editorial in this morning's New York Times indicates the measure of objectivity that is so important in the furture course of legislative action. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

AFTER THE LOST WEEKEND

Not since the Civil War has this country experienced an epidemic of domestic violence so widespread as it was this weekend. The looters and arsonists who rampaged through the streets of Washington, Chicago, and other cities disgraced the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King and mocked the principles for which he stood. These criminals burned down their neighbors' homes and ransacked the stores serving the black ghettos, thus victimizing thousands of Negroes who were left homeless or deprived of normal facilities for obtaining food and other necessities.

But it is important for all Americans to understand that it was only an infinitesimal minority of this nation's Negroes who participated in this mindless debauch. For every Stokely Carmichael seeking to fan the flames of destruction, there were hundreds of thousands of Negroes who worked hard and effectively to cool passions and to prevent or to end violence. Grim as was this lost weekend, it would have been unimaginably more dreadful if it had not been for the massive contribution of responsible Negroes—acting in the spirit of Dr. King's life work—to the maintenance of law and order.

The great majority of this country's black people stood aloof from or actively resisted the forces of anarchy that sought to capture the American Negro community these past few days. This is eloquent testimony that, despite past setbacks and disappointments, this majority still believes America's democratic institutions can and will satisfy the justified demands of the Negro people.

In the wake of Dr. King's martyrdom and its painful immediate consequences, the imperative task is to make these hopes reality. The need is for quick passage of legislation which will insure full civil rights, including open housing, for American Negroes. There must also be legislation appropriating the large sums required for a realistic attack on the unemployment, bad housing, semi-literacy and other ills afflicting millions in the ghettos. Congress bears the heaviest share of the responsibility and opportunity, but the legislatures of the states—from New York to California—whose cities are caught in today's great urban crisis must also act rapidly. No one who has lived through the past few days can have any doubts about the alternative if the surviving hope and faith are betrayed once again.

TRIBUTES TO THE PARTICIPANTS ON THE HANDLING OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRISIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since the death last Thursday night of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the Nation's Capital has experienced very serious property damage and the loss of several lives. Store windows have been broken, stores looted, and many buildings set fire, many of which were completely destroyed.

The full impact of this senseless violence in the Nation's Capital the past 3 days will probably never be fully known. However, before the fires had been extinguished, the looting curtailed, and the snipers guns had been silenced, the government of the District of Columbia began to meet the immediate and urgent needs of individuals victimized by the violence. The full resources of the District of Columbia government have been put to work in assisting individuals and families in serious need of food, shelter, clothing, and medical attention.

The relative calm that now prevails in the violence-scarred Nation's Capital can be partly attributed to the excellent work of the policemen, firemen, and the soldiers. After 3 weary days the death toll of only eight deaths, 986 injuries, 852 fines, and 4,865 arrests is a near miracle in a city of this size involved in serious turmoil and destruction. To a great extent, the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia is to be praised for contributing to the work of keeping the violence in check by treating human beings with restraint. The policemen worked very wisely to calm citizens and to handle firmly and fairly, yet authoritatively, the rioters in such a way that only eight deaths resulted in 3 days of serious turmoil.

I have heard of no incidents of Metropolitan policemen demonstrating undue force and impatience with rioters and looters and with the citizens of the District of Columbia. The speed in which looters were arrested and brought before the police courts is a shining example of the efforts of the Metropolitan Police Department and the judicial system in the District to deal with such problems.

Also to be praised are the firemen who, at the risk of their lives, went to the troubled areas to fight almost 900 fires during the past 3 days. Such action demonstrated their great concern for the safety and well-being of the people of the District of Columbia. They demonstrated bravery, patience, and devotion to duty, and I am proud of them. These men worked hard not only in fighting fires but also assisting fire victims whenever possible.

The Director of Public Safety, Mr. Patrick V. Murphy, and his associates are to be complimented on the way they coordinated and worked closely with the Mayor's office and the Armed Forces in keeping bloodshed to a minimum and in restoring law and order in the city.

The task of restoring calm to our Nation's Capital is not over. We must now try to care for persons displaced by the violence. Once again, much of this responsibility will fall on Mayor Washington and his associates. I am heartened to learn that over 5,000 volunteers are working with Mayor Washington's office providing food, shelter, and other services for the disaster victims. The wisdom shown by Mayor Washington and his Deputy, Mr. Fletcher, Safety Director Murphy and the police officers and firemen is an example to other metropoli-

tan areas of what can be done under a most trying situation. To the 40 policemen and 18 firemen already injured in the disturbances, I wish them a speedy recovery and return to duty soon. Their dedication and sacrifice to the public safety and welfare makes every citizen their debtor.

The cooperation between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, as well as the work done by churches, hospitals, and other organizations working so hard through the days and nights to bring peace and calmness to this city will long endure as a shining example that many people practice the spiritual teaching that we are our brother's keeper. I only hope and pray that we can learn from these last several days that rioting and looting is senseless and that when it does occur it must be dealt with firmly in such a way that bloodshed is kept at a minimum. The District of Columbia policemen, firemen, and the Federal troops have given us this example, and I wish publicly today to recognize their outstanding work and their fulfillment far beyond the line of duty of the thrust of public service which they have rendered so patriotically.

Again, I wish to highly commend Mayor Washington, Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Murphy, and Chief Layton for their conduct, guidance, dedication, and very hard work during this period of extreme danger in the Nation's Capital.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (S. 3262) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commisison in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 16324.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (H.R. 16324) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in the absence of Senator PASTORE due to illness I have the privilege of acting as floor manager for H.R. 16324, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1969. The distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, who has been absent from the Chamber for some weeks now, is expected to return to his seat in the near future. I know that my colleagues will be happy to learn that the senior Senator from the State of Rhode Island is making a remarkable recovery.

Mr. President, the Atomic Energy Commission's authorization request for fiscal year 1969, submitted to Congress on January 29, 1968, called for authorizations of $2,225,600,000 for operating expenses and $685,742,000 for plant and capital equipment, making a total requested authorization of $2,911,342,000.

Due to the rather critical budgetary circumstances we find ourselves in today, the committee reviewed the AEC's request with great care. The result of our efforts is the bill before you. I think it is a sound and prudent one. It would authorize appropriations to the AEC in the total amount of $2,618,301,000 for fiscal 1969, including certain changes in prior years' authorizations. This amount is nearly $300 million less than the AEC's authorization request to Congress. It is also about $15 million less than the AEC's fiscal year 1968 authorization. This significant reduction represents a nearly 11-percent reduction in the AEC's overall budget request. Insofar as the nonmilitary categories of the AEC budget are concerned, these reductions average approximately 23 percent.

The fact that the recommended authorization is less than that of fiscal 1968 takes on added significance when it is noted there is an increase of over $300,000,000 in the AEC's weapons program for fiscal 1969. This increase stems primarily from the president's decision last fall to deploy an ABM system. Also contributing to the increase in weapons expenditures is the recent intensification of AEC effort on the development and production of the warhead for the Poseidon submarine-launched intercontinental ballistic missile. Thus, the committee's recommended reductions in nonmilitary programs have been sufficient to completely absorb the increases necessitated in the military applications without any increase over the current fiscal year's authorization level.

Mr. President, I consider this bill noncontroversial. It is a good bill. It was reported by the Senate Members of the Joint Committee without any dissent. It was passed by the other body on April 4 by a wide margin—381 to 14. Therefore, unless my colleagues have any questions, I shall dispense with further explanation of the bill's provisions.

Section 101(a) of H.R. 16324 would authorize appropriations of $2,174,550,000 for "Operating expenses" of the AEC. On page 3 of the report before you, you will find a breakdown of the Joint Committee's recommended authorization for the AEC's major programs and subprograms. A more detailed discussion of each committee action will be found in the section of the report entitled "Committee Comments" beginning at page 7. If any Members have questions about any specific committee action, I will be happy to attempt to answer them.

Section 101(b) of the bill would authorize $74,011,000 for new construction projects, and $175,040,000 for capital equipment not related to construction. Again, I will be pleased to respond to any specific questions you may have on these items.

Section 102 of the bill would impose certain cost limitations of the initiation of construction projects, similar in most respects to limitations contained in other AEC authorization acts.

Section 103 of the bill would authorize the AEC to perform design work, subject to the availability of appropriations, on construction projects which have been submitted to Congress for authorization. This special authority would allow the AEC to undertake preliminary design work on projects which are of such urgency that actual physical construction must be initiated promptly after appropriations for the projects have been approved.

Section 104 of the bill would allow the AEC to transfer funds between the "Operating expenses" and the "Plant and capital equipment" accounts to the extent permitted by an appropriations act. In the past, the AEC appropriations acts have allowed the AEC to make transfers between these two accounts of up to 5 percent of the appropriations for either account, provided that neither appropriations could be increased by more than 5 percent by such a transfer.

Section 105 of the bill would amend the AEC Authorization Act for fiscal year 1958—Public Law 85-162—by extending for an additional year, until June 30, 1969, the date for approving proposals under the third round of the AEC's cooperative power reactor demonstration program.

Section 106 of the bill would amend previous AEC authorization acts to increase three project authorizations.

Section 107 of the bill would rescind authorization for a project which the committee believes to be no longer justified on the basis of current national priorities, except for funds heretofore obligated and such additional funds as may be necessary to close out the project. In rescinding authorization for this project, which was approved by Congress in fiscal 1965, savings of not less than $18,000,000 will be achieved. These savings are exclusive of additional costs for associated research and development and capital equipment not related to construction which otherwise would have been incurred in connection with this project. This estimate of savings also does not reflect the fact that the actual cost of the project has risen by an estimated $10,000,000.

HEART PUMP

Mr. President, one additional matter, I would like to bring to your attention because although only a small sum of money is involved, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy considers it of major

importance and added $800,000 to the Bill in excess of what was requested by the administration in its request to the Congress. This involves $800,000 to help develop a new type of heart pump to aid those with heart trouble.

More than a third of all deaths in the United States today are due to diseases of the heart and the proportion continues to rise. The subject has become one of particular public interest since Dr. Christian Barnard, of South Africa, performed his historic human heart transplant operations. A National Heart Institute study indicates that of the more than 700,000 lives claimed in a year by the disease, about 100,000 might have been helped if a circulatory support system were available.

The National Heart Institute has embarked on a program to develop assist system devices as well as a totally implantable system to replace the biological heart. The Atomic Energy Commission has been conducting parallel conceptual design studies for powering an implantable heart system with an isotopic energy source. Last year four separate radioisotopic engine concept design studies were conducted each by a different contractor. Each came up with a different concept all of which appear feasible. The basic principle, however, is the same in all. The heat of decay from a radioisotope—plutonium 238—would be used by a suitable converter to provide power for the heart pump.

The executive branch provided no moneys in the fiscal 1969 budget to proceed with development of these concepts. Since the committee's fiscal year 1968 authorization hearings, the National Heart Institute has changed its program objectives. The reason set forth is the need for a stepwise effort in the development of implantable heart assist devices. The National Heart Institute's immediate goal is an intermediate stage device with an external power source for implantation in animals at an early date.

The prospects for developing a radioisotopic heart engine appear excellent. Radioisotopic fuel development efforts indicate that the highly refined grade of plutonium .238 necessary can be produced. And medical opinion is that the radiation dose rate to the patient would be acceptable. The Atomic Energy Commission has a plan whereby an 18-month test program on model engines would be conducted to establish the performance capability of at least two of the concepts studied in the first phase. This program is estimated to cost $800,000. This would be followed later by a third phase to develop and test a prototype engine which it is estimated would take 3 years.

I consider the addition of $800,000 to the AEC authorization by the committee for the second phase of the AEC's parallel development effort to produce a very compact long-lived internal source of power for an implantable heart unit, a prudent and timely step in this very important effort.

I would like also to include in the RECORD a news release on this subject which was dispatched from my office on April 4, 1968.

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

NEWS RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW MEXICO, APRIL 4, 1968

Atomic Energy Commission efforts have succeeded in keeping alive a program to develop a nuclear-powered heart, Senator Clinton P. Anderson, D.-N.M., said today.

The AEC authorization bills reported to both the Senate and the House for fiscal year 1969 contain $800,000 to continue work with the National Heart Institute on a radioisotopic heat engine. An AEC request for direct funding of $1 million for the current year was turned down by the Budget Bureau.

The funds will enable contractors to evaluate designs for a protoype engine to power heart devices. The AEC hopes to go ahead with a three-year program costing $4 million.

"There are still technical and engineering problems to be worked out," Anderson said. "However, four conceptual design studies just completed for radioistopic engines confirm the capability of current technology to handle the assignment."

The AEC also conducts a nuclear fuels program to develop a safe radioistope for implantation in the human body. Elemental impurities have been significantly reduced from plutonium-238 through an electrorefining process. Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory prepared the first batch of this electrorefined fuel in August, 1967.

"Radioisotopic power sources appear to be completely implantable and have a relatively long life," Anderson said. "They offer substantial advantages over the non-nuclear circulatory systems for that reason.

He pointed to the nuclear-powered cardiac pacemaker being developed to assist patients suffering from heart block, which lasts ten years in comparison with the battery-operated device requiring a replacement every two years.

"It has been suggested that there is no urgency for funding such a long-term effort," Anderson said. "The death of a half million Americans each year from heart disease is a matter of national concern deserving high priority in the Government's research and development effort."

He added:

"The scarcity of organs already poses major obstacles to widespread heart transplants and the artificial heart will be called upon to answer the need. We need to prepare now."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee report (No. 1074), showing a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

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

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 101 of the bill authorizes appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission, in accordance with the provisions of section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, for "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment."

Section 101(a) of the bill deals with the authorization of appropriations for "Operating expenses." The Commission's authorization request under this heading was presented to the committee in terms of costs to be incurred during fiscal year 1969, adjusted in total to the obligations to be incurred during the fiscal year.

The committee is authorized a total of $2,174,550,000 for "Operating expenses," not to exceed $119,400,000 in operating costs for the high energy physics program category. It is the committee's intent that the amount specified for any program or category shall be exceeded only in accordance with specific arrangements which have been developed between the Commission and the committee. These arrangements include provision for periodic reporting to the committee of changes in estimates of authorized programs. These informal procedures, embodied in an exchange of correspondence between the Atomic Energy Commission and the committee, have operated efficiently. It is the committee's belief that legislative measures or other formal devices that would impose legal limitations upon the reprogramming of Commission funds are not necessary at this time. It is the committee's intent that the procedures specified in this exchange of correspondence shall remain in effect during fiscal year 1969.

It is intended that costs incurred pursuant to the authorization contained in this act shall be generally in accordance with the analysis of the proposed bills submitted by the AEC and other background and explanatory materials furnished by the Commission in justification of the AEC's fiscal year 1969 authorization bill.

Plant and capital equipment obligations are provided in three sections of the bill. Under section 101(b), an authorization is provided for new construction projects and capital equipment not related to construction. This authorization, together with the changes in prior year project authorizations provided for in sections 106 and 107, discussed below, comprise the total authorization for plant and capital equipment provided for in this bill. The AEC's request for authorization for these purposes was presented on the basis of new obligational authority required. New construction projects authorized under subsections (1) through (6) of section 101(b) of the bill total $74,011,000.

It is intended that the projects under this authorization be related, as in previous years, to the analysis of the proposed bills submitted by the AEC and other background and explanatory materials furnished by the Commission in justification of the AEC authorization bill. It is not intended to prevent technical and engineering changes which are considered necessary or desirable by the Commission consistent with the scope and purpose of the project concerned.

Pursuant to section 101(b)(7), appropriations are authorized for capital equipment not related to construction in the amount of $175,040,000. This equipment is necessary to replace obsolete or wornout equipment at AEC installations. Additional equipment is required to meet the needs of expanding programs and changing technology. Examples of typical equipment include machine tools, computers, and office equipment. The committee expects to receive a report from the Commission at least semiannually on obligations incurred pursuant to this authorization.

SECTION 102

Section 102 of the bill provides limitations similar to those in prior authorization acts.

Subsection (a) provides that the Commission is authorized to start projects set forth in certain subsections of section 101 only if the current estimated cost of the project does not exceed by more than 25 percent the estimated cost for that project set forth in the bill.

Subsection (b) provides similar limitations for the project in another subsection of section 101, except that the increase may not exceed 10 percent of the estimated cost shown in the bill.

Subsection (c) provides limitations on general plant projects authorized by subsection 101(b)(c), whereby the Commission may start such projects only if the currently estimated cost of such project does not exceed $500,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such project does not exceed $100,000; provided that the building cost limitation may be exceeded if the Commission determines that it

is necessary in the interest of efficiency and economy. Additionally, section 102(c) provides that the total cost of all general plant projects shall not exceed the estimated cost set forth in subsection 101(b)(6) by more than 10 percent.

Under arrangements previously agreed to by the Commission and the committee, the Commission shall report to the Joint Committee and the Appropriations Committees after the close of each fiscal year concerning the use of general plant project funds, and such report shall identify each project for which the proposed new authority has been utilized.

SECTION 103

Section 103 of the bill authorizes the Commission to undertake engineering design (titles I and II) on construction projects which have been included in a proposed authorization bill transmitted to the Congress by the Commission. It is understood that this work could be undertaken on projects which the Commission deems are of such urgency that physical construction should be initiated as soon as appropriations for the project have been approved.

SECTION 104

Section 104 of the bill provides authorization for the transfer of amounts between the "Operating expenses" and the "Plant and capital equipment" appropriation as provided in the appropriation acts. The AEC appropriation acts have, in past years, provided that not to exceed 5 percent of the appropriations for "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" could be transferred between such appropriations, provided, however, that neither appropriation could be increased by more than 5 percent by any such transfer. It is understood that any such transfer shall be reported promptly to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

SECTION 105

Section 105 of the bill pertains to the cooperative power reactor demonstration program. This section amends the AEC authorization act for fiscal year 1958 (Public Law 85-162) by extending for an additional year, until June 30, 1969, the date for approving proposals under the third round of the cooperative power reactor demonstration program.

SECTION 106

Subsection (a) of section 106 amends section 101 (b) of Public Law 90-56, the AEC's authorization act for fiscal year 1968, by increasing by $184,500,000 the authorization for project 68-2-a, new weapons production capabilities, various locations, and by increasing by $25,000,000 the authorization for project 68-4-f, 200 Bev accelerator.

Subsection (b) of section 106 amends section 101 of Public Law 89-32, the AEC's authorization act for fiscal year 1966, by increasing by $3,200,000 the authorization for project 66-2-d, environmental test facility, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, Calif.

SECTION 107

Section 107 amends the AEC's fiscal year 1965 authorization act (Public Law 88-332) by rescinding authorization for Project 65-5-a, Argone advanced research reactor, Argonne National Laboratory, except for funds heretofore obligated and such additional funds as may be necessary to close out the project. The committee believes that this project is no longer justified on the basis of current national priorities. The savings in project construction obligations effected by this action are estimated to be not less than $18 million. These savings are exclusive of additional costs for associated research and development and capital equipment not related to construction which otherwise would have been incurred in connection with this project, and do not reflect the fact that the estimated cost of the project has risen by $10 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the comments of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Mexico, effectively conveyed the spirit in which the Joint Committee examined the Atomic Energy Commission's authorization request for fiscal year 1969. "Scrutinize" would perhaps be more descriptive of our approach than "examine." In the jargon of the cost effectiveness people, I might say that this bill anticipates more output per dollar than perhaps any previous AEC authorization.

The most revealing statistic in our report is that the Commission's authorization requests for programs not involving military applications were reduced by 23 percent. As a result of this action, the committee is able to report out a bill that is over $15 million less than the fiscal year 1968 authorization, despite an increase of over $300 million in the weapons program. As Senator ANDERSON noted, the significant increase in the weapons program stems in largest part from the executive decision regarding deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system and an intensification of effort on the Poseidon missile system.

This year's AEC request was up about $300 million from fiscal 1968 spending levels, largely because of these added expenditures for national security. The committee's recommendations provide for decreases in nonmilitary programs of sufficient magnitude to cover completely this increase, and, in fact, provide for an authorization less than last year's. I believe, Mr. President, that the committee has been responsive to the current need for fiscal austerity.

Mr. President, the depth of our review of the Commission's request is exemplified by the recommended rescission of a prior-year authorization for the Argonne advanced research reactor. This project was authorized in fiscal year 1965 in the amount of $25 million. In the interim, the project completion date has slipped over 3 years, and the estimated cost has increased by $10 million, to $35 million. These facts did not escape our attention.

The committee recognized the desirability and potential utility of this basic research device. On the other hand, considered in the context of today's national priorities and in view of the slippage and estimated cost increase, the committee concluded that the project was no longer justified.

We estimated that the savings in project construction costs effected by the committee's action will be about $28 million. In addition, other savings will result from the curtailment of related research and development and of procurement of certain equipment that would have been needed for the facility.

Mr. President, our report contains other examples of this nature. The bill presented to you today has trimmed the excess that may have been in it, and perhaps even a little flesh and bone too. It is deserving of passage. The bill was reported without dissent by any of the Senate members of the joint committee, and was passed by the other body on Thursday, April 4, by an overwhelming margin.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, notwithstanding the rule of germaneness, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak on another subject for 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PLIGHT OF THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the well-known and authoritative syndicated columnist, Sylvia Porter, has written an excellent article concerning the plight of the small American farmer. This article was headlined, "Farmers Again in Squeeze."

While I compliment Miss Porter on her penetrating analysis of a most critical problem confronting about 1 million of our farmers, the headline writer would have done better to proclaim "Farmers Still in Squeeze." For farmers have been caught in a price-production cost squeeze for many years now, and it has driven millions of people off the land. Six hundred thousand people left their farms just last year.

Miss Porter gave a grim but nonetheless accurate picture of this situation when she commented that more than 1 million farmers are today threatened with economic extinction.

This is the farmer who feeds 200 million Americans, and about 160 million more across the world—although he is only about 6 percent of our total population.

This is the farmer who can out-produce and do so more efficiently than farmers anywhere in the world.

This is the farmer who has made American food the best buy in the world.

This is the farmer who has helped make our Nation fat and prosperous and secure.

He has provided a bounteous supply of food and fiber for the American consumer, at lower prices in terms of total income than anywhere else.

He has furnished the raw materials for our booming industries.

He is a hard working and dedicated part of this Nation's largest and most important business.

He has also been relegated to a position of second-class citizenship in the American economy. He is denied his fair share of the national income.

This to me is a national disgrace. It demands our attention no less than the critical social and economic problems of our large cities. The declining status of the farm and rural poverty go hand in hand with urban poverty. One very often produces the other.

The President's Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty had this to say in its recent report:

> Rural poverty is so widespread, and so acute, as to be a national disgrace, and its consequences have swept into our cities, violently.

I submit that much of the rural poverty that we have today, and a large part of the poverty that plagues our

cities today, can be traced directly to economic pressures that have forced almost 4 million American farms out of business in the past 30 years.

We can go back to just 1950 and see what has been taking place.

Between 1950 and 1967, realized net farm income nationwide increased only 13.3 percent, from $12.8 to $14.5 billion.

During the same period, farm production expenses went up 77.3 percent, from $19.4 to $34.4 billion.

In other words, with only a slight gain in income over a 17-year period, the cost of production almost doubled.

For my State of Georgia during this period, realized net farm income rose 38 percent, from $313.5 to $433 million.

But the cost of production jumped 110 percent, from $359 to $754 million.

More recently, farm prices were down 5 percent last year, while production expenses increased about $1 billion.

The American farmers' total realized net income last year was almost $2 billion less than 1966, down from $16.4 billion to $14.5 billion.

Now we are told that this is about 25 percent higher than it was in 1960, and this is supposed to show that the farmer is moving right along with everyone else in improving his income. This just is not so, for between 1960 and 1967, the cost of production climbed 31.3 percent.

And keep in mind that the taxes payable by farmers are up about 6 percent, farm wages up 8 percent, and interest charges on farm real estate debt up about 12 percent.

This then has been the story. The American farmer has been producing more for the benefit of the consumer and the general well-being of America. In fact, just about everyone benefits except the farmer, because he is having to pay more for what he produces, and yet receive less for his efforts and investment.

He is not getting ahead, or even holding his own. The farmer is being pushed further and further down the American economic ladder.

It is a shame that the farmer can multiply production, increase his efficiency, and feed a good part of the world, and still not be guaranteed a return on his investment.

The United States is presently in the midst of its longest period of prosperity. The farmer is entitled to 100 percent of his share of this prosperity—and not just a fraction of it that has left him lagging far behind other segments of the American economy.

I bring Miss Porter's column to the attention of the Senate and 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:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 4, 1968]

FARMERS AGAIN IN SQUEEZE

(By Sylvia Porter)

At a recent town meeting of a small New England village, residents voted to exempt the village's four dairy farmers from personal property tax on their livestock, although other types of stock in trade are taxable in this village. The reason the farmers got the break, it was explained, was that while the costs of feed grains, farm machinery, fertilizer and farm labor are rising steeply, the farmer is just about alone among businessmen in not being able to raise the prices of the products he sells.

"The exemption will save me $60 a year," commented one young farmer, "hardly enough to make the cost squeeze less painful."

You can multiply this cost-squeeze complaint by the more than 1 million small farmers throughout the United States, who are today threatened with economic extinction, although you probably won't find many examples of special concessions by townsfolk to help their pinched neighbors.

FARMERS GET LESS

Although we, as consumers, are paying 20 percent more for the food we buy than we paid two decades ago, the farmers who produce the food are getting 6 percent less for their efforts. Meanwhile, the costs of supplies and equipment the farmers must buy have leaped 30 percent.

Today, the farmer gets only 5½ cents of your after-tax $1 for his products, one-half of the share he got as recently as 1947.

Last year alone, the U.S. farmer was hit by a $1.5 billion farm-price drop. Today, per capita disposable income for U.S. farmers averages only $1,692, about 60 percent of the income for other Americans.

As a result, the flight from small farms—usually to big, congested cities—has been relentless. Since 1935, the number of U.S. farms has dropped from 6.8 million to under 3.1 million, the lowest number since 1875. In 1967, 600,000 Americans left their farms.

FACTS ARE BRUTAL

These are the brutal facts behind the new round of threats by the National Farmers Organization to withhold key food products to force up prices they receive.

These also are the facts behind a new proposal to establish a National Agricultural Relations Board at the federal level to serve U.S. farmers in the same way the National Labor Relations Board serves other U.S. workers, or to give farmers a new way to unionize on a national scale.

And these are the facts behind the President's call to Congress for more food-price supports, collective bargaining for farmers and the creation of a "National Food Bank" for surpluses which would help support prices to farmers.

The revolution on the farm is speeding up. The end is not foreseeable.

Here are examples of the amounts farmers get for each food $1 you spend:

Farmer's share of $1 spent

Item:	*Cents*
Corn flakes	7
Sandwich cookies	9
Whole wheat bread	11
Canned corn	12
White bread	15
Frozen peas	15
Fresh spinach	24
Potatoes	25
Sugar	38
Fresh milk	50
Eggs, Grade A large	57
Beef choice	58

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Georgia for having brought so graphically to the attention of all of us the seriousness of the rural problem of America.

A number of people have spoken of the great importance of reversing this trend so as to encourage people to stay in the rural sections of the country. We are plagued every day with manifestations of the problems caused by the concentration of people in the cities of America. And I think we will miss half the mark if we fail to appreciate that it is a twofold problem, a two-pronged problem that we are trying to come to grips with.

We must solve the question of what we are going to do about the problem of population congestion in the cities of America. And I think we would miss the mark completely if we only react from this ever growing problem. There is another question going beyond that. It is an important source of the problem, just as the distinguished Senator from Georgia has so pointedly brought to our attention this morning. I refer to the problem of the rural parts of America, the declining payroll, the declining return from farm income, the ever increasing debt that the farmer must carry.

I was talking not more than a week ago with an insurance appraiser. He told me that in his part of the country he was making higher appraisals, which does reflect some increase in real estate values.

The unfortunate thing, as the appraiser has pointed out, was not that the farmers and the ranchers were getting out of debt, but that they were getting more deeply into debt. They have to borrow more money in order to pay off bills that result from increased labor cost, increased taxes, increased gas and oil prices, increased prices of everything else, machinery, and the whole gamut of expenses that are part and parcel of the farming situation.

This has resulted in the farmers having to go even more deeply into debt. They increase their borrowing to meet their month-by-month expenses.

I think that unless we understand that this is a very important part of the problem of the cities and has contributed to the concentration of people in the cities because these people have left rural America, we are not going to solve the problems of the cities, nor of America.

I compliment the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his very able presentation.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. I concur with everything he has said. It is true that many of those engaged in agriculture in our country at the present time are living off capital—borrowed capital at that—and not income.

I also share the view of the Senator that the surplus agricultural workers that are going to our congested cities are contributing the most to the problems of America at the present time. They go there with few skills. They have limited education. They have little training. They are ill-adapted for urban life.

Many of those same people are the ones who were engaged within the last few hours in burning and looting in Washington, D.C.

Our country would have been far better off if those people had continued to live in the rural areas in constructive jobs and continued to make contributions to our society.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator not agree with me that the people who have fled the rural parts of

America and gone to the cities are as ill-equipped as any people in our cities today to find work and have an opportunity to take care of their families and to discharge the responsibilities that we ought willingly to assume insofar as our families are concerned?

Mr. TALMADGE. I agree completely.

Mr. HANSEN. I do not know how quickly we are going to recognize that the problems of the cities do reflect the deterioration of farm income. However, I think it is inescapable. We must face it, and the sooner we do face it the sooner there will be some reasonable prospect that we can stay this great inflow of people into the cities which magnifies the problems of the cities.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is correct, I thank him for his contribution to the record today in that regard.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16324) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, in connection with the authorization of appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1969, both the occupant of the chair, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the junior Senator from Tennessee have a most substantial interest in the welfare and the future of these projects, and in the future of atomic energy especially for peaceful purposes, because of the contribution that has been made by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and its work in connection with it.

I make today, particular reference to experiments being conducted now at Oak Ridge in the field of molten salt reactors leading to the era of molten salt breeder reactors which would bring the opportunity to construct and operate an economic and practical and soon-to-be-available system of breeder reactors for this Nation.

It was my privilege to appear before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and to urge that the full amount of budgetary requests for the continuation of the molten salt reactor experiment—MSRE—be funded this fiscal year.

This request was buttressed by the statement by Dr. Alvin Weinberg, Director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, that he, for his part, was willing to readjust appropriations within the laboratory itself in order to accommodate the transfer of funds from other projects to this project in order to continue the funding of MSRE at the requested level and at the level recommended by the Atomic Energy Commission.

For my part, I might say that MSRE is one of the truly significant and possibly even spectacular new developments that are in prospect as the next step in this fertile, technological revolution. I feel that in the matter of establishing technical priorities in this Nation, we cannot overlook the fact that energy is a unit and a measure of basic wealth and that the perfecting of a breeder reactor system, as promised by the molten salt concept, so far has been the most practical and the quickest route for the production of vast new quantities of very low cost electrical energy, thus contributing directly to the welfare of America and, indeed, of all the world. For we must bear in mind, as we all do, that in this era of social need, in this era of social demand, in this era of a heightened social conscience, America, the richest nation on earth, is still dirt poor in terms of those things we would like to undertake, those projects we would like to fund, that poverty we would like to totally alleviate, and the pain and disadvantage we would like to totally obliterate. Nuclear energy, especially the concept of breeder reactors, offers a real and a practical hope of great quantum jumps in the amount of available wealth that this Nation and the world have in its continuing fight against the plight of the poor, the needy, and the disadvantaged.

With these things in mind, I urged as strongly as I could the full funding of the molten salt reactor experiment at Oak Ridge. I was careful to point out that this in no sense is a regional concern, that the fact that the experiments are conducted in Oak Ridge simply made them more available for my inspection and possibly increased the depth of my knowledge.

To reinforce my vow of nonregional concern for this project, I expressed to the Joint Committee my willingness to participate fully in the making of spending reductions in corresponding amounts in other nonessential areas. As a member of the Public Works Committee, I expressed a willingness to see these cuts made in Tennessee if necessary. Dr. Weinberg also expressed his willingness to shift funds within the Oak Ridge budget in order to maintain the full requested funding for MSRE.

The Joint Committee, in its good judgment, and in recognition of the enormous problems that confront this Nation today, especially in connection with its fiscal policy, felt that this could not be done in this fiscal year, in the authorization before the Senate at this time, and with that judgment of the joint committee I fully concur. I reluctantly agree that it cannot be done this year, and I thank the Joint Committee for its courtesy in hearing my testimony and my urging that it be conducted in this manner.

I rise now to review the nature of this project, to underscore my feeling of the great importance and significance that it has for the entire country and for the entire world and civilization, and to urge that in funding this project—MSRE—at less than the full request for this fiscal year, we not lose sight of the high priority that a project of this type should have and that we not lose sight of the compelling justification for increasing the funding of this and similar projects in the next ensuing fiscal year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain testimony that I gave before the Joint Committee in connection with the matter under consideration.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1968

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and to testify on behalf of an increase in the authorization for the molten salt reactor experiment at Oak Ridge. I understand that the Atomic Energy Commission recommended $10 million for MSR in FY 1969, and the President's budget includes $6.7 million.

I am fully, acutely, and keenly aware of the urgent necessity for fiscal restraint, for reductions in the level of federal expenditures, and the deferral of spending in an effort to meet what I conceive to be a near-crisis situation in federal fiscal accounts; however, I am also keenly aware that things important too often give way to those which are merely urgent. And in this vein, I have proposed that a careful re-examination of projects in light of their importance, their promise, their cost, as well as their urgency, must accompany an intelligent rearrangement of the income and expenditures of the government.

I feel that the MSR experiment is of such vital national importance that the Commission's recommendation should be restored in its entirety and that in the exercise of the setting of priorities, a commensurate reduction of expenditures in some other field can and should be undertaken. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, to underscore my deep conviction in this respect, I am perfectly willing to have any other aspect of the AEC authorization or the Public Works authorization, within or without Tennessee, at Oak Ridge or otherwise, reduced by the sum of $3.3 million, or any combination of such reductions to equal $3.3 million, in order to meet the urgent requirements of the molten salt program.

In support of this proposition, I am told by Dr. Alvin Weinberg, the Director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, that he would be agreeable to a rearrangement of the total budget of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in order to reduce other budget items by a commensurate amount in order to restore the authorization request for MSRE.

On August 29, 1967, on the floor of the Senate I spoke on the importance of the MSR experiment and the spectacular promise of breeders, and the thermo breeder especially, to the long-term prosperity of this country and the entire world. Without repeating at length the points I attempted to make in that speech, I would respectfully urge that the development of economic breeder reactors must be accomplished if nuclear power is to provide the United States with a long-term source of low cost energy. The achievements for the past year offer considerable hope that the molten salt route can lead to early success in the development of economic breeders. During 1967 the MSRE passed well beyond the 6000 equivalent full power hours that AEC testified last year should be attained before its success could be judged. Development of processing methods and core designs that make it feasible to have a high performance MSBR using a single fluid containing both uranium and thorium move the MSRE closer to commercial success.

During the past year unexpected difficulties arose which made the early achievement of economic fast breeders look less likely and the development of economic thermo breeders more likely.

Because molten salt breeder reactors have much lower fissile fuel inventories, they are as effective as fast reactors (which have higher breeding ratio) in conserving our ore resources.

ORNL studies show molten salt breeders to have low fuel cycle costs because no fuel fabrication is required and the fuel inventory cost is low. Black and Veatch, who evaluated MSR's for Northern States Power Company, were quoted by *Nucleonics Week* as concurring in this and as saying that the concept should be given the attention of the utility industry. This is an important point because regardless of other merits, a reactor will not be used by utilities unless its power costs are low.

Thus molten salt reactors look more promising technically relative to fast reactors than they did a year ago, they serve as well as fast breeders in conserving ore, and they are economically very promising. Because of the importance of breeding to the nation, an aggressive program to develop molten salt breeders should be pursued.

How does the budget for Molten Salt Reactor work compare with that for Liquid Metal Fast Breeders?

In 1967 LMFBR costs were $42,592,000 while costs for the Molten Salt Program were only $4,128,000. In 1958 LMFBR funding increased about 55 percent to $66,050,000 while the molten salt increase to $4,200,000 was less than 2 percent. The proposed 69 levels are 82,000,000 for LMFBR and $6,700,000 for MSR. In addition to these operating funds, an increase of $35,000,000 in funding for the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) is being requested in the construction projects portion of the budget (This project was authorized in Fiscal Year 1967 at $87,500,000). Thus a comparison of planned spending in Fiscal Year 1969 would show $117,000,000 for the LMFBR and only $6,700,000 for Molten Salt.

SUMMARY

	1967	1968	1969
LMFBR	$42,596,000	$66,050,000	[1] $119,000,000
Molten salt	4,128,000	4,200,000	6,700,000

[1] Includes $82,000,000 operating, $2,000,000 as EBR-II modifications (69-4-b), and $35,000,000 for FFTF (67-3-a). Comparable capita lcosts for LMFBR for 1967 and 1968 are not available at this time.

What course of development ought to be pursued for MSBRs?

I respectfully submit that:

1. ORNL's molten salt budget ought to be increased to a level that permits full investigation of all important questions and rapid progress in the development of components and systems needed for breeder reactors.

2. A commitment should be made to construct a Molten Salt Breeder Experiment at the earliest moment the technology and budget considerations permit. Authorization in FY 1970 ought to be planned tentatively and the R & D and reactor design effort carried on at a level which would make this a feasible goal if the work of the next year continues to be promising.

3. The Molten Salt Breeder Experiment probably should be in the range of 200 to 300 Mwe.

4. Industry should be involved in the program as early and as fully as possible.

5. If all goes well, the design of a large reactor should be started before construction of the breeder experiment is completed and this overlapping pattern continued until commercial plants are achieved.

What budget levels would the preceding programs require?

ORNL's budget should be at a minimum of $10 million in Fiscal Year 1969 and ought to be $20 million in FY 1970 and the following years. With a $20 million budget, it will be possible to perform the R & D required for the breeder experiment, construct a non-nuclear mock-up of the essential parts of the reactor, and support some industrial participation. Additional support would be required for very extensive industrial involvement.

The breeder experiment itself would probably cost $60 to $80 million, part of which should be provided by the utility which gets the power.

What comparison can be made of the role of private industry in the Fast Breeder and the Molten Salt Thermal Breeder programs?

Widespread participation by private industry in the Fast Breeder Program, with the exception of the Fermi Reactor, became significant only after a public commitment had been made by the AEC to strongly support the development of the necessary technology. A comparable commitment to the Molten Salt Thermal Breeder must now be made if we are to be sure of private industrial support and participation. Such partnership between industry and government is not only desirable but absolutely essential to the ultimate success of the project; strong action by the government in providing a substantial and firm base upon which to establish and promote such a joint effort at this time is imperative.

In conclusion, I feel that most remarkable progress has been made with the Molten Salt Reactor Experiment. I believe that the molten salt concept is far more than a backup for the LMFBR and that it may be the best and least costly approach to nuclear power for the future. I respectfully urge that the Committee consider the authorization of $10 million, with a commensurate reduction of $3.3 million in other items for Fiscal 1969.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy also is favorably impressed by the work conducted to date at Oak Ridge under the direction of Dr. Alvin Weinberg on the molten salt breeder reactor. The staff members of the Joint Committee have visited the Oak Ridge laboratory to obtain firsthand information and have reported favorably to the committee as to the potential this experimental reactor appears to have. During the Joint Committee hearings to consider the Atomic Energy Commission fiscal year 1969 authorization, on January 31 we heard testimony from Dr. Weinberg concerning this project. Also, the junior Senator from Tennessee was a most understandable witness before the Joint Committee when he testified February 6.

Last year, the molten salt breeder reactor was funded at a level of $4.2 million. This year's level of funding is projected at $6.7 million, an increase of $2.5 million. Now, Dr. Weinberg and those working at the Oak Ridge laboratory on this project would have liked to have had $10 million to work with this coming year. Unfortunately, in view of the tight budget situation they are being held to $6.7 million. As of now, the Joint Committee is recommending a reduction of over 10 percent of the AEC budget. We have cut out $293 million. We did not cut this project. We have gone along with the $2.5 increase of last year.

The Joint Committee will continue to follow this project, and we hope and expect that Dr. Weinberg and his capable staff will continue to make technical advances and that next year, depending upon the budget situation, this project will be funded at a level commensurate with its achievements.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Tennessee for their comments. Very fine work has been done with respect to this matter, and I am happy that the Senator from Tennessee has raised the question again.

I have nothing further, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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. 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.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Savannah River plant near my hometown of Aiken, S.C., is the largest single investment ever made by the U.S. Government at one time. This important installation deserves the continued support of our Nation. Many peaceful and beneficial uses of atomic energy remain untapped. At the Savannah River plant much has been and can be done to explore further this potential reservoir of progress for mankind.

I should like to review briefly the activities at the Savannah River plant. While the production of materials for nuclear weapons is still the primary function of this facility, more and more time and effort are now being directed to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The Savannah River laboratory with a talented and well-trained staff of over 850—including 75 Ph. D's—is a center for this effort. This work involves some of the rarest radioisotopes. This is due to the plant's high flux reactors which operate at an intense radiation rate. These reactors are particularly suited to producing the radioisotopes being studied for applications in space, industry, and medicine. Research teams are looking for better ways to prepare and use these isotopes.

These peaceful applications of atomic energy include the following use for the present and future:

First. Commercial power generators in more than 50 U.S. nuclear fueled plants.

Second. Medical uses for treatment of cancer and research in this and other fields of preventive medicine.

Third. Food processing uses are being developed to prolong the shelf life of foods.

Fourth. Industrial radiography has developed uses of X-ray equipment to discover hidden flaws in large metal castings.

Fifth. In providing power for remote places, thermoelectric generators with radioactive isotopes as the heat source are compact and reliable, and emit energy for long periods without maintenance.

Sixth. Beyond these applications, other uses of atomic energy are in the theoretical or early experimental stages.

Mr. President, I am pleased the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has recommended so early this year, the fiscal year 1969 AEC authorization bill in order

that the work of the Atomic Energy Commission can go forward. This program will enable the work of AEC in developing the various applications of atomic energy to progress and continue to provide our Nation with the knowledge necessary to make the best use of the atom.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy deserves special praise for a difficult job well done on the fiscal 1969 Atomic Energy Commission authorization (H.R. 16324). We are all keenly aware of the budget stringencies that exist and the urgent need to cut spending wherever possible without endangering our national defense and welfare. In my opinion, the Joint Committee performed this task with reason and skill.

I am, of course, particularly interested in AEC programs, for much of the testing is carried out in my own State of Nevada. The Nevada test site ranks as a major Federal activity in southern Nevada, and its function is an essential part of our nuclear energy development program, both in weapons development and in the peaceful application of nuclear power.

From the Nevada test site standpoint, I do not think there can be any argument with the action of the Joint Committee. Reductions will apply there as they will throughout our nuclear program. However, I am pleased the committee was able to slice $293 million from the total authorization request without crippling any one segment of the AEC program. As I see it, the essential programs have been kept intact or given minimum reductions while less essential aspects have been realistically reduced.

I am particularly pleased the committee saw fit to give such a strong endorsement to the space propulsion systems program. The reduction of $3 million in the total $72 million authorization request for this program is a sensible and practical savings that will not permanently impair our project to develop a workable nuclear rocket engine. This action has already been endorsed in the House and I hope it will be here today in the Senate.

More significantly, probably, I hope the endorsement of our NERVA I engine development also extends to the space program authorization. As we witnessed last session, it does not help much to gain full funding for the AEC on this joint project if the National Aeronautics and Space Administration portion is cut back too far. This program must walk on two legs, and I fear the same budget cutters among our colleagues in the other body have been overzealous and will all but amputate the NASA leg if their recommendations are adopted.

Mr. President, my contention is that our great Nation cannot afford to abandon a project so vital to our long-range, overall space program. The nuclear rocket engine is the next logical step forward from the mighty Saturn rocket. Without it we are hobbling our future progress in space. As the Joint Committee stated in its report:

> The Committee is disturbed by the recent signs indicating that support for this program may be faltering and that development of the NERVA nuclear rocket engine may be curtailed. . . . Lack of support for the NERVA engine in fiscal year 1969 could seriously impair this country's ability to make use of the tremendous technical capability developed in this program over the past 12 years. Worse yet, without the development of a nuclear rocket engine, it is not possible to project a viable space program based on a significant time-wise advancement in propulsion capability.

I wish to emphasize the Joint Committee's next statement:

> Deferral is not possible without incurring certain irreversible penalties which will be very costly to this nation in the long run.

The Joint Committee goes on to say it would not have recommended even the slight reduction it did if there had not been such stringent fund limitations.

Mr. President, I urge full Senate endorsement of the committee's recommendations on our nuclear rocket program. And I call upon my colleagues in both Houses of Congress to support NASA funding as well so that this joint project can continue to move forward confidently on two good legs. It is to our Nation's benefit that it does.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending legislation and I commend the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the diligent work they have done on this measure. They have made a very strenuous effort to reduce the amount of this authorization. This is in keeping, I feel, with the very pervasive feeling throughout the Congress that Federal spending must be reduced in view of the present fiscal situation of the Nation.

The reductions accomplished in this authorization should provide an example for other authorizations yet to be considered. Combined in the budget are both military and nonmilitary requirements. Analysis will, I believe, demonstrate that in the course of reducing the total amount of this authorization by 10 percent, and in order to retain the military requirements contained in the bill, 23 percent reduction in nonmilitary items has been accomplished.

I need not recite the number of items—which include very valuable research and development as well as a number of other excellent projects—that have been laid aside and postponed in order to accomplish this reduction. But if we can accomplish in other areas what has been achieved by the Joint Committee in this high priority area of nuclear energy, we will be well on our way to meeting our responsibilities in this Congress in passing legislation appropriate and responsive to the present fiscal situation.

Now, Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to underscore with some particularity one aspect of the bill which has an important relevance to my State of Illinois in view of the foregoing general comments. The budget contains a figure of $25 million for the 200-Bev. accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill. The original request for this item was upwards of $242 million, which represented the total remaining authorization for the whole project. It will be recalled that $7.3 million was sought and appropriated last year.

I have had several calls on this reduction from interested persons who feared for the effective continuance of this project. I have received the assurance of the Joint Committee—and the Atomic Energy Commission—that the $25 million contained in this appropriation is the total capability for the project this year. It is all that can be spent constructively on the project in the coming year and all that was contemplated to be spent. I am happy to report that in no case were any of my callers more than satisfied that the project should go forward on this more current basis in the authorization process, in view of the national fiscal situation.

May I take this opportunity to thank the committee for their very commendatory reference in the report to this project. As I pointed out last year, we in Illinois are fully aware of the benefits in having this pioneering and forward looking scientific facility constructed in our State. We are mindful of the responsibilities that go with these benefits. In particular I am happy to say that the great progress our State has recorded in the sensitive area of nondiscriminatory housing—which I reported to the Senate at the time of the initial approval of this project last year—has continued and continued well.

As of the present time, more than 33 communities have enacted for themselves open housing ordinances. I am particularly pleased to note that 21 of the 33 communities that presently have these ordinances enacted them following the passage of the AEC authorization last year. All but one major population center in our State now has taken the action to meet this problem. And the chances for passage of a State fair housing law have greatly increased, if not in the short session this summer, in the next general session of the legislature next year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the committee report relating to the Weston accelerator project be included in the RECORD following these remarks. I ask also that I may have consent to insert pertinent newspaper articles reporting the continued progress in open housing in Illinois.

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

> (4) *Project 68–4–f, 200 Bev accelerator. Du Page and Kane Counties near Chicago, Ill.*—In regard to the 200 Bev accelerator facility proposed for Weston, Ill., the committee recommends additional authorization in the amount of $25 million for fiscal year 1969. An appropriation in this amount would provide for continuation of design and engineering services, procurement of various technical components of the accelerator, site preparation, utility installation, and initiation of construction on conventional facilities as well as the accelerator itself. The committee believes that orderly progress can be made on the project and would expect work to proceed in expectation of full project authorization for fiscal year 1970. Initial funds for the project in the amount of $7,333,000 were authorized and appropriated in the Commission's fiscal year 1968 budget.
>
> In its report on the AEC's fiscal year 1968

authorization legislation the committee considered and accepted the recommendations of its Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation concerning the scope and management of this project. In summary, those recommendations were:

(*a*) That an accelerator with a design intensity of 3×10 protons per pulse be constructed.

(*b*) That provision be made in the initial design of this machine for experimental areas consistent with the national scope and purpose of this facility.

(*c*) That the AEC give careful study to the possibility of constructing the accelerator in such a way as to permit a possible later increase in the accelerator's energy to 300 Bev or somewhat higher.

(*d*) That the AEC assure itself, first, that the organizations selected for the architect-engineering and construction management of this facility are reliable and experienced and second, that major design changes and procurements affecting the machine be made only with AEC approval.

In connection with this latter recommendation, the committee urged the Commission to give careful consideration to whether its responsibilities would most appropriately be exercised through direct contracting for architect-engineering and construction management of these facilities, or by having such services performed under subcontract to Universities Research Association, Inc. The committee stated that the Commission might wish to retain continuing flexibility with respect to whether such services shall be performed under direct contract or subcontract.

The committee is pleased to report that the AEC has been responsive to its recommendations. In particular, the committee is gratified that the accelerator design will conform to the criteria set forth in the above recommendations. The committee is very favorably impressed by the progress to date on this project by Dr. Robert Wilson, Director, National Accelerator Laboratory, and his colleagues. The committee commends them and wishes them continued success. The committee notes that AEC is requesting an appropriation of $25 million for the project for fiscal year 1969. The committee believes that these funds are necessary in order to assure that the talent that has been recruited for this project will not be dissipated.

The Joint Committee has reviewed the proposed assignment of prime contract responsibility to the University Research Association for the design and construction of the project. Although the record shows that those projects under direct contractual arrangements between the AEC and the construction contractors have been the most successful, the committee was assured that AEC has retained and will exercise adequate controls under the prime contract with URA to insure economy and efficiency. Diligent management supervision will be required to insure that this procedure works efficiently in practice. The committee plans to pay close and continuing attention to this matter as the project progresses. The committee is encouraged by the fact that the Stanford Linear Accelerators project, costing $114 million, was successfully constructed under a prime contract with Stanford University. This arrangement proved highly successful, in that the project was completed on schedule and within costs.

In recommending this authorization, the committee wishes to reaffirm its conviction that this facility is of the utmost importance to the Nation's scientific effort. That such machines are needed for a viable high energy physics program is beyond dispute, as evidenced by the achievements of experimenters utilizing the Alternating Gradient Synchrotron at Brookhaven National Laboratory, which at 33 Bev was formerly the highest energy accelerator in the world, surpassing to a slight extent the energy level of its sister machine at CERN. It is no longer the largest because the Soviets have completed construction of, and successfully tested, a 70 Bev accelerator. The committee submits that this Nation's world leadership in high energy physics—gained through the pioneering efforts of Ernest O. Lawrence at the University of California, and by the outstanding work subsequently done by Americans throughout the country—should be maintained. It should be maintained not merely for the purpose of being "first" in this particular area of science, but in recognition of the fact that high-energy physics is at the frontier of physical science today; and that talented scientists developed and trained in this important field are contributing to other disciplines as well.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 14, 1968]

CITIES LEAD FAIR HOUSING IN ILLINOIS—CHICAGO SUBURBS PICK UP WHERE LEGISLATURE FAILED

(By D. J. R. Bruckner)

CHICAGO.—In the past 15 months, 19 Illinois cities and towns have passed open housing laws and 11 others, all suburbs of Chicago, are considering such laws.

Almost 60% of the state's population now live in communities covered by open housing laws. Until two years ago, only Chicago, Peoria and East St. Louis had such ordinances.

More significantly, 15 of the cities and towns have passed their legislation since last July, when the Illinois Legislature, caught up in what is considered a "hot" political issue, buried a statewide open housing law.

An officer of a Chicago industrial corporation, reviewing the new city laws on open housing, said "the members of the Legislature may have been completely mistaken on this issue. Town officials are much closer to the people and much more vulnerable in politics; yet these towns are doing the job which the Legislature was too frightened to do, and the people are supporting them."

NUMBER STILL SMALL

But there is no indication the laws have changed patterns of racial segregation, and the number of Negro families moving into formerly all-white neighborhoods still is small.

But debates in most town councils have emphasized the new laws amount to an invitation to Negroes and a warning to real estate operators. In nine of the 15 communities which passed open housing statutes since last summer, councilmen stressed the moral issues involved and the educational aspects of these laws. Many councilmen also have stressed the necessity of dealing with the issue before a Negro ghetto grows up in their communities.

No careful politician in this state would have predicted such a movement even a year ago, and Illinois shares with Texas the distinction of being the nation's only major industrial states whose laws are silent on housing segregation.

There still is political risk involved in backing open housing, of course. In city elections last year a Chicago alderman who had written the city's 1963 open housing law retired from the race for city council, saying the heat in his neighborhood was too great on this issue. In suburban Evanston a council candidate built his entire campaign last year on opposition to open housing and won easily, as did another candidate in suburban Berwyn.

RESISTED PRESSURES

But most politicians say this is a relatively small casualty list in a battle of this dimension. The Legislature, in refusing to pass a law, they point out, resisted the pressures of Gov. Otto Kerner, the mayors of almost every city in the state, every major church organization in the state. Sen. Charles H. Percy (R-Ill.), the state's labor movement, the Chicago Assn. of Commerce and Industry and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Some city leaders said passage of their own laws was directly related to failure of an open housing law in the Legislature. Council members in Rock Island, Moline and Quincy downstate all said the failure of the Legislature to act prompted their cities to go ahead on their own.

In the Chicago suburbs the two major forces in the current open housing fight have been the federal government's decision to build a new 200 billion electron volt nuclear accelerator in Weston, and the extensive educational campaigns of the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Housing.

The council was established in August, 1966, at a meeting of the city's political, religious and business leaders with civil rights organizations under Dr. Martin Luther King, who had been leading open housing marches in the city for six weeks.

Included in Leadership Council membership are village presidents or mayors of more than 20 suburbs, and most of these town leaders have been actively campaigning for open housing laws in their communities.

Also, the council, which has the active backing of most major industries in the area, has been working closely with human rights commissions in most of the suburbs. All human rights commissions in the state have called for open housing laws in their own communities during the past 12 months.

Before the Leadership Council was set up, only Maywood among the Chicago suburbs has an open housing law. But, in the past year Weston, Elgin, Wheaton, Joliet, Skokie, Evanston, Highland Park and Arlington Heights have all passed such laws, and a movement is under way in 11 other suburbs for new open housing laws.

Staff members of the Illinois Commission on Human Relations said debate on the ordinances in all the cities has been heated, and in most of them real estate interests and right-wing groups have resisted passage.

DIVISIVE FIGHTS

Leadership Council director Edward Holmgren says, "We are not saying in this office that the opposition is getting any weaker, but the movement seems to be toward success in this endeavor. These fights are still awfully divisive, but each passage makes the next one a little easier for the next community. Maybe morality is getting popular."

The Leadership Council also is getting some active aid from suburban industries which are suffering from a tight labor market. Travel from the huge Negro ghetto in Chicago, or from smaller ghettos in suburban communities, is becoming a serious problem to many industries.

One business firm recently agreed to bring the Leadership Council into an agreement it has with its employes. Under the agreement, the company sells the suburban homes of employes who are transferred. These homes become open to all takers, Negroes included, whether the suburb where they are located has an open housing law or not. The Leadership Council has been actively encouraging Negroes to bid on these houses.

The Weston accelerator project, it was hoped, would create a rash of open housing laws in the area, but so far little has happened. Wheaton, a small city near Weston, passed one of the state's stronger open housing laws last July. Elgin, to the north of the accelerator site, passed a mild one in April and Batavia, adjacent to the site, is now debating a strong open housing law.

LITTLE MOVEMENT

But a heavy campaign led by Gov. Kerner last spring and summer produced very little movement in other nearby communities. Kerner called local officials to three separate conferences to plead for open housing laws but these communities have so far resisted this pressure.

An important effort to break at least one pattern of discrimination in the western suburbs appears in a suit filed in U.S. District Court by the Chicago Conference on Religion and Race against the suburb of Hinsdale and 14 real estate brokers. The village trustees of Hinsdale made an agreement with the brokers under which the real estate agents can only show properties to Negroes if they are instructed to do so in writing by the owners.

The suit argues that many communities silently assume their residents favor discrimination, but Hinsdale has publicly assumed it, and the suit argues this assumption violates the Constitution. The CCRR represents all major Roman Catholic, Protestant and Jewish churches in the city.

The effectiveness of open housing laws is debatable and some are being challenged. Most are so recent that few have been tested, but in some suburbs right-wing groups are actively promoting referendum campaigns to force a showdown on the issue.

REAL ESTATE STAND

The real estate industry is opposed to the laws either openly or covertly in most places in the state. The Chicago real estate industry fought for four years to have the city's open housing law repealed, until the State Supreme Court finally upheld the law last year. And, when Kerner issued an executive order declaring open housing for the state in 1966, real estate brokers sought and obtained injunctions preventing him from enforcing that order.

In 1966, only 179 Negro families moved into all-white suburban communities around Chicago. The 1967 count is not yet in, but it is not expected to be much greater.

However, this is counted progress by civil rights leaders who note that, from 1945 to 1960, only five Negro families had moved into all-white suburbs, and the total for 1945 to 1965 was less than the 179 who moved in 1966. Further, the rights activists say, many of the suburbs into which Negro families have moved in the past two years have no open occupancy statute of any kind. They predict greater movement will be stimulated by the passage of open occupancy laws.

Nonetheless, the Negro ghetto of Chicago contains more than 1 million people now, and it is expanding at a steady rate of between three to five blocks a week in a single continuous pattern which can never be broken by anything less than massive movement. Most local real estate experts believe 4,000 to 6,000 Negro families would have to move into integrated neighborhoods or suburbs each year to stop the spread of the ghetto.

WORKS TWO WAYS

Officials of the Leadership Council, university sociologists and some civil rights leaders, however, caution against measuring the effect of open housing laws by counting the movement of families. There is no direct relation between the laws and the movement, they say, and probably never will be. The laws, they argue, work in two basic ways; they serve as a moral declaration to Negroes and whites alike; and they supply a basic legal structure for integration.

And they have had an unpredictable effect on the politics of the state in this state, the "hottest issue" has not been blanketed by some statewide law which would protect local communities from a bitter internal fight; it is slowly rising out of the communities after the state government had ducked it.

Holmgren says, "We are not ecstatic over what is happening and we go through long periods of disappointment. But these communities are taking on powerful forces and powerful myths and dealing with them through their own small political systems. I think that speaks pretty well for the people, and for the future."

[From the Chicago Daily News, Feb. 21, 1968]

SPECIAL SESSION: UNIT OK'S HOUSING BILL

(By Henry Hanson)

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.—The Republican-controlled Illinois House Public Welfare Committee has voted approval of a new open occupancy bill to be submitted to the Legislature when it reconvenes March 4.

The action occurred last Friday at an unpublicized meeting on the 21st floor of the State of Illinois building, 160 N. LaSalle, Chicago, The Daily News learned.

The committee acted despite a joint declaration four days earlier in Springfield by GOP legislative leaders that the March 4 session would last only one day and no bills would be acted upon.

House Speaker Ralph T. Smith (R-Alton) and Senate GOP leader W. Russell Arrington of Evanston decided then that action on all bills be postponed until the legislature returns to work July 15.

Rep. Horace Gardner (R-Chicago), chairman of the Public Welfare Committee, said the open occupancy bill was approved by a 10-to-2 vote. Gardner is the only Negro in the Legislature to serve as a committee chairman.

Casting the two "no" votes were Republicans Jacob J. Wolf, a Chicago real estate dealer, and Henry J. Klosak, a Cicero lawyer.

Rep. Michael Zlatnik (R-Chicago), committee vice chairman, asked the committee to recommend passage of the bill and said he hoped the entire House would pass it on March 4 and send it to the Senate.

Democratic members of the 18-member committee supported the bill, including minority leader John Touhy (D-Chicago) and minority whip Clyde Choate (D-Anna), who cast proxy votes.

The House Public Welfare Committee has held four meetings on the controversial issue and has been the only legislative committee to function during recesses of the legislature.

The new open occupancy bill would be enforced by both the Illinois attorney general and the Illinois Commission on Human Relations.

It would forbid discrimination in sale or rental of housing and fix a penalty of a $500 fine for violators. The attorney general would be given $15,000 to enforce the law.

Owner-occupied dwellings of six or fewer units would be exempt from the law until June 30, 1970. The exemption would then be reduced to owner-occupied dwellings of four units until June 30, 1972, when the exemption would be reduced to two units.

Also in 1972, the attorney general and the commission would be permitted to file complaints of discrimination. Until then, complaints could only be filed by persons who said they had been discriminated against because of race, color or creed.

Half a dozen open occupancy bills passed the 1967 House, but were killed in the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 16324) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 3262 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the Senate's passage of the AEC authorization, another outstanding achievement has been added to the already abundant record of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Called upon to manage this measure for the able and distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who is recuperating from a recent illness, Senator ANDERSON performed the task with great devotion and splendid dedication. Its success was overwhelming.

I also wish to congratulate the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for his contribution to the discussion. As the ranking Republican in this body his interest and his participation are always most welcome and most appreciated. Finally, to the other members of the Joint Committee, to other Senators who participated in the discussion, and to the Senate as a whole, I extend my appreciation for the efficiency and the great dispatch which led to the disposition of this highly important measure.

PASSPORT LAWS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 910, S. 1418.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1418) to make several changes in the passport laws presently in force.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1968

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it has been nearly 2 weeks since the Senate approved the bill extending the excise taxes on automobiles and telephones, along with the proposal for curtailment of expenditures and a tax increase. During this period the bill has been delayed in conference because the administration still cannot make up its mind whether it wants this bill as it was passed by the Senate.

Only last week we were told that the administration wants the tax increase but that they are still unalterably opposed to the provisions of the Senate bill which would curtail expenditures. It seems that the administration is afraid to defeat the bill, but at the same time they do not want to accept it.

Mr. President, I have read statements

in newspapers to the effect that it is being suggested that the administration will ask for a simple extension of the excise taxes for a period of 30 or 60 days in order to give them more time to make up their minds.

The bill was introduced on January 31. The administration has had ample time to study the bill. The bill has been passed by the Senate, and it has been in conference for about 10 days. Surely the administration has had ample time to decide whether or not they want the bill.

Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I, as one Member of the Senate, am opposed to extending the excise tax for just a 30- or 60-day period. Let us settle this question. I believe the conference should agree to accept the Senate package. If the administration is not going to accept it let them tell the American people that they are unalterably opposed to any reduction in spending and that they only want more taxes in order to pour more money into the spending stream.

I am getting impatient with the hypocrisy of this administration, which goes on television and says it is for the control of expenditures and an increase of taxes but then, in the conference committee we find that they are unalterably opposed to any control over spending. The time has come for the administration and the Congress to put up or shut up. The conference can either accept or reject the Senate proposal, and then the American taxpayers, businessmen and individuals, can make their plans accordingly. They have a right to be told whether spending will be reduced and whether taxes will be increased.

There is no objection to the extension of the excise taxes. We can agree that should be done. But there is no reason for the delay in making the decision. Ten days have passed since the expiration of the law pertaining to the excise taxes on auto and telephone. Yet they are still being collected. This is an indefensible situation. It is one which should not have developed. However, it has developed solely because of the zigzag policy of the administration and its inability to make up its mind. Evidently the administration still cannot make up its mind. I most respectfully suggest that it get down to business. The time has come, as I said before, to put up or shut up, so far as this particular bill is concerned.

The decision should be made and the bill enacted before the Easter recess.

THE TRAGEDY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, regrettably, the past 3 days of mourning for the late Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., have been ones of further tragedy, marked by disorders, looting, fires, and other violence in the District of Columbia.

Calm returned to the city yesterday, and I understand that the situation is believed to be under control.

I have been in continuing touch with events since Friday morning and have been in close touch with Mayor Washington since then. I wish to commend Mayor Washington, Mr. Cyrus Vance, and their staffs for the outstanding job they have done in one of the most difficult times this Capital City has endured in many, many years.

I personally have toured most of the areas involved, and Mr. Owen Malone and other members of my staff have been in almost continuous touch with events as they have occurred.

I extend a special word of thanks and praise for the officers and men of the police and fire departments, as well. I think it is well known to those who have followed events by the various media that they have endured long hours and harassing events, during which they acquitted themselves extremely well. They reacted quickly to widely scattered trouble spots. As of 4 a.m. today, 5,333 arrests had been made. Fifty policemen and 18 firemen suffered injuries. Their work was marked by industry, efficiency, and restraint under terribly difficult conditions.

As I understand, a total of seven deaths have been attributed to the disorder. But for the outstanding job done by the police, there might have been many more.

I hope that those who feel that certain aspects of the problem could have been handled differently will understand and recognize that the trouble came quickly and that efforts to cope with it began immediately. Every resource of the District was brought to bear without delay. It may be, as some think, that different measures, different movements, and different tactics should have been in order. But this was necessarily a matter for the combined District of Columbia, Federal, and military judgment, and that judgment was brought to bear in the light of all the intelligence available.

The first order of business was the restoration of law and order, with a minimum loss of lives. Fortunately, this was accomplished, but the destruction and loss of property and businesses has been senseless and deplorable.

Now the Nation and the District of Columbia face the job of rebuilding and seeing to it that necessary aid is supplied to the unfortunate victims in the heavily damaged neighborhoods, and for the rebuilding and restoration of the heavily damaged business community. I am pleased to say that Mayor Washington has moved promptly in this area. The Committee on the District of Columbia stands ready to help in any way it can if legislation should be necessary. Frankly, at this stage, I do not know whether it is or is not. I think it may be more of a money problem than it is a legislative problem. Whatever is needed, I call upon the appropriate authorities to expedite the work of relieving human suffering and helping place the destroyed businesses back on their feet.

I hope that those who feel that certain aspects of the problem could have been handled differently will understand, as I have just said, that the trouble came upon us very quickly. The job now is to get on with the rebuilding. I want Mayor Washington and the members of his staff, who worked, as he did, 20, 21, and 22 hours a day over the past several days, to know that I stand ready to work with him and with the Government of the District of Columbia in any way that our committee can.

PASSPORT LAWS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1418) to make several changes in the passport laws presently in force.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair). The pending business is S. 1418, to make several changes in the passport laws presently in force.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, S. 1418 has a threefold purpose:

First. Section 1 provides that a passport shall be valid for 5 years without renewal, unless the Secretary of State limits it to a shorter period. Under existing law, a passport is valid for a period of 3 years and may be renewed for a further period of 2 years.

Second. Section 2 provides for a uniform fee of $2 for the execution of a passport application and a fee of $13 for the issuance of the passport. This total cost of $15 is the same as that for the present 3-year passport renewed for 2 years. Thus, while the total cost to applicants of passports does not go up, the expense of administration should go down. Section 2 also makes a technical change in the categories of persons eligible for no-fee passports and provides that they shall be exempt from paying an execution fee when the application is made before a Federal official.

Third. Section 3 eliminates the necessity of successive personal appearances by individuals who have already been issued passports. Present law requires that each time an individual applies for a passport he must personally appear before a person authorized to administer oaths so that he may swear to the statements contained in his application for a passport.

There is nothing in this bill which would in any way change existing authority to withdraw or recall or otherwise invalidate passports heretofore or hereafter issued.

I should add, S. 1418 does not contain any provision which would authorize the Secretary of State to restrict travel of American citizens to certain countries or areas. This subject is dealt with in a separate bill, S. 2766, which is pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

In short, all that the bill now before the Senate does, of any significance, is to extend the life of a passport from 5 years with renewal to 5 years without renewal. I hope the Senate will accept the bill without any delay.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator is agreeable, I should like to suggest, if he has the time, that we call up the treaty having to do with the charter of the Organization of American States, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations. We could at least lay the predicate today and vote on the treaty on Wednesday.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in connection with the bill now being considered by the Senate which would make several changes in the passport regulations presently in force, I would like to note that when the bill was being considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations, I proposed an amendment which was rejected by the committee. My amendment was designed to make section 212 (a) 28 of the Immigration and Nationality Act inapplicable to anyone seeking to enter the United States as a nonimmigrant temporarily for business or for pleasure.

Section 212(a) 28 provides, among other things, that an alien is ineligible for a visa of any kind if he is an anarchist or a member of the Communist Party of the United States or any other foreign state; if he advocates the doctrines of world communism; or if he is affiliated with any organization required to be registered under the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950.

At first glance, it might appear that the abrogation of section 212(a) 28 of the Immigration and Nationality Act—even for temporary visitors to the United States—would constitute a radical change in the qualitative restrictions which have been in force heretofore. A more thorough examination of the act will prove otherwise. In the first place, any visa applicant who is considered a security risk continues to be ineligible for admission to the United States under sections 212(a) 27 and 29 of the Immigration Nationality Act. Let me stress that—my amendment would continue to keep out all persons classified as security risks. In the second place, section 212(d) 3 of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides that an alien, who might otherwise be ineligible for a visa under section 212(a) 28, "may, after approval by the Attorney General of a recommendation by the Secretary of State or by the consular officer that the alien be admitted temporarily despite his inadmissibility, be granted such a visa and may be admitted to the United States temporarily as a nonimmigrant in the discretion of the Attorney General." As a matter of practice, such waivers, which are based on the recommendation of the Department of State, are almost always granted automatically. In other words, the present procedure has become anachronism.

Mr. President, the simple purpose of my amendment would have been to eliminate the requirement that a person who is a member of the Communist Party who wished to visit the United States temporarily—and most such visitors are naturally from Communist countries—would go through the cumbersome procedure of obtaining a "waiver of inadmissibility." My amendment would have thus simplified visa procedures rather than alter them substantially. And the simplification of visa procedures would have saved the U.S. Government a considerable amount of money as we now devote a ridiculous number of manhours to processing waivers that are almost always granted.

The Department of State fully supported my amendment. Under Secretary of State Katzenbach's letter to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to this effect is contained in the committee report on the bill now being considered by the Senate. Furthermore, since this bill was considered by the committee, President Johnson, in a letter to the Congress on February 23, has asked that "unnecessary and cumbersome barriers" inhibiting foreign visitors and businessmen traveling to the United States be eliminated. He proposed that the Secretary of State and the Attorney General be authorized to issue regulations exempting visitors to the United States from visa requirements for all but the most serious grounds of ineligibility.

Mr. President, I have already formally registered my disappointment at the action taken by the Committee on Foreign Relations in rejecting my proposed amendment, in the supplemental views which are included in the committee report and which were also signed by the Senator from Tennessee, Senator GORE and the Senator from Rhode Island, Senator PELL. I wish to register my disappointment again today. At a time when we are trying to improve our balance of payments and strengthen the dollar by encouraging travelers from abroad, and trying to expose as many visitors from abroad as possible to our country and to our way of life, it seems shortsighted, literally to a myopic degree, to refuse to take a step which would have reduced unnecessary Government expenditures in this country, encouraged tourism from abroad and—most importantly—promoted person-to-person contacts with those whom we should be most anxious to see have such contacts—visitors from the Communist countries of Eastern Europe and from the Soviet Union.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Pennsylvania and I discussed his amendment at great length. He did not press it. The committee did not accept it. I understand that Senator CLARK does not insist upon pressing it. I wonder, then, if the Senate may not proceed to vote on the bill.

Mr. COOPER. In essence, it would provide that passports be valid for 5 years instead of 3 years with one 2-year renewal as under existing law. This bill was recommended by the State Department, on the grounds that it would be of benefit to passport holders, and also would save the Department money, and reduce the increasing workload of our consuls and consuls general in connection with renewing passports.

When the Committee on Foreign Relations considered the bill, I was the only member who voted against reporting it. I did so for these reasons:

First, there is now before the Congress a bill, S. 2766, recently recommended by the State Department to provide certain additional controls to the Secretary of State over American citizens traveling abroad to supplement the deficiencies in our present passport laws created by recent court decisions. I believed it would be better to postpone action on this bill until after the bill, S. 2766 has been considered and acted on.

Second, as I have noted the bill makes a passport valid for 5 years without renewal. My belief that the period of issuance should remain at 3 years is based in part upon the misuse of passports by holders violating their terms.

It seems to me under these conditions that the shorter period would afford the State Department greater opportunity for surveillance by requiring persons holding passports to report to the appropriate officials every 3 years.

Another reason for believing that the period of time should remain at 3 years results from personal experiences I had in 1945 when I was serving in the Army of the United States and a member of the occupation forces in Germany. At that time, dozens of people holding American passports would come to headquarters in Munich and on occasion I had to deal with their problems. I found that in some cases their relatives in this country had lost contact with them and had no means of finding out their whereabouts. This would, of course, be normal under wartime conditions. But this problem can occur at this time.

I thought it would be helpful in such cases to the relatives of persons holding U.S. passports who have been out of the United States 2 or 3 years if those passport holders were required to come before the appropriate officials within 3 years, as presently provided by law. Further, under the old law, which has been nullified by the Supreme Court, a naturalized citizen remaining in the country of his birth for longer than 3 years would lose his citizenship and a naturalized citizen remaining in a country not of his birth would lose his citizenship if he remained there for a period of 5 years. The Supreme Court has so ruled. It does not follow that it is a sufficient basis for Congress changing the specific periods of passport validity.

The practical problems which I have noted have made me believe that the 3-year provision is more helpful than a 5-year provision would be. I believe that the shorter period would be of benefit both to the passport holder and to his family and associates in this country. I believe, in view of the legal questions which continually arise concerning estate and property matters, that it would be better for purposes of uniformity and consistency to maintain the provisions of the present law.

I hope that the House will consider these matters carefully and secure more information than we had and will consider the validity of my arguments.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement providing additional information concerning S. 2766, a bill proposed by the administration, which seeks to deal with the problem of unauthorized travel by American citizens to foreign countries upon which the State Department has placed passport restrictions.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is currently holding hearings on S. 2766, a bill to amend Title 18, which would provide the Secretary of State with statutory authority to restrict the travel of U.S. citizens

to certain foreign countries or areas upon a determination that the country or area is at war, engaged in insurrection or hostilities, engaged in armed conflict with U.S. forces or because our national interest requires these restrictions. Further, the bill provides specific criminal penalties for violations of these restrictions.

This bill has come to the Foreign Relations Committee with the strong recommendation and support of the State Department.

The need for new legislation is made necessary by recent court decisions. Last year, in U.S. v. Laub the Supreme Court held that there is no statute on the books today specifically making it a criminal offense for a citizen to travel to a country such as Cuba with a passport not specifically validated for that country which the Secretary of State has designated as off limits. Secondly, in Lynd v. Rusk, which was decided only 5 months ago, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has rendered ineffective the administrative controls established by State Department regulations to enforce compliance with the Secretary's area restrictions through procedures of passport denial or revocation. The Court found that the Secretary has authority to control the use of the passport but that Congress had not given him authority to control a person's travel.

It is my view that it would be much better to postpone action on the passport bill before us, S. 1418, until after the bill presently before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been fully considered and acted upon by that Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I hope, too, that the desire and the wish of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, based on his explanation of his present position, which was consistent with his views expressed in the committee, will be considered by the Members of the House when they consider this particular bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1418) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1418

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of July 3, 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 217a), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The validity of the passport shall be limited to a period of not more than five years. The Secretary of State may limit a passport to a shorter period. A valid passport outstanding as of the effective date of this Act shall be valid for a period of five years from the date of issue except where such passport is or has been limited by the Secretary of State to a shorter period."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of June 4, 1920, as amended (22 U.S.C. 214), is amended to read as follows:

"There shall be collected and paid into the Treasury of the United States quarterly a fee of $2 for executing each application for a passport and $13 for each passport issued: *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit the right of the Secretary of State by regulation to authorize State officials to collect and retain the execution fee of $2. No passport fee shall be collected from an officer or employee of the United States proceeding abroad in the discharge of official duties, or from members of his immediate family; from an American seaman who requires a passport in connection with his duties aboard an American flag-vessel; or from a widow, child, parent, brother, or sister of a deceased member of the Armed Forces proceeding abroad to visit the grave of such member. No execution fee shall be collected for an application made before a Federal official by a person excused from payment of the passport fee under this section."

SEC. 3. Section 1 of title IX of the Act of June 15, 1917 (22 U.S.C. 213), is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. Before a passport is issued to any person by or under authority of the United States such person shall subscribe to and submit a written application which shall contain a true recital of each and every matter of fact which may be required by law or by any rules authorized by law to be stated as a prerequisite to the issuance of any such passport. If the applicant has not previously been issued a United States passport, the application shall be duly verified by his oath before a person authorized and empowered by the Secretary of State to administer oaths."

SEC. 4. This Act shall take effect on the thirtieth day following the date of its enactment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

REV. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I share the sorrow of all Senators and of the Nation, and express my deep sympathy to Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr., and her children.

The assassination of Dr. King was a senseless and a tragic event. It is shameful and humiliating that murder, looting, and savage violence of every description have become so prevalent in our country. Respect for law and order has all but disappeared among some citizens in many of our great cities.

Dr. King, in his advocacy of nonviolence, in seeking better social and economic conditions for his people, was an influence for the restoration of respect for law and order. The violence which followed his death is a desecration of his memory.

Dr. King recognized clearly that the tragic war in Vietnam, contributed to the growth and acceptance of violence here at home, and he was a vigorous opponent of the war in Vietnam. For that he also deserves our approval.

Although the prospects are dim, one can only hope that as passions subside, the example of Dr. King will help to restore sanity and humanity to our country.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider Calendar No. 1, the protocol of amendment to the Charter of the Organization of American States, which was reported by the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously, and which I think has been cleared all around. The purpose is only to lay before the Senate the background and predicate preparatory to a vote on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

PROTOCOL OF AMENDMENT TO THE CHARTER OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the following protocol, which was read the second time, as follows:

PROTOCOL OF AMENDMENT TO THE CHARTER OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES "PROTOCOL OF BUENOS AIRES"

The Member States of the Organization of American States, represented at the Third Special Inter-American Conference,

CONSIDERING:

That the Charter of the Organization of American States, signed at Bogotá in 1948, set forth the purpose of achieving an order of peace and justice, promoting solidarity among the American States, strengthening their collaboration and defending their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their independence;

The Second Special Inter-American Conference, held in Rio de Janeiro in 1965, declared that it was essential to forge a new dynamism for the inter-American system and imperative to modify the working structure of the Organization of American States, as well as to establish in the Charter new objectives and standards for the promotion of the economic, social, and cultural development of the peoples of the Hemisphere, and to speed up the process of economic integration; and

That it is essential to reaffirm the determination of the American States to combine their efforts in a spirit of solidarity in the permanent task of achieving the general conditions of well-being that will ensure a life of dignity and freedom to their peoples,

HAVE AGREED UPON THE FOLLOWING:

PROTOCOL OF AMENDMENT TO THE CHARTER OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Article I

Part One of the Charter of the Organization of American States shall consist of Chapters I to IX, inclusive, in accordance with Articles II to X of the present Protocol.

Article II

Chapter I entitled "Nature and Purposes" shall consist of the present Articles 1 and 4 without change, except that Article 4 shall be renumbered as Article 2.

Article III

Chapter II entitled "Principles" shall consist of the present Article 5 without change, except that it shall be renumbered as Article 3.

Article IV

A new Chapter III entitled "Members" shall be added and shall consist of Articles 4 to 8, inclusive. The present Articles 2 and 3 shall become Articles 4 and 5, respectively. The new Articles 6, 7, and 8 shall read as follows:

Article 6

Any other independent American State that desires to become a Member of the Organization should so indicate by means of a note addressed to the Secretary General, in which it declares that it is willing to sign and ratify the Charter of the Organization and to accept all the obligations inherent in membership, especially those relating to collective security expressly set forth in Articles 27 and 28 of the Charter.

Article 7

The General Assembly, upon the recommendation of the Permanent Council of the Organization, shall determine whether it is appropriate that the Secretary General be

authorized to permit the applicant State to sign the Charter and to accept the deposit of the corresponding instrument of ratification. Both the recommendation of the Permanent Council and the decision of the General Assembly shall require the affirmative vote of two thirds of the Member States.

Article 8

The Permanent Council shall not make any recommendation nor shall the General Assembly take any decision with respect to a request for admission on the part of a political entity whose territory became subject, in whole or in part, prior to December 18, 1964, the date set by the First Special Inter-American Conference, to litigation or claim between an extracontinental country and one or more Member States of the Organization, until the dispute has been ended by some peaceful procedure.

Article V

Chapter III entitled "Fundamental Rights and Duties of States" shall become Chapter IV having the same title and consisting of the present Articles 6 to 19, inclusive, which shall become Articles 9 to 22, respectively; but the reference to "Articles 15 and 17" in the present Article 19, which shall become Article 22, shall be changed to "Articles 18 and 20."

Article VI

Chapter IV entitled "Pacific Settlement of Disputes" shall become Chapter V having the same title and consisting of the present Articles 20 to 23, inclusive, which shall become Articles 23 to 26, respectively.

Article VII

Chapter V entitled "Collective Security" shall become Chapter VI having the same title and consisting of the present Articles 24 and 25, which shall become Articles 27 and 28, respectively.

Article VIII

Chapter VI entitled "Economic Standards" shall be replaced by a Chapter VII having the same title and consisting of Articles 29 to 42, inclusive, which shall read as follows:

Article 29

The Member States, inspired by the principles of inter-American solidarity and cooperation, pledge themselves to a united effort to ensure social justice in the Hemisphere and dynamic and balanced economic development for their peoples, as conditions essential to peace and security.

Article 30

The Member States pledge themselves to mobilize their own national human and material resources through suitable programs, and recognize the importance of operating within an efficient domestic structure, as fundamental conditions for their economic and social progress and for assuring effective inter-American cooperation.

Article 31

To accelerate their economic and social development, in accordance with their own methods and procedures and within the framework of the democratic principles and the institutions of the inter-American system, the Member States agree to dedicate every effort to achieve the following basic goals:

(a) Substantial and self-sustained increase in the per capita national product;

(b) Equitable distribution of national income;

(c) Adequate and equitable systems of taxation;

(d) Modernization of rural life and reforms leading to equitable and efficient land-tenure systems, increased agricultural productivity, expanded use of undeveloped land, diversification of production, and improved processing and marketing systems for agricultural products; and the strengthening and expansion of facilities to attain these ends;

(e) Accelerated and diversified industrialization, especially of capital and intermediate goods;

(f) Stability in the domestic price levels, compatible with sustained economic development and the attainment of social justice;

(g) Fair wages, employment, opportunities, and acceptable working conditions for all;

(h) Rapid eradication of illiteracy and expansion of educational opportunities for all;

(i) Protection of man's potential through the extension and application of modern medical science;

(j) Proper nutrition, especially through the acceleration of national efforts to increase the production and availability of food;

(k) Adequate housing for all sectors of the population;

(l) Urban conditions that offer the opportunity for a healthful, productive, and full life;

(m) Promotion of private initiative and investment in harmony with action in the public sector; and

(n) Expansion and diversification of exports.

Article 32

In order to attain the objectives set forth in this Chapter, the Member States agree to cooperate with one another, in the broadest spirit of inter-American solidarity, as far as their resources may permit and their laws may provide.

Article 33

To attain balanced and sustained development as soon as feasible, the Member States agree that the resources made available from time to time by each, in accordance with the preceding Article, should be provided under flexible conditions and in support of the national and multinational programs and efforts undertaken to meet the needs of the assisted country, giving special attention to the relatively less-developed countries.

They will seek, under similar conditions and for similar purposes, financial and technical cooperation from sources outside the Hemisphere and from international institutions.

Article 34

The Member States should make every effort to avoid policies, actions, or measures that have serious adverse effects on the economic or social development of another Member State.

Article 35

The Member States agree to join together in seeking a solution to urgent or critical problems that may arise whenever the economic development or stability of any Member State is seriously affected by conditions that cannot be remedied through the efforts of that State.

Article 36

The Member States shall extend among themselves the benefits of science and technology by encouraging the exchange and utilization of scientific and technical knowledge in accordance with existing treaties and national laws.

Article 37

The Member States, recognizing the close interdependence between foreign trade and economic and social development, should make individual and united efforts to bring about the following:

(a) Reduction or elimination, by importing countries, of tariff and nontariff barriers that affect the exports of the Members of the Organization, except when such barriers are applied in order to diversify the economic structure, to speed up the development of the less-developed Member States or to intensify their process of economic integration, or when they are related to national security or to the needs for economic balance;

(b) Maintenance of continuity in their economic and social development by means of:

i. Improved conditions for trade in basic commodities through international agreements, where appropriate; orderly marketing procedures that avoid the disruption of markets; and other measures designed to promote the expansion of markets, and to obtain dependable incomes for producers, adequate and dependable supplies for consumers, and stable prices that are both remunerative to producers and fair to consumers;

ii. Improved international financial cooperation and the adoption of other means for lessening the adverse impact of sharp fluctuations in export earnings experienced by the countries exporting basic commodities; and

iii. Diversification of exports and expansion of export opportunities for manufactured and semimanufactured products from the developing countries by promoting and strengthening national and multinational institutions and arrangements established for these purposes.

Article 38

The Member States reaffirm the principle that when the more-developed countries grant concessions in international trade agreements that lower or eliminate tariffs or other barriers to foreign trade so that they benefit the less-developed countries, they should not expect reciprocal concessions from those countries that are incompatible with their economic development, financial, and trade needs.

Article 39

The Member States, in order to accelerate their economic development, regional integration, and the expansion and improvement of the conditions of their commerce, shall promote improvement and coordination of transportation and communication in the developing countries and among the Member States.

Article 40

The Member States recognize that integration of the developing countries of the Hemisphere is one of the objectives of the inter-American system and, therefore, shall orient their efforts and take the necessary measures to accelerate the integration process, with a view to establishing a Latin American common market in the shortest possible time.

Article 41

In order to strengthen and accelerate integration in all its aspects, the Member States agree to give adequate priority to the preparation and carrying out of multinational projects and to their financing, as well as to encourage economic and financial institutions of the inter-American system to continue giving their broadest support to regional integration institutions and programs.

Article 42

The Member States agree that technical and financial cooperation that seeks to promote regional economic integration should be based on the principle of harmonious, balanced, and efficient development, with particular attention to the relatively less-developed countries, so that it may be a decisive factor that will enable them to promote, with their own efforts, the improved development of their infrastructure programs, new lines of production, and export diversification.

Article IX

Chapter VII entitled "Social Standards" shall be replaced by a Chapter VIII having the same title and consisting of Articles 43 and 44, which shall read as follows:

Article 43

The Member States, convinced that man can only achieve the full realization of his aspirations within a just social order, along

with economic development and true peace, agree to dedicate every effort to the application of the following principles and mechanisms:

(a) All human beings, without distinction as to race, sex, nationality, creed, or social condition, have a right to material well-being and to their spiritual development, under circumstances of liberty, dignity, equality of opportunity, and economic security;

(b) Work is a right and a social duty, it gives dignity to the one who performs it, and it should be performed under conditions, including a system of fair wages, that ensure life, health, and a decent standard of living for the worker and his family, both during his working years and in his old age, or when any circumstance deprives him of the possibility of working;

(c) Employers and workers, both rural and urban, have the right to associate themselves freely for the defense and promotion of their interests, including the right to collective bargaining and the workers' right to strike, and recognition of the juridical personality of associations and the protection of their freedom and independence, all in accordance with applicable laws;

(d) Fair and efficient systems and procedures for consultation and collaboration among the sectors of production, with due regard for safeguarding the interests of the entire society;

(e) The operation of systems of public administration, banking and credit, enterprise, and distribution and sales, in such a way, in harmony with the private sector, as to meet the requirements and interests of the community;

(f) The incorporation and increasing participation of the marginal sectors of the population, in both rural and urban areas, in the economic, social, civic, cultural, and political life of the nation, in order to achieve the full integration of the national community, acceleration of the process of social mobility, and the consolidation of the democratic system. The encouragement of all efforts of popular promotion and cooperation that have as their purpose the development and progress of the community;

(g) Recognition of the importance of the contribution of organizations such as labor unions, cooperatives, and cultural, professional, business, neighborhood, and community associations to the life of the society and to the development process;

(h) Development of an efficient social security policy; and

(i) Adequate provision for all persons to have due legal aid in order to secure their rights.

Article 44

The Member States recognize that, in order to facilitate the process of Latin American regional integration, it is necessary to harmonize the social legislation of the developing countries, especially in the labor and social security fields, so that the rights of the workers shall be equally protected, and they agree to make the greatest efforts possible to achieve this goal.

Article X

Chapter VIII entitled "Cultural Standards" shall be replaced by a Chapter IX entitled "Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Standards" and consisting of Articles 45 to 50, inclusive, which shall read as follows:

Article 45

The Member States will give primary importance within their development plans to the encouragement of education, science, and culture, oriented toward the over-all improvement of the individual, and as a foundation for democracy, social justice, and progress.

Article 46

The Member States will cooperate with one another to meet their educational needs, to promote scientific research, and to encourage technological progress. They consider themselves individually and jointly bound to preserve and enrich the cultural heritage of the American peoples.

Article 47

The Member States will exert the greatest efforts, in accordance with their constitutional processes, to ensure the effective exercise of the right to education, on the following bases:

(a) Elementary education, compulsory for children of school age, shall also be offered to all others who can benefit from it. When provided by the State it shall be without charge;

(b) Middle-level education shall be extended progressively to as much of the population as possible, with a view to social improvement. It shall be diversified in such a way that it meets the development needs of each country without prejudice to providing a general education; and

(c) Higher education shall be available to all, provided that, in order to maintain its high level, the corresponding regulatory or academic standards are met.

Article 48

The Member States will give special attention to the eradication of illiteracy, will strengthen adult and vocational education systems, and will ensure that the benefits of culture will be available to the entire population. They will promote the use of all information media to fulfill these aims.

Article 49

The Member States will develop science and technology through educational and research institutions and through expanded information programs. They will organize their cooperation in these fields efficiently and will substantially increase exchange of knowledge, in accordance with national objectives and laws and with treaties in force.

Article 50

The Member States, with due respect for the individuality of each of them, agree to promote cultural exchange as an effective means of consolidating inter-American understanding; and they recognize that regional integration programs should be strengthened by close ties in the fields of education, science, and culture.

Article XI

Part Two of the Charter shall consist of Chapters X to XXI, inclusive, in accordance with Articles XII to XVIII of the present Protocol.

Article XII

Chapter IX entitled "The Organs" shall become Chapter X having the same title and consisting of Article 51, which shall read as follows:

Article 51

The Organization of American States accomplishes its purposes by means of:

(a) The General Assembly;

(b) The Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs;

(c) The Councils;

(d) The Inter-American Juridical Committee;

(e) The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights;

(f) The General Secretariat;

(g) The Specialized Conferences; and

(h) The Specialized Organizations.

There may be established, in addition to those provided for in the Charter and in accordance with the provisions thereof, such subsidiary organs, agencies, and other entities as are considered necessary.

Article XIII

Chapter X entitled "The Inter-American Conference" shall be replaced by a Chapter XI entitled "The General Assembly" and consisting of Articles 52 to 58, inclusive, which shall read as follows:

Article 52

The General Assembly is the supreme organ of the Organization of American States. It has as its principal powers, in addition to such others as are assigned to it by the Charter, the following:

(a) To decide the general action and policy of the Organization, determine the structure and functions of its organs, and consider any matter relating to friendly relations among the American States;

(b) To establish measures for coordinating the activities of the organs, agencies, and entities of the Organization among themselves and such activities with those of the other institutions of the Inter-American system;

(c) To strengthen and coordinate cooperation with the United Nations and its specialized agencies;

(d) To promote collaboration, especially in the economic, social, and cultural fields, with other international organizations whose purposes are similar to those of the Organization of American States;

(e) To approve the program-budget of the Organization and determine the quotas of the Member States;

(f) To consider the annual and special reports that shall be presented to it by the organs, agencies, and entities of the inter-American system;

(g) To adopt general standards to govern the operations of the General Secretariat; and

(h) To adopt its own rules of procedure and, by a two-thirds vote, its agenda.

The General Assembly shall exercise its powers in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and of other inter-American treaties.

Article 53

The General Assembly shall establish the bases for fixing the quota that each Government is to contribute to the maintenance of the Organization, taking into account the ability to pay of the respective countries and their determination to contribute in an equitable manner. Decisions on budgetary matters require the approval of two-thirds of the Member States.

Article 54

All Member States have the right to be represented in the General Assembly. Each State has the right to one vote.

Article 55

The General Assembly shall convene annually during the period determined by the rules of procedure and at a place selected in accordance with the principle of rotation. At each regular session the date and place of the next regular session shall be determined, in accordance with the rules of procedure.

If for any reason the General Assembly cannot be held at the place chosen, it shall meet at the General Secretariat, unless one of the Member States should make a timely offer of a site in its territory, in which case the Permanent Council of the Organization may agree that the General Assembly will meet in that place.

Article 56

In special circumstances and with the approval of two thirds of the Member States, the Permanent Council shall convoke a special session of the General Assembly.

Article 57

Decisions of the General Assembly shall be adopted by the affirmative vote of an absolute majority of the Member States, except in those cases that require a two-thirds vote as provided in the Charter or as may be provided by the General Assembly in its rules of procedure.

Article 58

There shall be a Preparatory Committee of the General Assembly, composed of repre-

sentatives of all the Member States, which shall:

(a) Prepare the draft agenda of each session of the General Assembly;

(b) Review the proposed program-budget and the draft resolution on quotas, and present to the General Assembly a report thereon containing the recommendations it considers appropriate; and

(c) Carry out such other functions as the General Assembly may assign to it.

The draft agenda and the report shall, in due course, be transmitted to the Governments of the Member States.

Article XIV

Chapter XI entitled "The Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs" shall become Chapter XII having the same title and consisting of the present Articles 39 to 47, inclusive, which shall become Articles 59 to 67, respectively.

The word "program" shall be replaced by the word "agenda" in the present Article 41 that becomes Article 61.

Article XV

Chapter XII entitled "The Council" shall be replaced by Chapters XIII to XVIII, inclusive, as follows: a Chapter XIII entitled "the Councils of the Organization; Common Provisions" and consisting of Articles 68 to 77, inclusive; a Chapter XIV entitled "The Permanent Council of the Organization" and consisting of Articles 78 to 92, inclusive (the present Article 52 shall become Article 81, and the reference therein to "Article 43" shall be amended to read "Article 63"); a Chapter XV entitled "The Inter-American Economic and Social Council" and consisting of Articles 93 to 98, inclusive; a Chapter XVI entitled "The Inter-American Council for Education, Science, and Culture" and consisting of Articles 99 to 104, inclusive; a Chapter XVII entitled "The Inter-American Juridical Committee" and consisting of Articles 105 to 111, inclusive; and a Chapter XVIII entitled "The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights" and consisting of Article 112.

Articles 68 to 80, inclusive, and Articles 82 to 112, inclusive, shall read as follows:

Article 68

The Permanent Council of the Organization, the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, and the Inter-American Council for Education, Science, and Culture are directly responsible to the General Assembly and each has the authority granted to it in the Charter and other inter-American instruments, as well as the functions assigned to it by the General Assembly and the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

Article 69

All Member States have the right to be represented on each of the Councils. Each State has the right to one vote.

Article 70

The Councils may, within the limits of the Charter and other inter-American instruments, make recommendations on matters within their authority.

Article 71

The Councils, on matters within their respective competence, may present to the General Assembly studies and proposals, drafts of international instruments, and proposals on the holding of specialized conferences, on the creation, modification, or elimination of specialized organizations and other inter-American agencies, as well as on the coordination of their activities. The Councils may also present studies, proposals, and drafts of international instruments to the Specialized Conferences.

Article 72

Each Council may, in urgent cases, convoke Specialized Conferences on matters within its competence, after consulting with the Member States and without having to resort to the procedure provided for in Article 128.

Article 73

The Councils, to the extent of their ability, and with the cooperation of the General Secretariat, shall render to the Governments such specialized services as the latter may request.

Article 74

Each Council has the authority to require the other Councils, as well as the subsidiary organs and agencies responsible to them, to provide it with information and advisory services on matters within their respective spheres of competence. The Councils may also request the same services from the other agencies of the inter-American system.

Article 75

With the prior approval of the General Assembly, the Councils may establish the subsidiary organs and the agencies that they consider advisable for the better performance of their duties. When the General Assembly is not in session, the aforesaid organs or agencies may be established provisionally by the corresponding Council. In constituting the membership of these bodies, the Councils, insofar as possible, shall follow the criteria of rotation and equitable geographic representation.

Article 76

The Councils may hold meetings in any Member State, when they find it advisable and with the prior consent of the Government concerned.

Article 77

Each Council shall prepare its own statutes and submit them to the General Assembly for approval. It shall approve its own rules of procedure and those of its subsidiary organs, agencies, and committees.

Article 78

The Permanent Council of the Organization is composed of one representative of each Member State, especially appointed by the respective Government, with the rank of ambassador. Each Government may accredit an acting representative, as well as such alternates and advisers as it considers necessary.

Article 79

The office of Chairman of the Permanent Council shall be held by each of the representatives, in turn, following the alphabetic order in Spanish of the names of their respective countries. The office of Vice Chairman shall be filled in the same way, following reverse alphabetic order.

The Chairman and the Vice Chairman shall hold office for a term of not more than six months, which shall be determined by the statutes.

Article 80

Within the limits of the Charter and of inter-American treaties and agreements, the Permanent Council takes cognizance of any matter referred to it by the General Assembly or the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

Article 82

The Permanent Council shall keep vigilance over the maintenance of friendly relations among the Member States, and for that purpose shall effectively assist them in the peaceful settlement of their disputes, in accordance with the following provisions:

Article 83

To assist the Permanent Council in the exercise of these powers, an Inter-American Committee on Peaceful Settlement shall be established, which shall function as a subsidiary organ of the Council. The statutes of the Committee shall be prepared by the Council and approved by the General Assembly.

Article 84

The parties to a dispute may resort to the Permanent Council to obtain its good offices. In such a case the Council shall have authority to assist the parties and to recommend the procedures it considers suitable for the peaceful settlement of the dispute.

If the parties so wish, the Chairman of the Council shall refer the dispute directly to the Inter-American Committee on Peaceful Settlement.

Article 85

In the exercise of these powers, the Permanent Council, through the Inter-American Committee on Peaceful Settlement or by any other means, may ascertain the facts in the dispute, and may do so in the territory of any of the parties with the consent of the Government concerned.

Article 86

Any party to a dispute in which none of the peaceful procedures set forth in Article 24 of the Charter is being followed may appeal to the Permanent Council to take cognizance of the dispute.

The Council shall immediately refer the request to the Inter-American Committee on Peaceful Settlement, which shall consider whether or not the matter is within its competence and, if it deems it appropriate, shall offer its good offices to the other party or parties. Once these are accepted, the Inter-American Committee on Peaceful Settlement may assist the parties and recommend the procedures that it considers suitable for the peaceful settlement of the dispute.

In the exercise of these powers, the Committee may carry out an investigation of the facts in the dispute, and may do so in the territory of any of the parties with the consent of the Government concerned.

Article 87

If one of the parties should refuse the offer, the Inter-American Committee on Peaceful Settlement shall limit itself to informing the Permanent Council, without prejudice to its taking steps to restore relations between the parties, if they were interrupted, or to reestablish harmony between them.

Article 88

Once such a report is received, the Permanent Council may make suggestions for bringing the parties together for the purpose of Article 87 and, if it considers it necessary, it may urge the parties to avoid any action that might aggravate the dispute.

If one of the parties should continue to refuse the good offices of the Inter-American Committee on Peaceful Settlement or of the Council, the Council shall limit itself to submitting a report to the General Assembly.

Article 89

The Permanent Council, in the exercise of these functions, shall take its decisions by affirmative vote of two thirds of its members, excluding the parties to the dispute, except for such decisions as the rules of procedure provide shall be adopted by a simple majority.

Article 90

In performing their functions with respect to the peaceful settlement of disputes, the Permanent Council and the Inter-American Committee on Peaceful Settlement shall observe the provisions of the Charter and the principles and standards of international law, as well as take into account the existence of treaties in force between the parties.

Article 91

The Permanent Council shall also:

(a) Carry out those decisions of the General Assembly or of the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs the implementation of which has not been assigned to any other body;

(b) Watch over the observance of the standards governing the operation of the General Secretariat and, when the General Assembly is not in session, adopt provisions of a regulatory nature that enable the Gen-

eral Secretariat to carry out its administrative functions;

(c) Act as the Preparatory Committee of the General Assembly, in accordance with the terms of Article 58 of the Charter, unless the General Assembly should decide otherwise;

(d) Prepare, at the request of the Member States and with the cooperation of the appropriate organs of the Organization, draft agreements to promote and facilitate cooperation between the Organization of American States and the United Nations or between the Organization and other American agencies of recognized international standing. These draft agreements shall be submitted to the General Assembly for approval;

(e) Submit recommendations to the General Assembly with regard to the functioning of the Organization and the coordination of its subsidiary organs, agencies, and committees;

(f) Present to the General Assembly any observations it may have regarding the reports of the Inter-American Juridical Committee and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights; and

(g) Perform the other functions assigned to it in the Charter.

Article 92

The Permanent Council and the General Secretariat shall have the same seat.

Article 93

The Inter-American Economic and Social Council is composed of one principal representative, of the highest rank, of each Member State, especially appointed by the respective Government.

Article 94

The purpose of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council is to promote cooperation among the American countries in order to attain accelerated economic and social development, in accordance with the standards set forth in Chapters VII and VIII.

Article 95

To achieve its purpose the Inter-American Economic and Social Council shall:

(a) Recommend programs and courses of action and periodically study and evaluate the efforts undertaken by the Member States;

(b) Promote and coordinate all economic and social activities of the Organization;

(c) Coordinate its activities with those of the other Councils of the Organization;

(d) Establish cooperative relations with the corresponding organs of the United Nations and with other national and international agencies, especially with regard to coordination of inter-American technical assistance programs; and

(e) Promote the solution of the cases contemplated in Article 35 of the Charter, establishing the appropriate procedure.

Article 96

The Inter-American Economic and Social Council shall hold at least one meeting each year at the ministerial level. It shall also meet when convoked by the General Assembly, the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, at its own initiative, or for the cases contemplated in Article 35 of the Charter.

Article 97

The Inter-American Economic and Social Council shall have a Permanent Executive Committee, composed of a Chairman and no less than seven other members, selected by the Council for terms to be established in the statutes of the Council. Each member shall have the right to one vote. The principles of equitable geographic representation and of rotation shall be taken into account, insofar as possible, in the election of members. The Permanent Executive Committee represents all of the Member States of the Organization.

Article 98

The Permanent Executive Committee shall perform the tasks assigned to it by the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, in accordance with the general standards established by the Council.

Article 99

The Inter-American Council for Education, Science, and Culture is composed of one principal representative, of the highest rank, of each Member State, especially appointed by the respective Government.

Article 100

The purpose of the Inter-American Council for Education, Science, and Culture is to promote friendly relations and mutual understanding between the peoples of the Americas through educational, scientific, and cultural cooperation and exchange between Member States, in order to raise the cultural level of the peoples, reaffirm their dignity as individuals, prepare them fully for the tasks of progress, and strengthen the devotion to peace, democracy, and social justice that has characterized their evolution.

Article 101

To accomplish its purpose the Inter-American Council for Education, Science, and Culture shall:

(a) Promote and coordinate the educational, scientific, and cultural activities of the Organization;

(b) Adopt or recommend pertinent measures to give effect to the standards contained in Chapter IX of the Charter;

(c) Support individual or collective efforts of the Member States to improve and extend education at all levels, giving special attention to efforts directed toward community development;

(d) Recommend and encourage the adoption of special educational programs directed toward integrating all sectors of the population into their respective national cultures;

(e) Stimulate and support scientific and technological education and research, especially when these relate to national development plans;

(f) Foster the exchange of professors, research workers, technicians, and students, as well as of study materials; and encourage the conclusion of bilateral or multilateral agreements on the progressive coordination of curricula at all educational levels and on the validity and equivalence of certificates and degrees;

(g) Promote the education of the American peoples with a view to harmonious international relations and a better understanding of the historical and cultural origins of the Americas, in order to stress and preserve their common values and destiny;

(h) Systematically encourage intellectual and artistic creativity, the exchange of cultural works and folklore, as well as the interrelationships of the different cultural regions of the Americas;

(i) Foster cooperation and technical assistance for protecting, preserving, and increasing the cultural heritage of the Hemisphere;

(j) Coordinate its activities with those of the other Councils. In harmony with the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, encourage the interrelationship of programs for promoting education, science, and culture with national development and regional integration programs;

(k) Establish cooperative relations with the corresponding organs of the United Nations and with other national and international bodies;

(l) Strengthen the civic conscience of the American peoples, as one of the bases for the effective exercise of democracy and for the observance of the rights and duties of man;

(m) Recommend appropriate procedures for intensifying integration of the developing countries of the Hemisphere by means of efforts and programs in the fields of education, science, and culture; and

(n) Study and evaluate periodically the efforts made by the Member States in the fields of education, science, and culture.

Article 102

The Inter-American Council for Education, Science, and Culture shall hold at least one meeting each year at the ministerial level. It shall also meet when convoked by the General Assembly, by the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, or at its own initiative.

Article 103

The Inter-American Council for Education, Science, and Culture shall have a Permanent Executive Committee, composed of a Chairman and no less than seven other members, elected by the Council for terms to be established in the statutes of the Council. Each member shall have the right to one vote. The principles of equitable geographic representation and of rotation shall be taken into account, insofar as possible, in the election of members. The Permanent Executive Committee represents all of the Member States of the Organization.

Article 104

The Permanent Executive Committee shall perform the tasks assigned to it by the Inter-American Council for Education, Science, and Culture, in accordance with the general standards established by the Council.

Article 105

The purpose of the Inter-American Juridical Committee is to serve the Organization as an advisory body on juridical matters; to promote the progressive development and the codification of international law; and to study juridical problems related to the integration of the developing countries of the Hemisphere and, insofar as may appear desirable, the possibility of attaining uniformity in their legislation.

Article 106

The Inter-American Juridical Committee shall undertake the studies and preparatory work assigned to it by the General Assembly, the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, or the Councils of the Organization. It may also, on its own initiative, undertake such studies and preparatory work as it considers advisable, and suggest the holding of specialized juridical conferences.

Article 107

The Inter-American Juridical Committee shall be composed of eleven jurists, nationals of Member States, elected by the General Assembly for a period of four years from panels of three candidates presented by Member States. In the election, a system shall be used that takes into account partial replacement of membership and, insofar as possible, equitable geographic representation. No two members of the Committee may be nationals of the same State. Vacancies that occur shall be filled in the manner set forth above.

Article 108

The Inter-American Juridical Committee represents all of the Member States of the Organization, and has the broadest possible technical autonomy.

Article 109

The Inter-American Juridical Committee shall establish cooperative relations with universities, institutes, and other teaching centers, as well as with national and international committees and entities devoted to study, research, teaching, or dissemination of information on juridical matters of international interest.

Article 110

The Inter-American Juridical Committee shall draft its statutes, which shall be submitted to the General Assembly for approval.

The Committee shall adopt its own rules of procedure.

Article 111

The seat of the Inter-American Juridical Committee shall be the city of Rio de Janeiro but in special cases the Committee may meet at any other place that may be designated, after consultation with the Member State concerned.

Article 112

There shall be an Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, whose principal function shal be to promote the observance and protection of human rights and to serve as a consultative organ of the Organization in these matters.

An inter-American convention on human rights shall determine the structure, competence, and procedure of this Commission, as well as those of other organs responsible for these matters.

Article XVI

Chapter XIII entitled "The Pan American Union" shall be replaced by a Chapter XIX entitled "The General Secretariat" which shall consist of Articles 113 to 127, inclusive. The present Article 92 shall become Article 127.

Articles 113 to 126, inclusive, shall read as follows:

Article 113

The General Secretariat is the central and permanent organ of the Organization of American States. It shall perform the functions assigned to it in the Charter, in other inter-American treaties and agreements, and by the General Assembly, and shall carry out the duties entrusted to it by the General Assembly, the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, or the Councils.

Article 114

The Secretary General of the Organization shall be elected by the General Assembly for a five-year term and may not be reelected more than once or succeeded by a person of the same nationality. In the event that the office of Secretary General becomes vacant, the Assistant Secretary General shall assume his duties until the General Assembly shall elect a new Secretary General for a full term.

Article 115

The Secretary General shall direct the General Secretariat be the legal representative thereof, and, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 91.b, be responsible to the General Assembly for the proper fulfillment of the obligations and functions of the General Secretariat.

Article 116

The Secretary General, or his representative, participates with voice but without vote in all meetings of the Organization.

Article 117

The General Secretariat shall promote economic, social, juridical, educational, scientific, and cultural relations among all the Member States of the Organization, in keeping with the actions and policies decided upon by the General Assembly and with the pertinent decisions of the Councils.

Article 118

The General Secretariat shall also perform the following functions:

(a) Transmit *ex officio* to the Member States notice of the convocation of the General Assembly, the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, the Inter-American Council for Education, Science, and Culture, and the Specialized Conferences;

(b) Advise the other organs, when appropriate, in the preparation of agenda and rules of procedure;

(c) Prepare the proposed program-budget of the Organization on the basis of programs adopted by the Councils, agencies, and entities whose expenses should be included in the program-budget and, after consultation with the Councils or their permanent committees, submit it to the Preparatory Committee of the General Assembly and then to the Assembly itself;

(d) Provide, on a permanent basis, adequate secretariat services for the General Assembly and the other organs, and carry out their directives and assignments. To the extent of its ability, provide services for the other meetings of the Organization;

(e) Serve as custodian of the documents and archives of the Inter-American Conferences, the General Assembly, the Meetings of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, the Councils, and the Specialized Conferences;

(f) Serve as depository of inter-American treaties and agreements, as well as of the instruments of ratification thereof;

(g) Submit to the General Assembly at each regular session an annual report on the activities of the Organization and its financial condition; and

(h) Establish relations of cooperation, in accordance with decisions reached by the General Assembly or the Councils, with the Specialized Organizations as well as other national and international organizations.

Article 119

The Secretary General shall:

(a) Establish such offices of the General Secretariat as are necessary to accomplish its purposes; and

(b) Determine the number of officers and employees of the General Secretariat, appoint them, regulate their powers and duties, and fix their remuneration.

The Secretary General shall exercise this authority in accordance with such general standards and budgetary provisions as may be established by the General Assembly.

Article 120

The Assistant Secretary General shall be elected by the General Assembly for a five-year term and may not be reelected more than once or succeeded by a person of the same nationality. In the event that the office of Assistant Secretary General becomes vacant, the Permanent Council shall elect a substitute to hold that office until the General Assembly shall elect a new Assistant Secretary General for a full term.

Article 121

The Assistant Secretary General shall be the Secretary of the Permanent Council. He shall serve as advisory officer to the Secretary General and shall act as his delegate in all matters that the Secretary General may entrust to him. During the temporary absence or disability of the Secretary General the Assistant Secretary General shall perform his functions.

The Secretary General and the Assistant Secretary General shall be of different nationalities.

Article 122

The General Assembly, by a two-thirds vote of the Member States, may remove the Secretary General or the Assistant Secretary General, or both, whenever the proper functioning of the Organization so demands.

Article 123

The Secretary General shall appoint, with the approval of the respective Council, the Executive Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs and the Executive Secretary for Education, Science, and Culture, who shall also be the secretaries of the respective Councils.

Article 124

In the performance of their duties, the Secretary General and the personnel of the Secretariat shall not seek or receive instructions from any Government or from any authority outside the Organization, and shall refrain from any action that may be incompatible with their position as international officers responsible only to the Organization.

Article 125

The Member States pledge themselves to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Secretary General and the personnel of the General Secretariat, and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their duties.

Article 126

In selecting the personnel of the General Secretariat, first consideration shall be given to efficiency, competence, and integrity; but at the same time, in the recruitment of personnel of all ranks, importance shall be given to the necessity of obtaining as wide a geographic representation as possible.

Article XVII

Chapter XIV entitled "The Specialized Conferences," shall be replaced by a Chapter XX having the same title and consisting of Articles 128 and 129, which shall read as follows:

Article 128

The Specialized Conferences are intergovernmental meetings to deal with special technical matters or to develop specific aspects of inter-American cooperation. They shall be held when either the General Assembly or the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs so decides, on its own initiative or at the request of one of the Councils or Specialized Organizations.

Article 129

The agenda and rules of procedure of the Specialized Conferences shall be prepared by the Councils or Specialized Organizations concerned and shall be submitted to the Governments of the Member States for consideration.

Article XVIII

Chapter XV entitled "The Specialized Organizations" shall be replaced by a Chapter XXI having the same title and consisting of Articles 130 to 136, inclusive. The present Articles 95 and 100 shall become Articles 130 and 135, respectively.

Articles 131, 132, 133, 134, and 136 shall read as follows:

Article 131

The General Secretariat shall maintain a register of the organizations that fulfill the conditions set forth in the foregoing Article, as determined by the General Assembly after a report from the Council concerned.

Article 132

The Specialized Organizations shall enjoy the fullest technical autonomy, but they shall take into account the recommendations of the General Assembly and of the Councils, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

Article 133

The Specialized Organizations shall transmit to the General Assembly annual reports on the progress of their work and on their annual budgets and expenses.

Article 134

Relations that should exist between the Specialized Organizations and the Organization shall be defined by means of agreements concluded between each organization and the Secretary General, with the authorization of the General Assembly.

Article 136

In determining the location of the Specialized Organizations consideration shall be given to the interest of all of the Member States and to the desirability of selecting the seats of these organizations on the basis of a geographic representation as equitable as possible.

Article XIX

Part Three of the Charter shall consist of Chapters XXII to XXV, inclusive, in accordance with Articles XX to XXIII of the present Protocol.

Article XX

Chapter XVI entitled "The United Nations" shall become Chapter XXII having the same title and consisting of the present Article 102, which shall become Article 137.

Article XXI

Chapter XVII entitled "Miscellaneous Provisions" shall be replaced by Chapter XXIII having the same title and consisting of Articles 138 to 143, inclusive. The present Articles 103 and 106 shall become Articles 139 and 142, respectively.

Articles 138, 140, 141, and 143 shall read as follows:

Article 138

Attendance at meetings of the permanent organs of the Organization of American States or at the conferences and meetings provided for in the Charter, or held under the auspices of the Organization, shall be in accordance with the multilateral character of the aforesaid organs, conferences, and meetings and shall not depend on the bilateral relations between the Government of any Member State and the Government of the host country.

Article 140

The representatives of the Member States on the organs of the Organization, the personnel of their delegations, as well as the Secretary General and the Assistant Secretary General shall enjoy the privileges and immunities corresponding to their positions and necessary for the independent performance of their duties.

Article 141

The juridical status of the Specialized Organizations, and the privileges and immunities that should be granted to them and to their personnel, as well as to the officials of the General Secretariat, shall be determined in a multilateral agreement. The foregoing shall not preclude, when it is considered necessary, the concluding of bilateral agreements.

Article 143

The Organization of American States does not allow any restriction based on race, creed, or sex, with respect to eligibility to participate in the activities of the Organization and to hold positions therein.

Article XXII

Chapter XVIII entitled "Ratification and Entry into Force" shall become Chapter XXIV having the same title and consisting of the present Articles 108 to 112, inclusive, which shall become Articles 144 to 148, respectively; but the reference to "Article 109" in the present Article 111, which shall become Article 147, shall be changed to "Article 145".

Article XXIII

A new Chapter XXV entitled "Transitory Provisions" and consisting of Articles 149 and 150 shall be inserted in the Charter and shall read as follows:

Article 149

The Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress shall act as the permanent executive committee of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council as long as the Alliance is in operation.

Article 150

Until the Inter-American convention on human rights, referred to in Chapter XVIII, enters into force, the present Inter-American Commission on Human Rights shall keep vigilance over the observance of human rights.

Article XXIV

The terms "General Assembly", "Permanent Council of the Organization" or "Permanent Council", and "General Secretariat", shall be substituted, as the case may be, for the terms "Inter-American Conference", "Council of the Organization" or "Council", and "Pan American Union", wherever the latter terms appear in those Articles of the Charter that have not been eliminated or specifically amended by the present Protocol. In the English text of such articles the terms "Hemisphere" and "hemispheric" shall be substituted for "continent" and "continental".

Article XXV

The present Protocol shall remain open for signature by the American States and shall be ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures. The original instrument, the English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish texts of which are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the General Secretariat, which shall transmit certified copies thereof to the Governments for purposes of ratification. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the General Secretariat, which shall notify the signatory States of each such deposit.

Article XXVI

The present Protocol shall enter into force among the ratifying States when two thirds of the States signatory to the Charter have deposited their instruments of ratification. It shall enter into force with respect to the remaining States in the order in which they deposit their instruments or ratification.

Article XXVII

The present Protocol shall be registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations through the General Secretariat of the Organization.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, whose full powers have been found to be in good and due form, sign the present Protocol, which shall be known as the "Protocol of Buenos Aires", at city of Buenos Aires, Republic of Argentina, this twenty-seventh day of February of the year one thousand nine hundred sixty-seven.

STATEMENT OF THE DELEGATION OF ECUADOR

The Delegation of Ecuador, drawing its inspiration from the devotion of the people and the Government of Ecuador to peace and law, states for the record that the provisions approved with respect to peaceful settlement of disputes do not carry out the purpose of Resolution XIII of the Second Special Inter-American Conference, and that the Permanent Council has not been given sufficient powers to aid the Member States effectively in the peaceful settlement of their disputes.

The Delegation of Ecuador signs this Protocol of Amendment to the Charter of the Organization of American States in the understanding that none of its provisions in any way limits the right of the Member States to take their disputes, whatever their nature and the subject they deal with, to the Organization, so that it may assist the parties and recommend the suitable procedures for peaceful settlement thereof.

STATEMENT OF THE DELEGATION OF PANAMA

The Delegation of Panama, upon signing the Protocol of Amendment to the Charter of the Organization of American States, states that it does so in the understanding that none of its provisions limits or in any way impedes the right of Panama to bring before the Organization any conflict or dispute that may have arisen with another Member State to which a just solution has not been given within a reasonable period after applying, without positive results, any of the procedures for peaceful settlement set forth in Article 21 of the present Charter.

STATEMENT OF THE DELEGATION OF ARGENTINA

On signing the present Protocol, the Argentine Republic reiterates its firm conviction that the amendments introduced in the Charter of the OAS do not duly cover the requirements of the Organization, inasmuch as its basic instrument should contain, in addition to the organic, economic, social, and cultural standards, the essential provisions that would make the security system of the Hemisphere effective.

For Guatemala:
EMILIO ARENALES CATALÁN
FRANCISCO LINARES ARANDA
ADOLFO MOLINA ORANTES
LUIS CORONADO LIRA
GUSTAVO SANTISO GÁLVEZ
ZELAYA CORONADO
ENRIQUE CLAVERIE

For Peru:
JORGE VÁZQUEZ SALAS
DAVID AGUILAR CORNEJO
G. HOYOS
JAVIER CORREA ELÍAS
EDGARDO LLOSA
JUAN MIGUEL BAKULA PATIÑO
ALVARO REY DE CASTRO
M. F. MAURTUÁ LARA

For Colombia:
GERMÁN ZEA
ALFEREDO VÁZQUEZ CARRIZOSA
HÉCTOR CHARRY SAMPER
JAIME POSADA
DANIEL HENAO HENAO

For Brazil:
JURACY MAGALHÃES
ILMAR PENNA MARINHO
M. A. DE PIMENTEL BRANÃO
ALEXANDRINO PAULA FREITAS SERPA
JOSÉ AUGUSTO DE MACEDO SOARES
C. GARCIA DE SOUZA
WANDERLINO MARIZ DE OLIVEIRA SOBRINHO

For Paraguay:
RAUL SAPENA PASTOR
JUAN PLATE
ANÍBAL MESQUITA VERA
C PAPPALARIO Z
ROQUE J. YÓDICE CODAS
L GONZÁLEZ A

For Nicaragua:
ALFONSO ORTEGA-URBINA
GUILLERMO SEVILLA-SACASA
RICARDO PARRALES S
FRANCISCO GAITÁN C

For El Salvador:
ROBERTO E QUIRÓS
ARMANDO PENA Q.
CAROLOS A. SIRI

For Venezuela:
IGNACIO IRIBARREN BORGES

For Ecuador:
JORGE CARRERA ANDRADE

For the United States of America:
ELLSWORTH BUNKER
EDWIN M. MARTIN
SOL M. LINOWITZ
LINCOLN GORDON

For Honduras:
TIBURCIO CARÍAS C
VIRGILIO R GALVEZ
SANTIAGO FLORES OCHOA

For the Dominican Republic:
E. DEL ROSARIO C.

For Panama:
D. FERNANDO ELETA A.
EDUARDO RITTER A.
J M SÁNCHEZ
R. OZORES

For Bolivia:
ALBERTO CRESPO

For Costa Rica:
FERNANDO LARA

For Uruguay:
LUIS VIDAL ZAGLIO
H GROS ESPIELL
H FERNÁNDEZ ARTUCCIO
AURELIANO AGUIRRE
JORGE ALVAREZ OLLONIEGO
EMILIO W. ORIBE
B. BRUM
ENRIQUE FERRI

For Haiti:
MARCEL ANTOINE
GERARD BOUCHETTE
MARCELINE ANTOINE

For Mexico:
ANTONIO CARRILLO F
RAFAEL DE LA COLINA
FRANCISCO G DE LA VEGA
V SÁNCHEZ GAVITO
ISMAEL MORENO
D L ARRETA MATEOS
J FAESLER
PETRICIOLI

For Chile:
GABRIEL VALDÉS S
For Argentina:
N C MENDEZ
C M GELLY Y OBES
J A MAZZINGHI
P SANTOS MUÑOZ
EDUARDO A ROCA

I hereby certify that the foregoing document is a true and faithful copy of the original of the Protocol of Amendment to the Charter of the Organization of American States "Protocol of Buenos Aires", signed at the Third Special Inter-American Conference, Buenos Aires, Argentina, February 27, 1967, March 30, 1967.

WILLIAM SANDERS,
Assistant Secretary General of the Organization of American States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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. FULBRIGHT. 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. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, has the treaty been laid before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification has not been laid before the Senate; the treaty is pending.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want to say just a few words in explanation of it.

Mr. President, first, I make a parliamentary inquiry. Would it be in order to vote on the resolution of ratification on Wednesday next?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it would be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the protocol of amendment to the Charter of the Organization of American States—Executive L, 90th Congress, first session—having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without reservations and recommends that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification.

1. MAIN PURPOSE

The main purpose of this protocol to the Charter of the Organization of American States is to make substantial revisions in the OAS structure and in the powers of certain OAS organs, all with a view to increasing the capacity of the OAS to function more effectively.

2. BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY

The amendments are the result of a long negotiating process which began with the Second Special Inter-American Conference in Rio de Janeiro in November 1965, and culminated at the Third Special Inter-American Conference in Buenos Aires in February 1967. The amendments were submitted to the Senate by the President June 12, 1967. On February 6, 1968, they were the subject of a public hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee, at which time they were supported, on behalf of the administration, by U.S. Ambassador to the OAS, Sol M. Linowitz. On April 3, the committee considered the matter in executive session and ordered the amendments favorably reported to the Senate.

During the process of negotiation, the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs held several consultations with officials of the Department of State. The subcommittee was particularly concerned to avoid anything which might appear to be a treaty commitment to a foreign aid program, and members of of the subcommittee participated actively in drafting the provisions on economic and social standards which were finally agreed to with modifications.

Aside from the new economic and social provisions, the amendments upgrade the status of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council and the Inter-American Council for Education, Science, and Culture—corresponding to the present Inter-American Cultural Council.

The powers of the Council of the OAS, which will henceforth be called the Permanent Council of the Organization, are also expanded somewhat. It is made the executive body for any decisions of the General Assembly or of Foreign Ministers meetings not entrusted to other bodies, and its authority is slightly broadened in the field of pacific settlement of disputes.

The Inter-American Conference, which is supposed to meet every 5 years but in fact has not met since 1954, is replaced by a General Assembly which will meet annually.

The term of the Secretary General is reduced from 10 years with no reelection to 5 years with reelection for one term, and the General Secretariat is given more explicit budgetmaking powers.

Finally, the amendments would write into the charter, with only slight changes, the procedure for admitting new members of the OAS as agreed on at the Washington Foreign Ministers Conference in December 1964.

Although these amendments expand considerably the economic and social articles of the OAS Charter, in the judgment of the committee they do not expand U.S. obligations in the economic and social fields. The principal value of the amendments is the more rational organization of the principal organs of the OAS, the provision for regular annual meetings of Foreign Ministers, and the clarification and modest expansion of the authority of the Permanent Council and the Secretary General. These measures should make it easier for the OAS to deal with the problems it faces and is likely to face. For these reasons, the Committee on Foreign Relations recommends that the Senate advise and consent to ratification of the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the protocol will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages, up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification, which will be read.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Protocol of Amendment to the Charter of the Organization of American States (The "Protocol of Buenos Aires") Signed at the Third Special Inter-American Conference at Buenos Aires of February 27, 1967 (Executive L, 90th Congress, first session).

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the resolution of ratification on the treaty now pending occur at 1 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That at 1 o'clock p.m. on Wednesday, April 10, 1968, the Senate proceed to vote on the resolution of ratification to Executive L, 90th Congress, first session, the protocol of amendment to the Charter of the Organization of American States.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to legislative session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MANSFIELD: 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. 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.

AMENDMENT OF THE VOTING ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1006, S. 2884.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 1006, S. 2884, a bill to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on January 29, 1968, I introduced S. 2884, a bill to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad.

Since 1955 the Federal Government has recognized the fact that millions of American citizens who are serving their country beyond the continental limits of the United States have been denied the right to vote in general elections simply because they have not been physically present to register to vote or to cast their votes in the same manner as other citizens who, more fortunately, continue to reside in their homes.

In 1955 the Federal Voting Assistance Act was passed for the purpose of giving members of the Armed Forces, their spouses and dependents, and to others accompanying the Armed Forces, the right to register and vote by absentee procedures regardless of where in the world they were temporarily assigned.

Today many thousands of additional American citizens who are neither employed by the United States nor in the service of the Armed Forces are disfranchised because the States have no procedures for registration or voting by citizens who temporarily reside abroad.

This bill—S. 2884—recommends, and I stress the word "recommends," to the States that they adopt legislative or administrative remedies which would give to all American citizens who are temporarily residing abroad and absent from their States of residence the right to register and vote in the same manner as members of the Armed Forces.

No rights of the States would be affected by this bill. States may act favorably or may ignore the recommendation.

The bill is not compulsory. It is merely an earnest recommendation by the Federal Government that absentee civilians be accorded the same privileges as have been given to members of the Armed Forces in all of the States.

Mr. President, the committee had before it for consideration a bill which would have made compulsory what we are seeking to accomplish here on a voluntary basis. The committee has not reported that bill. We have had numerous contacts from both associations and individual persons residing abroad who were interested in having Congress take some affirmative legislative action that would impose a mandatory restriction on the States in this regard; but the subcommittee did not deem such action advisable at the present time.

Moreover, had such legislation been enacted this year, obviously it could not have been passed in sufficient time to provide any meaningful result insofar as the elections coming up this year are concerned, because the States would not have had the opportunity to tailor their own election laws in the meantime.

However, the committee hopes that enactment of S. 2884 would encourage the States to take action to permit voting by the otherwise disfranchised people who are temporarily residing abroad. I point out that since the 1955 Voting Assistance Act was passed, substantially all of the States—I believe all except possibly one—have taken the necessary steps to permit members of the Armed Forces and persons employed by the U.S. Government who are residing away from their homes to register and vote in Federal elections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I shall not ask for a rollcall vote.

I am not unaware of the turmoil that has gone on in the Nation's Capital in the last 2 or 3 days. I am aware that important matters demand the attention of individual Senators and the Senate as a whole.

I do not believe we could compel a close examination of this measure today. I do not believe we could, under the existing circumstances, cause the measure to be studied by a majority of the Senators. I have a fear that the measure will pass, and I hope that what I say here will be taken note of by the other body.

The pending legislation is neither necessary nor advisable. It is a bill that proposes to give advice to the States. The Federal Government, in other words, would become a lobbyist and tell the States what they should do about absentee voters. No problem exists in 29 of the 50 States right now. The complaint is made against 21 States.

The pending measure would call upon the Federal Government to recommend to the States that they so change their law that individuals residing abroad can register by mail and vote not only in Federal elections, but also in State and local elections.

I ask how well qualified a voter who lives and has lived on the Riviera for years would be to cast what might be a deciding vote in a district, local, or even school election.

The pending bill goes that far. It is conceivable that someone spending a long time abroad—and that is the only way we can interpret the pending measure even though the word "temporary" is used—would have some information about national elections. It is conceivable that he would have some information about the administration in power and some information from reading foreign newspapers about the issues that have been raised and the candidates who are running for election or reelection. He may have sufficient information to vote for the party of his choice to control Congress. However, the pending bill does not stop there.

The pending bill is not limited to national elections. It has no legal force and effect. It would set up another Federal law. Somebody would have to administer it, or it would be meaningless, and that agency would tell the States, "You ought to change your law so that someone living abroad could register without coming home and could vote not only in broad national elections, but also in State and local elections."

Mr. President, there is in the majority report a statement prepared by the Bipartisan Committee for Absentee Voting. The address listed is 12 Rue de la Paix, Paris, France.

They contend that an estimated 50,000 Americans live in France. That might be true. We are not told what ties they still have with this country.

What is their complaint? Under the heading "State Barriers," they recite:

> The inability of Americans abroad to vote arises from two principal difficulties. Only about half the States have set up systems for permanent or absentee registration. The requirement excludes great numbers of people, because it is the rare American who can afford a special trip home to register.

That clearly implies that we are talking about people who live in Europe for a long time, because if it were the casual traveler or the serviceman who spends 2 years abroad, he would be able to register.

The pending bill, even though it uses the word "temporary," does not define whether temporary residence abroad would be for a longer period of time than a temporary agency in Washington or a temporary building. I do not know because it is not defined. The pending bill is for the benefit of a group of people who stay abroad for long years and complain that they cannot vote in 21 States because they cannot register by mail. The pending bill does not correct that. The pending bill would have the Government advise the States to correct it.

I am glad that it follows that course because the States determine the qualifications of voters.

When our Constitution was written, it provided that electors in Federal elections shall have the same qualifications as electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature. In other words, whoever could vote for the legislature in a State could vote for a Representative or in presidential elections. A Senator was to be elected by the legislature at that time.

So the whole concept of our federal system has been that the qualifications of voters are determined by States.

Why did we have to amend the Constitution to bring about suffrage for women? Because the Federal Government, in the absence of a constitutional amendment, had no authority to tell a State that it must allow women to vote. It was a needed and desirable change. It was a good thing that it was brought about. But they did it by amending the Constitution.

Following the War Between the States, why was the Constitution changed to read that no person shall be denied the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude? It was done because it has been recognized all through the years that the qualifications of voters are to be determined by the States.

With respect to a side issue, not involved at all in this bill, we hear a great deal about lowering the voting age to 18 or 19. There is no need for a Federal law. Some States have already lowered the voting age; some States are thinking about it. In other words, the power, authority, and responsibility to determine who can vote and how is a State matter. We have a bill before us that admittedly is to advise the States how they shall handle their absentee voting.

I made reference to the statement of the bipartisan committee located in Paris. That is not in the report; it is in the hearings. I wish that part to be corrected.

I shall not dwell on this matter, but I wish to point out that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections held one brief hearing on S. 2884. At that hearing, only three witnesses were heard. No further subcommittee meetings were conducted, nor was further study inaugurated or carried out.

In short, the Senate is being asked to pass a bill on the basis of the testimony of one Representative, whose State and district will not be affected by this recommendation, and one lobbyist, who represents an organization composed of approximately 500 dues-paying members who reside all over the world. S. 2884 is a recommendation to the 21 States that they adopt a system of absentee registra-

tion and absentee voting for the benefit of certain alleged citizens who are temporarily residing anywhere and everywhere in the world. And "temporary" is not defined.

In the statement which this bipartisan committee inserted in the RECORD, these facts are recited: Of those States which provide absentee voting, about half require notarization, and the Embassy is the only place in Paris authorized to perform this function. In the 1964 election, only approximately 1,200 ballots, including those of travelers, were notarized. Estimates range from 15,000 to 50,000 Americans living in France.

So that, despite the lack of statistics, it is clear that only a relative handful of Americans could vote. The situation in other countries was comparable.

Mr. President, we have had some close elections. The election in 1960 was very close. Are we, on the basis of the study given to this bill—three witnesses in a matter of a few minutes—going to give those people the power to determine the outcome of a presidential election? They say 50,000 reside in France. I do not know how many of them are living on the Riviera. I do not know how many of them go over there and work for years and years. But I do know that their complaint is that only a rare one of their number can go home and register.

Mr. President, as I have said, this bill deals with a subject that should be dealt with by the States. On what basis does the Federal Government give advice to the States? Because we have made such a success financially, because the Federal Government has made a success of its national problems, because the Federal Government has made such a success in regulating foreign affairs, we now have nothing to do but to give the States advice on how they should register voters?

Mr. President, I am not unaware that this measure, if forced to a rollcall vote, probably would be passed. I shall not ask for a rollcall vote. I express the hope that before this matter is taken up by the other body, and before it is signed into law, it receive some very thorough study; that before we cause Uncle Sam to be a busybody, advising States on what to do on matters that are virtually State matters, we had better get some facts, we had better find out the length of stay of these people, we had better find out what they know about the qualifications for school board members, what they know about the needs for a school bond issue, or who would be a good mayor or a good city council member.

The very heart of self-government is local government, and in this bill the Federal Government undertakes to advise the States to enlarge the voting of people living abroad, not only for Federal elections—there might be an argument in that respect—but also to advise the States to make it easier and to provide absentee registration so that these people can vote in local matters. I do not believe anyone would argue that a person who lives abroad 10, 15, 20, or 30 years does not have the information to cast an intelligent vote on a local matter. But that is what is being recommended to the States. Frankly, it is said that free advice is not worth any more than it costs. This is giving free advice to the States. The States have not asked for it. Three witnesses spent a little time asking for this bill.

To my mind, it is a mistake. In the light of the momentous problems facing our country, we should not be enacting this bill on this day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my individual views, which appear in the report, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the individual views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. CURTIS

It is with regret that I am unable to concur in the majority report on this legislation for the following reasons, to wit:

The Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections held one very brief hearing on S. 2884. At that one hearing only three witnesses were heard. No further subcommittee meetings were conducted, nor was further study inaugurated or carried out. In short, the Senate is being asked to act on the basis of testimony from one Congressman, whose State and district will not be affected by this recommendation, and one lobbyist representing an organization composed of about 500 dues-paying members who are residing all over the world.

S. 2884 is a recommendation to 21 States that they adopt a system of absentee registration and absentee voting for the benefit of certain alleged State citizens who are temporarily residing anywhere and everywhere in the world. Let it be clear that at no time has any State or State legislature been precluded from adopting legislation to permit and encourage absentee registration and voting, if that State felt such legislation was either necessary or desirable. As a matter of fact, the State of Washington has already enacted such absentee procedures. Additionally, similar bills are under study in six or seven other States. However, according to the testimony, 21 States have turned down the theory of absentee registration, and they should be allowed to do so without the advice and help of this body.

EXCERPTS FROM PAGE 19 OF HEARINGS ON S. 2884

"Senator CURTIS. I have one more question. Have any States turned down the concept of absentee registration?

"Mr. JOHNSON.[1] Twenty-one.

"Senator CURTIS. I mean, have they turned down a recent request?

"Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, sir. I have been in touch with a number of State legislatures. We have had our proposal before the legislature in Texas, but they adjourned without doing anything about it. *I would say that a number of them have turned it down. I think it might be different if the Congress recommended otherwise* (emphasis supplied).

"Senator CURTIS. But your group has made an effort?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, sir. But primarily in those States, as I indicated, where personal registration is still required."

Thus, S. 2884 encompasses a theory that belongs entirely in the province of the various States and their duly elected legislatures. I think it neither good practice nor procedure for the Congress to assume the role of lobbyist in the various statehouses throughout the country on behalf of a special and unique class of American citizen who may or may not be citizens of the State wherein they want to register by an absentee process.

Each State legislature knows the peculiarities of its own citizens, laws, and constitution, and how they would coincide with the concept of absentee registration. The recommendation of S. 2884 would work a definite hardship and expense in at least one State, where a constitutional amendment would be required. If the other States want to adopt or reject the theory of S. 2884, so be it; but such action should be taken without interference and advice from Washington.

Finally, I point out to my colleagues that the recommendations of S. 2884 extend to all elections—Federal, State, and local. While the qualifications of electors is under the Constitution a State matter, there might be some justification for the Federal Government advising the States as to Federal elections, but there is no basis for legislative advice to the States on purely local matters. It is conceivable that an individual who has been out of the country for one, two, or three decades might have some information as to presidential issues and candidates; but he is certainly not qualified to cast what might be the deciding vote in a local school election, or any other local election. We are all aware of the many extremely close elections that can be decided by the mail vote. I have serious misgivings about one of those close elections being decided by the votes of those individuals thousands of miles from the alleged State of their residence, and not subject to the edification of a campaign or the local newspapers, radio, and television reports.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Senator has made the point that we should not be giving advice to the States. I point out that this proposal simply amends the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955, which certainly was advisory to the States. It had no authority other than advisory; it was to try to permit voting by members of the armed services and people who were employed abroad by the Federal Government. That act was passed unanimously by the Senate.

Last year S. 1881 again was passed unanimously by this body. As I recall, that was a unanimous vote. That legislation amended the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955. Therefore, the Senate has acted twice and certainly it has acted very clearly in this area.

The States have followed the recommendations, as I indicated earlier. All States except one have complied with the recommendations set forth in the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955.

As I stated, I would have preferred S. 1881, which is mandatory and not simply advisory; and, of course, would have related only to elections for President and Vice President of the United States. However, that was not the will of the subcommittee nor of the committee to report that bill favorably this year.

Mr. President, as far as hearings are concerned, we did have brief hearings this year. However, last year, in 1967, we held hearings on this entire problem in connection with S. 1880 and S. 1881, which is the mandatory version.

We also had testimony from a Member of the other body who was interested in a companion bill which he had introduced in the House of Representatives, and on which there have been hearings. That bill has been reported from the committee and, I understand, it is now pending in the other body. A bill substantially identical to that bill is before us today.

[1] Stuart H. Johnson, Jr., League of Americans Residing Abroad.

Therefore, I submit this is not a new matter, by way of precedent. The legislation would simply amend the Voting Assistance Act of 1955 by striking out two sections and inserting in lieu thereof a new section that would provide:

(3) Citizens of the United States temporarily residing outside the territorial limits of the United States and the District of Columbia and their spouses and dependents when residing with or accompanying them.

Mr. President, the measure simply broadens the definition that was announced by the Senate and the House of Representatives in the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955.

I hope the Senate will pass the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2884

To amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101 of the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (5 U.S.C. 2171) is hereby amended by striking out subsections (3) and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a new subsection (3) as follows:

"(3) Citizens of the United States temporarily residing outside the territorial limits of the United States and the District of Columbia and their spouses and dependents when residing with or accompanying them."

SEC. 2. Section 204(b) of the Act (5 U.S.C. 2184(b)), is hereby amended by striking out subparagraphs (3) c., d., e., and f. and inserting in lieu thereof new subparagraphs (3) c., d., and e. as follows:

"c. A citizen of the United States temporarily residing outside of the territorial limits of the United States and the District of Columbia

"d. A spouse or dependent of a person listed in (a) or (b) above

"e. A spouse or dependent residing with or accompanying a person described in (c) above".

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

KEEP FEDERAL TROOPS IN WASHINGTON

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Friday afternoon, around 4 o'clock, as best I can recall, I talked with the office of Mr. Mike Manatos and Mr. Joseph A. Califano, Jr., at the White House, and urged that Federal troops be brought into Washington to assist the police in the protection of lives and property. I also called Mayor Washington about the situation as it was developing. He informed me that everything was being done to restore order and bring the situation under control, and that a request was being processed for Federal troops.

At 6:03 p.m., I talked with Mayor Washington. He stated that the situation was "contained with our own forces last night," and that "today there have been a couple of very bad mass meetings on 14th." The Mayor went on to say that "Carmichael made a couple of statements—quite inflammatory—at a press conference." The Mayor said that at about 1:30 or 2 p.m., bands started moving about. The Mayor said he had talked with President Johnson around 11 a.m. The Mayor said that the guard "is in now and on the streets in areas where the looting and burning are going on." He said that regular troops from the 3d Infantry were being deployed in an attempt to restore order. He indicated that about 600 of the National Guard personnel were on the streets at 5 p.m., and that the total number would go up to about 1,200.

I left my office around 6:15 p.m., and drove home, after which I talked with Deputy Mayor Thomas W. Fletcher at 7:30 p.m. Mr. Fletcher informed me that about 1,000 National Guardsmen were in the city, and that about 5,000 Federal troops were being deployed in precincts Nos. 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, and 13. He stated that fire departments in adjoining Maryland and Virginia jurisdictions were responding to calls for help in the District; that at 5:30 p.m. a curfew had been effected, the sale of alcoholic beverages stopped, and the sale of firearms prohibited; and that arrests were already being made under the curfew.

I then talked with Mayor Washington again, and he told me that the Federal troops were being deployed around the White House and the Capitol and were also being moved into the precincts to assist policemen and firemen. I asked Mayor Washington if the Federal troops were just going to be put on display for the purpose of making a "show" of force or whether they were going to be used to help make arrests, stop looting, and restore order. He assured me that they were not just on display and that they were going to be used effectively to restore order.

I again called Mayor Washington around 11:30 p.m. on Friday, but he was in the field. I again called him at 12:50 a.m. Saturday and left word with his office. I do not recall exactly, but I believe I had a subsequent conversation that night with the Mayor or with Deputy Mayor Fletcher. My notes are not complete on this score.

Upon hearing television reports Saturday that the looting was increasing rather than subsiding, I again talked with Mr. Califano at the White House, who stated that as of 11 a.m. Saturday, there was "some increased looting, not too much," and that there was "no real congregations of people" at that point. He said that access to certain troubled areas had been blocked and that the police and National Guardsmen had been told to move "very fast" on looters. He also stated that there were about 7,000 military personnel in the city at that point and that the orders were to "stop looters with the minimum force necessary," and that the most urgent problems had to be dealt with first, such as protecting firemen and other such matters.

About 2:10 p.m., on Saturday, I talked with Mr. Cyrus Vance, special assistant and adviser to the Mayor, about the situation. He said that he had just come from a visit to precincts 1, 2, 3, and 13, and that the second precinct looks troublesome. He indicated that there were some troublesome areas in the third precinct. He said that a lot of hostility was developing and that the curfew would go back on at 4 p.m. I asked him what use was being made of the military personnel, and he stated that they were helping to guard business establishments and pick up looters and work with the police as closely as possible in restoring law and order.

At 2:30 p.m., Mr. Califano called me back to state also that the curfew would be advanced to 4 p.m. He stated that there was an uneasy aspect developing, that there was a kind of intra-anger growing among many of the colored people because some of their own houses were being destroyed by the rioters, and that the burning of stores and other business places would mean a loss of jobs for many Negroes. He pointed out that many Negroes were employed in the very businesses that were going up in flames and that these people were becoming increasingly restive and that there was some fear that this restiveness could develop into some real trouble among the Negroes themselves.

Moreover, he pointed out that many Negro people were becoming increasingly disturbed because their sources of food supply were being destroyed by the looters and arsonists.

At 3 p.m., I talked with Mr. Warren Christopher, Deputy Attorney General of the United States, and urged that firm police action be utilized in dealing with the rioters and looters and that all reasonable force be applied to apprehend and arrest looters and other lawbreakers. I stated that business establishments should have the utmost protection available and that only a firm attitude on the part of the military and the police department, using whatever force was necessarily in order to make and maintain arrests, would discourage and convince the rioters that they were pursuing great risks in continuing to loot and destroy.

At 4:30 on Saturday afternoon I drove to Martinsburg, W. Va., for a speaking engagement, and, upon returning to my home at 11:30 that night, I called Chief Layton to say that I would like to visit the areas of the city in which the greatest disturbance had taken place. I assured him that I would not want to create any problem for him in view of the situation, and I told him that I could wait until Sunday or I could go at that time on Saturday night, whichever he thought the better suggestion. He indicated he felt it would be better to go at night, whereupon I departed around midnight and visited the sections of the city where most of the looting and burning had occurred. I was on Seventh Street and 14th Street NW., and H Street NE., as well as in other parts of the city. At that time the curfew was very effective and I saw only an occasional

person on the street. In all cases such persons were questioned by the police with whom I was riding or by the military, and in all instances the military personnel were closely guarding stores and intersections and were stopping and checking the few automobiles that came in sight. Fire trucks were at work, and the police and military personnel were doing a very good job in enforcing the curfew. I returned to my home at 3 o'clock Sunday morning.

I again talked with Mayor Washington around 5:30 p.m. on Sunday. He informed me that the curfew which had been put into effect at 4 p.m. would last until 6:30 a.m. on Monday. He also indicated that it was the plan to open the schools on Monday, today, until about 1:30 p.m., and that the curfew was planned to go into effect again this afternoon at 6 o'clock. He indicated the businesses would close at 4 p.m. today, thus allowing a 2-hour period to accommodate buses and also to accommodate Federal and District employees who would be moving out of the District ahead of the curfew. He also stated that Federal and District offices would close at staggered hours so as to avoid traffic congestion as much as possible.

Mayor Washington indicated that things were in "fairly good shape now" and that there had been one fire on 14th Street during Sunday. He said that no new incidents had occurred except of a minor nature. I asked what consideration was being given to the arrest of Stokely Carmichael and he said that "serious considerations are being given by the Justice Department. I am continuing to talk with the Department of Justice regarding Carmichael."

Mr. President, I want the record to show that I was in touch with city and Federal officials numerous times during Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. I want the record to show that I urged early use of Federal troops and National Guardsmen, and that I urged firmness and the application of whatever force was necessary to protect lives and properties, and stop the mass lawlessness to which the city and its citizens were being subjected.

I also want to commend the Metropolitan Police Department and the military personnel who worked far beyond the normal tours of duty in their efforts to restore order, and to commend the firemen of the District of Columbia and those departments in adjoining areas which assisted in bringing under control the scores of fires that erupted during the worst hours of the disturbance.

I wish to express deep appreciation to Mayor Washington, Deputy Mayor Fletcher, the White House personnel, Chief Layton, Mr. Vance, and others, who worked virtually around the clock in the effort to bring a most difficult and volatile situation under control.

Mr. President, what occurred was a deplorable and disgraceful display. I am sure that most citizens, Negro and white, were sickened by it.

I deplore the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., as I said on the floor of the Senate on Friday. The act was one of imbecility. I hope that the assassin will be promptly apprehended, convicted, and dealt with under the law.

However, what happened over the weekend in Washington and in other cities was entirely unjustified and, in my judgment, had no logical connection whatsoever with Dr. King's death. As I viewed the looting and other lawlessness, as shown on television, it was evident that a carnival and festive spirit was prevailing, as children and adults, with their arms filled with loot, with garbage cans filled with loot, with grocery carts filled with loot, passed before television cameras, smiling and waving their hands to the TV viewers.

Men and women carried away refrigerators, living room furniture, bedroom furniture, wearing apparel, whisky, and everything they could get their hands on, in an atmosphere of levity. It was a shameful and disgraceful performance before the Nation and the world, as thousands of people took advantage of the opportunity to go on a rampage.

I again express appreciation to the police, to the firemen, and to the servicemen who worked hard and who are still on duty in the maintenance of law and order. I hope that troublemakers, looters, and other lawbreakers will not be given a mere tap on the wrist and turned loose, but will be dealt with severely.

I also hope that Federal troops will remain in this city indefinitely, because if Washington is to be subjected to a summer campaign of demonstrations, as has long been planned, the presence of Federal troops will be reassuring.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 11816) to provide compensation for law enforcement officers not employed by the United States killed or injured while apprehending persons suspected of committing Federal crimes, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Dr. Martin Luther King must not have died in vain.

The time has come—if it has ever come—to turn a century of neglect into a time of action.

It will be meaningless to establish a day of prayer—to call for national mourning—if the emotions and deep shock of the American people are not translated into action.

There is a responsibility on the shoulders of every American to answer the question: What can I do?

And nowhere is this responsibility more clear—nowhere is it heavier—than on the shoulders of the Members of Congress.

This is no time to sit tight.

We know what we need to know. We know what we need to do.

We know the statistics—a rollcall of despair.

Four and a half million urban substandard housing units.

One out of four Negro teenage youths unemployed.

Thirty-seven percent of the graduating class of a Washington high school without jobs in the year after graduation.

Millions and millions of dollars of damage as a result of riots, looting, and destruction.

No Member of this Congress needs to look very far in order to find out what he can do.

The answers are available to us, and in all the detail we need in order to implement them.

More than 15 months ago, following extensive hearings on urban problems, I introduced a package of legislation that was based on six main themes. They were:

First, guaranteed job opportunities for all;

Second, providing a decent home in a decent environment that includes personal security and public safety;

Third, offering the maximum encouragement to private investment in rebuilding our cities and the lives of our people;

Fourth, involving the individual in his own destiny and emphasizing neighborhood development;

Fifth, reorganizing our agencies of government so that the new ideas of today will not wither on the bureaucratic vines of yesterday; and

Sixth, developing an educational system that will equip all children with the skills and resources necessary for a modern and growing society.

They are as valid today as they were in January of 1967. Perhaps more so.

Just this spring, the Kerner Commission told us in great detail everything we already knew, because its members knew full well that the answers were before the American people and had been for some several years, if not more.

How long must we wait?

Will the crisis in our cities—the crisis in the race relations—be set aside until every know-nothing, black and white, has had his say?

Are we to prove the apostles of violence correct?

Let us pray that this is not so. Because the violence of the past weekend—and the disorders of last summer—are destructive of more than property. Violence

is destructive of the spirit. It hardens the attitudes of men.

Nowhere has it produced lasting and positive results.

Violence does not eliminate the conditions it seeks to destroy. Often it causes them to endure.

Violence does not make life in the slum any less mean or more tolerable, or bring forth responsible leadership.

Violence does not create understanding.

Instead, violence breeds fear. Lawlessness creates a lack of confidence. Disorder pushes into the background those who would build. The glare of flames and the flashing lights of police cruisers illuminate only the wreckers and the wreckage.

The times and events cry out for sanity and for constructive action.

The tragedy of the past few days has been its familiarity.

What happened in Washington, in Chicago, in Baltimore, in Pittsburgh, and elsewhere has happened in many other cities for the past 5 years.

And each year, following the violence, Americans expressed great shock at the suffering and great outrage at the destruction. We have said to ourselves: It will not happen again. But it has. We have told ourselves that the best way to control riots is with quick, effective police action. And certainly there can be no quarrel with that. All of us are grateful, at least, that the loss of life in Washington was much lower than in other cities during similar tragedies.

But our great error has been to see the rioters as representing all black citizens. Our great error has been to try to exact a pledge from vandals and hoodlums before we assist those who are hard-working and decent people.

We must deal with two issues. One is the violence and controlling it when it occurs. The other is the conditions of poverty, of unemployment or jobs that lead nowhere, poor schools, and closed opportunity.

In every riot, there have been two issues. One has been the vicious violence, the rampage, and the looting. The other has been the conditions of the slums and poverty.

We justly condemn the rioting.

But condemning the rioting does not provide jobs for the poor. It does not build housing for the poor. It does not improve our educational system. Condemning rioting and preventing violence with quick, effective police action is only half the job. Now we must get on to the second half of the job, which we have ignored for so many generations.

Mr. President, for me to continue speaking about these problems—for anyone to continue speaking—is meaningless if we do not act to end them. Here in this city, among the institutions of our National Government, we have had far too much talk and far too little action.

We have passed legislation that authorized programs and then have not authorized the money to implement them or have authorized too little money.

We must face the truth. The greatest need is money. Unless we in Congress are willing to make a commitment of the purse as well as the heart—and so far we have done neither—then we cannot expect the actions of local individuals to have much meaning. The people in our cities who are acting, who want to end poverty, who want to assist those we have forgotten and cast off from our nation are in desperate need of a national commitment and a national framework for their action. We must provide this.

We must provide this in the spirit of Martin Luther King, who told us that we do not seek black victories or white victories, but victories of justice. And we must always bear in mind what this great man told us about our responsibility to ourselves, about the consequences of our inactions.

In what was a clear summary of American life in the mid-1960's, Dr. King, in testimony before my Senate subcommittee in December of 1966, told us:

> The new era of abundance finds us not only with proliferating ghettoes, but it finds us enmeshed in confused commitments and tortured values. Our confusion can be illustrated by an unanswered question. Are we more concerned with the size, power and wealth of our society, or with creating a more just society? The failure to pursue justice is not only a moral default. Without it, social tensions will grow and the recurring turbulence in the streets will persist despite disapproval or repressive action. Even more, a withered sense of justice in an expanding society leads to corruption of the lives of all Americans. All too many of those who live in the affluent America ignore those who exist in poor America. In doing so, the affluent Americans will eventually have to face themselves with the question that Eichmann chose to ignore: How responsible am I for the well-being of my fellows? To ignore evil is to become an accomplice to it.

RIOTS, BURNING, AND LOOTING IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this morning I had the opportunity to tour the three worse riot-torn and burned areas of our Nation's Capital. I am convinced more than ever that this wanton destruction represents the deeds of criminals and not the majority of our population in this city.

Unfortunately, the looting and burning was apparently condoned by large numbers of the populace in which it occurred. The stores hardest hit were in the main business sections of areas where minority populations are concentrated, although there was widespread vandalism and some looting in other sections of the capital.

Police authorities who accompanied me on this tour stated that the food and liquor stores were hardest hit, with clothing stores a close second. The looters first robbed the stores of all merchandise, and in many cases destroyed credit records. Then the buildings were set afire in an apparent attempt to camouflage the looting and also to add confusion and havoc, which aided the looters in moving into other areas while police and firemen tried to control the sections which were burning.

The outbreaks began Thursday night, April 4, following the assassination of Martin Luther King, and intensified during daylight hours on Friday, April 5, with the peak coming Friday afternoon and night. Fires and looting continued Saturday, April 6, but the buildup of National Guard and Federal troops on Saturday turned the situation around as Saturday night and Sunday saw only isolated incidents occur. An earlier call of military forces would have greatly reduced the loss of life and property.

Mr. President, I am convinced that this violence was only partially in retaliation over the death of Martin Luther King. His death was merely the catalyst in this destruction. You do not mourn a man's death by taking other lives and destroying the property of people. Those who participated in the looting and burning simply used this assassination in Memphis as an excuse to take the law into their own hands. The attitude of the rioters was not one of mourning, but more like a carnival atmosphere. Women and children participated in the looting, often waving at television cameramen and laughing as they moved about the streets with their arms filled with dry goods and other items.

The death of Martin Luther King and the rioting which has spread to more than 41 cities in the past few days both spring from the same source: The philosophy that one need only obey the laws that please him. Both the act of the assailant, and the actions of the rioters were nurtured in an atmosphere of tension and agitated emotion.

Mr. President, this Nation today has been worked up into a state of revolutionary tension. Officials are vainly striving to label these riots as "civil disturbances." Newspapers appear to be pleased that the damage is allegedly confined to propery. In my judgment, the damage goes far deeper. The damage goes into the very soul of the Nation. Civilization and freedom depend upon the maintenance of law and order. The first sign that such law and order is crumbling is the destruction of property.

For this reason, looting is not the same as mere theft or burglary. In the history of Anglo-Saxon law, looting has been seen as the prelude to arson and the collapse of public safety. Thus, security of property has always been the bulwark of human rights and the safeguard of freedom.

Looting and property destruction also does psychological damage to all citizens, both looters and victims. Both of them loose respect for authority, a loss that will be more evident in the future. The very center of freedom is the free acceptance by all citizens of the restraints of the law upon conscience and action. The person who is scarred by the collapse of authority will have difficulty returning to these inner restraints.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 159—INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION DESIGNATING JANUARY 15 OF EACH YEAR AS MARTIN LUTHER KING DAY

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the renewed outbursts of civil disorder in the cities of America are costly and futile counterpoints to the profound sense of grief which has swept across this Nation since last Thursday. The lasting imprint on this country's conscience and behavior will not be made by the misguided and reckless participants in these disturbances, however vividly we may remember the ugly scenes of these few days. The lasting impressions will be those etched in our memory by the good life and good works of the man whose death last week bound the great majority of Americans together in outrage and mourning.

All over the land people are seeking appropriate ways to express their bereavement at the passing of Martin Luther King, Jr. In these first days of our loss proper tribute has been paid to Dr. King, not in the streets, but in the churches and chapels, the schools and homes of the United States. And I am confident that the greater and lingering tribute will come in further action toward the glorious goals of brotherhood and justice so diligently pursued by Martin Luther King, Jr.

As Americans, individually and collectively, rededicate themselves to these ends, it would be fitting to pay our respects to this noble figure by enduring public commemoration of his life and philosophy.

For this purpose I believe the Congress should declare January 15, the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., an annual occasion of recognition for this man and his mission. To accomplish this I am today submitting the following joint resolution:

S.J. RES. 159

Whereas the United States of America is deeply grieved by the vicious and senseless act which ended the life of the Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Junior, this country's apostle of nonviolence;

Whereas the United States of America, and its Senators and Representatives in Congress, recognize and appreciate the immense contribution and sacrifice of this dedicated American;

Whereas the American people are determined that the life and works of this great man shall not be obscured by violence and anger, but rather that they shall remain a shining symbol of the Nation's nonviolent struggle for social progress;

Whereas it is incumbent upon us to recognize the violence, hatred, and national division do no honor to the man who has been taken from us;

Whereas mutual respect and a firm commitment to the ideals of nonviolence for which he labored will be the most lasting memorial to the life of the Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Junior;

Whereas it is fervently hoped that his death may serve to reconcile those among us who have harbored hatred and resentment for their fellow Americans, to the end that our country may at last realize the ideal of equality set forth in our Constitution: Therefore, it is hereby

Resolved, That, in honor of the Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Junior, who was born on January 15, 1929, January 15 of each year is hereby designated as "Martin Luther King Day". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation each year calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate the life and the service to his country and its citizens of the Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Junior, and to observe that day with appropriate honors, ceremonies, and prayers.

This proposal is not one I make lightly, but in the earnest conviction that we need to do all that we can to perpetuate the spirit and example of Martin Luther King, Jr. It is already evident that he occupies a unique place in American history. The values he epitomized are the very values which this country needs to sustain it on the march toward a more humane and equitable society.

I make this suggestion fully mindful of the fact that very few Americans have been so honored. No Negro American has yet been added to that small company of distinguished patriots who have received such tribute. At this time, more than any other, this Nation needs to raise up for itself and its posterity the image of reconciliation encompassed in the person of Martin Luther King. Approval of this resolution would be one measure of our commitment to do so.

Honor is not enough, but it is due. Symbols are not the substance of action, but in the long and complex paths of social evolution, symbols are also necessary. Dedication of a day each year to commemorate Martin Luther King, Jr., and his legacy to our Nation would symbolize in fitting manner our reverence for the man and our devotion to his principles.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I hesitate to speak at all following the eloquent statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

I merely rise to say that I believe that, better than anyone else, the Senator from Massachusetts clearly states the situation and the problems which face this country today.

I had the opportunity to listen to him yesterday on a television program. And it seemed to me that if our Government and its leaders and the people of our country follow the counsel and advice he gave on yesterday, our country could move from this growing alienation of the two great groups in our country and could move to that of equality which our Constitution promises, and, into a reconciliation of the two great peoples and fellow citizens of our country.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for his very kind and very generous remarks relative to my appearance yesterday on "Face the Nation."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 159) designating January 15 of each year as "Martin Luther King Day," was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON WEDNESDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, April 10, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 8, 1968:

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Walter H. Lieginger, Stockton, Calif., in place of F. J. Booth, retired.

GEORGIA

Charles E. Chandler, Bowman, Ga., in place of G. E. Chandler, retired.

Melvin C. Rogers, Chester, Ga., in place of G. A. Bowen, retired.

James W. Stubbs, Jr., Warner Robins, Ga., in place of H. H. Watson, retired.

ILLINOIS

John F. Braasch, Flossmoor, Ill., in place of G. E. Dean, retired.

Lloyd H. Whitworth, Hamel, Ill., in place of W. W. Steinmann, retired.

John A. D'Andrea, Itasca, Ill., in place of T. W. Harney, transferred.

INDIANA

Dolly M. Hall, Eminence, Ind., in place of I. I. Robinson, deceased.

Max W. Gooch, Harmony, Ind., in place of J. D. Lawson, retired.

Matthew J. Purzycki, Notre Dame, Ind., in place of J. V. Pelchat, resigned.

Lantia V. Lawyer, Oolitic, Ind., in place of I. M. Lawyer, retired.

Edwin R. Bartholomae, Plainfield, Ind., in place of C. A. Etchason, Jr., resigned.

IOWA

Isabelle B. Ramsey, Gruver, Iowa, in place of Elizabeth Dalen, retired.

Robert W. Book, Shenandoah, Iowa, in place of J. I. Haldeman, retired.

KANSAS

Marvin E. Jardon, Baldwin City, Kans., in place of L. N. Williams, deceased.

Delburt J. Hobelman, Fredonia, Kans., in place of E. W. Hull, retired.

Ernest E. Watkins, Ottawa, Kans., in place of T. J. Cummings, Jr., deceased.

Margie A. Hall, White City, Kans., in place of O. T. Kappelmann, retired.

KENTUCKY

Donald V. Overstreet, Parksville, Ky., in place of M. O. Tucker, retired.

MAINE

Conrad W. Babb, East Vassalboro, Maine, in place of N. P. Mason, retired.

T. Nathan Churchill, Washburn, Maine, in place of M. M. Freeman, retired.

Wesley M. Waters, Winslows Mills, Maine, in place of E. E. Cuthbertson, retired.

MICHIGAN

Shurley C. McIntyre, Vassar, Mich., in place of L. B. Akins, retired.

MINNESOTA

Joseph F. Dero, Minneota, Minn., in place of J. J. Jaschke, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Leon A. Ferguson, Jr., Arcola, Miss., in place of R. Q. Burney, retired.

Rodney M. Hentz, Courtland, Miss., in place of F. E. Figg, retired.

MISSOURI

J. C. Wagner, Lutesville, Mo., in place of R. I. Caldwell, retired.

Harold J. Maples, Marionville, Mo., in place of C. H. Willard, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Anthony E. Fittipaldi, South Plainfield, N.J., in place of John Kane, transferred.

OHIO

Ronald R. Ruppert, Franklin, Ohio, in place of M. M. Miller, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

M. Fern Copeland, Lone Grove, Okla., in place of T. L. Payne, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Leroy D. Larson, Russell, Pa., in place of F. M. Ruland, transferred.

TEXAS

Richard H. Van Court, Christoval, Tex., in place of V. L. Lock, retired.

Herbert L. Clayton, Olney, Tex., in place of F. N. Cook, retired.

VIRGINIA

Eugene O. Phillips, Covington, Va., in place of R. F. Smith, Jr., deceased.

Kathleen B. Branch, Dinwiddie, Va., in place of H. C. Barrow, retired.

Helen N. Merritt, Jetersville, Va., in place of C. S. Farmer, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Alfred H. Habeck, Athens, Wis., in place of E. H. Belz, retired.

WYOMING

Dessie A. Bebout, Shoshoni, Wyo., in place of H. M. Currah, retired.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captain, Medical

Kirschner, Leonard J., FV3124178.

To be first lieutenants, Dental

Andres, Carl J., FV3188523.
English, John R., FV3166255.
Schemke, James M.

To be first lieutenant, judge advocate

Vance, Richard R., FR3205413.

The following Air Force officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be majors

Cline, Gould L., FV717564.
Minish, James A., FV1903233.
Walker, Charles F., FV1908390.

To be first lieutenants

Abbott, John G., Jr., FV3147114.
Abrams, Aubray, I., Jr., FV3110529.
Adams, George F., FV3130287.
Adams, John I., FV3132373.
Adams, John P., FV3135406.
Adams, Nixon A., FV3136461.
Adams, Oscar R., FV3132756.
Adamski, Anthony J., FV3133203.
Ahl, Kenneth L. II, FV3155771.
Ahrens, James A., FV3135124.
Akridge, James A., FV3122331.
Alberchinski, Carl D., FV3138000.
Albright, David S., FV3155461.
Alexander, Kenneth G., FV3131687.
Alexander, Lynn B., FV3136031.
Alexander, Ronald, FV3145636.
Alfonso, Louis A., FV3146186.
Allan, William K., FV3155149.
Allen, Alonzo R. III, FV3144513.
Allen, Donald G., FV3128773.
Allen, Donald J., FV3156728.
Allen, Lytle E. III, FV3132474.
Allen, Raymond L., FV3136711.
Allison, Billy G., FV3136146.
Allan, John M. III, FV3136818.
Alto, David G., FV3129937.
Alvarez, Alberto, FV3119814.
Ammering, Theodore F., FV3146098.
Anderson, Gordon G., FV3136813.
Anderson, James T., FV3129806.
Anderson, Jerris C., FV3156283.
Anderson, John R., FV3122377.
Anderson, John W., FV3136488.
Anderson, Woodrow A., FV3146503.
Andrews, George R., FV3136436.
Arelland, Cayftano A., Jr., FV3136739.
Arendts, David T., FV3137108.
Ariail, Frederick P., FV3119998.
Armour, Leon, FV3133670.
Armour, Paul J., FV3130853.
Armstead, Joseph E., FV3131501.
Armstrong, John F., FV3130425.
Armstrong, Lewis C., FV3129357.
Armstrong, Robert M., FV3128848.
Armstrong, Robert P., FV3131643.
Arnett, Larry W., FV3129436.
Arnold, Charles P., Jr., FV3136892.
Arnold, Lloyd H., FV3146591.
Ashley, Raymond W., FV3147042.
Ashworth, Charles, FV3134443.
Astwood, Edwin V., FV3135355.
Atkins, Gary C., FV3154846.
Atkinson, Robert W., Jr., FV3154945.
Augustine, Charles F., FV3120334.
Austin, Donald D., FV3155275.
Austin, Noel F., FV3129044.
Auvil, Robert F., FV3129106.
Ayotte, Jean G., FV3134444.
Bablo, Charles A., FV3129625.
Bailey, Henry I., FV3128222.
Bair, Thomas F., FV3119978.
Baker, Emmett J., Jr., FV3130504.
Baker, John E., FV3131198.
Baker, Ronald F., FV3130832.
Ballard, Jerry M., FV3081329.
Balstad, Richard W., FV3146359.
Bara, Leonard J., FV3138781.
Barbieri, Richard E., FV3136002.
Barclay, Ralph D., FV3119583.
Bardelmeier, Marshall W., FV3120204.
Bare, Richard J., FV3146045.
Barkin, Richard D., FV3061887.
Barlow, Charles F., FV3099926.
Barnett, Truman L., FV3146966.
Barnhill, Charles C., Jr., FV3130030.
Baron, Bruce, FV3154687.
Barre, Edward I., FV3144926.
Barrett, Thomas J., FV3120130.
Barron, Art, FV3132760.
Barron, Barney F., FV3129360.
Bartling, Gary R., FV3131956.
Barto, Emerson S., FV3135113.
Baskett, Richard M., FV3130537.
Bastien, Stanley N., FV3139078.
Bateman, John P., FV3145117.
Bates, Daniel G., FV3144996.
Bauer, John G., Jr., FV3145335.
Bay, Philip E., Jr., FV3131088.
Beakley, John M., FV3132518.
Beaty, James K., Jr., FV3131089.
Beck, Alan W., FV3155793.
Becker, Raymond C., FV3138435.
Beere, Dennis F., FV3119517.
Beere, Henry M., FV3136267.
Beechy, Dean B., FV3131853.
Beets, Byron F., FV3146489.
Belina, John L., FV3137096.
Bell, James E., FV3130221.
Bell, Lawrence L., FV3132748.
Bell, Oral L., FV3131958.
Benecchi, Edward, Jr., FV3145180.
Benfield, Eric B., FV3146658.
Bennett, Jacob M., FV3127892.
Bennett, John D., FV 3132761.
Bentley, John F., FV3122472.
Beringer, William F., FV3135446.
Bernard, Jimmie, W., FV3138997.
Bernth, Terry J., FV3155132.
Berrean, John D., FV3156102.
Berry, William E., FV3119318.
Beson, Gary N., FV3131803.
Best, Robert S., FV3146842.
Betancourt, Ernest R., Jr., FV3137487.
Beverung, William C., Jr., FV3136904.
Bevington, Richard J., FV3135532.
Bickenbach, Jerry B., FV3107791.
Billingsley, John A., FV3120147.
Binkham, Charles D., FV3132378.
Bishop, William M., FV3146404.
Bixby, Frank R., Jr., FV3146884.
Black, Charles F., FV3120442.
Black, Donald G., FV3129173.
Blackburn, Allan W., FV3133079.
Blackwell, Gary L., FV3146610.
Blake, Neil F., FV3131644.
Blake, Ronald H., FV3129577.
Blauth, Robert J., FV3155422.
Blessing, Don H., FV3134013.
Blincow, Bruce R., FV3137903.
Blocker, Gettis A., FV3120000.
Blondet, William F., FV3132036.
Board, Michael E., FV3130707.
Boardman, Edward C., FV3137912.
Boerner, Roger B., FV3146663.
Bomhoff, Herbert M., FV3135459.
Bonney, Kent L., FV3156103.
Borgo, Peter A., FV3133628.
Boros, William G., FV3132286.
Bosse, Frederick C., FV3130404.
Boudreau, Richard L., FV3133629.
Boudreaux, Elie J., III, FV3154549.
Bourgeois, Paul J., FV3129860.
Bourque, George J., II, FV3146335.
Bowen, Albert S., FV3119932.
Bowman, Laddie F., FV3131855.
Bowman, Steven E., FV3130449.
Box, Gene E., FV3132523.
Boyanton, Earl B., Jr., FV3134874.
Boyd, Dene R., FV3129174.
Boyd, Hubert D., FV3065295.
Boylan, Hugh S., Jr., FV3133937.
Boyle, Anthony D., FV3134806.
Boyle, Francis J., FV3135470.
Boyle, Peter J., Jr., FV3137874.
Boynton, Gerald I., FV3129634.
Brace, Donald C., FV3131443.
Bradley, Rayburn F., FV3129619.
Bradley, Wayne D., FV3134014.
Bradshaw, James A., FV3130031.
Brake, Francis B., FV3135015.
Branch, Patrick K., FV3137875.
Branch, Paul R., FV3133958.
Brand, Troy C., FV3119621.
Brandt, Herman P., II, FV3132204.
Brannam, Clarence R., FV3134355.
Braxton, Richard B., Jr., FV3119900.
Breen, Patrick F., FV3132801.
Brenner, Wayne E., FV3137936.
Brethouwer, Richard I., FV3134816.
Brettel, Emile P., III, FV3128063.
Brewer, Larry K., FV3146428.
Brickner, Thomas E., FV3146614.
Bridger, Barry B., FV3131623.
Brisbois, John D., Jr.. FV3134841.
Brock, Gerald L., FV3135478.
Brocklehurst, Gordon B., FV3128985.
Brockman, Leslie R., FV3145949.
Broerman, Ramon K., FV3137723.
Bronson, Eugene C., Jr., FV3146453.
Brook, Robert E., FV3137724.
Brooks, James R., FV3154458.
Brooks, John F., FV3135482.
Brooks, Manuel P., FV3128064.
Brooks, Thomas A., FV3134404.
Brown, Ernest H., FV3119815.
Brown, Guy E., II, FV3119622.
Brown, James D., FV3137495.
Brown, Jerald A., FV3156972.
Brown, John O., FV3119548.
Brown, Richard L., FV3144957.
Brown, William E., Jr., FV3137883.
Brownlee, Russell F., FV3130006.

Bruetsch, Edward J., FV3128253.
Bruhl, Glyndon A., FV3130635.
Brumbaugh, Elliott F., Jr., FV3137887.
Bruner, James M., FV3132673.
Brungart, David L., FV3131467.
Brunson, James R., FV3122822.
Bryan, Thomas D., FV3132156.
Buchkowski, George F., FV3154804.
Buchta, Robert M., FV3135487.
Buckles, Glenn A., FV3130824.
Buley, Peter J., FV3146578.
Bumen, Robert I., FV3120373.
Bumgarner, James A., FV3135488.
Buond, William A., FV3129175.
Burbank, Theodore A., FV3156936.
Burger, Norman A., FV3135991.
Burkart, Elmer R., Jr., FV3156875.
Burke, Martin J., FV3144823.
Burnett, Charles Z., FV3132931.
Burnett, Paul T., FV3137497.
Burns, James E., FV3129176.
Burns, John W., Jr., FV3132126.
Burns, Kent B., FV31229445.
Burrowes, John H., FV3155697.
Busby, David N., FV3136777.
Bussing, George F., FV3138902.
Butler, David I., FV3154436.
Button, Edward J., FV3156246.
Byram, James W., FV3132005.
Byrd, Harold C., FV3131625.
Byrne, Robert J., FV3138123.
Byrum, Richard, FV3130516.
Cadman, Robert S., FV3135497.
Cady, John R., FV3135386.
Cagle, Thomas G., FV3199682.
Caldwell, Glenn T., FV3119740.
Calhoun, Joseph D., FV3129863.
Call, Eugene H., FV3131207.
Callanan, Robert A., FV3134803.
Calvert, David D., Jr., FV3157045.
Calvert, Dorral I., FV3147038.
Cambra, Edward R., FV3136800.
Campbell, David R., FV3136200.
Campbell, Louis F., FV3129178.
Campbell, William P., FV3136299.
Canavan, Leo J., Jr., FV3065391.
Canfield, John A., FV3137898.
Cannon, Roy D., FV3147260.
Cantley, Roger P., FV3146500.
Cardiff, Robert I., Jr., FV3129581.
Cardosi, Richard, FV3139022.
Carlson, Edward A., FV3129362.
Carney, Philip J., FV3156247.
Carpinella, Ronald J., FV3147108.
Carr, Thomas C., FV3132289.
Carrigan, Larry F., FV3119604.
Carroll, Oliver R., FV3129111.
Carson, Phillip L., FV3138014.
Carter, Samuel P., Jr., FV3157046.
Carto, Robert M., FV3145907.
Cartwright, Francis E., FV3135509.
Carvey, Edward T., FV3139023.
Carwise, Edward R., FV3145776.
Casada, Jerry J., FV3132749.
Cash, Milton A., FV3137906.
Casleton, Ronald G., FV3120152.
Cassidy, Joseph F., FV3130433.
Castellano, Benedict D., FV3119911.
Caswell, Stephen L., FV3119792.
Cates, Theodore L., FV3138021.
Cavanaugh, Charles M., FV3130058.
Cecrle, William J., FV3135513.
Cempura, Walter R., FV3146100.
Cerchione, Angelo, FV3147220.
Chand, Amer, FV3147093.
Chandler, Gary A., FV3157013.
Chaney, Richard A., FV3137911.
Chapman, James E., FV3154438.
Chappell, Ernest V., FV3134373.
Charbonnier, Robert D., FV3144944.
Chesley, Carl H., FV3131592.
Chiarello, Vincent A., FV3136108.
Childers, Ronald B., FV3145457.
Childs, Thomas D., FV3134194.
Chora, Charles, Jr., FV3145147.
Christensen, Dayton C., FV3154859.
Christian, Frank H., FV3109304.
Christopher, Troy D., FV3130552.
Churchill, Howard A., FV3120643.
Chute, William M., II, FV3129941.
Chwan, Michael D., FV3136152.
Clark, Charles E., FV3145333.
Clark, Dale R., FV3139307.
Clark, Darrell L., FV3155096.
Clark, Dennis W., FV3145467.
Clark, Jack M., Jr., FV3130714.
Clark, Willard C., FV3137729.
Clawson, Lynn, FV3127970.
Clements, George V., FV3139081.
Cleveland, Ronald N., FV3137730.
Clopton, William F., FV3133300.
Cochran, Theodore S., FV3133142.
Cochrane, Thomas D., FV3108068.
Coffin, Charles J., FV3156973.
Coffman, Richard M., FV3129872.
Coil, Johnnie G., FV3135057.
Coker, William E., Jr., FV3147200.
Cole, John R., FV3133137.
Cole, Merle H., FV3155097.
Cole, Thomas R., FV3157109.
Coleman, Charlie J., Jr., FV3135714.
Colletti, Edward H., FV3144857.
Collier, James A., III, FV3131965.
Collins, Gerald M., FV3119935.
Collins, Rodney D., FV3155525.
Condojani, Stanley S., FV3146522.
Conklin, Norris L., FV3135536.
Conlin, Robert D., FV3135537.
Connell, Robert D., FV3144905.
Connelly, Robert N., FV3120208.
Conner, William L., FV3134809.
Connor, Francis J., FV3135773.
Conrad, Edward J., Jr., FV3156491.
Cooley, Gilbert K., FV3130008.
Cooley, James V., FV3146928.
Cooper, Grier H., FV3156113.
Cooper, Leigh J., FV3137939.
Coppage, David J., FV3108155.
Corbett, Richard T., FV3129646.
Cordell, Vance H. Jr., FV3145870.
Cordone, Roy R., FV3110667.
Correll, John T., FV3120865.
Corsi, James A., FV3108424.
Costa, Peter L., FV3119669.
Costello, James R., FV3135888.
Couillard, Bruce A., FV3154906.
Courrier, Ernest A., Jr., FV3135123.
Courser, Robert E., FV3132113.
Cousyn, Jack, Jr., FV3146482.
Couvillon, Nichaf I., FV3154523.
Couzins, Richard D., FV3138660.
Cox, Thomas W., FV3155277.
Coxwell, George F., FV3139177.
Crabtree, Frederick P., FV3129181.
Cramer, Keith L., FV3135930.
Crawford, Donald E., FV3146435.
Crawford, Harold F., FV3134356.
Crawford, Roderick W., FV3132957.
Creed, George J., III, FV3157065.
Crennan, William J., FV3156852.
Crist, William L., FV3155729.
Criswell, Harry I., FV3139082.
Cronin, Joseph G., FV3128781.
Crooch, Dorven K., FV3132114.
Crook, Randall M., FV3134313.
Croom, William D., Jr., FV3155526.
Cross, Edward I., FV3144710.
Crossland, William P., FV3132501.
Crouch, Jackie E., FV3139024.
Crouter, John E., FV3135255.
Croxton, Roy D., Jr., FV3156386.
Cruz, Carlos R., FV3131049.
Cufley, James E., Jr., FV3137946.
Cullinane, Eugene T., FV3119961.
Culver, Kenneth W., FV3128784.
Cummings, Michael L., FV3138548.
Cunningham, David K., FV3147008.
Cunningham, Joseph D., FV3156249.
Curl, Larry W., FV3136211.
Curley, Michael J., FV3156940.
Curoe, Patrick J., FV3146681.
Curtis, John R., FV3133223.
Custin, Gerald F., FV3130102.
Cwiklik, Paul, FV3146705.
Cwynar, Richard W., FV3124932.
Dabney, Richard W., Jr., FV3124064.
Daeuble, Theodore C., FG3130103.
Dague, Jerome H., FV3128857.
Dale, Charles L., FV3134959.
Dalpes, Daniel J., FV3146462.
Daly, Michael J., FV3133614.
Damato, Neil V., FV3108426.
Daniel, Joe F., Jr., FV3137817.
Darby, Charles V., II, FV3134960.
Darcangelo, Robert J., FV3134651.
Daugherty, James R., FV3132541.
Davenport, Calvin J., FV3156532.
Davidson, Roger W., FV3137743.
Davis, Gale C., FV3155681.
Davis, Kenneth C., FV3146029.
Davis, Lawrence, FV3133941.
Davis, Robert F., FV3146608.
Davis, William J., FV3145703.
Davison, Raymond I., FV3137969.
Deady, Edwin H., FV3156659.
Dean, Lawrence F., FV3128070.
Dean, Robert C., FV3146650.
Dean, Wayne S., FV3129182.
Decker, Lambert J., Jr., FV3130835.
Dee, James M., FV3130112.
Dees, David A., FV3137973.
DeFranco, Carl P., FV3133405.
Dehen, James J., FV3145022.
Deimeke, Louis E., FV3146138.
DeLuca, John A., FV3130113.
DeMarsh, Roger L., FV3134467.
DeMartino, Francis A., FV3131513.
Deminico, Joseph J., Jr., FV3129878.
Denney, Jerry D., FV3130116.
Dent, David R., FV3134216.
Deresky, John M., FV3145932.
Dermody, William E., Jr., FV3145206.
Deschenfaux, Richard J., FV3130771.
Dettmann, Alan W., FV3155099.
Dewar, Dudley R., FV3129463.
Dibblee, Robert W., FV3134197.
Dickerson, Marshall I., FV3135384.
Dickson, Allan M., FV3129368.
Dicocco, Robert R., FV3155380.
Didrickson, Donald J., FV73144891.
Dietrichs, William H., Jr., FV3131863.
Digangi, Thomas V., Jr., FV3145030.
Dillenbeck, Richard C., FV3130519.
Dillon, Francis R., FV3119864.
Dillon, Joseph J., FV3146683.
Dills, Jack C., FV3134824.
Dixon, Carroll W., FV3156403.
Dixon, Todd H., FV3146175.
Doane, John W., Jr., FV3139083.
Dobrasz, John, FV3134468.
Dobryflecki, Arthur J., FV3130802.
Dockter, Kenneth B., FV3138142.
Dodd, John R., FV3137985.
Dodge, Thomas F., FV3154754.
Dodson, Philip O., FV3145884.
Doe, Oliver P., Jr., FV3133963.
Dokken, Paul O., FV3129051.
Dole, Jack N., FV3118606.
Dombek, Frank S., FV3155865.
Dorcy, Ronald B., FV3137746.
Dorr, James F., FV3119786.
Dorrell, Archie J., FV3138172.
Dotts, James F., FV3145384.
Doucet, Richard M., FV3139158.
Dougherty, Terry F., FV3131864.
Douglas, Dirk F. V., FV3146624.
Dowdey, John D., Jr., FV3146950.
Dowell, Lester R., FV 3145574.
Downey, Leaford D., FV3137991.
Doxey, John W., FV3156218.
Doyle, Charles P., FV3137992.
Drago, Anthony L., FV3144704.
Drake, James R., FV3133634.
Drew, Louis D., FV3147254.
Dreyling, Robert A., FV3130135.
Drezek, Thomas, Jr., FV3128858.
Dubois, Jules F., FV3144440.
Dubois, Robert C., FV3132831.
Duerksen, Jarol F., FV3134653.
Duffner, Russell A., FV3145752.
Duffy, Brian J., FV3135933.
Dugan, Lawrence M., FV3137996.
Dulong, Ronald D., FV3130083.
Duncan, Donald M., FV3137997.
Duncan, James E., FV3136252.
Duncan, Philip P., FV3156884.
Dunn, Bruce F., FV3135595.
Dunn, William R., FV3129897.
Dupree, Hugh J., FV3139182.
Duran, Frank T., FV3133502.
Dyben, John P., FV3120155.
Eakin, William D., FV3136345.
Earlewine, Robert E., Jr., FV3128085.
Easton, Gary E., FV3135351.
Ebert, William T., FV3147166.

Eddy, Gerald V., FV3119866.
Edlund, Sven W., FV3131470.
Edney, Bobby G., FV3136347.
Edstrom, Vernon C., FV3135601.
Edwards, Lendy G., FV3131689.
Egan, Terence K., FV3133922.
Ekstrand, James P., FV3138005.
Elliott, Larry A., FV3136353.
Ellis, Jeffrey T., FV3135610.
Ellis, Vernon D., FV3119589.
Engelrbecht, Robert A., FV3130406.
English, Geoffrey M., FV3156105.
Enney, Thomas J., Jr., FV3156573.
Erickson, John V., FV3138011.
Ernst, Clifford F., FV3132548.
Ertel, Bernard R., FV3138232.
Essenbreis, Larry D., FV3120212.
Estes, Albert W., Jr., FV3145488.
Evans, Arthur F., FV3135619.
Evans, Charles W., FV3107363.
Evatt, Bobbie B., FV3155905.
Everhart, Richard V., FV3135621.
Ewers, Michael H., FV3146252.
Fahrlender, Theodore T., FV3155883.
Fairbanks, Clyde, Jr., FV3138247.
Falconer, Norman R., FV3134542.
Fantaski, Thomas J., Jr., FV3145850.
Farmer, Larry L., FV3146758.
Farmer, Vernon D., FV3144402.
Fayak, Edward G., FV3136364.
Fee, David T., FV3129470.
Feibelman, Jay F., FV3144820.
Feldman, Michael, FV3130164.
Fellen, Sherwin M., FV3129375.
Feltner, Jerry A., FV3139057.
Fenstad, Harry R., FV3133202.
Ferguson, Dale F., FV3136288.
Fernandez, Alfred P., FV3155344.
Ferony, Louis J., Jr., FV3146689.
Ferrel, Richard I., FV3155486.
Fields, Kenneth C., Jr., FV3147092.
Fike, William A., Jr., FV3129946.
Finley, Howard N., FV3138027.
Fischer, Frederick R., FV3155431.
Fish, Robert W., Jr., FV3135629.
Fisher, Frank J., FV3129377.
Fisher, Tatom A., FV3130060.
Fitzgerald, Clifford P., FV3130804.
Fitzgerald, Dennis C., FV3132936.
Fitzsimons, Alfred M., FV3139028.
Flaherty, Martin J., Jr., FV3135633.
Flake, Mark C., IV, FV3134659.
Flamoe, Larry J., FV3129891.
Flangan, Richard E., FV3136369.
Flannagan, William R., FV3154674.
Fletcher, Robert., FV3145821.
Flood, James L., FV3136375.
Flower, Robert M., FV3135640.
Flowers, Armand H., FV3136377.
Flynn, Dennis R., FV3138035.
Foley, James E., FV3130719.
Fontaine, Richard M., FV3145938.
Ford, Joe P., FV3138290.
Formica, Richard J., Jr., FV3129913.
Forrest, Joe E., Jr., FV3156509.
Foss, Remington C., FV3147134.
Fossmeyer, David A., FV3138040.
Foster, Carl H., Jr., FV3147006.
Foster, James P., FV3131713.
Foster, Robert A., FV3139145.
Foster, Stephan R., FV3139159.
Fournier, George J., FV3138382.
Fowler, Albert F., FV3137750.
Fowler, Gerald J., FV3131403.
Fox, Charles E., Jr., FV3155813.
Fox, Neil R., FV3132418.
Fox, Raymond M., FV3130858.
Fox, Robert D., FV3132696.
Franciani, Alphonse A., FV3145977.
Franklin, Norman I., Jr., FV3132835.
Frederick, Richard A., FV3155814.
Fredette, John E., FV3135651.
Freeman, Merrill W., FV3139058.
Fretitas, John F., FV3145944.
French, Floyd A., Jr., FV3138310.
French, Raymond I., FV3132043.
Frey, Clifford P., FV3133342.
Fridley, James I., FV3145378.
Friel, William J., FV3144474.
Fritz, William D., Jr., FV3131260.
Fuhrman, Ben J., FV3137751.
Fuller, John I., FV3155867.
Fuller, Robert R., FV3130011.
Fulton, Kermit L., FV3129124.
Gagen, James R., FV3135659.
Gallagher, James I., FV3146433.
Galloni, Raymond A., FV3154691.
Gam, Michael P., FV3129379.
Garay, Roger, FV3131518.
Gardner, Thomas M., FV3130188.
Garlow, Robert M., FV3134623.
Garver, Edward G., Jr., FV3131610.
Gateff, Dugan S., FV3131810.
Gateff, Fit D., FV3145200.
Gatewood, Robert M., FV3119837.
Gatwood, Eugene G., FV3145700.
Gehle, Bernard H., FV3120759.
Geiser, Anthony E., FV3128865.
Geldbach, Arthur R., FV3135667.
Genovese, Donald D., FV3135669.
George, John S., Jr., FV3138935.
Gerrick, Stanley J., FV3126376.
Giannantonio, Joseph A., II, FV3132300.
Gibson, William T., FV3146586.
Gilbert, Lowell A., FV3156476.
Gilbert, Paul F., FV3156716.
Gilchrist, Larry K., FV3134742.
Giles, Gerry G., FV3040396.
Giles, Thomas I., FV3131331.
Gillis, Thomas E., FV3122320.
Gillis, Wiley R., FV3135059.
Givens, Donald L., FV3134825.
Glad, Larry C., FV3136405.
Glascock, J. D., FV3133808.
Godlewski, Donald J., FV3154675.
Goering, Robert G., FV3145006.
Goggins, James W., FV3134477.
Gold, Bruce J., FV3130720.
Gold, Harvey D., FV3136376.
Golden, Dennis J., FV3108562.
Goldstein, Charles L., FV3131471.
Goldstein, Michael F., FV3131261.
Golob, Gordon A., FV3132954.
Goodall, Lewis E., FV3129188.
Goode, Charles D., FV3135016.
Goodwin, John E., FV3132333.
Goranowski, Thomas J., FV3120286.
Gordinier, Peter A., FV3156009.
Gordon, Lyal D., FV3135683.
Gould, Elmer R., Jr., FV3129481.
Gould, Yale R., FV3136415.
Goza, Donald E., FV3136416.
Graser, Eugene T., FV3146470.
Graves, Don F., FV3129978.
Graw, Paul H., FV3145345.
Gray, James L., FV3138023.
Green, Galf F., FV3145410.
Green, Roger M., FV3135980.
Greenberg, Samuel L., FV3135687.
Greene, Howard B., FV3120288.
Greene, Raymond F., FV3146530.
Greene, William H., FV3137753.
Greenhalgh, Terry L., FV3132950.
Gregory, Harold D., FV3146409.
Gribbin, Peter W., FV3144955.
Gricius, Leonard P., FV3137755.
Grider, Donald E., FV3139186.
Griffin, Donald E., FV3147192.
Griffin, James R., Jr., FV3131657.
Griffis, Kenneth G., FV3107147.
Grim, Garrett D., FV3145872.
Grimes, Fred N., Jr., FV3119571.
Groll, Ronald, FV3146515.
Gross, Joseph G., FV3139285.
Gross, Leroy P., FV3119906.
Gross, Virginia L., FV3138695.
Grund, Richard L., FV3137756.
Gudvangen, Jerome, FV3144833.
Guenther, Hart J., FV3108255.
Guin, Robert G., FV3145434.
Gulick, John F., FV3137551.
Gullick, Francis M., FV3135348.
Gum, William S., FV3135694.
Gunn, Kenneth M., FV3146437.
Gunning, John R., FV3133038.
Gurd, Leroy B., Jr., FV3120163.
Gutermuth, William E., FV3119983.
Haan, Leslie R., FV3147083.
Habgood, Carol A., FV3137095.
Haddox, Donald L., FV3128565.
Haedrich, Bruce W., FV3156223.
Haff, Richard D., FV3131381.
Haga, John M., FV3135208.
Halber, Alexander J., FV3119838.
Halder, Ronald V., FV3134945.
Hales, Jesman A., FV3155602.
Hall, David L., FV3129672.
Hall, Terrence W., FV3119925.
Hallberg, Fredrick L., FV3138860.
Halligan, Raymond J., FV3088470.
Halt, Charles I., FV3138099.
Halverson, Richard A., FV3133073.
Hamble, Charles L., FV3120292.
Hamby, Frank J., FV3129290.
Hamer, George D., FV3134481.
Hamilton, Riley A., FV3136444.
Hancock, Margie N., FV3129151.
Hanle, Glenn B., FV3130673.
Hanley, Daniel J., FV3137555.
Hannan, Samuel T., Jr., FV3131771.
Hardwick, George M., FV3132504.
Hargett, Erskine W., FV3145742.
Harken, Harold D., Jr., FV3134827.
Harms, Robert W., FV3144666.
Harmuth, Michael W., FV3129381.
Harper, Paige L., Jr., FV3139311.
Harrick, George E., FV3155347.
Harrington, Danforth M., FV3138025.
Harrington, Francis C., Jr., FV3135715.
Harrington, Gerald L., FV3156440.
Harris, Ernest G., FV3145508.
Harris, John M., FV3146129.
Harris, Joseph E., FV3139126.
Harris, Robert W., FV3145628.
Harris, William W., Jr., FV3133028.
Harrof, Jerry N., FV3156762.
Harten, Kenneth D., FV3136457.
Hartman, Curtis N., FV3145641.
Hartsell, Monte W., FV3135726.
Hastings, Allan F., FV3156123.
Hathaway, David J., FV3129193.
Hathaway, Milton R., Jr., FV3135727.
Hauser, Rarchie S., FV3137757.
Hawkes, Richard D., FV3130560.
Hawly, Floyd E., FV3133093.
Haworth, Gerald W., FV3154493.
Hayden, Hubert C., Jr., FV3145458.
Hayden, Laverne C., FV3136462.
Haynes, Ronald D., FV3138384.
Haynie, Donald G., FV3135733.
Hazlett, John R., FV3146768.
Heald, Eugene J., FV3138114.
Healy, Raymond V., FV3119592.
Heaphy, Arthur J., Jr., FV3136466.
Hearn, Robert R., FV3138115.
Heath, Roger L., FV3130013.
Heaton, Larry R., FV3131980.
Hebbard, Stephen L., FV3155413.
Hebert, Thomas A., FV3137560.
Hedges, Ronald E., FV3146043.
Heidinger, Edward F., FV3155377.
Heil, Theodore R., FV3138119.
Heinisch, Harry C., Jr., FV3128320.
Heinrich, Hans C., FV3135739.
Heller, Michael L., FV3137760.
Helmuth, Dwight H., FV3155039.
Helser, Donald E., FV3135227.
Hemminger, David W., FV3129948.
Henderson, Danny I., FV3129921.
Henderson, Larry I., FV3135220.
Henderson, Richard F., FV3129194.
Hendrix, Jerry H., FV3134326.
Hendrix, William H., FV3128691.
Henkle, Edward B., FV3129384.
Hensley, Thomas T., FV3145734.
Herbert, Neville C., FV3131038.
Herman, Richard, Jr., FV3128870.
Hernandez, Ramiro V., FV3137106.
Herreto, Donald A., FV3103887.
Herrold, Ned R., FV3131266.
Hewitt, Harry R., FV3135744.
Heximer, Curtis D., FV3146801.
Heyde, Thomas M., FV3130223.
Hibbard, Edward I., FV3135005.
Hickey, Edward C., Jr., FV3136481.
Hicks, David L., FV3156496.
Hiester, David G., FV3136127.
Higgins, John A., FV3131527.
Higgins, John J., FV3116592.
Higgins, Thomas I., III, FV3154903.
Hightower, Larry I., FV3132960.
Hill, Glen H., FV3145373.
Hill, Jerry P., FV3138062.
Hill, John D., FV3061230.
Hills, Jackie F., FV3130261.
Hillyer, Michael W., FV3138132.

Hinckley, Robert R., FV3146679.
Heiner, Horace R., Jr., FV3145254.
Hines, Jerry D., FV3136486.
Hines, Johnny H., FV3136203.
Hirschman, Larry D., FV3131098.
Hite, Homer L., FV3130264.
Hitt, John A., FV3130004.
Hoare, Stephen A., FV3131557.
Hobart, David W., FV3050905.
Hock, Wayne, FV3138400.
Hockert, Charles W., FV3135213.
Hodge, Edward C., Jr., FV3144591.
Hodges, Murry E., Jr., FV3131605.
Hodges, Ronald H., FV3138136.
Hoepner, Richard W., FV3134889.
Hoefler, Harold R., FV3131629.
Hoffman, William C., III, FV3133589.
Hofmann, Lewis A., FV3130161.
Hogan, James R., FV3133100.
Hogan, James F., Jr., FV3144942.
Hogden, Vernon C., FV3120130.
Hoien, John A., FV3135752.
Holbrook, Kent E., FV3120492.
Holin, Lyle M., FV3130982.
Holland, David R., FV3138141.
Holland, Horace R., Jr., FV3132652.
Holmes, Frederick L., FV3129197.
Holmes, James L., Jr., FV3156319.
Holmgren, Darrell C., FV3145218.
Hopkins, Doran L., FV3144795.
Hopkins, Stephen, FV3138144.
Hora, William H., FV3137763.
Horner, John C., FV3147082.
Horoszewski, Roman D., FV3155203.
Hougland, James W., FV3132983.
House, Dayton H., FV3197224.
Houston, Victor L. P., FV3145647.
Howard, James P., FV3134268.
Howells, Harry W., FV3130274.
Hoynacki, Paul V., FV3129949.
Hoynes, Samuel W., FV3129681.
Huber, Arthur S., FV3139313.
Hudelson, Gary L., FV3133926.
Hudlow, Richard T., FV3139127.
Hoffman, Jeryl R., FV3147088.
Huffman, Roy E. II, FV3136515.
Huggins, James W., FV3139189.
Hughey, George L., Jr., FV3136516.
Hugh, Eldon R., FV3131981.
Hulme, John V., FV3119609.
Hultgren, Leland R., FV3134926.
Hults, Gary D., FV3134977.
Hunt, Don J., FV3146802.
Hunt, Paul T., Jr., FV3156899.
Hunter, Terry A., FV3135768.
Hurt, Larry N., FV3131012.
Hutchinson, Thomas F., Jr., FV3119748.
Hutto, William J., FV3130278.
Hutzler, Craig A., FV3130862.
Ickes, Lester B., FV3128013.
Iles, Charles E. III, FV3138165.
Imaye, Stanley M., FV3133910.
Irby, Wendell L., FV3138167.
Irvin, Raymond J., FV3147194.
Irwin, William R., FV3128795.
Iussig, Riccardo J., FV3107955.
Iverson, Ivan M., FV3137856.
Jackson, Edward L., FV3122271.
Jackson, Edward W., Jr., FV3133181.
Jackson, George C., Jr., FV3155569.
Jackson, John E., Jr, FV3138169.
Jackson, Marshall R., FV3138470.
Jacobs, David G., FV3129305.
Jacobs, Martin J., FV3129922.
Jajosky, Charles Jr., FV3131313.
James, John T., FV 3129950.
James, Roy N., FV3155913.
James, Terry L., FV3134934.
James, Thomas W. Jr., FV3130614.
Jaspers, Donald F. L., FV3147124.
Jedlicka, Thomas F., FV3138809.
Jeffers, Michael D., FV3145445.
Jeffery, Kirk W., FV3132789.
Jeffries, Carl R., FV3155869.
Jeffryes, Myron D., FV3146193.
Jenkins, Terence, FV3138175.
Jenkins, William D., FV3156900.
Jenny, Loyd G., FV3133602.
Jessee, Cecil A., FV3136535.
Jeter, James E., FV3156685.
Jewell, Eugene M., FV3138285.
Jimenez, Hugo G., FV3138178.
Johns, William E., FV3135262.
Johnson, Clarence C., Jr., FV3136539.
Johnson, David C., FV3147211.
Johnson, James L. F., FV3134546.
Johnson, John W., FV3132563.
Johnson, Richard M., FV3129133.
Johnson, Robert C., FV3137766.
Johnson, Robert W., FV3130066.
Johnson, Thomas W., FV3130481.
Jones, Lewis E., FV3146410.
Jones, Mark W., FV3132392.
Jones, Michael E., FV3147016.
Jones, Richard T., FV3154395.
Jones, Robert I., FV3138187.
Jones, Ronald C., FV3132963.
Jones, William E., FV3132564.
Jordan, Douglas I., FV3139005.
Josef, Richard M., FV3136555.
Joslin, Joseph W., FV3156326.
Juday, David C., FV3134118.
Jurco, Joseph M., FV3138493.
Kaffka, Jerry L., FV3156763.
Kagtyama, Kenneth H., FV3128752.
Kahl, David A., FV3135790.
Kalishek, Richard W., FV3134735.
Kammermann, Charles, FV3146979.
Kappmeier, Jay A., FV3156094.
Karnasiewicz, Edward, FV3145898.
Karre, Robert H., FV3136300.
Kasch, Norman W., FV3122851.
Kasznay, Andrew J., Jr., FV3129951.
Kaufman, Brian J., FV3136201.
Kaufman, Carl L., FV3132423.
Keath, Adrin S., FV3154530.
Keeler, Jim L., FV3155743.
Keen, Joel R., Jr., FV3146788.
Keim, Ralph W., FV3122852.
Kelley, Larry J., FV3133506.
Kelley, William A., Jr., FV3147253.
Kellogg, James W., FV3156721.
Kelly, John J., Jr., FV3144981.
Kelly, Robert F., FV3134448.
Kemmerer, Donald R., FV3156120.
Kemp, Truman D., Jr., FV3156327.
Kennedy, George B., FV3135012.
Kennington, Roy G., FV3135803.
Kent, Gary H., FV3121532.
Kent, Robert L., FV3130540.
Kenton, George K., FV3110516.
Kerr, Harold E., Jr., FV3118572.
Kerr, Ted D., FV3145622.
Kershasky, James M., FV3134892.
Kessler, Thomas M., FV3131065.
Ketter, Lawrence W., FV3119842.
Key, James C., Jr., FV3133783.
Kidwell, Marion F., FV3130308.
Killey, Philip G., Jr., FV3145061.
Kimmell, George S., FV3138525.
King, Arthur T., FV3119573.
King, Carl L., FV3156744.
King, George S., FV3130615.
King, Howard L., Jr., FV3130315.
Kingman, Richard E., FV3122874.
Kinker, Alan R., FV3155661.
Kintz, Paul A., FV3135179.
Kirby, Larry E., FV3138219.
Kirkby, Joseph T., FV3136584.
Kirkman, Peter C., FV3134225.
Kirkpatrick, Edward E., FV3155045.
Kittrell, James D., Jr., FV3133033.
Kladiva, Kenneth L., FV3144969.
Klaus, James A., FV3138224.
Klein, Herbert, FV3145905.
Klenda, Dean A., FV3130486.
Kline, Richard L., FV3130525.
Kluz, Theodore M., FV3147122.
Knight, John A., FV3145302.
Knight, Ralph E., FV3154696.
Knox, William F., FV3131662.
Knudson, Larry D., FV3129924.
Kobelski, Gerald F., FV3128860.
Kocun, John J., FV3145007.
Koehler, Mary J., FV3137769.
Kohler, Gerald M., FV3154811.
Koiner, John H., FV3132709.
Kondler, Ronald L., FV3136304.
Kontny, Rodney A., FV3144645.
Koontz, Wendell P., FV3129904.
Korejwo, Richard I., FV3129689.
Korpi, Raymond C., FV3132899.
Kosco, Richard J., FV3156253.
Koury, Michael I., FV3136600.
Krapp, Clifford W., FV3130038.
Krause, Jerold C., FV3131151.
Krebs, William E., FV3132984.
Kreslins, Evald, FV3139866.
Kriese, Willis D., FV3146616.
Kroll, Richard S., FV3146676.
Krosnoff, Gregory I., FV3128995.
Kuck, George A., FV3132232.
Kuester, John R., FV3147210.
Kuhn, Frederick G., FV3131269.
Kuhn, Wesley R., FV3138236.
Kurtz, Hugo F., FV3131124.
Kyle, William F., FV3138239.
Labella, Leonard, Jr., FV3144437.
Labo, Jack A., FV3130945.
Labrant, Harlan R., FV3155083.
Labuda, Albert S., FV3120221.
Lagrone, Walter A., FV3139316.
Lamers, Joseph R., FV3119441.
Lamm, Harold S., FV3129502.
Lampley, Hinton, Jr., FV3156952.
Lamson, Raymond C., FV3138244.
Lane, Thomas E., Jr., FV3135041.
Lange, Paul R., FV3136617.
Langer, Rodney F., FV3156591.
Lansell, Robert P., FV3131792.
Lany, Peter R., FV3137586.
Lappin, Robert P., FV3119843.
Lariviere, John J., FV3122853.
Larkan, James M., III, FV3154496.
Larrick, Donald M., FV3128882.
Larson, Gary K., FV3119442.
Latulipe, William M., FV3130341.
Lauck, Robert F., FV3131066.
Laughlin, Michael H., FV3156063.
Laurits, Juri, FV3130040.
Lavergne, Kenneth D., FV3146060.
Layman, Ronald L., FV3138584.
Leach, Edwin K., FV3147147.
Leach, Howard H., Jr., FV3146730.
Lear, Lawrence F., FV3136623.
Leblanc, Roger E. J., FV3134882.
Lecrone, James L., FV3130344.
Ledbetter, Robert W., FV3136624.
Lee, Joe L., FV3139318.
Lee, Thomas F., FV3135043.
Lefferts, Horace L., Jr., FV3108937.
Leggett, David C., FV3135849.
Leighton, Bernard H., FV3135850.
Leist, William B., FV3128019.
Leonard, Michael G., FV3138431.
Leonard, William C., Jr., FV3132383.
Leroy, Howard L., FV3145968.
Lesko, Kenneth A., FV3129954.
Letsch, Ronald H., FV3146230.
Lewis, Edwin J., FV3147145.
Lewis, William F., FV3135854.
Lhuillier, Joseph A., FG3103850.
Libucha, Edward J., FV3134496.
Liggett, William R., FV3155707.
Like, Lewis W., FV3132745.
Liller, James C., FV3130351.
Lillund, William A., FV3139085.
Linderman, Charles F., FV3138260.
Lindquist, Edward E., FV3134671.
Lindsey, Joe W., FV3116648.
Lingle, George W., Jr., FV3146134.
Linnander, Marshall E., Jr., FV3154912.
Linsea, Jack, FV3154784.
Lipnicky, Ronald J., FV3134497.
Little, Cynthia H., FV3145354.
Llope, Richard G., FV3131561.
Locascio, Joseph A., FV3135336.
Logan, William P., FV3147121.
Long, Gerald D., FV3146018.
Long, Neal A., FV3055389.
Long, Ronald H., FV3155573.
Longson, Weston J., FV3133416.
Lonie, Clayton C., FV3120301.
Lonkevich, George T., FV3137343.
Loo, Gum Y., FV3147056.
Loreck, Robert D., FV3145483.
Loughlin, Paul M., FV3118650.
Loughridge, Charles D., FV3138719.
Louis, Gerald, FV3155417.
Lovett, Gary A., FV3129986.
Lowe, Donald W., FV3138269.
Lu, Gerald M., FV3146020.
Luby, Paul W., FV3135867.
Lund, Arthur W., FV3122854.
Lung, Phillip F., FV3146592.
Lusey, Michael K., FV3145244.

Luther, Alexander J., FV3136642.
Lyman, James B., FV3106328.
Lynn, Robert R., FV3147063.
Lyon, Don A., FV3155917.
Lyons, Terence, FV3146806.
MacClendon, Travis, Jr., FV3130619.
MacDougall, Thomas R., FV3100144.
MacGinnis, David D., FV3119874.
MacKinen, Marshal A., FV3139319.
MacKlem, Allan W., FV3131184.
MacNaughton, Robert I., FV3131384.
MacNeil, Edwin C., FV3129206.
Madelans, Peter N., FV3134071.
Madigan, Edwin F., FV3156839.
Madigan, Richard F., FV3136648.
Maese, Robert T., FV3128757.
Magnani, David A., FV3135873.
Mahaney, Charles L., Jr., FV3130986.
Mahar, John J., FV3131582.
Mailen, Norman L., FV3129141.
Main, James R., FV3132986.
Mair, Alexander, FV3146088.
Malbasa, Joseph, FV3131838.
Malcutt, Bernard F., FV3138278.
Malone, George P., FV3137782.
Malone, James M., FV3137783.
Maloney, John J., FV3145928.
Mandeville, Maurice, FV3138820.
Marberry, James I., FV3146508.
Marett, James R., FV3119780.
Mark, James R., FV3134162.
Markovic, Edward R., FV3136656.
Marschall, Stephen, FV3144676.
Marsey, Edward R., FV3139036.
Marshaleck, Walter A., Jr., FV3129988.
Marshall, William E., FV3136659.
Martin, Carl R., FV3137261.
Martin, David, FV3131452.
Martin, James H., FV3146832.
Martin, Kenneth F., Jr., FV3138286.
Martin, Roger, FV3138287.
Martin, Russell D., FV3131068.
Martinez, Anthony, III, FV3139010.
Martinich, Raymond J., FV3131171.
Martinson, Lynn F., FV3136666.
Maryak, James E., FV3119856.
Mason, Chester B., FV3137128.
Mason, David J., FV3136309.
Mason, Gary B., FV3147206.
Masson, John D., FV3120137.
Massucci, Martin J., FV3137129.
Mata, Raymond, FV3137604.
Mathiesen, Alan F., FV3138292.
Mattern, Charles E., FV3139195.
Matthews, Roosevelt, Jr., FV3136669.
Matthys, John E., FV3136670.
Mattox, Gary F., FV3120251.
Matula, Raymond E., FV3132573.
Maurfr, Linn D., FV3144673.
May, Douglas L., FV3154929.
May, James N., FV3138509.
May, William L., FV3130463.
Mays, Abraham W., Jr., FV3119965.
McAlhaney, Henry T., FV3144931.
McCann, Dennis D., FV3120176.
McCarthy, Charles I., FV3155355.
McCarthy, James F., FV3132810.
McCarthy, William H., FV3155887.
McCauley, Thomas H., FV3135897.
McClanahan, Nofie A., Jr., FV3132016.
McClelland, Walter C., FV3138265.
McClure, Michael J., FV3137138.
McCollum, Frederick G., Jr., FV3155514.
McComb, David M., Jr., FV3139069.
McCormick, James M., FV3131041.
McCoy, Billy G., FV3156594.
McCutchon, Gary W., FV3145685.
McDaniel, Douglas D., FV3120177.
McDaniel, William F., Jr., FV3145450.
McDaniel, William H., FV3138306.
McDorman, James P., FV3135149.
McEnaney, James P., FV3137147.
McGarrity, William E., II, FV3136685.
McGavern, Cecil G., Jr., FV3128956.
McGovern, Michael D., FV3155448.
McGuire, James M., FV3147001.
McIlwain, Bruce D., FV3135096.
McIntosh, Raymond P., FV3135908.
McInturff, Thomas F., FV3146847.
McIntyre, Jack S., FV3135069.
McKay, James D., FV3130871.
McKinney, Steven I., FV3139295.
McKinnis, Michael F., FV3134796.
McKinsey, William G., FV3120305.
McKnight, Dan W., FV3129250.
McLaren, Robert D., FV3134530.
McLaughlin, Marvon D., FV3145581.
McLean, Laughlin D., FV3154891.
McMaster, Robert E., FV3136701.
McMullen, James H., FV3139070.
McNair, Billy C., FV3138767.
McNeely, Hugh M., FV3120257.
McNeely, James T., Jr., FV3120048.
McNeil, James L., FV3131018.
McNeill, Larry A., FV315563.
McVey, David T., FV3136706.
McWhirter, Jay M., FV3156049.
McWilliams, Phil S., FV3133144.
Meads, Laster B., FV3136708.
Meche, Norwood J., FV3130677.
Medeiros, Alfred L., FV3119875.
Meeks, Richard S., FV3128983.
Mehlhaff, Thomas H., FV3135923.
Meier, Louis A., FV3132182.
Meiser, Bruce R., FV3137162.
Meiwald, Frederick C., FV3146075.
Melander, Martin G., FV3130018.
Melia, Robert E., FV3144675.
Menfely, Clinton T., FV3155272.
Merdian, Richard S., FV3131071.
Merrick, Joseph F., FV3131172.
Merrill, Kenneth W., FV3156814.
Merritt, Robert K., FV3136715.
Metzger, Charles F., FV3119802.
Meunier, David R., FV3147250.
Meyer, John C., FV3128145.
Meyer, Kenneth V., FV3129703.
Meyer, Louis H., FV3147004.
Meyers, Gerald J., FV3147219.
Meyerson, Steven G., FV3139150.
Michaels, Ronald S., FV3138328.
Michalewich, Melvy, FV3145909.
Michaud, Edward R., FV3154892.
Miconi, William, FV3137167.
Middleton, Larry J., FV3131185.
Mielarecht, Robert D., FV3119896.
Millikin, Richard M., III, FV3156335.
Millard, John C., FV3136718.
Miller, Billy J., FV3134592.
Miller, Carter S., FV3119942.
Miller, Gerald L., FV3120178.
Miller, Henry L., FV3155579.
Miller, James B., FV3145229.
Miller, James C., Jr., FV3145272.
Miller, John L., FV3119211.
Miller, Kent, J. S., FV3134557.
Miller, Larry N., FV3135932.
Miller, Lawrence D., FV3156134.
Miller, Maynard M., FV3129209.
Miller, Michael F., FV3146850.
Miller, Paul R., FV3136723.
Miller, Robert J., FV3156336.
Miller, Robert L., FV3135047.
Miller, Stephen R., FV3136311.
Miller, Teddie I., FV3132576.
Miller, William H., FV3146528.
Millikin, Jay P., FV3136727.
Millington, Walter S., FV3155969.
Millis, David C., FV3129211.
Mincey, Willard K., FV3132429.
Miranda, Frederick I., FV3138334.
Mitchell, Edward H., FV3135939.
Mitchell, Lawrence A., FV3137790.
Mize, John D., FV3135940.
Mock, James W., III, FV3146412.
Modic, Richard V., FV3135098.
Moe, Dennis E., FV3144528.
Molina, Francisco D., FV3132313.
Moller, Peter, FV3132941.
Molohosky, Serge P., FV3131926.
Monette, Neal E., FV3132430.
Monroe, Franklin R., FV3145331.
Monroe, Richard E., FV3155317.
Moody, Forrest N., FV3138343.
Moody, Robert A., FV3145113.
Moody, Thomas R., FV3131020.
Moore, Charles E., FV3132395.
Moore, Herbert W., Jr., FV3156229.
Moore, Kenneth K., FV3134694.
Moore, Lloyd T., Jr., FV3155298.
Moore, Robert E., FV3146171.
Moore, Warren A., FV3109562.
Moorman, Frank T., FV3135943.
Morales, William R., FV3136741.
Morgan, Ivan G., FV3108173.
Morgan, Raymond L., Jr., FV3129907.
Morgan, Stanley R., FV3129405.
Morrell, Billy T., FV3064598.
Morris, David L., FV3133683.
Morris, Frankie E., FV3135303.
Morris, Neal R., FV3136747.
Morris, Richard N., FV3130527.
Morrison, Cameron E., Jr., FV3129407.
Morrison, Kenneth R., FV3137794.
Morrison, Rufus M., FV3138756.
Morrison, William C., FV3146181.
Morrissey, Leonard P., FV3131201.
Morrow, James R., Jr., FV3108478.
Mortenson, Robert F., Jr., FV3134953.
Mortier, Gerald R., FV3138790.
Morton, John T., FV3127930.
Morton, Richard I., FV3134884.
Moss, Charles E., FV3137854.
Moyer, George A., Jr., FV3134502.
Mueller, John C., FV3129077.
Mulder, R. R., FV3132753.
Muller, Michael, FV3139087.
Mullins, Meredith W., FV3144406.
Munger, Herbert F., FV3122856.
Murdock, Ronald D., FV3118675.
Murphy, Francis I., FV3135242.
Murphy, James L., FV3156603.
Murphy, James M., FV3134686.
Murphy, Karl D., FV3137188.
Murphy, William R., FV3131564.
Murray, George F., Jr., FV3129708.
Murray, Roger M., Jr., FV3130073.
Murrian, Richard T., FV3147024.
Myers, Jerry I., FV3138151.
Myers, John P., FV3132262.
Nappi, Ronald, FV3135951.
Nauseff, John M., FV3155503.
Neal, Richard L., FV3134699.
Neid, Edward C., FV3131186.
Neighbors, Gary I., FV3134798.
Nelson, Elvis J., FV3131202.
Nelson, Phillip H., FV3130074.
Nelson, Ronald E., FV3135955.
Nemeth, Joseph S., FV3129258.
Nesmith, Liston R., Jr., FV3145304.
Ness, Buford D., FV3119611.
Ness, Peter, FV3138365.
Neville, Robert R., III, FV3132239.
Newcomb, Wallace G., FV3130931.
Newland, Curtis A., FV3139134.
Newman, Daniel R., FV3129709.
Newman, Hartley S., Jr., FV3134799.
Newman, Samuel C., FV3146858.
Ng, Samuel C. W., FV3144539.
Nicholls, James R., FV3134955.
Nichols, Roy W., Jr., FV3135956.
Nicholson, Robert B., FV3146573.
Nickels, Charl W., Jr., FV3147173.
Niemeyer, Richard I., FV3120213.
Niquette, Thomas H., FV3129262.
Noell, Nelson H., FV3146215.
Nolan, Gerald T., FV3128095.
Nordan, Curtis R., Jr., FV3130019.
Norris, Gordon B., FV3120382.
Nottoli, James V., FV3120355.
Nowak, James E., FV3136773.
Nycz, Joseph H., FV3134767.
Nye, James W., FV3154834.
Nye, Jerrold L., FV3130872.
Oakley, Stephen G., FV3146444.
O'Brien, David D., FV3137798.
O'Brien, Donald R., FV3155606.
Oclair, David F., FV3155168.
O'Donnell, Walter F., FV3138377.
Oflschlager, Donald A., FV3144997.
Offer, Edwin R., FV3135969.
Ogden, Richard W., FW3134421.
Ogrodnick, Thomas M., FV3122194.
Ohnstad, Fills A., FV3129411.
Olander, Nels T., FV3155972.
Oldham, Albert T., FV3133107.
Olson, Orrin J., FV3131732.
Olson, Ralph E. A., FV3138787.
Olson, Richard W., FV3145769.
O'Neil, Burton D., FV3131495.
O'Neill, Philip J., Jr., FV3138382.
Orcutt, James R., FV3134522.
Orlowsky, Rorys, FV3131320.
Ort, Larry M., FV3120307.
Osborn, Terrell J., FV3146964.
Osborne, Robert L., FV3131777.

Osborne, Zackie F., FV3156915.
Osgood, Eric M., FV3146550.
Oss, John P., FV3138789.
Owens, Thomas E., FV3133367.
Pace, Jack L., FV3133838.
Paganoni, John A., FV3145602.
Pankau, Larry J., FV3136316.
Pankhurst, John F., FV3134703.
Papizan, Stanley D., FV3154932.
Parcelewicz, John M., FV3138302.
Parham, Donald M., FV3146022.
Parist, John T., FV3155012.
Parkhurst, Perrin F., FV3131889.
Parlette, David J., FV3129958.
Parrott, Evan H., Jr., FV3144685.
Parsons, Melvin I., FV3133640.
Pasieczny, Reginald E., FV3137232.
Passey, Glenn T., FV3132795.
Pate, Louis M., Jr., FV3139300.
Patterson, William R., FV3144971.
Paul, William S., FV3137235.
Pauley, Jerome S., FV3139152.
Paulson, James R., FV3120116.
Payne, Thomas J., FV3155641.
Peacock, Clay E., Jr., FV3145740.
Pearce, Jerry I., FV3138399.
Pearson, Anthony J., FV3137172.
Pearson, Robert F., FV3135987.
Pease, Ronald K., FV3128714.
Peavler, Louis J., FV31287861.
Peca, Louis J., FV3138401.
Peck, Harry R., FV3119989.
Pederson, Dennis G., FV3154863.
Pefries, Hervey A., FV3134606.
Peloquin, Andrew J., FV3154913.
Pence, Reece C., Jr., FV3136802.
Pendergast, Richard, FV3132277.
Penman, Robert D., FV3128149.
Pennington, Charles D., FV3132780.
Peppier, Robert W., FV3130906.
Perkins, Paul J., FV3145953.
Perkins, Ernest R., FV3119759.
Perkins, Joseph H., FV3137802.
Perkins, Thomas R., FV3146588.
Perrill, Walter A., FV3135994.
Peters, Lawrence W., FV3137243.
Petersen, Loren M., FV3133459.
Peterson, Earle C., FV3122881.
Peterson, William R., FV3147139.
Pettit, Lyle S., Jr., FV3144778.
Pfannkuch, Kurt J., FV3135073.
Pfeiffer, Edward H., Jr., FV3120360.
Pfeil, Kennert A., FV3132684.
Phenicie, Paul O., FV3156096.
Pianalto, Albert G., FV3136814.
Pickell, Charles R., FV3130652.
Pierce, Edward L., FV3130022.
Pierson, Silas J., FV3155473.
Pike, James E., FV3135244.
Pilkington, David L., FV3119692.
Pimentel, Antonio T., FV3134446.
Pinckard, Noel P., FV3132911.
Pino, Cristobal, FV3137253.
Piper, William F., III, FV3138816.
Pitman, Edward S., FV3145900.
Pittman, Nathan S., FV3146952.
Pizzo, Eugene T., Jr., FV3139323.
Pladars, Andris, FV3121568.
Platek, Anthony W., FV3130077.
Plenert, Jerry M., FV3154405.
Plunkett, Wilfred W., FV3138817.
Pocock, Donald L., FV3134049.
Poe, Lewis W., FV2207613.
Poehler, Michael S., FV3129216.
Poelzl, Paul R., FV3155015.
Polansky, Thomas W., FV3137255.
Poling, Howard E., Jr., FV3131796.
Polk, Robert C., FV3119265.
Pollard, Allen C., FV3132862.
Ponte, David, J., FV3136008.
Porft, Yves A., FV3146973.
Porten, Ronald E., FV3131419.
Porter, Samuel E., FV3136821.
Posgate, James C., Jr., FV3145720.
Poteet, Leon J., FV3155582.
Potter, Gerald G., FV3132094.
Potter, Robert K., FV3120353.
Potts, Douglas W., FV3129928.
Potts, William R., III, FV3132912.
Poucher, Frank I, Jr., FV3131156.
Powers, Lehman C., FV3156553.
Praeger, Ralph S., FV3154406.
Presley, Adrian F., FV3138426.
Prifre, Arthur G., Jr., FV3134343.
Primoli, Dennis I., FV3156981.
Pringle, Peter C., FV3131455.
Proctor, Cortez, A., FV3132398.
Procyson, John J., FV3138429.
Proffitt, Thomas O., FV3156725.
Proteau, Robert I., FV3129219.
Pshide, William W., FV3138430.
Pund, Harry C., III, FV3156341.
Purser, Tom V., FV3129811.
Puscher, Edward A., FV3132188.
Pyle, Darrel E., FV3145936.
Quayle, Dean W., FV3156844.
Quigley, William S., Jr., FV3155842.
Quill, Emmet C., FV3145899.
Quillin, Raymond L., FV3128966.
Quin, Ernest J., FV3147059.
Quirk, John T., FV3145189.
Raar, Wayne I., FV3131826.
Rabbitt, James F., FV3131417.
Rackley, Hubert J., FV3136837.
Rader, Robert D., FV3132189.
Rager, Ira S., FV3132021.
Ragni, James E., FV3128264.
Rains, James F., FV3135205.
Raison, William T., FV3135075.
Ramthun, Gary I., FV3139167.
Ramunas, Vilius, FV3122859.
Randall, Michael W., FV3136840.
Randow, Charles I., III, FV3155251.
Rasmussen, Roy H., FV3134609.
Raspet, David, FV3131023.
Ratcliffe, James A., FV3119830.
Rawlins, Jerry C., FV3119969.
Rawson, David P., FV3137809.
Ray, Darel H., FV3145572.
Ray, James F., FV3128120.
Raymond, Donald M., FV3154738.
Raynes, George D., FV3132700.
Rfbello, Ventora, J. Jr., FV3136842.
Reece, James L., FV3133952.
Reece, John M., FV3118989.
Reed, Darrell, D., FV3155644.
Reed, Walter A., Jr., FV3120153.
Reese, Clayton T., Jr., FV3132191.
Reese, Donald F., FV3120220.
Reh, Lawrence, FV3129991.
Reid, Barry L., FV3134566.
Reifel, Gareld L., FV3134131.
Reimann, Rene, Jr., FV3138443.
Reinan, Curtis V., FV3135353.
Renner, Robert L., FV3108074.
Renoue, Ronald R., FV3139088.
Rentz, Levy M., Jr., FV3156343.
Reutershan, Roger C., FV3144993.
Rewis, John J., FV3144544.
Rexroad, Ronald R., FV3137811.
Reyes, Rogelio, Jr., FV3138834.
Reynolds, Donald L., FV3134089.
Reynolds, John T., FV3146104.
Reynolds, Robert R., FV 3132720.
Rhodes, Kenneth F., FV3156407.
Rice, Charles I., FV3134242.
Rice, Stanley S., FV3155262.
Richardson, Michael E., FV3131203.
Richman, Robert S., FV3156749.
Richter, Carl J., FV3145011.
Rider, Ray L., FV3132078.
Riedell, Charles A., FV3155585.
Rief, Charles J., Jr., FV3133186.
Riggs, Dan W., FV3136321.
Riney, Robert L., FV3138458.
Rinker, Bruce C., FV3129416.
Rivas, Roman V., FV3128846.
Rivera, Antonio, FV3129525.
Riviezzo, Louis A., FV3135281.
Roach, Dale A., FV3132002.
Roach, Robert R., FV3129265.
Roberts, Charles P., FV3122834.
Roberts, Hulon, T., FV3156734.
Robertson, Orville G., FV3154959.
Robinson, Daniel W., Jr., FV3133930.
Robinson, Gerald D., FV3131746.
Roche, Michael F., Jr., FV3145091.
Rogers, Douglas J., FV3137645.
Rogers, John S., FV3156067.
Rohrer, James A., FV3134620.
Romanat, Arturo M., FV3132314.
Romano, Rudolph T., FV3136046.
Romeo, Pasquale, R. F., Jr., FV3138846.
Rompf, Robert A., FV3130877.
Rooney, Michael J., FV3131638.
Rorabeck, James A., FV3131797.
Roseler, Robert A., FV3134907.
Rosenzweig, Stephen, FV3147276.
Ross, Donald G., FV3131748.
Royer, Robert F., FV3131842.
Rubinstein, Herbert S., FV3136056.
Rudder, Joseph W., FV3138476.
Ruddick, Robert F., FV3120384.
Rupert, Louis C., FV3145731.
Russell, Albert I., FV3135330.
Russell, Daniel I., FV3146951.
Russell, Ray L., FV3108227.
Russell, Samuel H., FV3135312.
Rutenbeck, Fred O., FV3129932.
Ryan, Donald J., FV3130598.
Rykoskfy, Joseph F., Jr., FV3144481.
Saarela, William A., FV3131828.
Sable, Ronald K., FV3138481.
Saiki, Edwyn M., FV3120097.
Salger, Harvey P., FV3120229.
Sallee, James A., FV3136890.
Sammons, Robert K., FV3131459.
Sanders, Charles G., FV3146597.
Sanders, Thomas M., FV 3138485.
Sankey, Richard B., FV3145298.
Sarat, Bartholemew P., FV3134912.
Sarff, Sanford S., FV3144683.
Sarfga, John J., FV3155396.
Scanlon, Paul F., FV3119919.
Scarff, George D., III, FV3129268.
Schaffer, Bruce C., FV3133212.
Schafer, Daniel R., FV3136070.
Schafer, Harold G., FV3134211.
Schaffner, William O., FV3155761.
Scheitle, Joseph K., Jr., FV3136073.
Scheller, Michael J., FV3130969.
Schillen, Nicholas A., Jr., FV3134074.
Schillreff, Harold V., FV3144537.
Schiros, Francis, FV3146064.
Schlatter, John P., FV3144653.
Schlosberg, Joel F., FV3138492.
Schmidt, Allan E., FV3137310.
Schmidt, Joseph F., FV3138494.
Schmoker, George W., FV3129335.
Schneider, Anthony G., FV3133932.
Schneider, Arthur C., FV3139073.
Schofield, Jerry G., FV3137312.
Schaeder, Harold D., FV3119804.
Schoeder, Rudolph J., III, FV3154580.
Schuermann, Max I., FV3129222.
Schumacher, Donald E., FV3138682.
Schuur, David H., FV3155144.
Schwartz, Daniel O., FV3136914.
Scirior, Richard S., FV3139089.
Scott, Joseph I., FV3129731.
Scott, Larry H., FV3137317.
Scott, Richard W., FV3131374.
Scott, Robert J., FV3137818.
Scott, Thomas, FV3138867.
Scovill, Chris, FV3138903.
Seale, Kenneth L., FV3132721.
Seaton, Michael R., FV3135077.
Sebolka, James B. T., FV3128907.
Sechler, Joseph S., FV3107562.
Seeley, Glenn R., FV3129352.
Sehorn, James F., FV3132084.
Sellers, Archie H., Jr., FV3156462.
Sellers, Joe L. Jr., FV3129823.
Sergent, Eugene P., FV3138505.
Sewell, Milton H., FV3136921.
Shaffer, James R., FV3155932.
Shafferman, Edward L., FV3130737.
Sharp, Clifford G., FV3139050.
Shay, Howard W., FV3129535.
Shay, Richard P., FV3136924.
Shea, Robert F., FV3130081.
Shea, William F., FV3128826.
Shaeffer, John W. Jr., FV3146752.
Shearer, Alexander W., FV3137324.
Sheets, Harold T., FV3131733.
Sheffield, John A., FV3129536.
Shelton, Hugh J., FV3156554.
Sherer, James H., FV3129033.
Shetter, David H., FV3138513.
Shettlemore, Walter F., FV3154906.
Shinpaugh, Robert L., FV3134054.
Shipman, James M., FV3129090.
Shipp, George F., FV3146556.
Shivell, David R., FV3134180.
Shoemake, Ronald A., FV3132917.
Shura, John A., FV3131328

Shurtliff, John D., FV3154604.
Shuster, Jerrold S., FV3146007.
Siburn, George G., FV3155337.
Sickles, Herbert D., FV3129733.
Stemann, John W., FV3109114.
Siltanen, David M., FV3130878.
Silva, Claude A., FV3136930.
Silvernail, Jon J., FV3132966.
Simmons, James A., FV3137335.
Simonetti, Ronald R., FV3131287.
Simpson, John C., FV3131987.
Sims, Hugh D., FV3110063.
Sims, Robert L., FV3130659.
Sinclair, Frank D., FV3138518.
Singer, Stuart P., FV3155419.
Sjordal, Paul F., FV3155655.
Skatberg, Leon S., FV3136104.
Skerry, Hugh F., FV3154700.
Skillman, Sherman L., FV3128106.
Skinner, Thomas R. W., Jr., FV3107336.
Skrobot, John D., FV3133134.
Slater, Albert D., FV3128533.
Slater, Robert A., FV3139014.
Slaughter, John T., Jr., FV3132592.
Sloan, James M., FV3154410.
Sloan, William G., Jr., FV3130679.
Sluis, Norman, Jr., FV3156626.
Smetek, Ronald T., FV3130911.
Smialkf, Walter A., FV3130082.
Smith, David B., FV3133136.
Smith, David H., FV3146524.
Smith, Donald W., FV3129995.
Smith, Floyd R., FV3129035.
Smith, George C., FV3120319.
Smith, Gordon C., FV3146332.
Smith, Guy A., FV3136941.
Smith, Henry R., FV3137344.
Smith, Horace D., FV3132594.
Smith, James A., FV3145465.
Smith, James R., FV3132870.
Smith, Jeremy F., FV3132992.
Smith, Jodie R., III, FV3108273.
Smith, Larry R., FV3146759.
Smith, Lester C., FV3130439.
Smith, Marcus C., Jr., FV3130026.
Smith, Marvin W., FV3119949.
Smith, Matthew R., FV3119576.
Smith, Melvin R., FV3154938.
Smth, Paul D., FV3131830.
Smith, Richard C., FV3132586.
Smith, Richard I., FV3136943.
Smith, Roger D., FV3138899.
Smith, Rolf C., Jr., FV3146774.
Smith, Royal C., FV3145650.
Smith, Stanley G., FV3137351.
Smith, Stanley D., FV3156923.
Smith, Steven, FV3131190.
Smith, Turner, Jr., FV3066144.
Smith, William P., Jr., FV3129341.
Smits, Charles A., FV3135314.
Snodgrass, Thomas F., FV3145269.
Snyder, Robert F., Jr., FV3133891.
Sokolik, Gerard, FV3146568.
Sokolowski, Lawrence F., FV3137354.
Solander, Eric M., FV3133422.
Somers, Robert G., Jr., FV3145777.
Sordi, Roy J., FV3119639.
Soroka, Michael, FV3136121.
Soulry, Ralph C., FV3155225.
South, David J., FV3132798.
Souza, George, II, FV3134447.
Speckman, Leo D., FV3144755.
Speer, Bruce P., FV3129094.
Speer, James D., FV3131831.
Sponeybarger, Robert D., FV3135079.
Spor, Stephen T., FV3122837.
Spradlin, Freddie L., FV3156924.
Spring, Wayne K., FV3129910.
Sprotbery, Dale H., FV3102900.
Squazzo, Emil M., FV3144655.
Stackhouse, Asa M., III, FV3129911.
Stacy, Aaron T., FV3131024.
Stames, Thomas T., Jr., FV3129226.
Stanford, Weldon K., FV3129547.
Stanley, Brooke H., FV3132512.
Stanley, Earl A., III, FV3154939.
Stapp, James L., FV3129736.
Stark, Robert D., FV3133171.
Starr, William R., FV3131948.
Stavisky, William, Jr., FV3146336.
St. Clair, Meredith P., FV3132278.
Steele, Michael T., FV3134709.
Steele, Phillip A., FV3130047.
Steigleder, Roy R., FV3138884.
Stephenson, Robert J., FV3137827.
Sternal, Branch K., FV3146994.
Sterud, James A., FV3156487.
Stevens, Joseph E., FV3134847.
Stevenson, Walter H., FV3146660.
Steward, Lenwood, FV3138819.
Steward, Ronnie B., FV3146233.
Stewart, Donald M., FV3130741.
Stewart, James A., FV3129737.
Stewart, Samuel P., FV3133161.
Stewart, Thomas S., FV3120143.
Stewart, William E., FV3119577.
Stichler, Richard D., FV3136138.
Stickell, Rutherford D., Jr., FV3156358.
Stillman, Robert L., FV3134675.
Stoddard, Scott G., FV3133819.
Stogsdill, Kevin G., FV3119661.
Stokes, George B., FV3156631.
Stokes, James L., FV3131025.
Storm, Donald E., FV3132105.
Stoves, Charles G., FV3107153.
Strawn, Dale H., FV3131679.
Street, Ernest G., FV3147046.
Streeter, David W., FV3136328.
Stuhr, David B., FV3132364.
Stumhofer, David G., FV3132307.
Stump, Kenneth R., FV3146063.
Sturm, Robert B., FV3138074.
Suoer, Richard J., FV3155698.
Sullivan, John J., FV3146255.
Sullivan, Thomas J., FV3145787.
Sullivan, Thomas W., FV3134213.
Sully, John A., FV3146540.
Summers, George B., FV3145710.
Summerville, Carson O., Jr., FV3120064.
Sumrell, Howard O., FV3131607.
Sutcliffe, John H., FV3135004.
Suter, Thomas C., FV3134711.
Sutherland, Lewis G., FV3112104.
Swann, Wesley G., FV3138604.
Swanson, George P., FV3107648.
Swartz, J. A., FV3130501.
Sweet, Dwight A., FV3120386.
Sweeting, Gerald W., FV3131845.
Swenlin, Carl E., FV3137828.
Swett, Robert L., FV3146843.
Swift, Norman B., FV3131394.
Sykes, Larry D., FV3134939.
Szachara, Walter S., FV3130050.
Szymczak, Edward J., FV3146232.
Szymkowicz, Phillip A., FV3145914.
Talbot, Donald E., FV3134573.
Tanner, Robert W., FV3156826.
Tapia, Manuel H., FV3119613.
Tarre, Gerald S., FV3131905.
Tatom, John K., FV3147155.
Taylor, John C., FV3156034.
Taylor, Joseph B., FV3131734.
Taylor, William H., FV3137385.
Terapak, Robert M., FV3146846.
Terrill, Leo M., FV3147208.
Terry, Jay W., FV3132603.
Terwilliger, Richard L., FV3135010.
Test, James T., FV3123113.
Thaete, Kenneth D., FV3120122.
Tharrington, John C., FV3132924.
Thieme, Frank E., Jr., FV3119996.
Thomas, Allan R., FV3146834.
Thomas, Jack A., FV3138907.
Thomas, James M., Jr., FV3146967.
Thomas, Jimmie L., FV3134340.
Thomas, John C., FV3155591.
Thomason, Thomas J., FV3132246.
Thompson, David N., FV3138909.
Thompson, Don R., FV3128244.
Thompson, Gary J., FV3156099.
Thompson, Glen M., FV3134935.
Thompson, James R., FV3137390.
Thompson, John M., FV3134091.
Thompson, John W., FV3145437.
Thompson, Max F., Jr., FV3155593.
Thompson, Phillip F., FV3136990.
Thompson, William I., FV3145316.
Thornton, Penrod S., FV3156635.
Thorup, Michael W., FV3131082.
Threet, James C., FV3154941.
Tidwell, Robert I., FV3156705.
Tindell, Bobby P., FV3147160.
Tingley, Lawrence F., FV3138564.
Tirman, Valentin W., Jr., FV3119615.
Tobias, Bruce R., FV3138565.
Todd, George E., FV3136999.
Toliver, Richard, FV3119578.
Tollefsen, Albert F., FV3134061.
Tompkins, Tommy R., FV3130580.
Torikai, Francis T., FV3120100.
Toth, Miron W., FV3146811.
Towner, Dick L., FV3119616.
Townsend, Howard G., Jr., FV3139018.
Tracy, Irving A., FV3138914.
Trawick, Aldolphos, FV3107165.
Traylor, Bobby C., FV3156752.
Tricarico, Vincent, Jr., FV3138844.
Tripp, Leslie G. H., Jr., FV3138915.
Trojanowski, James C., FV3120125.
Troyer, Alan J., FV3134972.
Tucker, Jerry A., FV3133576.
Tucker, John A., FV3137402.
Tucker, Jon L., FV3144532.
Tudor, Billy D., FV3138575.
Tullis, Frank L., FV3138576.
Turner, David C., FV3145767.
Turner, Michael A., FV3136170.
Twaddell, Jerry W., FV3155057.
Twiford, Clement W., FV3132367.
Twombly, James F., FV3145896.
Tyler, Dale G., FV3128723.
Ulitt, Carl E., Jr., FV3139171.
Ulman, Lawrence F., FV3137410.
Unkel, Terrence D., FV3138933.
Urban, John F., FV3131330.
Urbanski, Raymond M., F3136173.
Uren, Nicholas G., FV3145086.
Uthe, Warren A., FV3134687.
Utterback, Ralph M., Jr., FV3155768.
Vancamp, Kenneth J., FV3154819.
Vanhorn, Billy L., FV3137832.
Vanmeter, Richard H., FV3139092.
Vanoverschelde, Eugene L., FV3156489.
Vecchio, Joseph J., FV3138593.
Venable, Grady P., FV3155091.
Vick, David R., FV3137955.
Vickrey, Charles W., FV3135108.
Vida, Joseph T., FV3156370.
Vierno, George P., FV3146574.
Vines, Thomas L., FV3120070.
Viscasillas, Philip A., FV3131439.
Vogel, John M., FV3145864.
Wade, James W., FV3132513.
Wadsworth, Peter, FV3154598.
Wagner, James A., FV3130052.
Wagner, Richard C., FV3156056.
Walker, David D., FV3138602.
Walker, Gary L., FV3130441.
Walker, Hubert C., Jr., FV3145724.
Wall, Jerald C., FV3146606.
Wallace, Paul A., Jr., FV3129163.
Walling, Thomas O., FV3137425.
Walsh, Louis C., FV3132370.
Walters, Roger W., FV3131684.
Waltman, Richard P., FV3315299.
Walton, George T., Jr., FV3136193.
Wandling, Larry W., FV3135110.
Wang, Joseph C. T., FV3132139.
Ward, Jerrold D., FV3135235.
Warddrip, Robert L., FV3147111.
Warf, Christopher G., FV3134727.
Warren, Elton A., Jr., FV3128836.
Warren, John R., FV3130000.
Watson, Michael D., FV3156371.
Watson, William M., FV2211912.
Wayland, Richard D., FV3132125.
Wazney, Edward L., FV3122888.
Wear, Norman G., FV3139304.
Weaver, James S., Jr., FV3156145.
Weaver, Richard M., FV3136197.
Weaver, Robert E., FV3123934.
Webb, Danny A., FV3138613.
Webb, Michael M., FV3135361.
Weber, Joseph F., FV3130914.
Webster, Arthur T., FV3130582.
Weiner, Leonard I., FV3122862.
Weis, Dan J., FV3136200.
Weis, Erhard G., Jr., FV3131698.
Welch, Alfred F., FV3133174.
Wells, Carl H., Jr., FV3129970.
Wells, Elwin, FV3132970.
Wells, Robert S., FV3132682.
Wells, Ronald D., FV3147080.
Wentworth, Dennis G., FV3145105.
Wertz, Daniel L., FV3132876.
West, Hirum F., FV3135143.
Wetzsteon, Sterling, FV3155105.
Wheatley, Richard D., FV3135111.

Wheeler, Richard F., FV3057946
Whelan, Charles K., FV3129159.
Whitaker, Roger S., FV3133133.
White, Benjamin T., FV3129606.
White, Douglas W., FV3138938.
White, Frederick J., FV3129935.
White, Michael F., FV3138939.
White, William C., FV3139172.
Whittlinger, Gary F., FV3144416.
Wiand, Harold F., FV3135109.
Wickham, Donald M., FV3138623.
Wicks, Duane J., FV3146058.
Widdifield, Noel F., FV3120388.
Wiegand, Albert A., FV3138624.
Wieland, Michael H., FV3130087.
Wiggen, Gerald F., FV3138625.
Wigglesworth, George E., Jr., FV3137045.
Wiggs, David L, FV3136332.
Wilder, William M., III, FV3137236.
Wilds, Edward G., FV3156146.
Wiles, Jackie L., FV3132669.
Wiles, James K., FV3156035.
Wiley, Francis T., FV3138998.
Wilhelm, James L., FV3136210.
Wilhelm, John P., FV3127889.
Williams, Charles S., Jr., FV3138947.
Williams, Clarence R., FV3146056.
Williams, David M., FV3134093.
Williams, Douglas L., FV3128119.
Williams, Gary K., FV3146984.
Williams, Hoyle B., Jr., FV3133169.
Williams, Jan K., FV3129843.
Williams, Lonnie, FV3144912.
Williams, Richard F., FV3146700.
Williams, Robert J., FV3145680.
Williams, Walter H., III, FV3137046.
Willman, Gary L., FV3134517.
Willson, Herbert D., FV3122863.
Wilson, Charles R., FV3134974.
Wilson, Dwight F., FV3132993.
Wilson, James M., FV3119682.
Wilson, John A. III, FV3137053.
Wilson, John H., FV3136215.
Wilson, Larry A., FV3129428.
Wilson, Larry D., FV3137054.
Wilson, Marion G., FV3134916.
Wilson, Thomas L., FV3108185.
Wiltrout, Boyce W., FV3146972.
Wiltuck, Robert, FV3137847.
Winburn, Clifford I., FV3137057.
Windey, John L., FV3134435.
Winebarger, Forrest S., FV3137058.
Winland, Gene E., FV3137060.
Winn, Robert C., FV3138635.
Wishart, James P., FV3129750.
Wisler, Richard A., FV3133036.
Wojtusik, Thaddeus, FV3145193.
Wolf, Charles R., FV3129841.
Woodard, Darrell D., FV3138928.
Wouds, Edward, FV3133312.
Wooldridge, Dale A., FV3133155.
Wordell, Lynden F., FV3119886.
Workman, Joseph P., FV3137461.
Worley, Ben J., FV3147246.
Worthy, Howard R., FV3130088.
Wright, Lyle H., FV3131106.
Wrobel, John E., Jr., FV3155028.
Wuest, William A., FV3156264.
Wusk, Larry L., FV3155129.
Wyckoff, Robert A., FV3134518.
Yagodzinski, Francis P., FV3134519.
Yeend, Richard C., Jr., FV3119544.
Yelvington, William M., FV3129040.
York, Wayne P., FV3119997.
Youngblood, Winston R., FV3136231.
Yuss, Frederick I., FV3144439.
Zamora, Alonso G., Jr., FV3146544.
Zarucchi, Leroy D., FV3129566.
Zavatson, James M., FV3146728.
Zepeda, Fernando, FV3137852.
Zern, Richard A., FV3129430.
Zielinski, Edward J., Jr., FV3129633.
Zimmerman, Jon C., FV3120203.
Zimmerman, Robert G., FV3144721.
Zimmerman, Robert K., FV3130749.
Zodin, Ronald R., FV3156529.
Zook, Harold J., FV3132201.
Zuberbuhler, Rudolph U., FV3120127.
Zumwalt, James F., FV3155288.

The following distinguished graduates of the Air Force Officer Training School for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Barrett, James S., Jr., FV3216057.
Barron, Joseph T., Jr., FV3225125.
Blau, Stuart J., FV3223299.
Blunt, James H., FV3223552.
Brandon, John D., FV3223127.
Brewer, James C., FV3223417.
Buxton, William C., FV3223786.
Castillo, Jose R., FV3223304.
Crawford, David R., FV3223087.
Crews, Donald R., FV3225126.
Davidson, Cullen I. G., FV3223856.
DeLong, Myron J., Jr., FV3223723.
Falk, Frank J., Jr., FV3223629.
Gambardella, Andrew W., Jr., FV3223543.
Glascoe, Gary R., FV3223911.
Hintze, Robert W., FV3223482.
Jaep, William F., Jr., FV3223444.
Johnson, Norman E., FV3223538.
Keible, Edward A., Jr., FV3223622.
Kennedy, Charles D., FV3216074.
Knight, James E., FV3216077.
Lafferty, Alfred L., Jr., FV3223980.
Lewis, Bret B., FV3223804.
Malvestuto, Louis A., FV3216082.
Mandell, Bradford B., FV3216083.
May, John W., FV3216086.
McMacken, Roy W., FV3223848.
Moore, Lester R., FV3223364.
Munger, Steven S., FV3223694.
Pace, Lawrence, FV3223657.
Pearson, Todd W., FV3223939.
Raymond, William C., FV3223194.
Rich, William R., FV3216092.
Robertson, Samuel T., III, FV3223490.
Sasena, William J., FV3223961.
Simpson, Larry A., FV3223129.
Siskind, John P., FV3223159.
Startin, Mavis J., FV3223176.
Stout, Delbert B., FV3223197.
Swifrzbin, Ronald W., FV3223422.
Thompson, Geoffrey R., FV3223403.
Vaughn, Lauren K., FV3216100.
Waybright, Robert C., FV3223744.
Wayman, Robert F., FV3223849.
Wayne, George H., FV3223481.
Wolf, Edward G., FV3216101.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 8, 1968:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

J. William Doolittle, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

William K. Brehm, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Randolph S. Driver, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Barry James Shillito, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list, in grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code section 3962:

TO BE GENERAL

Gen. Dwight Edward Beach, O18747, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERALS

Lt. Gen. William White Dick, Jr., O18384, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Robert Hackett, O18380, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, O18968, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Edgar Collins Doleman, O19131, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Joseph Mark Ambrose, O460406.
Brig. Gen. LaVern Erick Weber, O963734.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Arkansas Valley Leaders Hear TVA's Don McBride

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Arkansas River Valley stand on the threshold of a great future—a future of industrial development and prosperity which is beginning now and which will accelerate in 1970 when the Arkansas River will be navigable to Catoosa, Okla.

The members of the Arkansas Basin Development Association recently were given a look across that threshold, and what we saw was both challenging and inspiring. We were told of the great future we have in store, and we also were warned of the tremendous job of planning and conservation which we must perform, and perform well, if we are to enjoy the full benefits of the development of this river.

These pictures were brought to us by Mr. Don McBride, a director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, who has studied the progress made by the TVA, and the pitfalls encountered along the way in this Nation's first and highly successful experiment in overall development of a river basin.

Mr. McBride has spent his life in water resource development. As a consultant and adviser to the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, he was as responsible as any man for bringing about the development program on the Arkansas River Basin.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Mr. McBride's remarks and observations are a "must" reading for anyone interested in the full development of America's water resources. I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFLICTS IN A DEVELOPED RIVER

(Address by TVA Director Don McBride at the annual meeting of the Arkansas Basin Development Association, Tulsa, Okla., March 15, 1968)

Yesterday 1970 was a long way off; today it is just tomorrow.

The people of the Arkansas Basin are about to be handed a completely new tool to shape the future economic progress of this valley.

A natural river has been changed; what was unpredictable, undependable, and con-

trolled only by the whims of weather is now a harnessed, orderly, obedient servant—if properly utilized.

This new tool has several handles: flood control, navigation, recreation, hydroelectric power, municipal and domestic water supply, water quality control or pollution abatement, fish and wildlife opportunities, and probably many others. Likewise, the shore lands, now protected from flood, will give opportunity for intensified agriculture, development of industrial and port sites, subdivisions for housing and shopping, development of parks and playgrounds and resorts. Don't overlook the possibility of the new town concept.

This tool with many handles we hope will be useful in solving some of our country's most pressing problems. We can assume that industries will seek out this instrument—this river which can perform so many tasks. We can assume that they will create new jobs in new areas, hopefully relieving some of the pressing problems of unemployment and underemployment in the congested cities. Results such as this are now taking place in the Tennessee Valley, ratifying the faith that many of use have placed in the economic validity of public investment in resources development.

The important question is how will all this be managed and by whom? How will the best use of this resource be determined? What sort of development will bring about the greatest benefit to the greatest number of people?

Does the tool that cost almost two billion dollars of federal funds need to be supplemented by a planned program of state, local, and private investments?

Can we plan to use this resource to the fullest degree, or will we use it catch-as-catch-can—letting it grow up like Topsy—in a way that will be costly, wasteful, and destructive of the potential opportunity? Will future generations have to unravel some colossal ball of yarn, snarled by our negligence, and start over at great expense?

I pose these questions because there are conflicts in a developed river. In TVA we have discovered some of these and are now struggling with problems created day by day and year by year as man changes the way he uses his rivers and land. This society of more sophisticated commerce and industry places higher priorities on the protection of our environment and ways must be found to meet that demand.

The physical change brought about by the development of a slack water navigation channel within itself creates new conditions. For example, in a chain of lakes, water released from upper reservoirs into slack water pools behind locks and dams down river does not carry the oxygen of a free-flowing stream, thus does not "purify" itself as readily as a flowing stream.

Another physical change that is taking place on the Arkansas is the accretion of lands caused by stabilized banks of the navigation channel. This land will become shore land usable for many purposes.

Yes, we have created a new river, and over the past 30 years we have struggled and prayed to make this dream a reality. You remember one of Bob Kerr's sayings: "Be careful what you pray for—you may get it."

But we were careful, in our prayers and in our plans. We have visualized tows of barges carrying raw materials to industrial plants along the river, and finished products away to other markets. We have seen in our mind's eye the long line of workers coming and going from these plants. We have visualized the new recreational developments, the busy ports, the prosperous farms, mines, and forests—a new Utopia for business.

It can happen—if we are as wise in planning its use as we have been in promoting its construction.

You are to be congratulated on the great progress that you have made in preparation for the utilization of this new resource tool. The cities certainly are to be commended for voting bonds and the acquisition of sites for ports. The highway program is progressing to serve these ports. Many industries are making elaborate plans for new plants. The Corps of Engineers and the State Park Department have done an outstanding job of developing recreation facilities and planning for expansion to meet the exploding demand. This is commendable, but let's take the long look and see if we can fit the pieces into a pattern of development that will provide the best for now and for the future. This long look will reveal, I am confident, a new course of action.

A multiple-purpose river development stimulates multiple demands for the use of the water and for the use of the shoreline which gives access to the water. Not all of these demands are consistent. Not all of them are compatible. The resolution of these conflicts will require your foresight, strong action, and firm decision. It had best come now, rather than sometime in the future.

I speak from the experience of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Nation's first demonstration in multiple-purpose river development, which in 1968 is completing its 35th year. It is an experience which can be very valuable to the people and the businesses of the Arkansas Basin.

It may be summed up by saying that abundant resources attract man with his tools and his toys—with his industries and his pleasure boats. In using these resources, however, he can also destroy them. We must be provided from the beginning in conserving them perpetually.

We have seen examples throughout the Nation of resources once thought to be so prevalent that we could never use them up; yet they have been wasted and neglected to the detriment of entire regions. The plow made possible the marvelous harvests of the Great Plains. It also made the prairies vulnerable to wind erosion. The result was devastation and the dust bowl in the dirty thirties.

The forests of the Appalachian region seemed inexhaustible, but they were logged off without replanting. Erosion and fire plagued the mountainsides. The Great Lakes were regarded as an everlasting source of fresh clear water. Their use as a dumping ground for untreated city and industrial wastes now has turned Lake Erie into what some call a cesspool, and Lake Michigan is in danger of becoming a dead lake.

The developed river and its watershed are subject to the same use and abuse. What seems to be plentiful at the moment becomes in a few short years scarce in quantity and deficient in quality—unless we act from the beginning to prevent it.

The lakes provided a much improved source of water for cities, both for household use and for sewage disposal. Recognizing the dangers of pollution, TVA encouraged states to set up pollution control agencies and interstate agreements for pollution abatement. These arrangements succeeded in holding the pollution problem in check for many years.

After World War II, however, a new set of circumstances entered the picture. The great depression was over. Consumer demand, pent up during the war, was making itself felt. Wages and incomes were rising. Construction of the Tennessee waterway, which was speeded up during the war, was completed in 1945. Electrification of the region, which has been retarded by material shortages during the war, went forward rapidly.

One of the first realizations to come from this period was that flood control, heretofore justified on the basis of the damage it prevented, had an additional more positive value. It protected the shoreline sites where industry could build new plants, with easy access to the water. Steadily new industries were seeking these riverbank locations, putting to work the harnessed waters for transportation, for processing water, and for the power they produced.

At the same time, the more affluent society was demanding recreation facilities. TVA had anticipated this value and had earmarked strategic lands for development by the states, counties, and cities for park purposes. But the demand went beyond these plans. Shoreline lands were sought for cabin and camp sites, for resorts and marinas, for club sites and housing subdivisions.

Out of these circumstances arose a conflict of a different sort. Recreation facilities, requiring much less capital than an industrial development, were in a position to preempt the more desirable waterfront sites. This is a critical matter in the Tennessee Valley where much of the shoreline is rugged and rocky; level land near the water, easy to build on, is scarce. Yet industries were badly needed to provide jobs for the unemployed and underemployed. Balanced economic growth required a resolution of this conflict that would permit industries and recreation to move ahead together. But even the recreation development, we found, was not uniformly good. In some instances, fly-by-night developers marked off lakeshore lands into 50-foot lots, scraped out some cheap rutty roads, sold enough properties to make a quick profit, and then left. The result was the makings of lakeside slums economically irretrievable for recreation use.

Out of experience such as this it became apparent to TVA that the most strategic resource resulting from river development is the shoreline itself. Here is an asset made of land and water having a value that far exceeds the sum of the two. It is a scarce resource which will increase in economic importance as the years go by. Created through the expenditure of public funds and designed to serve the public interest, it must be safeguarded by public action.

In this same period, the economic character of the entire Tennessee Valley was undergoing fundamental change. As farms became more efficient with electrification and mechanization, their young people moved to the cities. Industries took root along the waterway and inland from it. From a predominantly rural region, the Tennessee Valley has become largely a manufacturing and commercial region. The heavy migration to other states for job opportunities has been dwindling and has finally stopped. Nowhere in the Valley is there a surplus of trained or skilled labor, although unemployment still exists in unskilled labor categories.

These are the circumstances that have contributed to the Valley's growing urban populations and new pressures upon the resource base. The cities found TVA lakes very convenient sources of municipal water supplies, but some were less than diligent about the sewage they discharged into those same lakes. It took time for a public consciousness to become aroused sufficiently to raise public funds to build treatment facilities to combat the pollution threat. In the meantime, untreated waste was discharged into the lakes in increasing volume, threatening the usefulness of the waters for downstream cities and for recreation purposes.

There are other conflicts I could mention out of TVA's experience. The sum of them all, however, is this one major conflict: to satisfy the needs of the present without sacrificing the opportunities of the future. In its last annual report to the President, the TVA Board stated this problem in full dimension:

"As the nature of the regional economy has changed, the nature of its conservation

problems has also changed. The danger to natural resources is due less to neglect and underdevelopment, as in the past, than to the possibility that overuse or improvident use may, in the future, diminish their utility. Consequently, before damage is done, TVA and the people of the region must achieve a public consciousness that they have entered a 'new generation' of potential resource management problems requiring not only vigilance but serious, deliberate counterattack to hold them in check."

The Tennessee Valley was not the first to experience these conflicts, and the Arkansas Valley will not be the last. We could cite the Merrimack, the Hudson, the Potomac, and many others.

We have raised some basic questions. Now it is time to offer some answers.

The resolution of conflicts in reservoirs and shoreline use lies largely in advance planning. And I realize as I speak that planning is a "bad word" for many of you. It conveys for some the idea of restriction, of limitations on freedom of action. For others it conveys the notion of government interference. It need not and should not mean either of these. As expressed by the TVA Chairman recently in describing such work in the Tennessee Valley, "We must make a distinction between a planned society and a planning society. Here we are talking not about restrictions but about expanding our freedom in the future by the intelligent and democratic use of our freedom today."

Planning is most effective, and is most responsive to local needs, when it is done at the local level. Not only does the choice of functions—that is, the choice of water uses—rest at the local level but here reside the legal instruments required to guide the economic use of shorelines. Here lie the powers of zoning and subdivision regulation. Here lies the basic power to decide where streets shall run, where and to what extent electricity, water and sewage lines will be available. Here lies the power of decision as to where local funds shall be invested and for what purpose.

But a river is not a respecter of local political jurisdictions. State participation in planning is essential, and where more than one state is involved, organizational forms must be found to encompass the concerns of the entire basin and its subregions.

When TVA began building Melton Hill Dam on the Clinch River in eastern Tennessee in 1960, planning started at once. A regional planning commission was formed of elected officials from adjacent counties and cities. The Tennessee State Planning Commission worked closely and indispensably with us. Together we studied the shoreline of the future lake. We earmarked land suitable for barge terminals. Other lands were designated for industry. Still others were considered best for housing, for parks, marinas, and other recreational uses.

The local jurisdictions followed through with the actions necessary to safeguard these lands for the purposes which would provide the greatest economic boost for the area. Oak Ridge and Clinton both created port authorities so they could take full advantage of the new lake's navigable waters. Thus when the dam was finished, these communities had laid firm foundations for building on their newly created assets. We feel that many conflicts have been avoided on Melton Hill by this early action, and many economic opportunities preserved.

Each new reservoir presents its own problems and opportunities but, generally speaking, the preplanning pattern I have just described, with strong local participation, has been followed in other instances.

Now, if we guard the shoreline we must also guard the quality of the water. In recent years, as pollution has come to be recognized as a national problem, stringent standards have been set for our rivers. Wise conservation should include local programs to support this national effort. For example, the strengthening of state pollution control agencies, in terms of their available funds, their staff, and the standards they must enforce, will do much to safeguard the future of our water supplies. Here in the Arkansas River, one of your major tasks must be the desalination of the waters of the Arkansas and its tributaries. The plan has been evolved by the Corps and Public Health Service, but the funds to initiate it may be even more difficult to obtain than were construction funds for the navigation project. But it is a must if you are to realize the full potential of the developed river.

TVA has undertaken a program to supplement our national effort by pinpointing the seriously affected reaches of the Tennessee and intensifying remedial measures. We are preparing a long-range plan to roll back the pollution wave—if we may call it that—so that the region, even as it undergoes further industrialization, will have steadily improving water supplies rather than deterioration such as has occurred elsewhere in the country.

Where TVA owns land with industrial potential, it sells only with the stipulation that careful, adequate precautions will be taken to protect water quality. We are now requiring waste treatment devices on houseboats. We have an extensive research and monitoring program to prevent warm water from our thermal power plants from excessively raising the temperature of our streams and reservoirs.

All that I have related from the experiences of TVA represent matters which you of the Arkansas Basin will confront in some form, sooner or later. Our urbanizing, industrializing society, our mobile, affluent people, are making demands upon our rivers and their shorelines which require continuous counteraction.

The lesson of TVA experience is that the benefits of river development are neither automatic nor everlasting. A controlled river is like the intricate mechanism of an automobile: it must be maintained and managed and fine-tuned. More than that, if this river system is to be put to work without being harmed, its multiple uses must be carefully thought out in advance. So, to preserve these advantages requires a new degree of watchfulness and a large degree of discipline which we can only place upon ourselves. We are faced with uncomfortable decisions or uncomfortable consequences.

The planning process is the vehicle in which we can move best toward our objective. Where it is practical, where it is representative and democratic in operation, planning is the best guarantee of the greatest good to the greatest number.

Samuel J. Lefrak, a builder and businessman, in an enlightened address to students and parents at Amherst College, referred recently to some of these problems in these challenging terms:

"To tackle this great urban problem, there must be an end to haphazard planning, an end to conflict between units of government and between government and business. All must work together, using the best and most enlightened talents to transform chaotic, stifling urban complexes into proud livable cities, worthy of the American dream. No other generation of Americans has ever had so great an opportunity and so great a responsibility."

TVA was built as a demonstration to the Nation. Its experience is an open book. I invite you to come and acquaint yourselves with its story, in detail, for the Arkansas Basin can profit from it.

As I come back "home" today, it has been my desire to place myself in the role of a continuing participant in the building of the Arkansas Basin. One who has shared for so long your plans for the future can never shrug them off. The people of the Arkansas Basin, I am confident, will build in this region an economy that will be in its day a model to the Nation as valid and meaningful to future generations as that of TVA today.

Man has a strong desire to leave behind him some sort of monument or memento that will endure for at least a short time in people's memories. I like the story of Robert Frost, grown old, on one of his last lectures. A great crowd of students gathered after a reception at Ann Arbor to bid him goodbye. Frost walked away to enter a waiting car to take him to the airport. As he reached the car door, he turned back to the crowd and said: "Remember me. Remember me."

Well, I'm not Frost, but I share his very human desire to be remembered by the people with whom I have labored—and whom I love.

"That Our House stand together and the pillars do not fall."—Kipling.

Equalization of Military Retired Pay

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the report of the U.S. Veterans Advisory Commission on the Veterans Benefits System. The report was published just recently as a part of our continuing effort as a nation to keep abreast of our obligation to those who have offered their services to keep us strong and free.

The excerpt I wish to draw to the attention of Senators is a part of recommendation No. 74, in which it is noted that the retired soldier deserves to have his rate of retired pay based on current active duty pay rates. This objective is the basis of S. 2170, which I introduced, and of which a number of my fellow Senators are cosponsors.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATION NO. 74

The Commission recommends equalization of military retired pay.

BACKGROUND TO RECOMMENDATION

Retired members of the uniformed services have suffered a loss in their earned compensation due to the action of Congress in 1958 of suspending, and later abandoning, the direct relationship between retired pay and current active duty rates. As a result, military retirees of the same rank, who have served exactly the same length of time, enduring equivalent hardships and dangers, now draw eight different rates of pay. The difference is not related to rank or length of service but solely to date of retirement.

The Commission believes that elimination of this growing inequity would do much to reestablish the good faith of the Government in carrying out its moral obligations. This action would also create confidence among current active duty servicemen that their *earned* rights would not also be swept away after completion of their service.

Therefore, the Commission, recommends that a request be made to the Secretary of Defense to initiate and lend his support to a legislative proposal for basing the computation of military retirement pay on current active duty pay rates.

Don Brotzman Reports

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am the author of a newspaper column, "DON BROTZMAN Reports," which appears in several daily and weekly newspapers in Colorado on an occasional basis.

This morning I utilized this medium to express some of my thoughts about the violence which has rocked Washington and other cities in the past 3 days.

Mr. Speaker, I now submit the text of my column for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

DON BROTZMAN REPORTS

(By U.S. Representative DON BROTZMAN, Colorado Second District)

WASHINGTON.—On Friday, April 5, I viewed a scene which will be burned into my memory for the rest of my days.

I saw our nation's Capitol silhouetted against the smoke of Washington in flames. I felt a sense of history, for no American—thank God—had seen anything like it since the British sacked Washington during the War of 1812.

My vantage point was the roof of the Longworth House Office Building.

Not 10 feet away was a flag pole, with an American flag posted at half staff as a symbol of mourning for Dr. Martin Luther King.

Here it was, summarized in a single view. The flag at half staff. The nation's Capitol. And the smoke from dozens of buildings being put to the torch.

My first impression was one of anger at the very idea that there were men who would use a tragedy such as Dr. King's assassination to vent their lust for arson and plunder.

My second impression was one of sorrow over the obvious fact that the very people that Dr. King had strived to help—the hard-core poor of the ghetto—were the principal victims of the madness which gripped Washington.

Somewhere on the streets below there was the unmistakable crack of a small-caliber rifle. Two shots. My administrative assistant heard them, too. Who fired, and what was the target, we never learned.

I returned to my office and told my staff to leave the area immediately to be with their families during the crisis, and then I went to my own home in nearby Maryland.

Fortunately, neither myself nor any members of my staff were involved in incidence of violence during the terrible weekend in and around Washington.

When Monday arrived the fires were mostly extinguished. Eight persons were dead. A thousand had been treated for injuries. Arrests totaled 4,000. Block upon block of houses and businesses within sight of the Capitol lay in ruins.

I cannot speak for other members of Congress, but for myself I summarize my feelings as follows:

Washington's violent weekend did not diminish my resolve to place more of the nation's resources into the crusade to make America's dream available, for the first time, to all men and women. The conditions which made Washington and other cities ripe for the demagogues and the vicious must be eliminated.

But taking first things first, some of those resources must now be channeled to direct confrontation of those who fanned the sparks into conflagration last weekend. The law-abiding must be protected from the law-breakers. Firm enforcement of the law of the land is mandatory, not optional.

This nation began to die the day that some people forgot that the laws must apply equally to all men—that ours is a government of laws, not of men. I think it is also true that our nation will be on the road back to health on the day that the majority in Congress and the Administration decide that social justice is impossible unless civil justice is maintained inviolate.

Pollution and Progress

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, last week it was my privilege to participate in the 3-day national pollution control exposition and conference held in Houston, Tex., and sponsored by the Houston Junior Chamber of Commerce, the largest jaycee chapter in the world. As a former jaycee myself, I am especially proud of this excellent example of involvement by jaycees in solving problems of their community and Nation.

The conference was an impressive example of how business and government can share information in their joint efforts to control the many forms of pollution which now plague our country.

As a Delawarean, I was particularly impressed with the keynote address delivered Wednesday morning by Dr. Samuel Lenher, vice president and director of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Wilmington, Del. Dr. Lenher was a member of the task force on environmental health and related problems which produced a report last June spelling out the dangers posed to our environment by pollution and recommending steps to reverse this trend.

In his speech Dr. Lenher made the point that "our Nation's attitude toward pollution has changed from apathy to anxiety."

He said:

And well it might. Our physical environment, sad to say, is being contaminated faster than nature and man's present efforts can cleanse it. We must reverse this process of deterioration before it is too late. We must cease degrading our environment and start to improve it.

He spelled out the steps which must be taken and emphasized the fact that "never has there been a better opportunity or a clearer obligation" for industry to become involved in government decisionmaking.

Mr. President, Dr. Lenher's timely address is well worth the careful reading of those in government and industry. I ask unanimous consent that the text, along with an editorial from the Wilmington, Del., Morning News of April 5, commenting on Dr. Lenher's speech, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLLUTION AND PROGRESS

I am happy to be in Houston and to be part of this national conference, the purpose of which is to improve our understanding of environmental problems and ways to control them.

It is apparent that this country is now awake to the environmental hazards resulting in large measure from our affluence and population growth. I often wish that we did not have such frequent and pungent reminders of the problem.

Pollution of our environment finds itself not only in our daily news, but with unfortunate frequency in our eyes, lungs and drinking water. Reports of bad tastes in water, smoky and irritating air, and fish kills in rivers are heard all too often across the country.

Awareness is a necessary prelude to effective action. Certainly we are now very much aware of what ails us, even though we lack magic solutions. Our nation's attitude toward pollution has changed from apathy to anxiety. And well it might. Our physical environment, sad to say, is being contaminated faster than nature and man's present efforts can cleanse it. We must reverse this process of deterioration before it is too late. We must cease degrading our environment and start to improve it.

This three-day conference and exposition is but one reflection of our belated awakening to the results of decades of neglect and indifference. I believe it will give new and needed momentum to the efforts now being mobilized.

THREE MUSTS

In my remarks today, I shall emphasize three principal areas that I believe are at the heart of any concerted, national effort to combat pollution in its many forms.

First, we must set quality standards that realistically take into account our present knowledge and then establish a reasonable timetable for industry, municipalities and others to meet these standards. On this score, we are making headway, but we are also making mistakes.

Second, we must develop a broad, nationwide program of research and development to attack problems that are currently beyond our ability to solve. This research would provide us with information about some of the more subtle biological effects of pollution on air and water, the esthetics of pollution, the discoloration of air and water by minute amounts of materials and the treatment and disposal of solid wastes. Research in these areas must be sharply accelerated.

Third, to solve our environmental problems, we must embark on a new era of cooperation among governmental agencies at all levels, industries large and small and the nation's research institutions. It will take such a consortium of public interest to accomplish our goals. We can no longer afford an uncoordinated approach. We must have a total approach. At long last, we are beginning to take meaningful strides in this direction.

POLLUTION NO RESPECTER OF ISMS

Pollution problems have for some time been front-page news in Houston and in other cities across the nation. Just the other day, along with all the other news that's fit to print, there appeared a story in *The New York Times* reporting that a mood of defeat and despair appears to be emerging among scientists and conservationists in their bitter, decade-long struggle to prevent the world's largest body of fresh water from becoming a cesspool.

The story went on to say that, "Despite pleas by conservationists and assuring promises of purification measures by industrial officials, a flow of yellow and odoriferous waste water is already being dumped into the lake by a huge wood pulp plant, the first of several planned for the area."

The dateline for this story could very well have been any number of cities in the United States. But it is interesting that the dateline was Moscow. The lake in question was not Lake Erie or Lake Michigan but Lake Baikal in Siberia.

This story clearly drove home to me something that we, who are wrestling with pol-

lution problems, understand but sometimes forget: Unlike the old melodrama, environmental pollution provides no single and easily identifiable villain who can be dispatched with a single shot. To be sure, in a few cases, it is possible to identify and censure a particular culprit. And I suspect that Soviet authorities may attempt to do so in this instance. But in its broadest dimensions, we all know that pollution is a by-product of industrial civilization, whether the system be capitalism or communism.

Our task is to ensure that every American can thrive in an attractive and healthy environment. If we are going to get on with this job, we must devote our energies to finding answers, not scapegoats. Because of the urgency of the hour and the scope of the task at hand, it is easy to lose sight of this elemental fact.

NEED FOR CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM

I say this because it is only too easy to lose perspective in our efforts to combat air and water pollution and the many other environmental problems. To try to cope with the present situation, scores of anti-pollution measures are being drafted, debated and enacted throughout the land.

In 1967, the states passed 112 laws dealing with air and water pollution, noise abatement, and solid waste disposal—three times the number of such laws passed the previous year. These efforts probably will be stepped up in the years ahead.

Many of us in industry view this sometimes frenetic legislative activity and mixed feelings. We would be shortsighted—and indeed somewhat blind—if we did not readily concede that voluntary action has been inadequate. There is a definite need for technically sound regulations and standards at the local, state, regional and even the federal level. And sound measures merit our full support.

However, we in industry, who have some technical competence and experience in this area, feel we should speak out against unsound proposals. When we do so, I believe we serve the broad public interest, not merely our selfish interests. Our friends in government should not equate constructive criticism with obstructionism.

In case there is any misunderstanding, let me say that this is a time for action, not casual conversation. But let me caution that in our haste to proceed, we not compound our problems with stringent or unworkable laws and regulations which can have an unnecessarily harsh impact on continued industrial growth. Let me repeat, this is a time for action, but there is never a time for panic.

A TOTAL APPROACH

If I can make any contribution to this conference by my remarks this morning, I believe it rests in the area of challenging representatives of government and industry to merge their efforts to an even greater degree than we have been doing. To achieve success, we must travel together down this difficult road of constructive change.

To make headway, we must have full cooperation, not punitive legislation, not overzealous administration and not bitter litigation. And I think we are equal to the task.

I am greatly encouraged by trends of recent months. Despite some difficulties, I detect a new spirit of cooperation between government, research institutions and industry.

It was my privilege to serve on the Task Force on Environmental Health and Related Problems created by former Secretary John W. Gardner of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. We were charged with recommending to the Secretary goals, priorities and a strategy to cope with environmental threats to man's health and welfare.

In June 1967, we submitted our report entitled "A Strategy for a Liveable Environment." Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, was both kind and succinct in describing our report. He called it "a bold attempt to lay aside the artificial barriers that tend to limit efforts to deal with environmental health and to seek, as far as is humanly possible, a total approach to the health problems of man in his total environment."

This is probably the best, brief summation of our efforts that I have seen. I am quoting Senator Muskie because we do not have the time to go into detail about our findings and recommendations.

INDUSTRY INVOLVEMENT

As many of you know, our committee recommended 10 action goals as a foundation for the needed effort in facing our environmental challenges. Despite the great costs and manpower-depleting demands brought on by the war in Vietnam, progress is being made in some, if not all, the 10 areas dealt with by our committee.

Following this report, the President of the United States called a meeting of industrial leaders and cabinet officers to consider the program and timing of a new federal air pollution abatement law.

A few days later, cabinet members and their senior officials met with major industry operating vice-presidents to work out a government-industry approach to air quality improvement. These meetings demonstrated the need for government-industry cooperation in solving environmental control problems.

Since last November, under the Air Quality Act of 1967, a concerted effort has been under way to provide the framework for this cooperation effort. The challenge has now been laid squarely before industry and government to make this statute work, and as President Johnson said, "Stop pollution before it chokes our children and strangles our elderly—before it drives us indoors or into the hospital."

To industry, I would urge that careful attention be given to all requests from government officials for manpower assistance at the local or national level. Members of industry will be called upon to serve on study groups and advisory councils which will guide the states in developing air pollution standards.

The question for management is not whether personnel can be spared for this important work, but whether we can afford to decline the offer. Industry has often wished to be involved in government decision-making that affects its operations. Never has there been a better opportunity or a clearer obligation.

A VELVET OR IRON GLOVE?

To those individuals who participate, I would urge most ardently that the tasks they undertake be examined from the broadest point of view. They should keep the needs of the nation, its people and future generations uppermost in mind. And they must key their recommendations to the practicality of timely action.

Industry should, and I believe will, be an active participant in this national effort in much the same way that Du Pont has been a cooperating partner with Texas in this state's battle for clean air and water.

As we travel this road together, a change in attitude may also be required of some people in government. The normal frustrations of government service may well tempt those in authority to react with the strong arm of the law in cases where the velvet glove of persuasion might better serve all of our interests. It is my personal experience that persuasion often works wonders where force or the threat of force fails.

Now let us turn to another area of crucial concern and one where there is real progress. This is the critical problem of our water resources. I know this is of particular interest to the people of the Lone Star State who have an abundance of everything except this precious commodity. I have been reading with interest about your bold programs to solve the Texas water shortage.

WALK BEFORE WE RUN

In this connection, I would like to report that our four plants in Texas are using air for cooling in many applications where water frequently is used. In this way, our engineers tell me, these plants are releasing some 300 million gallons of water per day for other uses.

On the national level, it is encouraging that all of the states have now submitted water standards and programs for implementation as required by the Water Quality Act of 1965. My latest information indicates that the Secretary of the Interior has approved the standards of 30 states.

The state pollution control agencies, with their limited manpower and financial resources, are to be highly complimented for accepting the responsibility thrust upon them and performing a herculean task in the relatively short time available to them.

However, I would be less than candid if I did not mention one issue that has provoked confusion, delay and controversy in establishing water quality standards. This has been the uncertainty as to what constitutes a national water quality goal.

The announced federal policy has been that secondary treatment of municipal wastes and an equivalent degree of treatment for industrial wastes would be required, regardless of local standards and the purposes for which the water is used.

Yet there is nothing to support such an all-encompassing view in either the specific provisions of the Water Quality Act itself or in the expressions of policy by Congress in enacting it.

It seems to me that to insist on tertiary or even secondary treatment of water when there are many places that do not yet have primary treatment is an indication that we need more thought along priority lines. May I respectfully urge that the disadvantages of prolonged negotiation over mandatory secondary treatment requirements be weighed against all advantages of having approved water criteria in all the states. The road ahead is so long that we must walk the first mile before we plan for the last.

MAKE USE OF AVAILABLE TECHNIQUES

On this particular question, I believe federal officials may wish to modify their present position, if federal, state and industry cooperation in implementing water quality standards is to be achieved. The alternative may well be that the national water quality control program could be set back for an indefinite period of time. As a nation, I doubt that we can afford this any more than we can afford unrealistic plans and policies.

Along with many of my colleagues in industry, I am disturbed also by several other proposals which have gained some currency of late. I shall cite just two examples.

In solid waste disposal, I am somewhat dismayed by certain proposals that would in effect outlaw the use of incinerators through the setting of unrealistic performance standards. Surely we do not wish to eliminate one of the few techniques now available to conserve our land-fill areas.

A new and highly effective tool for solid waste disposal is an improved incinerator developed by my company. Using high velocity jets, this incinerator has found wide application in Du Pont and is being adopted by many municipalities and other industries to whom the technology was donated in the public interest. This incinerator—and probably all others—would be banned under a regulation being proposed in at least one state.

I submit that this is something like throw-

ing out the baby with the bath water. By all means, let us search for better methods to fight pollution, but let us not delay action on the basis that the best tools now available are not good enough. Action must be taken on the knowledge and technical capability now available while better answers are being sought.

MANY YEARS OF EFFORT

In the same category, I question some of the proposed restrictions on the combustion of high sulfur fuels. Certainly we must reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide in our most densely populated areas. But is it realistic at present to require the use of low sulfur fuels in rural areas where the air quality already meets long-term goals? In view of an acute shortage of low sulfur fuels, I hardly think so.

Let me say that I fully realize our government officials are wrestling with a tremendously complex problem. I know that they are under great pressure to achieve quick results.

I often marvel at their patience in listening to well-intentioned and, I hope, helpful advice and counsel such as I have just given. But this works two ways, and they have every right to ask: "What are you doing to solve the problems that you help to create?"

This is a fair question. I cannot presume to talk for industry, but I am glad to tell you about how we in Du Pont feel about pollution abatement and what we are doing about the problem.

Our earliest recorded concern goes back to 1903, when a division was set up to study systems for supply of steam and clean water. In 1938, long before the present clamor for action, the company adopted a policy which stated that no plant would be built unless 1) a workable method of waste disposal, meeting or exceeding all statutory requirements, is incorporated in the original construction plans; and 2) there is ample supply of water available for present and future needs.

Although the expenditure of funds is not the only criterion to measure the effectiveness of programs in air and water pollution and solid waste disposal, sizable outlays certainly evidence a deliberate effort to have an effective program.

SOME ADVANCES

During the past year, Du Pont expended about $10 million in facilities for air and water pollution control. Our facilities currently in operation or under construction stood at $118 million at the end of 1967. It is estimated that our current investment will at least double over the next five years.

Here in Texas we have nearly $17 million invested or authorized to be spent on pollution abatement facilities at our plants in Beaumont, Orange, Victoria and in nearby La Porte.

Our manpower effort also is being accelerated. In 1960, the equivalent of 250 employees were working on environmental control. Today, the number has risen to 650 and future increased manpower involvement to operate and plan improved control installations is expected.

Du Pont also is combatting pollution on another front. The company is spending more than $7 million annually on antipollution research projects employing about 180 scientists, engineers and technicians.

Our scientists are searching for better ways to treat and dispose of solid waste, to purify brackish water and to reduce contamination. Already these efforts are yielding significant results, ranging from demisters which prevent escape of some corrosive gases to the atmosphere to "Permasep" permeators, being developed for the desalination of brackish water.

Such efforts to solve our own problems are speeding the development of a growing number of devices and techniques which are being widely adopted by others. A case in point is the incinerator I mentioned a few moments ago.

A 70 PERCENT INCREASE IN 1 YEAR

The company also has developed a new scrubber for removing dusts, mists and vapors from plant stacks. This device is proving many times more efficient than similar types of equipment heretofore available.

We have, in addition, developed a photometric analyzer for the continuous monitoring of plant stack sulfur dioxide. New Jersey has approved this device in lieu of costly, wet chemical tests every hour. Incidentally, the Texas Air Control Board is considering approval of this device. It is more accurate and less time-consuming than existing techniques.

These are just some examples of what privately financed research has accomplished and the list could be expanded. I may add that in the spirit of free enterprise, we hope to recover some of this investment in the form of new commercial products and more efficient processes for pollution abatement.

However, whether costs are recovered or not, our antipollution efforts will continue to grow. Many problems will take a long time to solve. And I would not be so brash as to suggest for one moment that Du Pont has solved all of its pollution control problems. We have not, but we are giving it a mighty effort. In some instances, acceptable pollution abatement is beyond the existing state of the art; in others, so costly as to make processes economically unfeasible.

An industry's pollution control costs move ever upward, the effect will be an upward push on prices and a downward pull on earnings.

Even by Texas standards, the cost figures for pollution abatement are somewhat staggering. Manufacturers spent 70 per cent more on pollution abatement equipment and facilities in 1967 than they did in 1966, according to the most recent figures available. Expenditures by 392 major manufacturing companies (which represent roughly two-fifths of total capital spending by U.S. manufacturers) totaled some $290 million last year, compared with $171 million in 1966.

THE PROMISE OF A REGIONAL APPROACH

To clean the nation's waterways of industrial and municipal wastes and keep them clean in the next five years will cost an estimated $29 billion, according to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. The air pollution cleanup will also cost enormous sums. These expenditures will place a major burden on industry, particularly the small manufacturers.

Once goals are established that meet the nation's needs, an intense effort must be made to find the most economical ways to achieve these goals. For let us remember that these soaring pollution abatement costs represent an unproductive, although necessary investment.

One approach that has great potential involves the establishment of regional waste treatment plants in river basin areas that would serve both industry and municipalities. This plan's salient feature is that municipalities and industry would both benefit from the joint venture.

Such jointly financed facilities are the most economical way yet suggested to treat waste in accordance with desirable standards. Only through such cooperative arrangements can we solve this problem while we minimize the cost, whether the cost be reflected in higher taxes, more expensive products, lower earnings or a combination of all three.

In closing, let me say that the task ahead is large, complex, but far from hopeless. Man created environmental contamination and he can also correct it. And we in the chemical industry feel we have a major role to play.

HOPE FOR THE FUTURE

Our scientists and engineers are deeply engaged in the war on hunger and disease. They are searching for answers to the dreary catalogue of ills that beset urban life—from polluted air and water to rat-infested slums. Science and engineering are the key to air and water purification, noise abatement, improved solid waste disposal and rodent control. Research in all these areas must be supported vigorously.

I am confident our technical people will give us the tools and techniques to do the job if we provide them with the means. And I believe that aroused and enlightened public opinion will demand that they receive unstinting support.

Furthermore, I believe that we are now on the right course toward winning the battle for clean air and water. That course, as I have suggested, involves a massive and concerted effort on the part of industry, science and government, working together to develop programs that are technically sound and economically feasible.

We have made a brave start. We must not be discouraged by the detours along the way. We can afford to make some mistakes. But we cannot and, I believe, shall not falter in reaching for our common objectives.

A FIRM LEADS IN THE CLEAN-UP

Last June a memorable report opened this way: "American affluence today contaminates the nation's air, water, and land faster than nature and man's present efforts can cleanse them."

A member of the Task Force on Environmental Health and Related Problems that produced the report was Samuel Lenher, a vice president of the Du Pont Company. This week he still had to tell the National Pollution Control Exposition and Conference in Houston, Texas, that "our physical environment, sad to say, is being contaminated faster than nature and man's present efforts can cleanse it."

After all, less than a year has elapsed since the report's ominous warning.

Yet there has been progress during these months just the same, as Mr. Lenher goes on to describe. He salutes the federal Air Quality Act of 1967 for laying a challenge "squarely before industry and government to make this statute work, and as President Johnson said, 'stop pollution before it chokes our children and strangles our elderly—before it drives us indoors or into the hospital.' "

"The question for management," Mr. Lenher continues, "is not whether personnel can be spared for this important work, but whether we can afford to decline the offer. Industry has often wished to be involved in government decision-making that affects its operations. Never has there been a better opportunity or a clearer obligation."

Besides the 1967 Air Quality Act, there are 112 new state laws around the country dealing with air and water pollution, solid waste disposal, even noise abatement—"three times the number of laws passed the previous year." All this Mr. Lenher finds good. Like a Dutch uncle he tells American industry it will have to do its level best to clean itself up. He calls for government and industry to join hands in broad programs of research and development.

But nothing in the Lenher speech is more eye-catching than his report of his own firm's entry into the field of equipment and techniques for control of air and water pollution. He speaks of the "improved incinerator" for burning up solid wastes—the design for which has been "donated" (his word) for use by any industries and municipalities in the interest of better air for the public to breathe. Meanwhile the company seems ready to join the competition in producing or licensing gear for the big American clean-

up ahead. "Our scientists are searching for better ways to treat and dispose of solid waste, to purify brackish water, and to reduce contaminations."

It makes sense that an industrial firm which has led for years in controlling its own noxious effluents should use its experience to get into the commercial field of designing and selling equipment that will help in the tremendous job that has to be done throughout the nation.

Earl Warren's Dream

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Earl Warren's dream has now departed from lofty platitudes and sugar-coated force laws to become a nightmare for all Americans.

Forced equality—court decreed laws favoring communism—minority pressure control—reapportionment—handcuffing of law-enforcement officers and destruction of all States rights has now centralized all power in the hands of a few who do not act and have demonstrated their incapability of action or lack of courage to protect their country and people.

If racism exists—it has been generated by Earl Warren and his runaway court, hellbent on destruction of the separation of power and abolition of all legal protections.

Let no one blame the American people—put the blame where it belongs, with the so-called leaders and their guided concepts.

The flag of these United States should fly at half-mast with 20,000 American boys dead in an undeclared war—our cities ravished by hordes of revolutionaries and sacking our land. Our flag should be at half-mast—in mourning for America.

Has freedom become freedom to destroy freedom?

All about us is Earl Warren's dream come true.

Mr. Speaker, I include several clippings from the Sunday Star here in Washington, D.C., following my remarks:

COST OF THE RIOTING BEYOND CALCULATION

Washington, its normal business pace almost completely disrupted, has suffered the worst financial loss in its history.

As armed troops and police continued to patrol the city, and as burning and looting continued in many sections, usual business functions were brought to a virtual standstill.

City and business leaders struggled to assess the loss yesterday. They weren't getting very far.

Losses probably will run into the tens of millions of dollars.

Only part of this represents the direct damage of fire, breakage and looting. More intangible but nonetheless real are the millions of dollars lost because stores and other business establishments closed down on a normal busy Friday afternoon and Saturday.

Business wasn't the only loser. Once again there are no figures, but it is feared that perhaps hundreds of persons, many of them Negroes, are without jobs because the places where they work will be out of business for a long time, perhaps permanently. Many other employees are out a day's wages because of yesterday's closings.

"The whole thing is impossible to assess at this time," said William Calomiris, president of the Metropolitan Board of Trade. "We can't play dollar number games at this time. It would be misleading. What we can say is that the real loss is the business that will not come into Washington as a result of the current climate. It's the mending of that climate that's all-important now."

Evidence of his comments were all too clear yesterday.

Because of fear and uncertainty, because of the curfew that yesterday took effect at 4 p.m., people were getting out of town. Others who had planned visits weren't coming.

The scheduled finale of the Cherry Blossom festival had been cancelled, and Austin Kenny, assistant director of the convention and Visitors Bureau, commented:

"This is usually a good time of year for business, and the festival adds about $8 million to business revenue. Much of that is lost this year."

All over the Washington area the "sorry, no vacancy signs" came down as tourists steered clear of the troubled city.

"We've been wiped out," said the manager of a large downtown motel which had been turning down reservations for weeks.

The Washington Hilton reported the cancellation of about 850 reservations for some 1,200 persons after the riots began. The Holiday Inn in the District had about 25 percent of its rooms occupied.

Not only hotels but restaurants and sightseeing services were hard hit.

Many downtown restaurants were closed, although officials of the Restaurant Association of Metropolitan Washington said "we are trying to keep as many restaurants as possible open." The effect of the curfew, however, kept people from traveling to restaurants and places of entertainment.

Completely stunned and trying to keep abreast of events were officials of food and drug chains with stores throughout hard-hit sections of the city.

"It's awful," said an official of Safeway Stores. "It's absolutely impossible to evaluate. We sit and a call says everything's okay at a particular location, and the next 10 minutes we get calls that the store is damaged and closing down. And we have customers calling, wanting to know where they can shop."

That was in late afternoon. Of Safeway's 73 stores in the District, about 40 had closed down because of damage and looting. Some of the stores were in ruins. Lesser losses were reported at Giant and A & P stores.

George B. Burrus, president of Peoples Drug Stores, said 17 of the chain's 50 stores were badly damaged in the disturbances. Except for a few in the northwest section of the city, all the stores will be closed today.

Like many other businessmen, Burrus said that if all goes well most of the rest will reopen tomorrow.

Burrus also echoed widespread comments among business men on the response of the city to the outbreaks. He praised police for "doing the best they can." But he criticized District officials for failing to call in troops earlier.

In the downtown commercial area major damage and loss of goods were restricted to a few stores. The big department stores escaped serious damage, although several large windows were smashed at the Hecht Co.

Nearly all these stores announced plans to reopen tomorrow. Their executives were reluctant to disclose estimates of the business volume lost because of Friday's early closings and yesterday's all-day closing.

Particularly hard hit in the downtown area were the D. J. Kaufman and Bruce Hunt men's wear stores.

Their owners attempting to clean up and assess losses yesterday, expressed deep resentment at the failure of police and soldiers to stop bands of marauders.

"We had no protection," said Oscar I. Dodek, president of Kaufman's and former chairman of the Commissioners Council on Human Relations. His store at 14th and I Streets NW was looted and gutted by fire, with the loss running into several hundred thousand dollars.

LOSS TOPS $25,000

Larry Nathan, head of the Bruce Hunt store, at 1325 F St. NW, believes his loss in merchandise, taken in a succession of lootings, runs more than $25,000.

"We were one of the first downtown stores to hire Negro salesmen," he said. "Our people have been active in civil rights causes. I don't understand and I'm shocked."

It is believed that firms in the downtown area were adequately protected by insurance.

However, up 14th Street and 7th Street and along H Street NE, the ghetto business blocks where store after store was gutted from Thursday night on, it's a different story.

Most owners of these businesses had some kind of insurance, but not enough.

They were underinsured, particularly in protection against loss of stock. And some had fire insurance policies covering only mortgage values.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

Yesterday many of these owners were still trying to figure out what happened to them. Some picked their way through rubble, looking for what they could save. Some stayed home because police warned them to do so They were uncertain as to what happens next.

"I'm not going back," said Abraham Zevin. His father founded the family's hardware store at 1742 7th Street NW 50 years ago. It was looted and burned Friday.

"Frankly I'm frightened," he said. "I have no hatred for the people. But I couldn't stand to go back."

Zevin said that the building and merchandise were insured, but not to the full extent of the loss.

Particularly hard hit were liquor stores throughout large parts of the District.

At 7th and S Streets NW stands the total wreckage of a building that housed not only the Log Cabin Liquor Store but a number of Negro businesses as well.

Irving Abraham, who ran the store, bought the building a year and a half ago. Last August, though he had reported no losses, his insurance was cancelled. He had several new policies cancelled since then.

"I don't know what insurance I have, and what I don't have," he said yesterday. "I try to contact my agent, and everybody else is trying to talk to him."

Abraham estimates his building was worth $85,000, his fixtures, $15,000, and his stock $25,000.

"I don't know whether to go back or not," he said. "I've lost a great deal, and it's not only me. The whole second floor collapsed, and my tenants lost their businesses, too. They're all Negro. There was a doctor who had been in business 45 years, and a barber and a beauty shop. We had gotten along fine."

Within the large irony of widespread pillage in the wake of Dr. Martin Luther King's assassination, many smaller ironies followed.

One concerns Mortimer Lebowitz, former president of the Urban League, presently serving on its board and a leader in employing Negroes. He owns four Morton's stores in the District. One on H Street NE was wiped out, a second on 14th Street NW was substantially damaged and looted, and a third on Pennsylvania Avenue SE was looted.

Lebowitz was fully insured, however, with added protection to pay the salaries of his employees while his stores are out of action. He employs nearly 100 people in each of the two damaged stores, 90 percent of them Negro.

WAS NOT SURPRISED

He was "not in the least surprised" at what happened. "You know who does the hitting. It's not the people concerned about civil rights. It's the kids who want this kind of action."

Lebowitz and many business leaders believe the federal government bears much of the responsibility for seeing that business life is restored to normal in Washington.

"There is a public responsibility here," he said. "I hope the federal government will recognize the fact that our business establishments pay taxes, that they serve the community, that they provide employment to people who need employment."

What the federal reaction will be is uncertain. There has been no move, for instance, to declare Washington a disaster area.

The insurance and refinancing picture is one of confusion.

Insurance companies that have policies on damaged and looted ghetto businesses are expected to stand behind these policies, said Albert F. Jordan, superintendent of the District's department of insurance.

ESCAPE CLAUSES CITED

Many policies have escape clauses. Some pertain to insurrection. In others, while riot damage is covered, vandalism and mischief are not, and much will depend on how claims are judged.

"I don't think the companies will use their escape clauses," Jordan said. But he added that the primary responsibility of the companies was to avoid going bankrupt.

L. Manning Hoffman, president of Firemen's Insurance Co., said yesterday: "I think the insurance companies will be understanding."

From the businessmen to the insurancemen, just about everyone assessing the problem is wondering about the difficulty of getting insurance in the days and weeks ahead for those who want to rebuild. One company yesterday was calling its agents all over town instructing them to write no new business.

Jordan said insurance companies are working to support legislation in Congress to create a reinsurance pool to cover extraordinarily large losses from riots. Congress also will have to pass backup legislation to permit insurance companies to participate in the pool locally.

It would be financed by an extra 2 percent charge for fire insurance premiums. In effect, all persons with fire insurance would be taxed to pay for damage to businesses and homes caused by major big-city disturbances.

The Board of Trade's Calomiris expressed optimism that banks and other financial institutions in Washington will be receptive to expected demands for financing to rebuild and repair business establishments.

Other business spokesmen said the Small Business Administration must play a large part in making loans available for rebuilding and restocking.

NINETEEN DEAD IN RIOTING ACROSS NATION

Fresh waves of looting, arson and sniping hit sections of the United States again yesterday, and across the nation 19 persons were counted dead in violent Negro reaction to the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

Heavy troop reinforcements were sent into Washington in the wake of stepped-up violence.

Five thousand federal troops were sent to beleaguered, riot-ravaged Chicago last night.

Shooting, fires and looting were reported in Baltimore where at least two stores were aflame. Five downtown blocks were sealed off, and Maryland Gov. Spiro T. Agnew declared a state of crisis and ordered the National Guard into the city.

A Negro college area and the Tennessee state Capitol building in Nashville were ringed with National Guardsmen as a precaution against disorders.

National Guardsmen were on duty in five states, from Illinois to Arkansas. They were on standby alert in two others.

Chicago has 10 dead, Washington 4, the Detroit metropolitan area 2, and Minneapolis, Memphis and Tallahassee, Fla., 1 each, UPI reported. Sixteen of the victims were Negroes.

More than 1,000 persons had been injured and at least 4,200 arrested in about 50 cities across the nation.

A determined show of force by Guardsmen and police forces working around the clock restored order to dozens of cities that had been hit by disorders Thursday night and Friday.

In contrast to the rioting in Chicago and Washington, police in Los Angeles reported that "nothing is happening at all" in the Watts area, scene of violent rioting in 1965.

BALTIMORE

BALTIMORE.—Shooting, fires and looting erupted here last night, and Gov. Spiro T. Agnew immediately proclaimed that a state of public crisis existed and ordered National Guard troops into the city.

City police sealed off a five-block-long business section just north of the downtown area, where trouble was first reported.

But numerous incidents, in various areas, were reported within the next hour.

All off-duty policemen were ordered to report for duty, and a curbside command post was set up to handle calls and dispatch officers.

Two stores, one which sells furniture, were reported burned in the original area where merchants sell mostly to Negroes. A newsman on the scene said there was widespread evidence of vandalism, and rocks were being thrown through store windows.

(A spokesman at Johns Hopkins Hospital said the injured were arriving at a rate of one every two or three minutes, United Press International reported. No serious injuries were reported but several policemen were treated at Mercy Hospital for cuts and bruises suffered when they were hit by flying glass, bricks and other objects.

(Three fires were reported along Greenmount Avenue, a street that runs through the heart of one of the city's worst slum areas. Fires were reported in other areas. Looting occurred in the Gay Street area.)

DETROIT

DETROIT.—Calm prevailed in Detroit yesterday under the vigilant watch of policemen and National Guard troops, after hours of sporadic violence following the assassination of King.

Authorities were determined to prevent any repetition of last summer's racial riots in which 43 persons were killed and millions of dollars in damage was inflicted.

Despite the calm, Gov. George Romney and Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh ordered a state of emergency and an 8 p.m.-to-5 a.m. curfew continued over all of Wayne County (Detroit) and parts of two adjoining counties.

Romney said a decision would be reached tomorrow on whether to extend the curfew and continue the patrols of some 3,000 National Guardsmen backing up the fifth largest city's 4,000-man police force.

Romney ordered mobilization on a standby basis of 9,000 National Guardsmen in Michigan's Lower Peninsula, but reported yesterday all outstate areas were calm. Troops were committed only in Detroit.

Two Negroes were shot to death near looting scenes. Three other persons were wounded by gunfire, at least two of them by police, and three policemen were injured.

More than 100 of those arrested were accused of violating the curfew, and the mayor said that 38 overnight fires were not abnormal.

PITTSBURGH

PITTSBURGH.—Roaming gangs of Negroes stoned cars, set fires and smashed windows in two areas overlooking downtown Pittsburgh yesterday in the second day of vandalism to strike this city since the death of King.

Mayor Joseph M. Barr ordered all bars and liquor stores in the city closed until Wednesday. Gov. Raymond P. Shafer ordered a statewide closing of liquor stores until further notice.

A spokesman for the city's Safety Department said Barr and Safety Director David Craig were meeting to discuss whether to call for outside help.

The action came following a night and day of hit-run vandalism in the Hill district where scores of windows were smashed and 68 persons arrested.

The violence spread to the North Side, also bordering downtown Pittsburgh, yesterday afternoon. Police said a carload of Negroes smashed windows at about a dozen stores in a shopping center, set a fire at a supermarket and then robbed it. Several shots were fired during the robbery but no one was reported injured.

Police reported 19 persons were arrested yesterday, nine charged with violating the Uniform Firearms Act. There were 19 fires yesterday and the safety director's office said arson was suspected in all of them. Damage was minor but firemen reported they were stoned at least twice.

At nearby Aliquippa, Pa., Mayor Clarence D. Neish declared a limited state of emergency and imposed a sunset-to-sunrise curfew for all persons 21 years of age or under.

Shafer said his ban on liquor store sales would remain in effect "until such time as the conditions that brought it about are removed."

NEW YORK

NEW YORK.—New York City kept an uneasy racial calm yesterday, broken only by minor incidents of looting and fighting in Negro areas.

Police, who arrested 109 persons in Manhattan and Brooklyn during Friday night and early yesterday, termed the situation "incomparably better" following earlier outbreaks of Negro violence in which scores were injured after the death of King.

Beefed-up police patrols cruised the streets on Manhattan's East Side, and the Midtown area, and stood guard in Harlem.

NASHVILLE

NASHVILLE, Tennessee.—Some 2,000 National Guardsmen, city police and state troopers moved yesterday to seal off the city's Negro college area where two students were wounded Friday night during violence. Other guardsmen surrounded the State Capitol.

The actions, described as precautionary, came after a stormy protest meeting by Tennessee A&I State University students with a faculty committee during the morning.

A faculty member, declining the use of his name, said the students complained that Guardsmen and police "had torn up two dormitories" in a search after the 4-hour violence Friday night. Officers denied the charges.

Meanwhile, city authorities tightened a curfew on metropolitan Nashville.

The Capitol was ringed by troops, standing at parade rest with bayoneted rifles, shortly before noon.

The guardsmen moved into the Capitol area as 1,000 students massed at A&I for a

memorial service for King. The service was solemn and orderly.

ALBANY, GA.

ALBANY, Ga.—Authorities yesterday ordered bars and liquor stores closed in an effort to avoid any outbreaks of racial violence in this south Georgia city where six years ago King led some of his first mass demonstrations.

Six stores—all but one owned by whites—were set on fire Friday night and Negroes riding in automobiles took pot shots at service stations. Officers also investigated several cases of rock-throwing and isolated cases of looting. Two persons were arrested.

GREENSBORO

GREENSBORO, N.C.—Greensboro and Raleigh, focal points of racial violence in North Carolina in the wake of the slaying of King, continued under the emergency control of thousands of National Guardsmen yesterday.

At Greensboro, Mayor Carson Bain issued a proclamation clamping an emergency dusk-to-dawn curfew on the city effective at 7 p.m. yesterday. The curfew was intended to shut down all activity during the night.

North Carolina A. & T. University, scene of violence Friday night in which three policemen were wounded by snipers, shut down early for the Easter holidays.

During the day Friday, Raleigh had been the scene of major disturbance, and bayonet-wielding National Guardsmen dispersed with tear gas Negro students who had blocked traffic in a street near Shaw University. That city was quiet yesterday under control of more than 1,000 guardsmen.

PINE BLUFF

PINE BLUFF, ARK.—Gov. Winthrop Rockefeller ordered the National Guard into Pine Bluff early yesterday after gunfire broke out between Negroes and state police. Three Negroes were wounded and 354 others arrested.

About 100 local Guardsmen began patroling about 2:30 a.m., some three hours after the shooting subsided. Another 400 were being called in from Sheridan, Prescott and Arkadelphia.

The shooting began about 11:35 p.m. Friday in a Negro area one block south of Main Street in this Arkansas River city of 54,000, which is about 45 miles southeast of Little Rock. It followed four big fires in the western part of the city, at least one of which was attributed to a gasoline bomb.

Mayor Austin Franks invoked a curfew from 7 p.m. until daylight and announced that city and Jefferson County authorities had banned the sale of beer and liquor.

PHILADELPHIA

PHILADELPHIA.—State police and the National Guard remained on standby alert yesterday in the event of racial disturbances in the nation's fourth largest city.

A limited state of emergency was in effect, banning gatherings of 12 or more persons; police were on extended duty tours with days off canceled, and sales of liquor and beer were halted.

Mayor James H. J. Tate issued the emergency proclamation Friday night because "there exists the threat of public disorder in the City of Philadelphia."

Police here and in Chester, Bristol, and West Chester, were kept busy Friday night with minor disturbances including window smashings and minor fires.

LOOTING, ARSON CONTINUE, SOME EASING IS REPORTED: 5 ARE DEAD, 781 INJURED IN DISTRICT

(By Woody West)

Despite the presence of over 11,500 federal troops reinforcing District police, looting and arson continued in the District early today.

However, Mayor Walter E. Washington said at 11 p.m. last night that the situation has taken a turn for the better.

"It is much better than last night. I am happy to say that the streets are calm but it's too early to predict what the rest of the night will bring," he said.

The Mayor, with Cyrus Vance, the President's liaison man, Deputy Mayor Thomas Fletcher and Police Chief John B. Layton emphasized that looting "certainly is not going to be ignored or condoned."

Earlier, the Mayor invoked yesterday's curfew at 4 p.m., an hour and a half earlier than on Friday, the first day it was used.

The curfew was in force until 6:30 this morning.

TOLL OF VIOLENCE

Shortly after the mayor's announcement about 3 p.m., police cruisers with loudspeakers and bullhorns drove through trouble areas warning persons to get off the streets.

By 9 p.m. yesterday, this was the toll of two full days of disorder following the murder of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in Memphis Thursday.

1. Five persons dead.
2. 2,899 persons arrested.
3. 781 persons injured; this included 2 soldiers, 17 firemen and 26 policemen.
4. 595 fires.
5. Hundreds of buildings burned to the ground and looted; whole blocks, particularly along 7th and 14th Streets NW, and H Street NE, almost totally destroyed.

There were 2,000 troops in the city by yesterday morning. By mid-afternoon, officials said, 9,500—including soldiers, paratroopers and Marines—had been deployed and another 3,000 were being held in reserve.

CRACKDOWN ON LOOTING

Dressed in battle gear, with helmets and carrying side arms, the troops were quickly posted at intersections in riot areas and along main streets into the city.

Incidents continued at a steady pace into late evening including scattered disorders and some suspected arsons in the suburbs. At 9 p.m., the D.C. Fire Department, which had reported 40 new fires as of 5:30 p.m. yesterday, said it had 17 active blazes and had logged 55 between 5 and 9 p.m. Police and military units were continuing to respond with firefighting equipment for protection.

Two confirmed sniper incidents were disclosed by city officials late yesterday afternoon. Police responded to three other sniper reports during the early evening but none of them was confirmed.

The main Greyhound bus terminal on New York Avenue was evacuated shortly after 8:30 p.m., when a report of a bomb was called in to police. A check of the station turned up a ticking mechanism that was not believed to be an explosive device.

Police were forced to evacuate the 12th Precinct stationhouse at 17th Street and Rhode Island Avenue NE, when a teen-age boy hurled a tear gas projectile at the building.

The cannister exploded on the steps and the gas drifted inside forcing many of the officers out. The boy escaped on foot.

After 6:30 p.m., calls from police units for "transport" for prisoners began to increase in frequency from wide areas of the city as the curfew and looting crackdown became more stringent.

The 7:30 p.m. arrest figure of 2,899 included 867 who were charged with looting and 844 with curfew violation. Of the curfew violators, 170 were arrested between 5:30 and 7:30 p.m., police said. The others were charged with a variety of offenses, primarily disorderly conduct.

THOROUGHFARES BLOCKED

Some entrances to the District from Maryland and Virginia were blocked off by last evening and police were turning back persons who could not prove they were District residents or were on legitimate business.

Meanwhile, suburban supermarkets were crowded throughout the day and many in the stores were Negroes, although the centers are in white residential areas.

Security was particularly tight around the White House and on Capitol Hill.

The mayor, at a late afternoon conference with the Urban Coalition, was quoted as saying a "crackdown" on looters was under way, but that restraint would be used.

Among those who attended the two-hour meeting at the District building were the Rev. E. Franklin Jackson; Carl Moultrie, head of the local branch of the NAACP, and Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, all of whom commended the city for its tactics.

At the command post at police headquarters, top city and federal officials conferred throughout the day and into the night.

Among those present were Mayor Washington; Cyrus Vance, the President's liaison man; Gen. W. H. Hollis, commanding the regular troops in the District, Public Safety Director Patrick V. Murphy and other top city police officials.

Deputy Mayor Thomas Fletcher came to the command post at 9:45 p.m., after a 2½-hour tour of the city.

"The city is very quiet. Nothing is going on as far as I can see. It is so quiet that it is eerie," he said.

BLAZE AT YWCA

Even as he spoke, however, the police radio continued its heavy traffic and fires continued in several areas, including a major conflagration at the YWCA building at 200 Anacostia Road SE where flames were shooting high into the sky.

The mayor announced that the curfew would continue indefinitely, but he said the time for today's to begin would be decided sometime during the early afternoon.

At 7:30 p.m., a long section of H Street NE from 1st Street east, was closed to all but fire, police and military traffic, with troopers posted at all intersections to enforce the blockade.

At about the same time, 14th Street NW, north of Thomas Circle, also was closed.

A large section of Near Northwest, from 6th to 11th Streets and New York to Florida Avenue NW, sealed off since late yesterday, continued to be blockaded.

Federal troops began to move into the city late Friday after the president approved Mayor Washington's request for help. The mayor said in his request, "I do hereby declare and determine that an emergency situation exists within the District of Columbia. . . ."

PRESIDENT'S ORDER

The President's proclamation and executive order stated, "The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to take all appropriate steps to disperse all persons engaged in acts of violence, to restore law and order, and to see that the property, personnel and functions of the federal government . . . are protected against violence or other interferences.

The soldiers began appearing in the street in early evening. Among the first were members of the 6th Armored Cavalry Regiment from Ft. Meade.

After the initial outbreak Thursday night and the violence that continued almost unabated through Friday morning, a slight lull occurred in the dawn hours yesterday. Between 4 and 5 a.m., the police put out only 13 calls, and between 5 and 6 o'clock, only 26.

But then the tempo picked up again and continued throughout the day, the looters apparently hardly daunted by the presence of troops and the steadily increasing rate of arrests.

PUBLIC ACTIVITIES CANCELED

As one index of the destruction, officials of the hard-hit Safeway food chain said they had closed down 40 stores. They were uncertain of how many had been destroyed but at least five were reported burned to the ground.

A military spokesman, at 5:30 p.m. yesterday, gave this breakdown of troops "committed to the situation in the District of Columbia":

3rd Infantry Regiment, Ft. Myer, Va., 700 men; 6th Armored Cavalry, Ft. Meade, Md., 2,200; D.C. National Guard, 1,300 Marine Corps Schools Battalion, Quantico, Va., 700; 91st Engineer Battalion from Ft. Belvoir, Va., 700; 1st Brigade of the 82nd Airborne, Ft. Bragg, N.C., 2,000; 716th Transportation Battalion, Ft. Eustis, Va., 500; 544th Support and Service Battalion, Ft. Lee, Va., 700; 503rd Military Police Battalion, also from Ft. Bragg 500 men.

TWO CASES OF SNIPER FIRE

By late yesterday, the first two confirmed incidents of sniper fire were reported by city officials, although no one was injured.

Upper 14th Street, NW, the area of initial violence, was still the scene of disorder yesterday. A major fire in the 2800 block of 14th drew a crowd of several hundred persons and soldiers had to force the crowd back to permit firemen to get at the blaze. Tear gas was used in this fire and at several areas to disperse crowds and to permit firemen to get at burning buildings.

Lower on 14th Street, nearly every building between Park Road and Clifton showed evidence of either arson or looting or both. Sanitation Department workers were out again yesterday morning trying to clean up the debris and broker glass.

On 7th Street NW, from L to T Streets, destruction was equally bad and several fires were still burning furiously last night.

A reporter who toured the area around the John F. Kennedy playground said the intersections of 7th and O and 7th and P Streets were level. The buildings, including the O Street market, were totally demolished.

Along H Street NE, from 3rd to 15th and Bladensburg Road, the scene was one of desolation, and looters were still active in that area late yesterday. The Sears Roebuck store in the 900 block of Bladensburg was particularly hard-hit by looters.

Liquor stores seemed to be the first target of looters and even protective metal grillwork was ripped away from storefronts by crowds trying to enter.

The outbreaks, however, were not restricted yesterday to the three hardest-hit areas—14th, 7th and H. A drugstore in Anacostia was burned down. Markets and Liquor stores in Far Northeast near the District line were looted, and "sporadic" incidents continued throughout most of the city.

GOLF SHOP BURNED

In nearby areas, the pro golf shop of Arlington's Army-Navy Country Club burned into ruins at 8:30 last night—apparently the work of Molotov cocktail-hurling arsonists.

Arlington fire inspector Philip Purtell said, "I think it was a Molotov cocktail thrown right through the window."

When firemen arrived at the golf shop, located near the edge of the club's grounds at 17th Street, Arlington, adjoining a suburban Negro area, the entire wood frame structure with a glass-front was ablaze.

Though firemen had the blaze under control by 9 p.m., the building was a total ruin. Admiral Edward King, Army-Navy Club board chairman, told reporters that the building was empty for hours before the blaze and that the club had been closed before dusk.

Arlington fire headquarters received several calls for fire-bombings near the predominantly Negro Green Valley section.

The first blaze was in the rear of a group of stores in the 2400 block of Columbia Pike.

At 8:33 p.m., a firebomb was tossed at an apartment house in the 2700 block of South 16th Street. It was quickly extinguished by Arlington firemen.

The Clinton Grove Elementary School, which is in a racially mixed section of Prince Georges County was extensively damaged by fire at about 8:40 p.m. County officials said vandalism had been committed at the school on Temple Hills Road in Clinton and that there were indications the fire had been deliberately set.

Acting on a report that a plane had been shot at, the Federal Aviation Agency yesterday instructed aircraft to avoid flying low over the District as much as possible. Planes approaching and leaving National Airport were directed to stay west of the city, or to maintain an altitude of 5,000 or 6,000 feet while over the District.

A tower official said the shooting report had come from Montgomery County police, who said a small civilian plane with police aboard had been shot at in the vicinity of Kenilworth and Eastern Avenues NE.

The downtown shopping area escaped relatively unscathed ground.

Almost all public activities, including the last two days of the annual Cherry Blossom festival, were canceled.

But curious citizens proved a problem yesterday to police. Some streets were reported nearly bumper-to-bumper as spectators drove slowly through areas hit by fire and looting, sometimes while the looters continued to race along the streets yesterday after being the target of rampaging bands Friday. Hardest hit downtown were the D. J. Kaufman haberdashery at 10th and Pennsylvania, which was sacked repeatedly; the main Hecht Co. store at 7th and F Streets, where numerous plate glass windows were kicked in, stores along G Street from 10th to 14th, and parts of F Street only three blocks from the White House.

In the 1200 block of 6th Street NW, yesterday, as tear gas hung in the air after use by police, two youngsters were seen playing basketball, handkerchiefs tied over their faces.

At the 2nd Precinct, a reporter talked to a man about 20 just arrested on a looting charge.

Reporter: "What are you here for?"

Suspect: "Nothing."

Reporter: "What do you think about all this burning?

Suspect: "We're going to burn down this whole place—it might take years. We'll do it."

Peoples Drug Stores, with 50 in the city, reported that they had been forced to close down 17 of their stores.

The Anacostia area last yesterday revealed few signs of looting, and despite the curfew, considerable traffic moved along main arteries.

About 100 troops were stationed at the large Sears Roebuck store at Alabama and Naylor Roads SE and other soldiers were posted at that shopping area.

Attempts to moderate the looting and convince people to get off the streets have come from a variety of directions—James Brown, one of the top "soul" singers in the country came to Washington from Boston today and went on television and radio.

"COOL IT," MAYFIELD SAYS

In addition to established civic leaders, other local figures seen on the streets included Rufus Mayfield, youthful former chairman of the board of Pride, Inc. Mayfield late yesterday was circulating on 7th Street, a reporter said, urging the younger looters to "cool it," Marion Barry, a Pride leader, also toured 14th Street yesterday, talking to members of the crowd.

The five dead, four of them Negro, were:

Ronald J. Ford, 29, of 803 Allison St. NW, found with two deep slashes, one across his throat and one across his chest. Police said a trail of blood led from a plate glass window to where the body was found at 6:45 p.m. Friday, beside the Cardozo playground on 11th Street NW.

Thomas Williams, 14, of 4221 Brooks Road NE, who police said was accidentally shot when a crowd rushed a policeman who was apprehending looters in the 3900 block of Minnesota Avenue NE, about 9:15 p.m. Friday.

Ernest McIntyre, 20, of 40 Chesapeake St. SE, shot about 9:30 p.m. Friday, outside a liquor store in the 4000 block of South Capitol Street, police said.

Harold Bentley, 34, of the 4600 block of Hunt Street NE, who died after a brick wall from a burning building in the rear of 513 H St. NE, collapsed on him about 10:35 p.m.

George Fletcher, a 20-year-old white man from Virginia, beaten to death on 14th Street, the first night of the riots.

Letter From Vietnam

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following letter sent to me by Mike Gardner of Santa Maria currently serving in Vietnam with the U.S. Army Special Forces:

FEBRUARY 26, 1968.

DEAR MOTHER AND DAD: It's very hard for me to write. I'm emotional and so disgusted with my own generation in the States that I don't care to see any of them unless they have taken time to fully consider our national plight and realize they are cowards and sellouts and not what they call "Peace Marchers". I've not been the type to over say "My Country, right or wrong, my country", but recently I've decided that I'll start saying that because we are more right than the other side, which is doing such a magnificent job of subverting our country from within.

I feel very deeply about the loss of my close friends. They are now all dead save two. Jim Vernon was shot down on helicopter recovery and pretty shot up, but he survived. Murray is very scared but still in one piece and will come to work for Delta soon. The rest have been killed. All of them won medals. O'Keefe is the most intelligent person I ever met and came into this organization for idealistic reasons. He was on an A team which wasn't making any contact, so he went to a Mike Force which usually does and kills V.C. He was completely blown away by a direct hit from an 82 Chinese Mortar and it took them a week to change him from M.I.A. to the K.I.A. list.

Teevens won the DSC and has been put in for the medal of honor. He earned both. He had 5 years of college, was a money making professional singer and had things his way. He wanted to do some good, though, and he did—at high cost.

Jim Vernon was a big, wise gentle man who inspired confidence in everyone who dealt with him. He went to a more stringent organization than I'm in (there's only one) and paid the usual price for that honor.

Major Tu died leading his battalion against the North Vietnamese regulars who tried to take over Nha Trang. Their plan was to capture the leg corps headquarters (they did that) then go on to take over the local prison and release the prisoners to fight with them. We stopped them at the prison at a very high cost on both sides. Our Rangers officer's staff is extinct as is a few score of rangers from each company. I cried when Major Tu died, something I haven't done in six years.

I'm bent but knowing how to bend keeps you from breaking and I think the only permanent effect from my little warp will be an

intolerance for lazy sign carriers and people who discredit the democratic way of life as we know it. It's so hard for these rascals who are demonstrating to see that they can go any where in the U.S. without telling the police. They can say almost anything they want against any national or regional leader and a hundred other advantages that exist in no other country including South Vietnam. I guess our young people have so much personal freedom they are hanging themselves with it.

I have two major worries right now. (1) Living through this war (2) being able to complete my education and live in our society without going to jail for killing a loudmouthed demonstrator with my bare hands.

I wrote two long letters recently but tore them up because they are just personal and meaningless. Reality is very harsh now, but I don't want to flinch from it because it will take a very realistic thinker to do any good for our society in the years that will come to me.

Please ask my other relatives and friends to forgive me for not writing, but I don't have anything very cheery to say to them right now. This war is getting very serious and everything I do is classified anyway. I've been on two local operations on this little rest break we've had, known as the battle for N'ha Trang and both times had to fight tough North Vietnamese. We're a long way from North Vietnam, too.

Here's a Montagnard skirt from a dusty little village in the Central Highlands and a picture from Nha Trang. Also there is a shirt (blue and gold) for Jeff and (silver and blue) for Mikey.

Every day I learn better how to deal with the situation here. I'm hard and I'll make it so let me tell you about my art work. I took some bacterial stain and mixed it with varnish and alcohol and applied to some nicely grained wood I found here, after sanding it down. I came up with 5 different shades of stain and the grain shows up beautifully. Today I took them over to a nugent painter and he's going to paint a night jump, some vines, a special forces troop and a helicopter gun ship on various boards. Write soon, I have to run (Diarrhea).

Love,

Your son,

MIKE.

Law and Order

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution reaffirming the purposes of the International Order of DeMolay and condemning disrespect for law and order be printed in the RECORD.

Certainly it is important that respect for law and order be maintained. The International Order of DeMolay is to be commended for its timely interest in this matter.

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

RESOLUTION REAFFIRMING THE PURPOSES OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORDER OF DEMOLAY AND CONDEMNING DISRESPECT FOR LAW AND ORDER

Whereas, one year ago the members of the International Conference of State, Provincial, and Jurisdictional Master Councilors reaffirmed the DeMolay ideals of clean living, clean thinking, and clean speaking, and

Whereas, it is the purpose of the Order of DeMolay to help all young men to live clean, manly, upright, and patriotic lives, and

Whereas, we deplore the situation wherever riotous demonstrations, unlawful protests, or other manifestations of disrespect for law and order have occurred, and

Whereas, while we respect the rights of lawful and intelligent dissent, designed to strengthen the opportunity of all peoples to make their beliefs and opinions known, the continuing spread of disrespect for law and order weakens the moral fiber of our several nations and dissipates the strength of the free world,

So, Therefore Be it Resolved, that this meeting of the International Conference of State, Provincial, and Jurisdictional Master Councilors reaffirms the foregoing, and rededicates ourselves to the DeMolay precepts of loyalty to God, home, and country, subscribed to by free thinking men,

Be It Further Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be presented to the heads of government of our respective countries.

Unanimously adopted in Washington, D.C. on the second day of April, 1968.

Four State GI's Die in Viet Combat

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, S. Sgt. Balfour O. Lytton, Sgt. John H. Barnes, Sp4c. Raymond L. Mason, and Cpl. John T. Summers III, four fine 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.

FOUR STATE GI'S DIE IN VIET COMBAT—LYTTON, BARNES, MASON, AND SUMMERS KILLED IN ACTION

Four more Maryland soldiers, including three Baltimore men, have been killed in action in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Reported dead were:

S. Sgt. Balfour O. Lytton, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Balfour O. Lytton, of 917 Crawford drive, Rockville, Md.

Sgt. John H. Barnes, husband of Mrs. Bonnie W. Barnes, of 628 Washington avenue, Lansdowne.

Spec. 4 Raymond L. Mason, son of Mr. Walter Mason, Sr., and Mrs. Alice Mason, of Baltimore.

Cpl. John T. Summers, 3d, son of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Summers, Jr., of 1329 Winston avenue.

Sergeant Lytton, 23, who was known as Sonny, was killed March 25 in a fierce firefight near Pleiku.

TRAINED AS MEDIC

He enlisted in the Army in late 1964 and qualified for the Special Forces.

Trained as a medic and a communications specialist, he first went to Vietnam in May, 1966, and served among the Montagnards in the Central Highlands, teaching them English, hygiene and football, as well as military defense. A Montagnard was assigned by the villagers to be his bodyguard and was reportedly given instructions by the villagers to die if need be to protect the American adviser.

During his first tour of duty, Sergeant Lytton was wounded in action and received a Purple Heart.

Sergeant Lytton requested two six-month extensions of his tour of duty in Vietnam, serving on both occasions in the Central Highlands, where he was killed.

PLANNED ON CAREER

Sergeant Lytton hoped to make the Army his career and had expressed a desire to attend officers' candidate school.

A 1963 graduate of Richard Montgomery High School in Rockville, Sergeant Lytton had worked for a year with the Army Map Services before enlisting.

He is survived by his parents.

Sergeant Barnes, 22, a member of the 101st Airborne Division, was wounded in action March 26 near Quong Tri when a mortar shell exploded near him. He died from massive shrapnel wounds the next day.

WOODLAWN GRADUATE

He graduated from Woodlawn High School in 1963 and was a student at Catonsville Community College when he enlisted in the Army in March, 1966.

He qualified as a paratrooper and volunteered for Vietnam duty.

Sergeant Barnes had served in Vietnam since December, 1967. He had been stationed at Ben Cat, Cu Chi, and Quang Tri.

In addition to his wife, he is survived by his mother, Mrs. Louis H. Barnes, a brother, Thomas M. Barnes, of the home address.

Specialist Mason, 20, of 345 East Twenty-second street, died March 21 of wounds he received when a shell exploded on his tent at Khe Sanh.

After graduating from Clifton High School, Specialist Mason enlisted February, 1967, in the Army and qualified as a paratrooper in the 101st Airborne.

He went to Vietnam after last Thanksgiving and had written home telling his family not to worry, that "there was a war to fight, and he had to do his part."

In addition to his parents, he is survived by his grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Jerry Moody, of Baltimore; five sisters, Barbara Mason, Brenda Mason, and Roberta Mason, of the Twenty-second street address, and Mrs. Diana Graham and Mrs. Corlea Lee, both of Baltimore; and five brothers, Walter Mason, Jr., and Nathaniel Mason, both of Baltimore, and Robert Mason, Roland Mason, and Anthony Mason, of the Twenty-second street address.

Corporal Summers, 18, was killed in action last Thursday, when a land mine exploded.

Born in Danville, Va., Corporal Summers had lived in Baltimore nearly his whole life.

He was a 1967 graduate of City College. He enlisted in the Army in June, 1967.

Corporal Summers had been on duty in Vietnam since December, 1967, with Company B, 2d Battalion, 47th Mechanized Infantry Division.

In addition to his parents, he is survived by two sisters, Mary F. Summers and Sophronia A. Summers, both of the home address.

Outside Agitators

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. HOLLAND. They come among us, Mr. Speaker, from time to time, to remind us that beneath every human skin, behind every human face, in the depths of each human soul, there stands the image of God.

They come among us, flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood to reassure us that our God did not mean for His children to hate one another. They come to tell us that all men are created equal, that to demean any man because of his

race or his belief, or his social standing or his name, is to demean all men, including—especially including ourselves.

They come among us, Mr. Speaker, to plead for decency and sanity and that unspeakable virtue, love. They come among us and they are called Socrates or Jesus or Lincoln or Gandhi or Kennedy or King.

And what do we do, Mr. Speaker? We kill them.

Martin Luther King, 1929–68

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, April 4 is a date to be written in blood—the Reverend Martin Luther King felled by an assassin's bullet.

As the national spokesman for Negro progress through nonviolent protest, Dr. King was the single most important and influential bridge between the discontented Negro and the white community. His untimely death opens up a chasm of understanding between the races and is, in every sense, a national outrage.

I have long deplored the increasing violence of our turbulent times. Hatred and bitterness seem to permeate American life, and this hostility is nowhere more apparent than in the civil rights movement. For, despite much progress in the civil rights area in recent years, the entrenched militancy of both sides only inflames the conflict. With the Negro asking for individual freedom and the privileges thereof, many whites suppose it follows that they must sacrifice their own rights. Many of the letters my office has received protesting the open housing bill have reflected this irrational point of view, and I am stunned.

President Johnson recently sounded the call for an end to national "divisiveness." The tragedy of Martin Luther King and the ensuing national disorder illustrate just what senseless and brutal forms this "divisiveness" can take. Regardless of who is responsible for the appalling murder of Dr. King, we cannot afford to write it off as an isolated act by a demented individual. Blood is on the hands of many a law-abiding citizen who, while not culpable of overt acts of violence against his fellow man, is nonetheless guilty of contributing to the immoderate climate where such crimes can happen. Supposedly intelligent persons who would never dream of joining or condoning a mob of looters and arsonists are nevertheless unbridled when it comes to making defamatory statements and threatening remarks against national leaders and their policies. Thus bitterness is unleashed in other, more subtle but no less dangerous, ways so that man's inhumanity to man threatens to erode the very foundation of our democratic society.

Martin Luther King, throughout his public career, was fatalistic over the possibility of premature death. But he hoped that someday it would be said, "He died to make men free." Not only Negroes, not only whites—but all men.

National revolution—for what else can we call the widespread desecration of the past few days?—can only be prevented by national resolution. We must resolve that Martin Luther King did not die a prophet without honor in his own country. Violence does him this dishonor.

Questionnaire Results

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, each year I send out a legislative questionnaire to my constituents asking their views on the important issues of the day. I think the composite of over 10,000 replies will be very interesting and I place the results of the questionnaire in the RECORD at this point:

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

1. If we get assurances from North Vietnam that peace talks will start when the bombing stops, would you favor discontinuing the bombing?

	Percent
Yes	48
No	44
Undecided	8

2. Because of the budget deficit the President says we have to raise more taxes and he has proposed a 10% surcharge on your income tax. Would you favor the increase under present conditions?

	Percent
Yes	9
No	89
Undecided	2

3. Without a tax increase, the budget deficit next year will probably be anywhere from $20 to $40 billion. Should the federal government delay or discontinue federal projects such as river and harbor development, federal building construction, improvement of federal parks, etc., in order to cut the deficit?

	Percent
Yes	61
No	33
Undecided	6

4. Assume that the government cuts out of the budget all waste, and unnecessary federal spending at home, but because of the war, a tax increase is still needed to balance the budget. Would you support the tax increase under these conditions?

	Percent
Yes	66
No	29
Undecided	5

5. In your opinion, how necessary is it for the federal government to have a balanced budget?

	Percent
Very necessary	80
Not necessary	9
Don't know	11

6. Is it wise to "ease" our opposition to Russia by entering various treaties such as the one to protect all astronauts, the Consular Treaty, the treaty to ban outer space weapons, the Nuclear Test ban treaty, etc.? Some say that Russia will not live up to a treaty, so why make the effort. Others say we can't quit trying and that we should do all possible to show our good intentions. What do you say? Should we continue to try to cooperate with Russia?

	Percent
Yes	50
No	43
Undecided	7

7. Should we refuse to do any more business with or deliver any more gold to France until she has paid us the $6 or $7 billion debt from World War I and World War II?

	Percent
Yes	85
No	11
Undecided	4

8(A). The Constitution does *not* set the age at which a person may vote. Historically this has been done by the States. Would you favor an amendment to the U.S. Constitution allowing 18 year olds to vote?

	Percent
Yes	45
No	50
Undecided	5

8(B) Would you favor a state law allowing 18 year olds to vote?

	Percent
Yes	50
No	46
Undecided	4

9(A). In view of the recent riots and the rising crime rate, a new push is being made for a federal gun control law. Would you favor such a law?

	Percent
Yes	30
No	65
Undecided	5

9(B). Has your opinion on this subject changed since last year?

	Percent
Yes	6
No	92
Undecided	2

10. Several ways have been suggested to fight the increase in crime in the country; which methods would you favor? The methods were ranked as follows:

1—Stiffer sentences in criminal courts. 2—Strengthen local police force. 3—Let local police handle problems without interference. 4—Limit the authority of the Supreme Court. 5—Give Congress the right to overrule Supreme Court decisions. 6—Better schools. 7—Gun control law. 8—Rebuild slum areas in cities. 9—More FBI agents. 10—More antipoverty money. 11—National police force. 12—More Federal District attorneys.

Tiwa Indians of Ysleta, Tex.

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate has just recently passed H.R. 10599, which would designate the Tiwa Indians of Ysleta, El Pasco County, Tex., as a band of American Indians and to transfer to the State of Texas any responsibility that the United States might have for them. I have long been working to help alleviate the condition in which the Tiwas are existing. During the last session of the Texas Legislature, a measure was passed that would set up a program to help the plight of the Tiwas; however, according to the Texas attorney general, it was first necessary that they be recognized as an

official Indian tribe by the U.S. Government.

Now that this act has been accomplished, I am certain that the State government will move with all possible dispatch to solve the many problems that exist. I am proud that my State has taken it upon itself to solve a problem where jurisdiction was vague. It is certainly in the best tradition of local self-government that such action was taken. Texas has long been proud, and rightly so, of its heritage in this area.

Robert E. Hollingsworth

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, each year we spend the winter months immersed in committee hearings on various bills, many for the purpose of authorizing appropriations to the various agencies of the Federal Government. In our concern for the detailed examination of the scope and progress of the agency programs, we may often fail to take public note of important milestones both for the programs and the people who have significantly helped accomplish the success of those programs.

On January 2, 1968, the Atomic Energy Commission marked without ceremony the completion of 21 years as the executive agency in charge of the U.S. Government's nuclear energy programs. As an original and continuing member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and before that on the House Committee on Military Affairs which legislated the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, I participated, as a midwife so to speak, on the occasion when the legal basis for the organization of the Commission was established.

Only Mr. MELVIN PRICE, from Illinois, and myself remain as original House members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Few people in the Government have that long association with the atomic energy program. We are fortunate, however, that there are people in the executive branch who continue their association with that program and provide the necessary leadership and I want to speak to you today about one of them.

In June 1947 a young man dedicated to Government service began a career with the Atomic Energy Commission as a budget analyst in the Division of Finance. This young man will soon celebrate 21 years of service with the Atomic Energy Commission. His name is Robert E. Hollingsworth.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you share with me the belief that any stature, maturity or esteem that organizations acquire may all be properly identified with the responsible individuals of the organization who made them possible. The Atomic Energy Commission is no exception.

There are of course the chairman and the other commissioners who have given and continue to give outstanding service in the making of policy for this unique government agency. Of greatest importance, however, is the continuous leadership provided by the career service. My experiences with the Post Office and Civil Service Committee together with my service in the House Government Operations Committee have convinced me of the importance of recruiting good people to the Federal Government service. In this modern age of program planning and cost analysis, where applicable, the need for well-trained and capable people is of even greater importance.

The head of the Atomic Energy Commission's nonregulatory career service, its chief executive officer and administrator is the general manager. It is fortunate for both the agency and the country that an able career servant has worked his way up to the top.

Bob Hollingsworth has been general manager since August 1964, deputy general manager for 4 years before that and assistant general manager prior to that appointment.

It is very important to our country to have young men educate themselves to public service and carry out the purpose of their training over a long period of responsible assignments. In meeting the challenges of modern government in a democratic society more capable young men and more dedication to public service are needed.

Bob Hollingsworth has risen to each challenge every single time and has in turn rewarded his country with very outstanding service. As an inspiration for young people everywhere and as a matter of interest to the House, I include in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a statement relating the story of Bob Hollingsworth's service to the Commission and his country together with a mention of his qualifications and achievements, as follows:

ROBERT E. HOLLINGSWORTH

Robert E. Hollingsworth has been General Manager of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission since August 11, 1964. He is the chief executive officer of an Agency of the Federal Government which has two broad responsibilities—to make the maximum contribution to the defense and security of the United States, and to develop the many peaceful uses of atomic energy for the benefit of people at home and abroad.

Mr. Hollingsworth, a career Government employee for more than 25 years, is responsible for directing programs entailing the expenditure of about $2.5 billion a year, an operation which includes the supervision of approximately 7,300 employees and the administration of contracts involving more than 120,000 contractor employees. The AEC's operations extend to virtually every state in the Union and its cooperative programs reach nations and organizations on every continent.

AEC PROGRAMS ARE VARIED

The work of the Atomic Energy Commission involves all of the sciences and many industrial processes and techniques.

This agency has the responsibility for designing, testing, manufacturing and storing all nuclear weapons. It has applied its specialized technology to the creation and maintenance of a nuclear Navy. It also is taking an active role in the work of seeking to restrict further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The AEC also has a broad program for developing peaceful uses of atomic energy. Included are programs for using nuclear reactors to desalt sea water; for developing nuclear power reactors, with a goal of producing "fast breeder" reactors which produce more fuel material than they consume. Other programs important to the Nation are those to develop nuclear rockets for space missions and the continuing research to increase still further the benefits already being derived from radiation and radioisotopes to fight disease, hunger and poverty. The AEC also conducts a broad program of basic research and administers international cooperation programs.

The Commission carries out its programs through research laboratories and production facilities located throughout the Nation and valued at about $8.3 billion. These facilities, operated under contract for the AEC by industrial and educational organizations, are directly supervised by 13 major field offices and a number of smaller area offices.

All of these activities require constant attention and direction of Mr. Hollingsworth as General Manager.

SOME PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. Hollingsworth has taken a series of steps designed to strengthen the Commission's organization and improve staff efficiency. He has appointed vigorous and imaginative people to key positions, and given them great flexibility in the conduct of their programs, emphasizing results rather than techniques. In addition, Mr. Hollingsworth has changed portions of the agency's organizational structure to adapt staff assignments to shifting program requirements. For example, he undertook extensive reorganization of the reactor development program, which involved a consolidation of space related activities, a strengthening of the engineering capabilities and a clearer realignment of other program functions under a newly created position of Assistant General Manager for Reactors.

Another accomplishment concerns the cut in production of plutonium and enriched uranium, announced by the President in January 1964, following studies of needs for military and peaceful uses. A cutback of this size can seriously affect communities where the materials are produced. However, the Commission was determined to minimize community hardship. It established a new program designed to divide AEC work among a larger number of contractors, and to persuade each new contractor to invest private funds in services and economic activities in the community where he has a contract with the AEC.

The execution of the program under Mr. Hollingsworth's direction has been eminently successful—so much so that economic prospects have improved in the communities concerned. An example is what has happened at the AEC's Hanford Works in Richland, Washington. After announcement of the cutback, a great number of people feared they might lose their jobs. One action by the AEC was to transfer operations from a single operating contractor to six new contractors—an immediate stimulus to diversification of industry in the area. A joint community-AEC effort has drawn $38 million of private investment into the Richland area. The prospect now: More jobs instead of fewer jobs.

This pioneering AEC program has attracted the attention of others who may face similar problems in the future.

Mr. Hollingsworth has energetically pushed AEC's participation in the President's program to reduce the costs of Government. He has established a system of reports and rewards to recognize outstanding achievements. The results have been very significant. During the past several years there have

been cost reductions in AEC programs of several hundreds of millions of dollars, and very importantly, these reductions have been accomplished without harm to the effectiveness of the programs.

HIS AEC BACKGROUND

The Division of Production is responsible for the production of special nuclear materials, principally enriched uranium and plutonium, a responsibility which is central to the atomic energy program. During his eight years in that Division, Mr. Hollingsworth received the basic experience and training that have led him to the top executive position in the AEC.

Until 1954, the atomic energy program remained essentially a Government monopoly. The 1954 Act provided for the entrance of private enterprise into the program under Government regulation. The regulatory responsibility was assigned to the Atomic Energy Commission along with the continuing responsibility for pursuing an active and expanding program for developing new application of atomic energy. Mr. Hollingsworth, as Assistant General Manager and later Deputy General Manager, went through the mass of arguments, proposals, viewpoints and suggestions which poured into the Commission. He concentrated on basic issues and focused his attention on significant elements requiring supervision. Throughout this trying period, he proved to be a constant source of knowledge and wise counsel and his mature judgment was invaluable in the formulation of policy and the making of management decisions.

During his three years (1956–1959) as Assistant General Manager for Administration, he was assigned responsibility for assisting the General Manager in the overall management of the Agency with primary emphasis for furnishing day-to-day administrative direction and coordination of all programs and supporting activities of the Commission. In this role, Mr. Hollingsworth was highly effective.

During the years that he served as Deputy General Manager, Mr. Hollingsworth provided vital and stabilizing leadership in the direction of the Commission's diversified operations.

The Commission's programs are planned and administered in accordance with a carefully designed and executed program-budget plan and procedure. Mr. Hollingsworth has given continuing leadership over the years to the Program Budget Review Committee which has brought him into direct involvement with all major programmatic developments.

The AEC's many complex missions are accomplished primarily through contract arrangements. Many of these contractual arrangements are of the cost type, with or without fee, and are carried out in Government-owned facilities. The keystone of AEC operations has been the development of its contract management policy principles designed to obtain the maximum results in the public interest. Mr. Hollingsworth has been the chief architect over the years in the development of AEC contractual policy.

It is important to note the contract authority which has been delegated to Mr. Hollingsworth by the Commission. He is authorized to enter into individual contracts involving commitments by the Government of up to $10 million.

HIS QUALIFICATIONS FOR GENERAL MANAGER

Mr. Hollingsworth's excellent record over the years, in administrative and executive positions in the Nation's atomic energy programs, laid the background for his ultimate selection as General Manager.

He received his A.B. degree in Government at Columbia University in 1939, then spent two and one-half years in graduate study at Columbia in Public Law and Public Administration. He entered Federal service in 1941 as a Budget Analyst in the Department of Agriculture. He served in the U.S. Army from 1942 to 1946, attaining the rank of Lieutenant Colonel.

He began his career with the Atomic Energy Commission almost 20 years ago as a Budget Analyst in the Division of Finance, shortly after the newly created civilian agency was activated on January 1, 1947, to replace the Manhattan Engineer District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

From the beginning of his association with the AEC, Mr. Hollingsworth has endeavored to familiarize himself with all details important to operation of the agency. He moved to the Division of Production in 1948 as Chief of the Budget and Reports Branch, and he has held increasingly important executive assignments ever since. He was Assistant Division Director in 1956 when he was appointed Assistant General Manager for Administration. Three years later he was named Deputy General Manager. He served almost five years in this position until his appointment as General Manager.

HIS PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Robert E. Hollingsworth is a quiet man but he speaks forcefully and clearly without wasting words. He has an incisive mind and a saving sense of humor, along with a breadth of discernment which enables him to anticipate situations and attitudes. A natural leader, he picks his officials with care, encourages them to seek new solutions and gives them authority to act. He encourages initiative; he is easy to approach; and he understands the problems of his staff. He reaches decisions quickly, makes them known clearly, and thus finds time to deal with the multiplicity of problems demanding his attention.

His academic background, coupled with his broad experience and extensive reading, has given him a rich understanding of public administration. He has the loyalty and devotion of his staff, a fact which has done much to further the Nation's atomic energy programs.

Teachers in Politics

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, April 5, marked the beginning of "Teachers-in-Politics Weekend." This program was sponsored by the National and State National Education Association chapters to encourage and educate teachers in effective and intelligent participation in our national life.

As Gen. Omar Bradley, retired, has said:

> The teacher is the real soldier of democracy. Others can defend it, but only he can make it work.

Yes, the democratic system is only a hollow phrase unless it is backed up by an informed, discriminating electorate.

During the last few months, I have received nearly a thousand letters from students in my district, ranging from grade schoolers requesting U.S. Capitol flags to college students concerned about the war in Vietnam. In these times when so many of our young people seem to deny their civic responsibilities through a philosophy of noninvolvement, it is heartening to hear from students who are eager to participate in their government. But to their teachers must return much of the credit.

Many schoolteachers and administrators are active in my political organization in Los Angeles. They have proved of inestimable value in both keeping me informed of local issues—such as the disruption of classroom instruction by excessive jet aircraft noise—and in educating my constituents in the political process. Yet, since National and State politics are an extremely fluid process, it is imperative that teachers, like students, keep up with current events.

The National Education Association deserves commendation for its leadership in this area. By promoting and arranging this farsighted "Teachers-in-Politics Weekend"—which includes, incidentally, six sectional clinics in my home State of California—this fine organization is again proving itself a dynamic force in education today.

We Must Preserve Law and Order

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, at this time of lawlessness and confusion, the advice of Director J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, is worthy of special note.

It is submitted for printing in the RECORD.

Our country cannot progress if we are unable to preserve law and order.

The material referred to follows:

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR TO ALL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS

In a riot there are no victors. The losers include everybody—the rioters, the victims, law enforcement, the community, the State, and the Nation.

Causes of riots can be counted by the score. A study of the overall problem indicates, however, that the widespread violence in our country to some degree is a direct outgrowth of the civil disobedience movement. In recent years, some leaders of dubious stature have made a grandiose gesture of willfully violating laws they deem to be unjust. For the most part, these individuals, although admittedly guilty of breaking the law, have gone unpunished. Young thugs and misguided teenagers, seeing others defy authority and the courts with impunity, have been led to believe that any crime under a banner of complaints is justified. Consequently, they ignore the law and roam through their communities creating violence and terror. Certainly, those who espouse the theory of civil disobedience and authorities who free guilty violators must share a portion of the blame and responsibility for the turmoil in our streets. It should be abundantly clear that the doctrine of civil disobedience is a doctrine of self-destruction.

Stern, decisive action is needed when a street disturbance begins. Justice is not served when a growing horde of vandals and looters is appeased and their pillage overlooked lest "a show of force might provoke them to greater violence." Quiescence does not satisfy rioters. Procrastination or uncertainty on the part of authorities denotes weakness or concession to a mob. Thus, the

offenders are encouraged, and their violence gains momentum.

A judicial self-appraisal by the news media of their riot coverage might also be in order. Some media have already taken action in this regard. There can be no quarrel with the all important role of keeping the public informed as quickly and as completely as possible. No one rightfully expects riots to be played down or salient facts withheld.

On the other hand, militant agitators, hate mongers, and publicity-seeking rabble rousers who incite riots have no fear of overexposure. They know that television, radio, and front-page news stories are the best and quickest means of getting their views before the public. Thus, they seek attention from the news media. In riot reporting, objectivity and balance, always key factors of responsible journalism, help expose distortion and reduce the special treatment of those who advocate violence. Strict adherence to high journalistic principles is a valuable public service in matters affecting public safety.

Many proposals have been advanced to help eliminate the causes of riots. Just as there is no single cause, there is no single remedy. I do know, however, that the answer will not be found in sociological remedies alone. If our system of law is to survive, then the law must be enforced. Those who break the law, acting alone or in concert, must be detected and arrested, promptly prosecuted, and given proper, substantial punishment. In halting riots and removing crime from our Nation's streets, this should be the first order of business.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER, *Director.*

OCTOBER 1, 1967.

Spiraling Tax Take

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, with the deadline fast approaching for the payment of Federal income taxes, I thought that the editorial which appeared in the Columbia City, Ind., Post and Commercial Mail was most timely.

It points out the present heavy burden of taxation being shouldered by the American taxpayers. Then it goes a step further and calls attention to the serious fiscal condition of the Nation. This is a dark picture. However, because of the clarity with which the editorial speaks out on this situation, I thought it should be brought to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The question of taxation is plaguing all of us. With the steady rise in taxes at the local, county, State, and Federal level, it is obvious that we shall reach the point eventually—unless there is a reversal of our tax policies—where the taxpayer will be unable to absorb this responsibility.

The editorial follows:

SPIRALING TAX TAKE

Even without an income tax surcharge, Americans will be paying more in taxes this year than they did last year.

According to Tax Foundation estimates, the total federal, state and local government tax take will be $217 billion in fiscal year 1968 (July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968). This would be an increase of $10 billion over fiscal 1967.

Federal tax collections are expected to rise to $148 billion in 1968 from $143 billion in 1967. State and local collections will climb from $64 billion to $69 billion.

It all figures out to about $3,550 in taxes for each American family in 1968—up $134 from the previous year and nearly double the amount 10 years ago.

Economic growth of the country explains the rise in federal income. The federal tax rate has remained unchanged since it was cut in that long-ago, halcyon year of 1964. It is on the state level that taxes have both increased in rate and multiplied in scope.

Seven new state income and retail sales taxes, plus 49 increases in existing sales, income, gasoline, cigarette and selected excise taxes were enacted by the several states last year. Thirty states now levy both general sales and income taxes.

On the local level, property taxes supply seven-eighths of county, city and village income.

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, 4 days have passed since the profoundly tragic assassination of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the numbing grief still clings to many of us like a cold sweat. The horrified disbelief has not yet diminished. And the tears in our hearts overflow with a bewildering shame.

So many have added their voices of tribute in honor of a memory that can never dim. What is said now is only for a record to be read one day as one more meager contribution to the millions of words that enshrine his greatness.

Dr. King succeeded in doing more than any one man since W. E. B. DuBois to shock the moral consciousness of America out of its complacency about the black man's deprived manhood. Whereas Dr. DuBois used the tools of impassioned scholarship and naked logic, Dr. King summoned the awesome majesty of Christian principles to his side and his utensils were an eloquence of voice and word rarely heard in this land.

For the first time since the days of Lincoln, America was forced to examine its national guilt, its betrayal of Christian teachings, and its violations of the democratic ethic. The immorality of a way of life that imposed a second-class citizenship on an entire race of people was exposed forcefully by the power of Dr. King's leadership.

Ever since our Founding Fathers added their names to that first document of emancipation, the Declaration of Independence, we have called ourselves a nation of Christians. But who amongst us has had the courage to follow that noble injunction that "whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also."

Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., did.

And he held out his hand to all men, black and white, to walk with him in man's procession toward his godself. He could still call upon black men to "love your enemies" and "bless them that curse you." And for white men, who despitefully used him and persecuted him, he prayed for them and did good to them.

This was the ultimate gift of love which one man can give his brother. And Dr. King gave it tenderly and without reservation.

From the heartsore bitterness the assassin's bullet burned in the souls of black men and women that terrible night in Memphis, there has been a massive escalation of violence that, in turn, has done violence to his memory. Unlike many of us who would condemn such barbarism, Reverend King would be the first to seek forgiveness for those who would stain his legacy of love.

So, we must be mindful of the glorious days when the warmth of his words and the steel of his courage forged a lasting link between black and white in the chain of humanity.

Vengeance is not what we seek. Any group can sink to the depths of savage retribution.

What we seek is equality.

What we seek is justice.

What we seek is respect and an acceptance of our membership in the family of man, not as part-time servants, but as full-time shareholders.

These are the essential concepts of what the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., marched, prayed, and died for. And if we here in this Congress of the United States believe we have any responsibility to this Nation to make this magnificent man's life meaningful, then it is the Congress which must bring to our democracy the same quality of excellence Dr. King brought to his own life's work.

Mr. Speaker, unless we move forthrightly on a constructive legislative program, then all of what any of us say in tribute becomes empty rhetoric echoing in the canyons of hypocrisy.

My southern colleagues come to mind as I think of how deeply Reverend King's peaceful martyrdom has touched all of us. The words of that stirring hymn, symbol of this Nation's first war of brother against brother, were the first I recalled after hearing the news of Dr. King's death:

As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free.

Dr. King's dream is that we instead live to make men free and in so doing, make certain that His truth will go marching on.

A Challenge to Teachers

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, as reasonable and respected leaders in their community, teachers have both the opportunity and the responsibility to exercise constructive leadership in politics and government.

In a nation like ours, which has a wonderful heritage of government of the people, by the people, and for the people,

the quality of government and the wisdom of decisions made by government leaders depend directly on how many citizens and which citizens participate in politics. If the right kind of people stay out of politics, they leave a clear field for the wrong kind.

Only where citizens, and particularly those in a position of leadership like teachers, actively work for right leadership, responsible decisions on the issues and proper priorities in public policy can government be at its best in our country.

I challenge the teachers of Alabama to be part of the reason our children's needs are met in education and our State's best interest promoted through their constructive participation in the political life of Alabama.

Commissioning of Battleship "New Jersey"

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, it was my pleasure to attend the commissioning of the U.S.S. *New Jersey* at Philadelphia. It was one of the most impressive ceremonies that I have ever had the pleasure of attending and a day which will live long in the memory of those who were present. It was a great day for the U.S. Navy.

The principal speaker was Hon. Paul Ignatius, Secretary of the Navy. Mr. Ignatius has been with the Defense Department for many years, and it has been my privilege to see him frequently on his appearances before the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. I have served on the Navy Subcommittee for 23 years and can say categorically that Mr. Ignatius is the most knowledgeable, dedicated and hard working Navy Secretary who has appeared before the Committee during that time. Mr. Ignatius made a most timely speech at the commissioning ceremonies and I highly recommend that each Member of the Congress read his speech. The commissioning occasion, the ship, the Secretary's speech and the ceremony were most impressive.

The speech follows:

REMARKS BY HON. PAUL R. IGNATIUS, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, AT THE COMMISSIONING OF THE BATTLESHIP "NEW JERSEY," PHILADELPHIA NAVAL BASE, PHILADELPHIA, PA., APRIL 6, 1968

Admiral Moorer, Admiral Speck, Captain Snyder, Officers and men of this great ship, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

On this day fifty-one years ago, April the sixth, 1917, the United States brought an end to a century of isolation from foreign affairs, and went to war against Germany.

President Woodrow Wilson, in his address asking the Congress to bring the nation into the great struggle of the first World War, said: ". . . we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts,—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free."

This nation has followed that course, with honor and devotion, applying the richness of its resources and the creativity of its people, sometimes suffering reverses but always persevering, for half a century.

From the outset, our involvement in world political affairs required the maintenance of a powerful naval force.

Fifty years ago, the battleship—though far less impressive and powerful than the ship we put back into commission today—was the symbol of naval power.

In war, her huge naval rifles could sweep enemy fleets from the seas. In peacetime, the arrival of one of these splendid ships, bristling with guns, in a foreign harbor was a symbol of the strength and majesty of the country under whose flag she sailed, and whose purposes she served.

But in recent years, the battleship disappeared from the navies of the world, overshadowed and outreached by aircraft carriers and their supersonic aircraft. Yet today, looking upon her mighty array of 16-inch and 5-inch guns, we cannot but feel the same awe and respect that the earlier battleships inspired in the hearts of all who saw them.

New Jersey, like the other ships of the Navy, is a symbol of the determination of the United States to uphold the principles on which our democracy is founded and which guide our relationships with the other nations of the world. While the circumstances which face us today are in many respects different from those of a half-century ago, our basic objectives are the same. And the need for patience, determination and courage to ensure the fulfillment of our objectives is the same today as it was when President Wilson emphasized their importance in 1917.

Our country is engaged in a limited war, in Southeast Asia, in support of the "rights and liberties of small nations," as President Wilson said, to live in freedom and independence, unmolested by their neighbors and free of fear of domination or attack by other states. We are there, not to conquer but to protect, not to impose our will but to provide security, so that a government that will be representative of the desire of the people to live in safety, according to their own aspirations, can become strong enough to maintain its continuity in a troubled area of the world.

We have returned this great ship to the fleet to help in this effort. When the effort is completed, the ship will be retired to inactive status, as it was after World War II and again after the Korean conflict. Like our nation's objective in Vietnam, this ship's objective is limited—not to widen the war but to bring it to a successful conclusion, not to deepen our involvement but to make our withdrawal possible. Our aim is peace, our objective is the conference table, not the battlefield; and the events of the past weekend have further demonstrated that this ship, the Navy it joins, and the country it serves have no other purpose in Vietnam.

Many of those who served in this ship in former engagements are here today. They can attest from personal experience to the accuracy and efficiency of our naval gunfire in World War II and in Korea. Naval fire support from our cruisers and destroyers in the South China Sea has played an important part in our effort in Vietnam.

New Jersey is scheduled to join these cruisers and destroyers in September of this year, bringing to bear her nine 16-inch guns and her twenty 5-inchers. She has a smaller crew than she carried in earlier days because her mission is more limited than it used to be. Newer and more sophisticated ships and weapons have replaced her guns as a means of defending the Fleet. But her heavy gunfire support of operations on the land is the most effective and accurate in the United States Navy.

First, her range is greater than that of any other ship—enough to allow her to fire an explosive projectile weighing 2,700 pounds from here to Wilmington, Delaware, about 20 miles away.

Second, her gunfire is more accurate. The effectiveness of 16-inch gunfire on most targets at all ranges is over two times greater than that of 8-inch gunfire. And the destructive power of a 16-inch shell is far greater than an 8-inch shell.

She can provide round-the-clock support for troops ashore under almost any weather conditions; can provide it farther inland than the smaller ships; and can pinpoint difficult targets more accurately.

The response of *New Jersey's* officers and crew and of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard personnel to the challenge of bringing a 45,000-ton ship from the Reserve fleet to battle-ready status has been superb. We have had many requests from former crew members to serve aboard her again. The morale of the crew is excellent; they are ready and determined to do their job. But, their patience, determination and courage must be matched by our own. For neither this battleship nor all the ships of the United States Fleet, nor all our men in uniform, can succeed without the support and understanding of the American people. Our task in Vietnam is complex and demanding, but we must see it through to a satisfactory conclusion. To do otherwise would increase the dangers we face and lead to instabilities greater than those which our present effort is designed to overcome.

We live in an era of disorder and instability. It did not begin with Vietnam and it will not end when peace comes to that unfortunate land. We have attempted, as a nation, to use our military power wisely, not provocatively but with restraint, in order to provide time and to create opportunities for more stable relationships to emerge. Our record has been consistent, effective, and steadfast. The Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine, NATO, Korea, the Berlin crisis in 1961, and the Cuban missile crisis in 1962 are examples that come to mind. Our aims today are not unlike those expressed fifty-one years ago by Woodrow Wilson when he said: "We seek no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the right of mankind."

Let us then put this ship into commission once again, hopeful that her journey will be brief, but resolved as a nation that our course, like hers, will be steady and unwavering. We salute her Captain and her crew, wish them Godspeed and smooth sailing, and express our confidence that she will be a worthy champion of her country's cause in the difficult days that lie ahead.

Insurance Program Highlights

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, throughout my investigation of the American Farm Bureau Federation, I have made a number of charges concerning the incestuous relationship between the AFBF and its insurance companies. And the Farm Bureau has issued press release after press release denying them.

Now, however, in a newspaper pub-

lished by and directed toward Farm Bureau members, the AFBF is admitting, to those who belong within its "family circle" that my charges are, in fact, true.

In the March 1968, edition of the South Carolina Farmer Roy Putnam, State manager, admits that what I have been saying all along is true—that the Farm Bureau and its insurance companies are one and the same. I intend to bring this admission to the attention of the Internal Revenue Service which is in the process of conducting a full-scale investigation into the financial activities of the organization.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully place the pertinent material from Mr. Putnam's editorial in the RECORD at this point. I would make only one correction in his statement—I would substitute the words "Farm Bureau officers" for the words "Farm Bureau members." This would be a more accurate description of the Farm Bureau organization and purpose.

The editorial follows:

INSURANCE PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

(By Roy Putnam, State manager)

In my opinion, the proper role or objective of our Insurance Program can be simply stated. This objective has been, is, and shall continue to be for the purpose of helping acquire and maintain Farm Bureau Membership.

This objective has been largely attained in the past and can continue in the future if each of us remembers that our Insurance Companies are owned, operated and controlled by Farm Bureau Members for the benefit of Farm Bureau Members. This basic fact is of utmost importance.

Teachers in Politics

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a long and honorable tradition in this country that persons having similar interests join together to pursue their goals within the political arena. Such organized citizen participation in the political process is a major contributing factor to the success of our form of government.

With these facts in mind, I welcome the members of the National Education Association into the great game of politics.

The NEA's Citizenship Committee has designated this weekend, April 5, 6, and 7, as "Teachers-in-Politics Weekend." During those 3 days, NEA members will be meeting throughout the country to participate in political clinics and workshops aimed at acquainting teachers with the issues and providing them with the knowledge of how best to make their views felt.

Teachers have an extremely important role to play in our society. They are the persons who instruct our youth and thereby determine in large measure the quality of our national life. As guardians of the education of the Nation's youth, teachers have a vital interest in improving the quality of education and in insuring that high quality instruction is available to all American children.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I have taken an active role in the successful legislative drive to expand the Federal role in education. In these efforts, I have worked closely with teachers in my district, both individually and through their representative organizations.

I look forward to continued close cooperation with teachers in achieving our mutual goal of bringing the best possible educational opportunities to the youth of the country.

River Priorities

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, this Congress has taken the steps necessary to bring vitally needed power to Nebraska. However, Nebraskans also realize the difficult fiscal situation that the country faces and the need to set priorities. This need is set forth in an excellent editorial which appeared in the March 25, 1968, issue of the Omaha World-Herald. The editorial reads as follows:

RIVER PRIORITIES

It was good news that bids have been opened on construction of the first segment of the 345-thousand-volt line that would carry Missouri-River produced power between Nebraska and the Dakotas.

A joint bid of two Nebraska firms was listed as the apparent low one.

Hopefully work will begin this year.

Nebraska and the Midlands badly need the line, perhaps desperately need it until new power plants are built and operating.

The line would run from Fort Thompson, S. D., where it will connect with the big dam power generators and with electrical co-operatives, to Grand Island, where it will connect with the Nebraska Public Power System.

It was recommended by the power systems in the Missouri River Basin after the blackout of July, 1966, which darkened Nebraska, Iowa and parts of the Dakotas and Minnesota.

It was realized that there were not enough lines, nor big enough ones, to bring Bureau of Reclamation power in case of an emergency or in case of breakdown of an existing line when summer load demands were excessive. The Bureau markets the power from the dams operated by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Congress appropriated the money for the line, which is expected to be in operation by the summer of 1970 if all goes well.

The President's budget for the year starting July 1 also asks five million dollars for continued construction on the Missouri River navigation channel.

In the face of channel trouble on the lower river between Kansas City, Mo., and the mouth and a construction slowdown because of lack of funds it appears that the completion date for the nine-foot navigation channel will be delayed until 1975.

The Engineers, who are doing the channel work, could use more money and could work faster if they had the money, but the prospect of austerity budgeting makes more funds unlikely.

The upper river between Kansas City, past Omaha, to Sioux City is in better shape. Engineers say that the controlling navigation depth generally is 8½ feet.

One other piece of cheering news: with record amounts of water stored behind the big dams up-river, extra water can be released this summer and next to help the barge operators float past the construction areas below.

The current drive to cut Federal spending may call for new delays in completing the navigation channel. If so, we hope the cities and states affected will accept the disappointment in good spirit. The war effort and the stability of the dollar must come first.

As for priorities on the river, the new power line is unquestionably a more pressing need than improvement in navigation.

It is essential to keep the lights on and to have power for industry, including that part of industry which produces defense materials. The line to Grand Island should proceed without delay.

The Need To Enact the National Veterans Cemeteries Act

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, you are aware of my long interest in providing full burial rights for all of our veterans. This subject has been of prime concern also, of course, to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which has been holding hearings on legislation to improve and strengthen our veterans' burial system, and carry out the recommendations of the U.S. Veterans' Advisory Commission which issued its worthy report after long study.

During the course of these hearings I prepared testimony which I should like to make part of the RECORD today. It is my belief that no subject today is more in need of our prompt consideration than that which would restore the true and intended significance of the time-honored burial benefit to millions of veterans' families. As a supporter of the President's veterans burial program and the sponsor of legislation to carry out the Veterans' Advisory Commission recommendations in this field, I respectfully submit the text of my prepared testimony:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CLAUDE PEPPER BEFORE THE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL VETERANS CEMETERIES ACT, APRIL 1, 1968

Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of legislation to create a unified and all-encompassing Veterans Cemeteries Act. The legislation embodies the proposals set forth in the U.S. Advisory Commission Report on Veterans Benefits which would restore the original and true significance of veterans burial rights.

First of those propositions is that the entire Federal cemetery function, with exception of famous monuments and tombs, be assigned to the Veterans Administration.

Second, that, without delay, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs conduct a study on methods of providing burial grounds for all veterans convenient to their homes;

Third, that the Administrator establish uniform criteria for eligibility for burial in the Federal cemetery system;

Fourth, that Arlington National Cemetery be reopened to all eligible veterans;

Fifth, that the burial allowance for vet-

erans be increased to $400, $100 of which shall be reserved for payment toward a gravesite for those not buried in national cemeteries;

Sixth, that the burial allowance not be denied to any veteran because of the existence of any other burial or death benefit, public or private.

I have framed the legislation so that the first provisions regulate operation and maintenance. Here concerned are such diverse and specific matters as keeping of the register and the placement and position of headstones.

The next part is a unification of the presently disorganized rules governing entitlement to burial. The rules now vary according to the locality and administration of the cemetery. For instance, cemeteries at military installations are generally reserved for soldiers who were on active duty at the installation at the time of death. In accordance with the proposition first stated, that all Federal cemeteries with very few exceptions come under the control of the Veterans Administration, any honorably discharged veteran of the Armed Services would be entitled to burial in such cemetery. Eligibility would also accrue to Reserve or National Guard members, and ROTC members who incur death during training exercises. Spouses and minor children would receive the same entitlement. The Administrator would also provide plots for servicemen missing in action. Entitlement would not devolve on veterans guilty of subversive activities. The rules set forth governing the furnishings of head stones are generally the same. The rest of the subchapter relates to such specific matters as: selection of cemetery superintendents from among disabled veterans; entombment in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater; acquisition of land, provision of approach roads and prohibition of right-of-ways, and the Veterans Administration's control of cemeteries outside the United States.

The next subchapter provides that the Administrator of Veterans Affairs shall undertake a study for acquisition of new land for cemetery space, especially as regards the needs of metropolitan areas, and that the study shall be submitted to the House Veterans Affairs Committee. Also, the sections of this subchapter increase the $250 maximum burial allowance—which surely we would all agree is unrealistic—to $400. If the deceased veteran is not buried in a National Cemetery, the Administrator would reserve one-fourth of that sum to cover expense of purchase of the burial site. The amount of the veteran's estate, or other means for defraying burial expense will not affect entitlement to the allowance and would not reduce it.

As I explained upon introduction of this legislation, four agencies presently control the cemeteries in which veterans may be interred as a matter of right. I believe that a unified control under only one agency would be most efficient. Logic would require, I submit, that this agency be the one created to administer veterans benefits. Acting upon the proposal of my colleagues and my own, recently we placed the legislative jurisdiction of veterans cemeteries all within the House Veterans Affairs Committee. We should act upon the wisdom of our own example and do the same for actual administration and management of the cemeteries which we have done as regards legislation.

The shortage of space in veterans cemeteries is becoming acute. I do not believe that mere acquisition of new land will solve the problem. Land must be acquired which is convenient to communities in which veterans live. In creating new cemeteries we must certainly take into consideration which localities have the largest veteran population of the entire nation. In the same manner, we should not acquiesce to the restriction of burial in Arlington Cemetery. Everyone who has ever borne arms for defense of America has had until now the right to burial there. Let us restore and preserve that right by acquisition of more land adjacent to Arlington. Also, I propose by this measure not only to increase the burial allowance, but to extend it for the first time to servicemen who fall in battle.

The preamble to the U.S. Veterans Advisory Commission's Report, which as I've said, endorses these proposals, states, in the words of President Johnson: "Our government and our people have no greater obligation than to assure that those who have served their country and the cause of freedom will never be forgotten or neglected." By consideration of the problems here addressed, we would act in accordance with that noble sentiment.

Prince Georges County Memorial for Vietnam Heroes Gains Support

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, the Prince Georges County detachment of the Marine Corps League has proposed the establishment of a memorial to those American servicemen who have died fighting for our commitment in Vietnam.

This proposal is gaining widespread support and I have strongly endorsed the idea. I feel that it is extremely worthwhile and long overdue. At this point I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper article from the Prince Georges County News of April 4, 1968, describing the project:

VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL EYED BY PRINCE GEORGES MARINE CORPS DETACHMENT

(By Phyllis O'Neil)

"The need for a permanent memorial to honor our fallen Vietnam veterans from Prince Georges County is long overdue," says James E. Merna, commandant of the Prince Georges County Detachment of the Marine Corps League.

For the past couple months, the detachment has been talking about such a memorial. "The league," explains Merna, "would like to make arrangements for the erection of a perpetual memorial in honor and in tribute to those brave and courageous residents of Prince Georges County who lost their lives in connection with the conflict in Vietnam." The County Commissioners, Merna says, have promised to donate the memorial site.

Marine veteran Merna is the originator of the program "Operation Appreciation," a continuing aid and recreational program for all of the U.S. Marines recuperating at Bethesda Naval Hospital from wounds received in Vietnam; to show these deserving Americans, that they have not been forgotten, and that their great personal sacrifices in defense of freedom are appreciated. Since the birth of this program on May 21, 1966, wounded veterans have benefited from 44 outings.

The current undertaking is going to be called "Operation Remembrance."

In a letter to Prince Georges Commission Chairman Gladys N. Spellman, Merna said that according to information he had requested and received from Rep. Hervey G. Machen, D-Md., the latest records of the Department of Defense through last Dec. 31, shows 38 from Prince Georges County have died in Vietnam. Their average age was 21. These servicemen, from all branches of the military, came from 22 cities and towns in the county, including Berwyn Heights, Bladensburg, Greenbelt, Hyattsville, Lanham and Laurel.

The records of the number killed are sent out quarterly by the Department of Defense. The report for the first quarter of 1968 has not yet been received by Merna, but the number killed in Vietnam from Prince Georges is believed to have reached near 50. Through last December 31, 349 servicemen from the state of Maryland have lost their lives in Vietnam.

The proposed memorial to honor fallen Vietnam veterans, although sponsored by the Marine Corps League Detachment, will be for servicemen from all branches of the military.

Merna pointed out to Mrs. Spellman that while the majority of the 38 county servicemen lost their lives in 1966 and 1967, some were killed in action in Vietnam as far back as 1963 and 1964.

Says Merna, "With the construction of such a memorial, Prince Georges County will be one of the very first locales in the nation to so honor its men of the Armed Forces who died in Vietnam."

With some research, the detachment has discovered, says Merna, that of the few existing memorials in Prince Georges County in honor of U.S. fighting men and defenders, most go back quite a few years, most of them to World War I. Two of the more prominent ones are the Memorial in front of the Courthouse in Upper Marlboro, and the American Legion Peace Cross Memorial in Bladensburg. The former is dedicated to "The sons and daughters of Prince Georges County who served their country in the Great War of 1917–1918" while the latter "to the heroes of Prince Georges County, Md., who lost their lives in the Great War 1917–1918 for the liberty of the world."

Each has inscribed thereon the names of the 49 county residents who lost their lives in World War I.

"Exactly 50 years later," explains the spokesman for the detachment, "with our great nation now involved in another conflict in defense of liberty and freedom, it is indeed both appropriate and essential that the memory of those who lost their lives in this present struggle in Vietnam against aggression be perpetuated." Detachment of the Marine Corps League (a national veterans organization of present, retired and former Marines) intends to undertake this community project leading to the construction of such a permanent memorial. A fund drive will be launched shortly to finance its construction.

The purpose of the letter to the commissioners was to inform them of the detachment's plans and to hopefully obtain the Board of County Commissioners' support and approval for the project. It is hoped that the county might be able to set aside a tract of land for the memorial.

Merna says, "I have been contacted by the commissioners' office with regard to the Detachment's program to erect a perpetual memorial in honor of all the county servicemen killed in Vietnam and the commissioners endorse wholeheartedly this project and have promised to donate the land requested for the memorial. Continues Merna, "The County Commissioners want to feature and publicize our memorial project as the highlight of their annual St. George's day observance at the Upper Marlboro Fairgrounds on Friday evening, April 26."

The proposed memorial will be the first in the State of Maryland and one of two in the nation. The first is a "flower garden type" in Springfield, Ore., to honor our Vietnam war victims.

When told of the Memorial program, Mrs. Joseph R. Smallwood of 4910 Whitfield Chapel Rd., Lanham said, "I think it's wonderful." Mrs. Smallwood lost her 23-year-old son, L. Cpl. James Francis Smallwood in Vietnam. Another son, S. Sgt. John Smallwood, is now serving as a paratrooper with the Army in Vietnam.

The Smallwood family erected a flagpole in its front yard in honor of James, and flies the American flag which was draped over his casket on Memorial Day and other appropriate holidays.

Mrs. Smallwood says, "The men deserve a memorial such as the one proposed by the Marine Corps League."

Dr. King's Spirit Can Be Kept Alive

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, South Dakotans have never been troubled with the type of civil rights agitation and discord that has befallen many States in recent years.

South Dakotans believe that a man should be judged upon his character and integrity rather than on the color of his skin or the church he attends. Were it otherwise, I as a member of a minority group—the American Indian—never would have had the opportunity to serve this body.

Living in such a State, it is difficult for many to comprehend the type of conditions which the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King was trying to correct. Yet, I believe most South Dakotans held a deep respect for what Dr. King was trying to accomplish and particularly for his insistence upon the principle of nonviolence in moving toward those objectives.

One of the finest newspaper tributes to Dr. King that I have seen came from the contributing editor of the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader, Mr. Fred C. Christopherson.

The editorial follows:

DR. KING'S SPIRIT CAN BE KEPT ALIVE

While Dr. Martin Luther King was alive, he was an articulate and effective spokesman for the Negro. His memory and the nature of his death can be even more instrumental in promoting the welfare of his race if his followers respect his spirit and his attitude.

But it can be the other way if the occasion of his assassination becomes the spark that ignites riots and destruction. In that case, he will have died in vain.

As the record clearly demonstrates, Dr. King warrants deep and earnest respect for all who subscribe to the principle of human equality without regard to creed, color or race. His efforts in this field were extensive and productive. He was constantly at work doing what he believed should be done. But always he sought to stay within the framework of dignity and non-violence. That is one reason why he accomplished so much and why he was so widely accepted as a constructive leader in a humanitarian endeavor.

He was conscious of the risks involved in what he was doing—fully aware that he might be struck down at any moment by an individual with a warped mind, as was President John F. Kennedy. He realized, too, that there was strong organized opposition in some areas to his programs and that this could result in a violent reaction. Such considerations, however, didn't alter his course. He did what he believed should be done and did it very well.

The finest tribute to his memory will be a continuance of his program in the manner he advanced it. That, one may hope, will be the prevailing response.

Veterans' Administration Hospital Expenditures for World War I Veterans for General Medical and Surgical Conditions, 1919–68

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at my request the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration has compiled a very interesting report on the amount of funds expended for World War I veterans who have been hospitalized in general medical and surgical hospitals of the Veterans' Administration or its predecessor agency for the period of 1919 to 1968. I am sure that all individuals who have an interest in the welfare of our veterans will be impressed with the statistics which have been compiled under the able direction of Mr. Bernard Kaufman. Reports and Statistics Staff Director, Department of Medicine and Surgery. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of this interesting document:

INTRODUCTION

In 1920, there were 4,566,000 World War I veterans in civil life. Between 1920 and 1962, almost $30 billion[1] was expended on these veterans or their dependents for all types of veterans' benefits. During this period there was an average of 3,830,000 living World War I veterans. When this latter number is applied to the amount expended, it results in an average expenditure per veteran of $7,827.

More than 15 percent ($4.5 billion) of the total expended on World War I veterans during this period was expended for their care in Veterans Administration or U.S. Veterans' Bureau hospitals. This amount excludes the cost of: care in non-VA hospitals; outpatient care; domiciliary care; and new construction, major alterations and non-expendable equipment.

This study deals primarily with the expenditures for the World War I veterans for care in VA and predecessor hospitals for medical and surgical conditions for the period 1919 to 1968.

EXPENDITURE FOR HOSPITAL CARE 1918–68

During the fifty year period 1919–1968 more than $15.9 billion was expended for the hospital care of veterans in Veterans Administration or U.S. Veterans' Bureau hospitals. Of this amount, more than 38 percent or $6.1 billion was expended on the World War I veterans. The table below shows the amount expended on World War I veterans by type of patient.

Total	$6,134,694,000
Medical and Surgical	3,540,475,000
Tuberculosis	565,260,000
Psychiatric	2,028,959,000

In any year between 1920 and 1943, almost 9 out of every 10 veterans were veterans of World War I. On February 29, 1968 there were 1,808,000 World War I veterans, or less than 7 percent of the veterans in civil life. Yet, almost 28 percent of the VA hospital net operating costs expected for fiscal year 1968 will be expended for the care of World War I veterans.

GENERAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL CARE

The table attached shows for World War I veterans hospitalized for general medical and surgical conditions in VA and predecessor hospitals, the net operating costs and cost per patient per year, 1919 through 1968. Cost per patient is shown in terms of actual expenditures and expenditures in terms of the Purchasing Power of the Consumer Dollar[2] in 1967 and in 1919—the year immediately following the cessation of hostilities of World War I.

Data on the number of patients per year were derived from the number of days of care and average length of hospital stay. The quotient is the number of discharges. VA experience in calendar year 1966 showed that there were 1.3 discharges per patient in all but psychiatric bed sections. This statistic was applied to the discharges in each year (1919–1968) to obtain number of different patients.

To obtain the net operating costs, the product of patient days and per diem cost were computed. The number of patient days of care was developed from the number of patients remaining on any given day. This day was usually October 31, November 30 or June 30. When the number remaining on these days was not available another day was used. In most instances the hospital per diem costs were available in the Annual Reports.

LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

The primary source for the data used to develop the table was the Annual Reports of the Veterans Administration and its predecessor, the U.S. Veterans Bureau and other data collected by the Veterans Administration.

The problem associated with obtaining the historical data necessary to develop cost per patient in this study was formidable. The kinds of data required were not in any consistent or convenient form over the fifty year period studied. Relationships applicable to current data were applied freely to past data. It was assumed that the definitions that apply to current data applied equally to the historical data.

The factor discharges per patient for calendar year 1966 was applied over the entire period. An assumption was made that the differences in the average length of stay by age group since 1952 could apply to the average length of stay in the earlier years. These two factors played an important role in determining the number of different patients.

Cost data appears to be reasonably acceptable. In most instances per diem costs were available by type of hospital or patient. When applied to patient days, a close approximation of net operating cost could be obtained.

A word is required about the conversion of the cost data in terms of the purchasing power of the dollar. The data shown adjusts for inflationary factors. They do not fully reflect for the VA hospital system, costs generated by new advances and improved quality in medicine over the years. A 1922 dollar for example was worth almost twice that of a 1967 dollar. However, the per diem cost in 1967 was more than seven times that in 1922 and, when adjusted for the purchasing power of the dollar in 1922, it was more than 3.5 times the per diem cost.

SUMMARY

In spite of the problems encountered in the collection of the data for this study, the total $6.1 billion reported as expended for VA hospital care of the World War I veteran

[1] Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1957, as Amended. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census.

[2] U.S. Department of Labor, BLS, (1957–59=$1.00). Base converted to 1967=$1.00 and 1919=$1.00.

between 1919 and 1968 is reasonably accurate. Conservatively, an additional $2.7 billion will be spent in the next 30 years based on the expected World War I population through the year 2000 and the incidence and cost of such care expected in 1968.

The study concentrated on the expenditures for care of general medical and surgical conditions in VA hospitals only. Expenditures for domiciliary and restoree care, nursing home care, outpatient care, psychiatric and tuberculosis care in VA and non-VA facilities; and expenditures for general medical and surgical care provided in non-VA hospitals were not considered. It may be purposeful to examine these factors involving expenditures made on behalf of the World War I veteran at a later date.

WORLD WAR I VETERANS

AVERAGE ANNUAL COST OF GENERAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL HOSPITALIZATION, VA HOSPITALS, 1919–68

Year	Number of World War I patients	Net operating cost (in thousands)	Cost per patient		
			Actual	1967 dollars	1919 dollars
1919	6,381	$1,095	$172	$332	$172
1920	32,080	5,496	171	284	147
1921	51,798	8,888	172	322	167
1922	44,626	9,488	213	424	219
1923	32,027	8,359	261	509	264
1924	34,867	8,524	244	476	246
1925	18,701	4,728	253	483	250
1926	20,867	4,535	217	412	213
1927	25,066	4,765	190	365	188
1928	27,266	5,028	184	357	186
1929	30,150	5,666	188	365	190
1930	29,032	6,180	213	426	222
1931	43,203	8,963	207	455	236
1932	53,153	10,816	203	495	258
1933	42,631	7,997	188	485	252
1934	49,559	11,890	240	600	312
1935	66,551	15,212	229	556	289
1936	70,830	15,952	225	542	281
1937	78,742	16,775	213	496	256
1938	89,941	17,717	197	465	240
1939	78,767	17,888	227	547	284
1940	84,530	18,662	221	526	272
1941	87,715	20,576	235	533	275
1942	74,438	19,555	263	539	279
1943	62,416	20,278	325	627	325
1944	60,018	$19,507	$325	$618	$309
1945	72,775	19,218	264	488	253
1946	76,236	24,500	321	549	286
1947	65,175	52,060	799	1,191	615
1948	73,939	51,916	702	969	505
1949	92,634	64,848	700	980	504
1950	94,738	69,590	735	1,014	529
1951	105,695	84,342	798	1,021	527
1952	140,293	131,923	940	1,184	611
1953	146,993	138,507	942	1,168	603
1954	145,305	136,966	943	1,160	594
1955	162,905	149,568	918	1,138	588
1956	168,351	168,090	998	1,218	629
1957	143,266	148,692	1,038	1,235	633
1958	139,470	152,941	1,096	1,260	658
1959	130,319	163,146	1,252	1,427	739
1960	138,543	174,054	1,256	1,419	728
1961	148,653	182,467	1,227	1,374	712
1962	142,117	182,597	1,285	1,414	732
1963	142,174	188,868	1,328	1,448	757
1964	140,063	193,131	1,379	1,476	758
1965	131,699	192,983	1,465	1,553	806
1966	105,607	167,423	1,585	1,617	840
1967	104,568	148,762	1,423	1,423	740
1968	109,141	206,343	1,891	1,891	983

Pfc. Kenneth R. Totten, Jr., USMC, Killed in Vietnam

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report that Pfc. Kenneth R. Totten, Jr., USMC, of Brewster, N.Y., has become my 51st constituent to have lost his life in Vietnam.

I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by inserting herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, the following article:

[From Patent Trader, Mt. Kisco, N.Y., Apr. 4, 1968]

MARINE KILLED IN VIETNAM

BREWSTER.—Marine PFC Kenneth R. Totten Jr., 18, of Tilly Foster, Brewster, N.Y., was killed by mortar fire Saturday while in action against hostile forces near Quang Tri Province, just below the demilitarized zone, in Vietnam.

The son of Kenneth Sr. and Mary Smith Totten, PFC Totten is the 10th Putnam County man to be killed while in action with United States forces in South Vietnam.

He enlisted in the Marine Corps on February 14, 1967, from Brewster where he had been a resident for two years.

He was born on November 29, 1949, in Mahopac. He had attended schools in Mahopac, Carmel and Brewster. He was a student at Brewster High School until January, 1967.

Besides his parents, he leaves his paternal grandfather, Frank Totten, of Brewster; his maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Archie Smith, of Tilly Foster; four sisters, Miss Linda Totten, Miss Rhonda Totten and Miss April Joy Totten, all of Tilly Foster and Mrs. Margaret Kenny, of Carmel.

A date for funeral services, with Rev. H. Pierce Simpson, officiating, will be announced by the Cargain Funeral Home, Carmel, as soon as the body is returned to the United States.

Burial, with full military honors, will be in Raymond Hill Cemetery, Carmel.

August Little Soldier, Chairman, Tribal Business Council, Fort Berthold, N. Dak.

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 5, the Minot Daily News carried a story from August Little Soldier, chairman of the Tribal Business Council at Fort Berthold, N. Dak. I think the attitude of the three affiliated tribes is very notable and should be brought to the attention of all Members:

NEW TOWN.—Indian people from the Fort Berthold Reservation, who might participate in the planned "poor peoples' march" on Washington, D.C., April 22 will not be representing the people of the Three Affiliated Tribes.

August Little Soldier, chairman of the Tribal Business Council at Fort Berthold, issued a statement to The News depicting the Indian peoples' position only a couple of hours before the leader of the planned march on the nation's capitol, Dr. Martin Luther King, was felled by an assassin's bullet in Memphis, Tenn.

Little Soldier said. "It has been brought to the attention of the Three Affiliated Tribes that a march is scheduled for April 22 in Washington, D.C., relative to the deplorable conditions of the poor people, especially the minority groups.

"We are in sympathy with the poor people and think conditions should be changed. We do not think marching on the City of Washington is the proper procedure. This will no doubt lead to nothing more than mob violence.

"The Fort Berthold Indian people need to show by their own efforts, in proving of themselves and if they do, we are sure ample assistance will be made available.

"Any participants in the march from this reservation will not be representing the Indian people of the Three Affiliated Tribes."

The dead civil rights leader has been planning, what he said would be a "non-violent" demonstration in the nation's capitol, since late last fall.

Dr. Martin Luther King

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, what died last Thursday night in Memphis was more than a man, more than a spokesman for a just and urgent cause, more than a great national leader. The molten insanity that killed Martin Luther King exploded also in the conscience of America, shattering forever a portion of that delicate and irreplaceable spirit that distinguishes human society from a den of wolves.

We search for meaning in the meaningless. We seek hope in what seems hopeless. We comfort one another and ourselves with the solemn promise that Dr. King's dream will become our own, and that his legacy of firmness and love in the battle for human equality will be taken up by us all.

Eloquent and stirring words have been heard throughout the Nation since last Thursday's tragedy, and I do not belittle the sincerity or convictions of those who spoke them. But words alone are as ephemeral and meaningless as the wind, and as powerless to work lasting good. Unless we seize what may well be our last opportunity to translate words into constructive action, the consequences of our

failure will fall not only upon our heads, but upon the Nation as a whole.

Better Housing Opportunities for All

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as you know the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, has concluded its hearings on the President's proposals for new housing legislation. I strongly support that program and have cosponsored the bill to carry out his recommendations.

During the hearings I was pleased to offer testimony again before the honorable subcommittee which has done so much to provide better housing opportunities for millions of citizens throughout the land. So that these remarks concerning the housing proposals can be made part of the permanent RECORD, I am offering my testimony for inclusion at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CLAUDE PEPPER, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, REGARDING THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1968 AND OTHER HOUSING LEGISLATION, APRIL 4, 1968

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am very happy to have this opportunity to appear today to discuss some of the housing measures being considered by this distinguished Subcommittee. Having served here previously, I know what a large volume of legislation and crowded schedule of witnesses you are confronted with during these hearings. I shall, therefore, attempt to keep my remarks as brief and to the point as possible.

I appeared before this Subcommittee last April in support of three bills, H.R. 6028, H.R. 7245, and H.R. 8620, which I had introduced during the last session. These bills are still pending before this committee, and I would like to stress again my belief that they would be very useful pieces of legislation and deserve careful consideration and favorable report by this Subcommittee.

H.R. 6028 is designed to broaden the Open Space Land program to permit assistance for the development of open space land, regardless of the method of acquisition of the land. Under present law, only land acquired specifically under the Open Space Land program is eligible for assistance. This seems unnecessary restriction on the program, and my bill would eliminate it. Section 606 of the Administration's Housing and Urban Development bill is designed to strengthen and improve the Open Space Land program, and my proposed amendment is in the same vein. I feel that this extremely valuable program can be made to provide still greater benefits, especially for urban areas, if the program incorporates the changes proposed by the Administration and by my proposed amendment.

The basic provisions of my second bill, H.R. 7245, have been included in Section 208 of H.R. 14357, presently pending before this Subcommittee. This bill is identical to S. 2700 reported out by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last session. Section 208 amends the 701 planning program in a number of desirable ways. Among the proposed changes is one that I feel is particularly important—sufficiently so that I introduced legislation to bring it about last session. My bill, H.R. 7245, and Section 208 of H.R. 14357 would add to the preamble of Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 a statement making it clear that the intent of Congress is to permit localities to have the option and discretion of utilizing private planning consultants instead of government employed professional staff, where appropriate. Thus, this amendment would make it clear that the use of private planning consultants would not prevent a locality from receiving Federal financial assistance for planning carried out under the 701 program.

My third bill, H.R. 8620, is designed to amend the Housing Act of 1959 to provide more equitable compensation payments to businesses that are forced to relocate because of urban renewal activities. This bill contains three basic provisions to help accomplish this objective: (1) the elimination of the restriction that relocation payments may be made only to businesses earning less than $10,000 per year; (2) an increase in the maximum payable relocation benefits to a more equitable level than at present; and (3) the provision of fair compensation to businesses that are injured by the displacement of their customers by urban renewal. This three-pronged approach should provide a workable means of helping to solve some of the problems of providing just compensation for dislocations resulting from urban renewal activities.

In addition to these specific measures which I have introduced, some of which have been incorporated in more comprehensive bills sponsored by other Members, I also support the objectives of the other provisions of the Administration's Housing and Urban Development bill, H.R. 15624. I have long favored the concept of expanding Federal assistance to promote individual home ownership and I will support whatever programs might be effective in making it possible for our low income families to own their own homes. I am pleased, nevertheless, that the Administration's program recognizes that low income home ownership is no panacea for all of our housing ills. It is necessary that we have substantial programs to provide adequate rental housing in our large urban areas, where high land costs and population densities make single-family housing uneconomic. We cannot expect everyone to fit into the same pattern of housing or the same pattern of living. It is inevitable, it seems to me, that a very large portion of our new Federally-assisted housing construction will continue to be rental dwellings, multi-unit cooperatives and condominiums, and perhaps new forms of housing designed to meet the needs of all income levels in our society.

I wish to commend this subcommittee for its dedicated efforts to deal with our nation's housing problems with vision, imagination and real concern for the better housing of the American people. I believe the measure I have dealt with in this statement will help to continue the progressive efforts of this subcommittee in the housing field.

The "Pueblo": How Long, Mr. President?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 77th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

Lutheran Church in America on Vietnam

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, long before the recent peace initiatives, many churches and religious communities had called for appropriate action as a step toward bringing the Vietnam tragedy to a conclusion. Among those church bodies was the Lutheran Church in America, which is one of the largest Lutheran communities in the United States. In a resolution on Vietnam, the leaders of the church held it to be "important that every effort be made to bring all parties to the conflict toward a stance of openness and flexibility with a readiness to respond to whatever beginnings of solutions may emerge."

This statement expresses the hope of many Christians at the moment who feel that "the deepening crisis in Vietnam is a cause of grave concern among all men of good will who seek the establishment of peace with justice and freedom."

I wholeheartedly join these and many other voices in our country who hope that the parties to the conflict in Vietnam will be open and flexible "with a readiness to respond to whatever beginnings of solutions may emerge," or have emerged, "toward the establishment of peace with justice and freedom" in Vietnam.

I place the resolution on Vietnam by the Lutheran Church in America, in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM

The deepening crisis in Vietnam is a cause of grave concern among all men of good will who seek the establishment of peace with justice and freedom. Especially troubling are the following aspects of the situation:

1. The rapidly mounting number of dead and wounded on both sides of the conflict;
2. The steady escalation of military commitments in Vietnam and, with it, the increased danger of a full-scale war in Asia;
3. The difficulty in achieving conditions which would make feasible the termination of military action in Vietnam in the near future;
4. The vast destruction of natural and developed resources;
5. The tragic diversion of attention and economic support from the assault upon domestic and world poverty to the growing war effort in Southeast Asia;
6. The turmoil and frustration among the people of South Vietnam in seeking to establish representative self-government.

Christians cannot be content to remain silent in the crisis of conscience that confronts them. They must be true to the conviction which is uniquely their own: that all men, regardless of nationality, politics, or ideology, are equally the object of God's judgment and loving kindness in Jesus Christ.

In facing the present situation in Vietnam, Christians must take cognizance of the fact that simplistic solutions are unrealistic. Attempts to bring easy answers to so complex a set of problems may only complicate them. Neither extended war nor immediate unilateral withdrawal by the United States seems to answer the problem. Continuance of the present limited war seems to be no solution. Consequently, it is important that every effort be made to bring all parties to the conflict toward a stance of openness and flexibil-

ity with a readiness to respond to whatever beginnings of solutions may emerge.

In view of the church's universal concern and its awareness that the situation in Vietman defies simplistic solutions, the Lutheran Church in America calls upon its congregations and their members:

1. To engage in intensive study and free discussion of the Vietnam question, bringing to bear Christian insight upon all aspects of this crisis.

2. To pursue such study and discussion while exercising due caution against conclusions which:

a. Assume that ends justify means.

b. Overlook the dangers of the United States acting unilaterally rather than in cooperation with other countries through the effective utilization of international agencies such as the United Nations.

c. Absolutize international conflicts so that one's own position it is seen as totally good, and the enemy's as totally evil.

d. Disregard America's traditional commitments to freedom of expression, and the right of dissent.

e. Ignore or underestimate international communism's declared purposes of aggression, conquest and destruction of freedom.

3. To seek to foster within their communities a climate of political opinion characterized by such openness to new approaches as to foster a corresponding openness on the part of those holding national political office.

4. To stand in compassion and understanding beside those to whom the conduct of national policy is entrusted, to pray for them and to support them, though not uncritically, in their efforts to solve the dilemmas they face.

5. To be especially mindful of the spiritual and moral problems of men called to military service, including those who on grounds of conscience feel that they cannot participate in war.

Finally, the Lutheran Church in America commits itself to:

1. Continued works of mercy, relief, and rehabilitation in Vietnam through Lutheran World Relief; and

2. Joint efforts through the Lutheran World Federation, the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., the World Council of Churches, and particularly with the churches in Asia, in the quest for fuller understanding and possible solutions of the international issues related to Vietnam.

Teachers-in-Politics Weekend

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, educators throughout the United States are actively engaged in the business of preparing today's youngsters to know the role of an effective citizen in a democratic society. For a teacher to tell youngsters what is essential for citizenship is not enough; he must be a part of the elements of society that make citizenship real, active, and meaningful.

The professional educator in Kansas is rapidly becoming aware of the necessity to be a participant in our political system. Well over 2,000 teachers and administrators are presently active in a political organization known as PACE. The Political Action Committee of Educators has established goals that are designed to improve the level of education, encourage political participation, and to assemble, through research, information that will make the Kansan aware of the need for improvement of the school system of the State.

But involvement in politics with the sole purpose of improving education is not enough. Teachers need to support their political party, campaign for the improvement of governmental effectiveness, and become involved in responsible citizenship.

Partisan classroom politics is not what the teacher should practice. Political participation outside the classroom with genuine practice of the responsible role of citizenship will provide the example that is so important in the education of the youngster for his role in democracy.

The efforts of the National Education Association to establish a Teachers-in-Politics Weekend, April 5 to 7, are to be applauded. Perhaps this recognition of teacher responsibility in the political system will go far to encourage more teachers to become more active citizens.

Citizen Participation in Politics

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in order to exercise full citizenship, every individual must be willing to become a politician. Sometimes that word is looked on with scorn or distrust, but the very basis of our system depends on active participation in politics by every citizen.

Today, it is often difficult to choose among the many candidates for different offices. In one county in my own congressional district, there will be eight State representatives, four State senators, 21 judges, two county commissioners, two school board members, three port authority members, two court clerks, a sheriff, tax collector, tax assessor, voting supervisor, State public service commissioner, State attorney, county solicitor, public defender, and of course, the President, U.S. Senator, and U.S. Congressman on the general election ballot. Most of these positions will be contested, so that the voters will be exposed to the various campaigns of some 106 candidates, and even somewhat more in the party primaries. Needless to say, it will be extremely difficult for the individual citizen to make an intelligent choice.

Business and professional, farm, labor, trade, teacher, and other associations can play an important role. These groups have an interest in government, as it affects their particular business, profession, or occupation. It is important that their membership enter into the political process knowledgeable in the ways of politics, and that a number of their members become candidates for public office or work for the election of candidates who think as they do on the issues of the day.

Floridians are daily witnesses to oppression, as hundreds of refugees cross the Florida straits from Castro's Cuba, where free elections and political action are forbidden. Yet, how many Floridians voted in the last election? How many will vote in the primaries and general election this year? Individual and group action can and should be taken to insure full participation by all citizens in the most important part of self-government—the election of qualified candidates to public office.

Senator Percy Speaks Out on the Issues

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the context of the rivalry between the two major parties for command of the most positive and forward-looking solutions to the problems facing our Nation, it is a pleasure to call attention to a contribution of the Republican Party to the Nation's service. Senator CHARLES H. PERCY represents an example of the vitality and fresh thinking of our party as the election year progresses.

An interview with Senator PERCY appears in the April issue of Playboy magazine. This magazine continues a fine public service started with earlier interviews of public figures such as Carl Sandburg, Bishop James Pike, Albert Schweitzer, and Mayor John Lindsay.

The interview was conducted by Allen Otten, political correspondent for the Wall Street Journal and a distinguished member of the Washington press corps. It is very well written and gives very accurate and broad-gage view of a distinguished member of our Illinois delegation.

I include it at this point in the RECORD:

PLAYBOY INTERVIEW WITH CHARLES PERCY: A CANDID CONVERSATION WITH THE NEWSMAKING JUNIOR SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS

(NOTE.—The real-life incarnation of the legendary all-American hero—a poor but honest young man who earns fame and fortune through gumption and stick-to-itiveness—has seldom been more archetypally embodied than in the blue-eyed, clean-jawed person of 48-year-old Charles Harting Percy, the junior Senator from Illinois. From an impoverished boyhood—at one point during the Depression, his family was on relief—he rose before turning 30 to head a major camera company and become a millionaire many times over. In politics, he's zoomed ahead even faster, from fundraising front man in the late Fifties to red-hot Vice-Presidential—or even Presidential—prospect in 1968. Despite his own disclaimers and the fact that he's spent just over a year in his first elective office, politicians, pundits and polsters now uniformly rank Chuck Percy right along with Richard Nixon, George Romney, Nelson Rockefeller and Ronald Reagan in the 1968 sweepstakes. Their reasons are sound: He is abundantly endowed with all the essentials for success in the political big time. These days, for better or for worse, a man's image is powerful political capital; and young, handsome, personable Chuck Percy is every inch the ideal politician—just as his photogenic wife and children look exactly like the proper family. On television, he comes across smoothly; with his deep, resonant voice and pear-shaped articulation, he pours forth

thoughtful and polished phrases on almost any topic.

(But Percy is more than mere facade. He reads widely, works diligently from dawn till late at night, thinks fast on his feet and has the business background so highly regarded by much of the American electorate. Liberal Republicans regard him as one of their own; yet conservatives remember that in 1964, unlike many party liberals, he reluctantly but officially backed Barry Goldwater. Thus, any one of the major Presidential contenders, left or right, might well give the nod to Percy as his running mate. And if a convention deadlock for the ticket's top spot should develop, the ensuing search for a mutually acceptable compromise candidate could well add the most successful chapter yet to Chuck Percy's rags-to-riches success story.

(Brought up in northeast Chicago, Percy demonstrated early a singular compulsion to get ahead. At the age of five, he was out selling subscriptions to Country Gentleman and won a plaque for lining up more than any other city salesman in the nation; at eight, he was an area captain, with the largest route in the Chicago region. Then, in rapid succession, Edward Percy lost his job when the bank where he worked as a cashier failed; and he was completely wiped out in the stock market. In order to help the family in its long, difficult struggle to recover, Chuck had to work even harder; he sold still more magazines, marketed the cookies and cakes his mother baked and started a shopping service for women unable to go to the store themselves. Usually busy with several simultaneous jobs throughout high school, by the time he reached college, he had learned the cardinal creed of capitalism: You can make more by using other people's labor and services than by selling your own. At the University of Chicago, where he went on a half scholarship, Percy perfected a cooperative agency that pooled the buying of food, clothes, linen, appliances and the like—at large-volume discounts—for the campus fraternities; by his senior year, his fee for this service was $10,000. He also worked for a group of small colleges seeking potential applicants among area high school graduates; they paid Percy five cents a name for each prospect and ten dollars for each student who actually signed up with one of them. Farming out the work to classmates, he paid them three cents a name and five dollars a sign-up.

(But Percy's big break came when he asked Joseph McNabb, his Christian Science Sunday-school teacher, to hire his in-and-out-of-work father. Head of the small Bell & Howell camera company, McNabb took a liking to the industrious youngster; he found a job for the father and offered another—plus scholarship help— to the son. Percy worked for him during summers and vacations and, after graduation in 1941, was put in charge of a new Bell & Howell division that handled defense contracts. The division expanded rapidly and McNabb saw to it that Percy was on the board of directors by the time he was 23. Kept on as a company officer during his three years in the Navy, he was awarded hefty stock options and was ultimately designated as McNabb's successor. When McNabb died in 1949, Percy became head of the company shortly before his 30th birthday. He did a top-notch job of expanding the company's sales at home and abroad, diversified manufacture into new lines and generally built the corporate image of a responsible, forward-thinking business concern. While most camera manufacturers supported high U.S. tariffs—to keep out German and Japanese competition—Percy preached tariff reductions, arguing that the carrot of U.S. tariff cuts would persuade foreign countries to reduce restrictions on American cameras. (Bell & Howell subsequently acquired sole U.S. distribution rights for Japan's Canon camera company.) His lobbying for this unusual position—along with activity as an Illinois Republican fund raiser—brought him to the attention of President Eisenhower, who decided that Percy should be encouraged in public service and installed him as head of a prestigious Republican Committee on Program and Progress, designed to shape long-range party policy. This position helped push him into the spotlighted job of platform-committee chairman at the 1960 Presidential convention, where he unfortunately got caught in the sharp cross fire between Nixon and Rockefeller forces, found himself in deep water and turned in one of his rare less-than-impressive performances.

(But Percy's taste of political high life had whetted his appetite to run for office—and he typically decided he might as well start at the top. He fixed his sights on the Illinois governorship; but months of arduous campaigning found him running far behind a popular political veteran, then-Illinois Secretary of State Charles Carpentier, for the G.O.P. nomination. Carpentier, however, suddenly suffered a heart attack, pulled out and threw his support to young Percy—who won the nomination and seemed securely aimed toward victory and a brilliant future. But a funny thing happened on his way to Springfield: The National Republican Convention nominated Barry Goldwater for President. Hoping to escape the preconvention infighting between the party's liberal and conservative wings, Percy promised to go along with whatever might be the majority decision of the Illinois delegation. This finally found him uncomfortably and unenthusiastically backing Goldwater in the campaign. Running dismally in Illinois, Goldwater lost by almost 900,000 votes and dragged Percy down with him. Though Goldwater was certainly the crucial factor in Percy's 180,000-vote deficit, the Illinoisan could have done more to help himself; in campaign appearances, he came across stiffly, tried to tightrope walk and often contradicted himself on key issues.

(Only momentarily daunted by the setback, however, Percy soon decided on another bold stroke; rather than wait four more years for another crack at the governorship, he would run for the next major office opening in Illinois—the Senate seat of the respected veteran Democrat, Paul Douglas. Many thought Percy was courting another defeat and, with it, political oblivion; but a warmer and more relaxed Percy waged an intelligent, aggressive campaign. Douglas was hurt by his advanced age, an anti-Democratic white backlash, the Vietnam war, a general Republican tide in the nation—and a second deep personal tragedy for Chuck Percy. His first wife had died only four years after they were married, the victim of an adverse reaction to penicillin after two operations for colitis. Now, in the midst of the Senate campaign, an intruder broke into his suburban-Chicago home and brutally murdered 21-year-old Valerie, one of his twin daughters. The tragedy made more voters view him as a human and sympathetic figure.

(In the Senate, Percy has shown none of the usual freshmen-should-be-seen-but-not-heard reluctance to speak out. He has been sharply critical of U.S. bombing policy and has suggested that the President be required to submit annual reports to Congress outlining the nation's foreign commitments. He sponsored a widely supported bill that would provide funds for slum dwellers to remodel and buy their homes at low down payments and low monthly carrying charges. Ultimately, his persistence forced the Administration to accept a watered-down version of this proposal as part of a housing bill now making its way through Congress. He's also emerged as a leading Senate advocate of more commercial and cultural contracts with Communist nations. Almost immediately upon election, too, he began traveling the speakers' circuit, addressing groups ranging from bank presidents (whom he urged to support his housing plan) to students at Berkeley (where he talked of "changing values" and the need to protect individual privacy). In practically all appearances, he went over predictably big.

(Probably Percy's greatest political handicap is a widely shared feeling among his critics that he's too perfectly drawn, too anxious to please, a little too cute and cautious, a little too ambitious and eager. In December, his eagerness took him to the Vietnam front lines, where he was caught in a mortar attack—and subsequently had to face a domestic barrage of criticism for what many constituents saw, erroneously, as a rash, headline-grabbing act. And about the same time, a brouhaha began to brew over a private fund supplied by friends. Percy quickly explained that for some time, he'd been making up the difference between his Senatorial expenses and his Senatorial salary out of his own pocket and that his benefactors neither expected nor earned any political favors for helping him out. But when his critics continued to express their displeasure over its existence, Percy announced in January that the fund was being dissolved; he returned all the money and asked all the donors to make their names public. Apart from these incidents, Percy's track record to date has been enviable and spotless.

(To keep it that way, Percy organizes his time down to the split second. Perhaps because he travels at almost a dead run to and from the Senate, between committee meetings and between chamber and office, he makes a point of physical fitness; a onetime captain of Chicago's championship water-polo team, he tries to swim daily in the Senate pool. At meetings, he reads and signs correspondence while other people talk, rarely missing anything. Then, from time to time, he puts his letters aside long enough to make his own remarks.

(Percy allocated three large blocks of time for Washington correspondent Alan Otten—capital bureau chief of The Wall Street Journal—to interview him for Playboy in his ground-floor office (once occupied by another ambitious young politicial hopeful, New York's Senator Robert Kennedy) in the New Senate Office Building. One appointment was canceled; Percy had to meet with Treasury Secretary Fowler and Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin to discuss his housing bill. The second appointment was kept but repeatedly interrupted by dashes to the Senate floor to vote. The final session broke for half an hour while Percy attended a party for Senator Dirksen.

(Each time Percy sat down on the couch in his large corner office to talk to Otten, however, his mind focused completely on the questions, which he answered thoughtfully and fully. Occasionally, his secretary would come in and hand him a written query; he'd shake his head yes or no without even breaking sentence. Only two subjects were put off limits: his preference among the candidates for the Republican Presidential nomination and his chances of winning that nomination himself. That situation, he explained, kept changing so fast that anything he might say for publication could be hopelessly out of date by the time it appeared in print. We began by asking what prompted him to enter such a volatile and uncertain profession.)

PLAYBOY. What made you decide to leave the lucrative and orderly world of business, in which you were obviously very well established, for the unpredictable and not very profitable arena of politics?

PERCY. Well, sometimes I wonder. Some days you have such a series of frustrations—unable to get anything done—that you wonder why you would want to leave a well-ordered, structured life, where you can make a decision and then enforce that decision without the process that we have to go through in government. But it was a gradual

weaning away from business that I went through.

When I came back from the War, I started right in on politics with the Republican organization, trying to interest returning veterans in contributing part of their time to politics. From that I went into fund raising, policy writing and platform-committee writing; I backed and supported candidates. But then I had the frustration of seeing the platforms that we wrote not fully enunciated, of backing candidates whose performance was then disappointing, and I realized that the only place I could make a satisfactory contribution, where the factors were more under my control, would be in actually holding public office. I would have no one to blame then but myself if I lost. I had finished 25 years with one company and, having been elected head of that company at an early age, I also felt that it would be fairer to the succeeding management if I let them try their own approach and their own ideas, rather than just hang on until I had my 50-year watch and then retire with a big banquet; I wanted to leave feeling that I still had something to contribute but that I should give the fine men I worked with a chance to proceed on their own.

PLAYBOY. To what extent were you motivated by the feeling that too many people, particularly businessmen, tend to criticize our political system without offering any alternatives or doing something about it themselves?

PERCY. I think there is a great deal of denunciation of bureaucracy and the high cost of government by businessmen but relatively modest involvement on their part—in contrast with the labor leader, who gets right down to the guts of politics. He organizes, he supports, he works at the precinct level and up. The labor leaders know and have learned through the years that they can gain more for labor in the halls of Congress and the state legislative halls than they can on the picket lines.

PLAYBOY. You've finished your first year in elective office. Have you been able to get as much accomplished as you expected?

PERCY. When I came to Washington, I took into consideration the fact that it would be my first time in public office, that I would be a freshman member of the Senate, that I would be a member of the minority party, and I was prepared for the worst. But my Democratic associates have treated me as graciously as my fellow Republicans; and every one of my G.O.P. colleagues in the Senate and 110 members of the House supported the first bill that I put in [the National Home Ownership Opportunities Act—*Ed.*]; I've been told it was the first time in 50 years that a major bill has had the support of every Republican Senator. I was also fortunate, of course, to have as my senior colleague from Illinois Senator Everett Dirksen, who has given me immeasurable help and support in many aspects of my career here. And the committee work that I've done has been equally rewarding. I was assigned to the very committee that I wanted to get on—Banking and Currency—and to its subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, and have been treated extremely fairly by the chairman of that committee, Senator John Sparkman, and by the ranking minority member, Senator Wallace Bennett. So that part of my job has been very satisfying.

PLAYBOY. What about the frustrations you mentioned earlier?

PERCY. Well, the slowness of the legislative process can certainly be frustrating. It's designed to keep any man of evil intent from accomplishing his own designs, but it applies also to men of *good* will, with worthwhile ideas. The resistance to new ideas, ideas that have not been tried and tested, is unbelievable. The forces marshaled to stop the National Home Ownership Opportunities Act, for example, were powerful. There was one day when I was sure the wheels of Government must have stopped, when there were about 30 top officials, from the Housing Department and the Federal Reserve Board and half a dozen other agencies, in one room for the entire day, arguing over just one feature of that bill. When you get to the end of a long legislative session like that and everyone is tired and upset and sometimes angry, everything seems almost to grind to a halt. The system is designed to slow things down and that's just what it does.

PLAYBOY. Any other frustrations?

PERCY. Our staffs are inadequate, too. The staff size for all Senators is geared to some median state. It may be more than adequate for a small state, but it's totally inadequate to deal with the load in a large state like Illinois, one and a half hours away by jet and 60 cents away by phone, where daily papers flood the people with information about issues. And the number of committees you have to serve on here in the Senate is appalling. I have 14 committee and subcommittee assignments. Some of them overlap and you're never able to get your homework done the way you'd like. But despite all these problems and though the work is exhaustively demanding, the challenge and diversity is exhilarating. And you develop a very healthy respect for the quality of the men you work with. I think, even more than I did before, that a United States Senator has the best elective job in the world.

PLAYBOY. Some of the men you work with don't seem to appreciate your eagerness and impatience to get things done. In private conversations, several fellow Republicans have called you too pushy, too much the young man in a hurry. Governor Romney, in fact, was reported to have described you as "an opportunist"; and then when news of this leaked out, he explained that he meant this in a good sense, in the sense of "recognizing the right time to act." But many people feel that the more common and less favorable meaning of the word was intended and is, in fact, completely appropriate. What's your answer?

PERCY. They could well be right. You have a good illustration of my attitude toward my work when I came to the Senate. The tradition is that a new Senator do nothing for the first six months to a year, that he just sit and listen. Under ordinary circumstances, I think this would be a wise thing; but today we're not confronted with ordinary circumstances. We're enmeshed in a tragic war in Vietnam; we've had an eruption in the Middle East; we've had a new crisis in Korea; we've had our cities burning. How can I sit there—one of two Senators from one of our great states—and say to myself, "I'm not going to express opinions; I'm not going to put a bill in; I'm not going to work, because I'm not supposed to." I think a tradition like that makes no sense in today's society, and I'm not going to be so false with myself, my constituents and my colleagues as to sit here and do nothing simply because that's the tradition. It's time to *break* a few of the traditions. When the five or six Senators who are in my class, including Senator Baker, Everett Dirksen's son-in-law, met and had lunch with Senator Dirksen and Senator Mike Mansfield early in our Senate careers, we put this question to them. They said, "Don't ever sit there if you've got something to say and not say it. You have not only a right but an obligation to start to work the day you get here." Well, that's just what we've done.

PLAYBOY. Have your other Senatorial elders taken the same positive attitude toward this disavowal of tradition?

PERCY. Oh, I think they've viewed it in mixed fashion. Though I haven't had any criticism come directly to me, I can well imagine that some does exist. But you can't keep a dynamic institution such as the Congress of the United States exactly the way it was before. The times are simply too critical. There's a lot of work for all of us, and I think every member of the Senate expects us to pick up our share of the load and get about our business.

PLAYBOY. If we might dwell on the subject of opportunism a bit longer: Repeatedly in the late Fifties and the early Sixties, you declared your admiration for Illinois' Senator Paul Douglas as a great political leader and a great humanitarian. And yet you ran against him, beat him, and ended what most people thought was a very noteworthy Senate career. Some critics regarded that as a confirmation of Governor Romney's charge of opportunism. How would you reply?

PERCY. I don't think it was opportunism and I don't think Senator Douglas thought so, either. I called him up during the Christmas holidays in 1965, while he was getting a well-earned rest in Mexico, and I told him I had thought long and hard about this and that 16 party leaders, headed by Senator Dirksen, had asked me to run for the Senate. And I said, "I've decided to go ahead." I expressed my hope for a high-level campaign, based on issues and not on personalities—a hard-fought and clean campaign. He told me, "You have no alternative." He indicated his feeling that the two-party system in Illinois depends upon the G.O.P. putting up the strongest candidate it has. He also expressed the hope that we could have a campaign that would distinguish itself for its high level. I think that we fulfilled that wish to a great extent. Now, I didn't like beating Senator Douglas, because I think he is a fine man and was a fine Senator. But I must say that although I disliked beating him, I'd have like it even less if he had defeated *me*.

PLAYBOY. Well, when you announced your candidacy against Douglas in 1966, you promised you wouldn't make an issue of his advanced age. And yet your campaign posters——

PERCY. I said his age, not his *advanced* age.

PLAYBOY. All right. Yet your campaign posters and literature showed you in an open-necked shirt, looking about 20 years old, above the slogan "A Strong New Voice for Illinois." Wasn't this really making Senator Douglas' age an issue?

PERCY. I don't think so. The slogan "A Strong New Voice for Illinois" meant exactly what it said—a new voice speaking for the state of Illinois; there was no age implication whatsoever intended. And I made a public statement right at the start of the campaign that Senator Douglas later quoted many times, that a man's age in the Senate should not be a determining factor. I said that no man should be qualified simply because he was young or disqualified simply because he wasn't. There was nothing that anyone could specifically point to and say that age had been made a factor in that campaign. Senator Douglas, on the other hand, mentioned it several times; he gave a public statement on the health report that he'd had from his doctor; he was shown and depicted many times swimming. He took every opportunity to demonstrate and prove that he was in good physical condition and alert mentally—all of which I felt was perfectly appropriate for him to do. But one principle in our campaign was that we wouldn't discuss age, and I never did.

PLAYBOY. Whether or not age was an issue in your campaign, your swift rise in politics seems to exemplify a trend toward personable young men in public office. Do you agree with those who feel that these qualities have become essential to political success in the Sixties?

PERCY. As far as youth is concerned, I don't think it's a controlling asset at all. Everett Dirksen is one of the most colorful personalities in public life, one of the most sought-after men by the Washington press and certainly by television. He's a man with many

youthful ideas. I've known young people who are old fogies in the way they think, and I've known older men—like Senator Douglas—who have been dynamic and bold in their concepts. But I think Jack Kennedy did do a great deal to advance the cause of young men in politics, just as I hope that I have perhaps given new hope to young men in business that they can be entrusted with the management of a large corporation.

PLAYBOY. Aren't clean-cut, all-American good looks such as yours becoming an equally important political asset in attracting the pivotal bloc of white voters?

PERCY. Let's take a few specific personalities: Jack Javits in New York, for instance. I have never known him to claim that his greatest asset was his handsome looks, but he is certainly a tremendously successful politician, and I'm proud to have him as a Republican. On the other hand, of course, you've got John Lindsay, who is the epitome of fine appearance; but his appeal, as I've seen as I have gone around New York, attracts the Negro in Harlem, the Mexican, the Puerto Rican as well as Broadway and Wall Street. As we drove through the streets, people would call out to him. He has associated himself with the hopes and aspirations of the poor rather than just the rich. And I think that Governor Rockefeller in New York has done the same thing, and very, very successfully. He is a dynamic man, with broad voter appeal.

PLAYBOY. On a related theme, many commenators have expressed the view that the political success of such former show-business personalities as Ronald Reagan and George Murphy is attributable almost entirely to their marquee names and attractive TV images. Do you think there's much truth to that?

PERCY. Shirley Temple Black is prettier and it didn't work for her. A politician's ability has to be more than skin deep, and I tend to think that television and the press dig rather deeply. A candidate running for public office, where problem solving has to be the primary consideration and responsibility, can cover up with clichés and slogans for just so long, but then he's got to produce. I think that over the long pull, most candidates are going to have to have something more than an image that is appealing and pleasant to the viewer. There isn't any question, though, that television and radio have brought about a change. They require a new asset in a candidate, and it's one of those factors that's now taken into consideration, along with all the other factors. But I hope we'll still be looking for intelligence, perception, depth of reasoning and the ability to recognize problems, conceive alternate solutions and then decide upon and carry out the best solutions. I think in the end that's going to be the only kind of politicians who will really survive—if our society is to survive.

PLAYBOY. Speaking of political survival, a great deal has been written lately about the high cost of serving in public office—particularly in the Congress. Arizona Congressman Morris Udall, in fact, wrote an article on this subject for Playboy last November. Do you feel, as some of your colleagues do, that the mounting burden of expenses for campaigning, Congressional correspondence, official junkets, constituent relations and the like are making it increasingly difficult for men of modest means to enter politics?

PERCY. Yes, I do. There are many men for whom this is a far more serious problem than it is for me, but it's becoming increasingly difficult even for men of some means to enter and remain in politics. I'm concerned that personal wealth is rapidly becoming a requirement for office seeking—a requirement never contemplated by the founding fathers. Somehow, we've got to make it possible for the best qualified men and women, rich or poor, to have an equal chance to gain and hold public office.

PLAYBOY. A group of your friends in Illinois recently tried to raise $100,000 to help pay for the extra expenses you incur as a Senator with a large correspondence and much in demand as a speaker around the country. If you're well off personally, why did they think it was necessary?

PERCY. They thought it was necessary because the cost of being a Senator from a large state like Illinois far exceeds the allotment provided by the Government. Senate allotments and benefits, so far as office space and staff are concerned, tend to favor Senators from the majority party, from smaller states and those with seniority. I'm from the minority party, from a big state and a freshman. I plowed my entire Senate salary and fees back into office expenses, and during my first 11 months in office, I spent another $40,000 of my own money to do my job the way I thought it should be done—the way I promised during my campaign it would be done. The group of friends you mentioned learned of this, and they felt that public office should not entail such a large financial sacrifice and offered to try to raise some money to help offset part of my expenses.

PLAYBOY. When the fund began to be widely publicized, there was a good deal of speculation that it might be improper, that it might give the contributors some sort of special claim on you. In the wake of this criticism, you asked your friends to call it off. *Was* the fund improper and, if not, why did you change your mind and decide to stop it?

PERCY. There was nothing improper about it or I never would have given permission to let them raise the money. Despite the fact that every step was taken to guarantee the full integrity of the fund and its use, there was widespread concern and misunderstanding about it. So I decided that until such time as the Congress has clearly defined a set of rules for activities of this type. I would ask that all the money be returned, and it was.

PLAYBOY. Do you think the Senate should provide larger expense allowances for Senators from big states, or should make it clear that expense funds such as the one your friends were raising are perfectly proper?

PERCY. As I just indicated, I would hope that Congress would draw up a set of ground rules for office seekers and officeholders who now operate with inadequate funds and without guidelines.

PLAYBOY. How can other Senators get by without this sort of fund? Isn't much of your extra expense due to the fact that you're being widely discussed as a possible Presidential or Vice-Presidential candidate?

PERCY. Let's be realistic. If I wasn't being mentioned that way, the expenses I incur would undoubtedly be somewhat—but not much—lighter. The day I arrived in the Senate, however, bags of mail were piled up outside my door. For months on end, I received 1500 to 2000 letters a day—85 percent from Illinois—plus 200 phone calls a day and 21,000 visitors my first year. Someone had to handle all of this, and I hired the necessary staff to help me do the quality job people had a right to expect of me. The extra cost of research and development expenses for my Home Ownership Opportunities Act amounted to only the cost of six low-cost houses, and yet we ended up with a bill that will help 230,000 families own their own home who could not otherwise. That's a good return on an investment, and I'd do it again.

PLAYBOY. Isn't there the temptation, though, for some members of Congress who find the cost of giving official parties, entertaining constituents, etc., excessively high, to resort to testimonial dinners and other fund-raising functions where the proceeds go to the Congressmen themselves, who might then be unduly obligated?

PERCY. Speaking for myself, I've never had to accept a dime that had any string attached. In fact, only once did anyone try to tie a string to a gift; it was a $1,000 contribution to the Republican Party in Illinois when I was finance chairman. I sent it back. As far as other members of Congress go, I don't know what they do. But for the most part, I doubt that you'd find a more honorable group of men and women anywhere in the world than in the United States Senate and the House. But I think a uniform procedure and code of ethics is long overdue, including names of contributors and an audited statement of expenditures. I also favor public disclosure of earned income for legislators and the requirement that a copy of income-tax returns be filed with the Comptroller General of the U.S.

PLAYBOY. You were among the Senators who voted to censure Thomas Dodd for his misuse of campaign funds. Justifiably or not, some critics regarded your subsequent approval of an expense fund for yourself as an example of ethical inconsistency. Do you think that's unfair?

PERCY. Yes. There is no parallel at all between the two cases, and I don't see any inconsistency in my position on either. The facts about my expense fund were public knowledge; the money was never intended for personal use and no one has even slightly implied that it ever would have been so used. The only money ever spent for my official additional office expenses was my own. When questions were raised about the propriety of these supplementary monies, however, I asked for all of it to be returned before a penny was spent and requested that the donors make their names public. With respect to the censure of Senator Dodd by the Senate, I'd rather not comment about that. The proceedings and judgment are a matter of public record.

PLAYBOY. Your critics also accuse you of contradicting yourself on a number of other important issues. At one time, for example, you were against fair-employment legislation; now you're for it. You were against open occupancy; now you favor it. You were critical of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling; then you supported it. How do you explain these reversals in position?

PERCY. I hope I don't have my mind so rigidly set in concrete and my ideas so firmly fixed that I'd refuse to alter a judgment that I had made, after an intensive study of an issue, with new facts, new circumstances, new conditions confronting us. If a person can go through life without making a mistake or having cause to change his mind, I think it's to be admired, but I've never been able to. And when I make a mistake, I want to clearly acknowledge it and announce that I've made a mistake; and if I have to change course, then I do so—without any shame or apologies whatsoever. But the fact that my critics are able to point out only two or three position changes in the course of the 22 years I've been in politics, I think, shows they've had to dig pretty deep to try to come up with some issues.

Let's take each one of those you mentioned. On one-man, one-vote, I think a good case can be made that this is not the only principle of democratic government, and that's the point that I wanted to make originally. We also have a tradition of unrepresentative, nonpopular government—in such institutions as the Electoral College, the Senate of the United States and the Supreme Court. But as I saw the state legislatures change, as I saw each state respond to population changes—with more and more being drawn from the suburbs and the cities, and the rural communities becoming less and less of a dominant factor in the state legislatures—I found those legislatures to be more responsive, creative bodies of government than before. It's for that reason that I became a strong adherent of reapportionment. After I saw 36 states reapportion themselves with far more creative state legislatures than they had before, I became convinced that one-

man, one-vote, as it affected state legislatures, was an absolutely proper principle. But that doesn't mean, of course, that I think it should be the principle by which we elect the Senate of the United States; so my initial statement that this is not the only principle of representative government still stands.

As for fair-employment practices, I have always felt that we should have equality of opportunity as a principle of our society, but for a long time I didn't believe it would be necessary as a coercive force in law. I became increasingly disillusioned, however, about the prospects of moving fast enough without it. I recognized that in business we have virtually a monopoly on private employment and that you can't allow a monopoly of that type to discriminate against a person—as it all too often does—simply because of race, color or creed. For that reason, I changed my position as a businessman and I went to the state legislature and fought for a fair-employment-practice law at the state level. I felt it would be better to have the law at the state level, rather than wait for the Federal Government to act. There's no question that these laws have opened doors that never would have been opened otherwise. I had thought we could rely on education and voluntary action, but I was 1000 percent wrong, and I admitted it.

The same process of thought change took place on open housing. I felt initially that this could be done without law, but I became increasingly disillusioned that we would never move fast enough in this field without the moral force of law behind it. So I publicly announced that I had been mistaken before—that the times were changing too rapidly, that we must respond much more quickly to the legitimate needs and aspirations of all our people. Since then, I have fought for open-occupancy legislation.

PLAYBOY. There's no open-occupancy statute in your former home town of Kenilworth. Would you support one?

PERCY. I did.

PLAYBOY. How many Negro families are there now in Kenilworth?

PERCY. We have, I think, 3000 people and we have one Negro family. They moved in four years ago; they've been well received in the community and we've had no problem as a result of it. But I would much prefer to see every village, every city in the state of Illinois, with an ordinance for open occupancy, and I certainly have commended every city recently—Joliet, Elgin, Weston and others—that has come forward with these ordinances. More than half the people in Illinois are now living under such local laws. Progress is being made locally, but it is too slow and too piecemeal. That's why I've been working to pass open-occupancy bills at the state and Federal levels. It will take many years, of course, to bring about freedom of residence in every city and town across the country, even with Federal legislation—just as it has taken years with the various other civil rights laws—but that's no excuse to delay any longer in setting that process into motion.

PLAYBOY. Most of your efforts in the housing area have been directed toward passage of your bill proposing home ownership by lower-income families. This would set up a Government-chartered foundation, backed by Government credit, to provide low-interest loans to unions and other groups that would acquire slum housing, rehabilitate it and sell it to poor families who would pay partly with labor and partly with cash. Even assuming that this would work as well as you think it would, isn't it a rather limited and long-term solution to the problem of urban renewal?

PERCY. Long-term, yes; limited, no. In the past 30 years, America has moved from one third homeowners to two thirds homeowners, but this has happened mainly in areas outside the inner city. In the next decade, we will have to find ways to increase ownership in the city itself, where home ownership is rare and getting rarer, especially in our swelling ghettos. The core cities are soon going to be all black, surrounded by white suburbs, unless we can find a way to make our cities attractive enough to lure white families back in. Just as we have found a way to develop and stabilize the suburbs, we are going to have to find a way to stabilize the cities. This will be an enormous task; but a good beginning, I think, would be to encourage ownership—ownership of business as well as ownership of housing; we've got to help our minority groups become entrepreneurs as well as taxpayers. This is really the foundation of our society—to be somebody, to have something of your own, to make a contribution. Yet millions can't achieve it.

Ownership gives a sense of pride and dignity to people; it helps them integrate into the community. If you're a transient coming into a community with only the thought of getting out of it, you haven't any roots, any stake; you don't care enough. And that feeling of not being wanted or needed is the lack that we find in the city. We have got to find a way to take the rural immigrants from the South and give them the same sort of acclimation to urban living that we gave to the immigrants from Europe when they came and landed at Ellis Island and were brought in by their kinfolk and taken into their community. The Greeks, for instance, went to the Greek Orthodox Church, and they went to the Greek restaurants and were in a community and had folklore enough to cushion them through the adjustment to their new life. There isn't that transition now. We simply assume, as we throw these individuals into urban life, that they are going to adjust somehow. Well, they haven't adjusted. The adjustment is taking place on the street now—and the experience has alienated them, from their roots, from each other and from their new environment.

The whole essence of our homeownership program is to see if we can't democratize the city to the point where you have the same sort of feeling of belonging, the same sense of being an important part of the community in which you live, that middle-income Americans develop in owning their own homes or a condominium or a co-op apartment. They participate; they decide who is going to be living there; they make decisions about their landscaping, their gardening, their improvements, and so forth. I think we have to give the low-income city dweller the same feeling that he has something to say about the immediate environment in which he finds himself. If he has *that* feeling, he will have a feeling of pride and interest in the community—just as in the suburbs when you have your own home, you are immediately interested in the parks, the schools, the village administration, the police department, and the like. You can get Negroes into white communities and whites into Negro communities if everyone is convinced that each fellow will take care of the property, and keep it up, and not throw trash into the yards, and all the rest. We have an area in Chicago where it's about 50 percent Negro and 50 percent white; this neighborhood is stabilized. The one thing they all have in common is their mortgage. And all are concerned with their property and take care of it.

When I went through Bedford-Stuyvesant with John Lindsay, I saw that on blocks that were stable, the homes and businesses that were owned by the people on that block; a block away, where it was unstable, the entire block was transient. There will have to be many, many other changes before we can achieve stability, of course. I'd like to explore, for example, the possibility of Federally subsidized experiments with educational parks in the midst of the cities, model schools that will attract whites as well as Negroes. But we've got to crawl before we can run; before we can undertake such ambitious projects as these, we've got to show that we care enough about those who live in the ghetto to pass such basic legislation as a rat-control bill without bickering over the amount of money necessary to keep their children safe from attack by vermin while they sleep.

PLAYBOY. The rat-control bill calls for a relatively modest $40,000,000 appropriations; but the cost of your home-ownership plan, added to that of all the other urban-renewal and city-beautification bills currently under consideration, would run into billions a year. The Administration claims it's already spending all that can be afforded on such programs without a substantial increase in taxes, as requested by President Johnson. Would you favor raising taxes in order to pay for these projects?

PERCY. Yes, I would—not only to help narrow the gap in our deficit but to symbolize the fact that the Administration has been dead wrong when it has said we can have guns and butter with no sacrifice on anyone's part. Both the war and our urgent domestic programs are going to have to be paid for by the present generation, and one way to do that is within a tax increase. We must also drastically reduce nonessential Federal spending; for instance, I have proposed delaying public-works projects generally, even if they affect Illinois. But I feel also that there are many, many areas of urban redevelopment that private enterprise can be brought into, and I have talked to many labor-union heads and corporation heads about it. I've spent a good deal of time in Chicago, New York, Pittsburgh, Detroit and Los Angeles working on that very thing, seeing how we could interest private enterprise in investing in the cities to a much greater extent than it is right now. If it doesn't invest more in some of these problems today, tomorrow it's not going to have the consumers, the educated employees, the climate for business that we've had in the past.

PLAYBOY. Many urban experts have begun to believe that the basic answer to the ghetto problem is simply to get more income into the hands of ghetto families—with Government-provided jobs or some sort of family allowance, negative income tax or other direct cash payment. Do you think this would be effective?

PERCY. More income alone isn't going to solve anything—we can't just hand people a check and say we've discharged our obligation. I've met and talked with enough slum families to know that a very high proportion of the extra income might go into things that would not exactly be for the enrichment of family life. Much of it would be wasted. A slum family doesn't know how to buy properly at a store. They are frequently overcharged. They don't know how to plan the use of their funds. Just a modest investment in social-welfare work to train people to budget their time, their energy and their funds more intelligently would provide a tremendous return for society.

PLAYBOY. Then you'd put the emphasis on Government services rather than on Government subsidy.

PERCY. Yes, that's right—though it doesn't have to be done only on the Federal level. Again, I think it's an alliance for progress by Federal, state and local government and, to the greatest extent that we can, by private enterprise. In addition to consumer training, of course, we've got to provide incentives for ghetto dwellers to undertake some course of action other than the one they're pursuing. We've got to motivate them to, say, watch television only two hours and go to class three hours, instead of watching TV five hours. In the New Illinois Committee, we pushed adult literacy for minorities, offering the incentives of education and a job. We had no trouble getting classes filled night after night. But it has to be done in a friend-

ly atmosphere. We found it didn't work in a school. That was degrading the adults in the eyes of their children; school was a place where children went, not grownups. So we put the classes in churches; that was fine; that was where adults went anyway. When they finished these courses, we got them jobs. This is the kind of program we've got to undertake on a national scale.

PLAYBOY. Isn't it unrealistic to propose costly new antipoverty projects at a time when many of your Republican colleagues have become so disenchanted with the Administration's War on Poverty that they've suggested abandoning the entire program?

PERCY. I don't think so. But the fact that the director, Sargent Shriver, spends 85 percent of his time in Congressional relations and 15 percent—by his own estimate—helping the poor is certainly symbolic of the fact that Congress is not convinced that this program is well conceived, that the haste with which we went into it was justified and that the promise it offered, which has fallen very short in performance, has been a good thing for the country. I myself feel that, whatever its shortcomings, this kind of effort is badly needed. Though there are many programs that can and must be improved, I think some good has been accomplished. But we must do much more than we have if our cities are to be saved and the promise of a decent life for all our citizens is ever to be fulfilled.

PLAYBOY. Most observers feel that the lack of such legislation and the nonenforcement of civil rights laws now on the books are largely responsible for the riots in many of our big-city ghettos. Do you agree?

PERCY. Yes, I think there's a growing awareness on the part of Negroes and the other minority groups that for all the discussions, all the reports, all the committees, all the laws, all the fine-sounding words, equality of opportunity remains unfulfilled in this country. They went through the period of demonstrations and nothing happened. They paraded for laws and, when they finally got their laws, *still* nothing happened. Year after year, they continue to live in the same despicable conditions. Now, we've had ghettos in American life ever since we've had a country; but in the type of ghetto developed by the immigrants coming in from abroad, they always had the feeling that they were there with a culture, a background, ties that held them to the community. Now we've taken those communities and filled them full of people who don't have the same background, the same cultural ties, the same heritage of family, the same loyalties to one another. Poor whites and Negroes have migrated from the rural South into the alien environment of the urban North in such numbers that society isn't equipped to help them—or those who already live there—adjust to the conditions of their new life. Every night, in their dismal living rooms, they see on installment-plan television sets what the world is like outside the ghetto. Before TV, they really didn't know much about it; but now this world of glamor is poured every night into a tenement slum and all they know is that they can't get their share of what everyone else seems to have *more* than his share of. There isn't any escape from the ghetto—the kind of escape that's been possible for every other immigrant group that's come into the city. They realize that they're locked in—so they want to break out and *grab* what's coming to them. And finally, that's just what many of them do. Their growing frustration has been such that they engage in criminal acts—and that's what they are—that a few years ago they never would have dreamed of committing.

PLAYBOY. What do you think the Federal Government should do to prevent new outbreaks of rioting this summer—and to stop those that do break out?

PERCY. The first thing we have to do is recognize that the frustrations that cause riots don't exist just in the summer; they exist all year long. We've got to find answers to the problem of housing, jobs and education that will last from January first to December 31st; and we've got to start implementing those answers now—on a massive scale. But it's going to take years to undo so many decades of inaction and neglect. For the immediate future, we've got to face the likelihood of more riots—and to equip ourselves to deal with them more effectively than we have. If there's any lesson we learned from last summer's riots in Detroit, it's that the National Guard will have to undergo a great deal more training before we can expect it to cope responsibly with such a disturbance. We've also learned a valuable lesson about riots in general—that a civil disturbance turns into a riot when the looting begins. The moment it becomes apparent that you can go in and grab a television set and a police officer might turn his back and not interfere—as has happened in several cities—that knowledge becomes so widespread so rapidly that the local disorders soon turn into full-scale rioting. We're going to have to have swift, firm and decisive police action with whatever riot-control devices may be necessary to curb these outbreaks in the early stages—with a minimum of bloodshed and property damage—before they escalate out of control. We may find these devices distasteful, but the alternative is anarchy.

Most of our energy, however, must be put into preventing riots rather than quelling them. The hatred and suspicion that exists between the white policeman and the Negro ghetto dweller, for example, which has been the spark that has ignited some of the riots, must somehow be defused.

PLAYBOY. The hostility between white police and ghetto Negroes seems to reflect a larger alienation between white and black throughout the country. Some time ago, a *Chicago Sun-Times* poll of Negro and white racial attitudes concluded that whites were less in favor of integration than they had been a year earlier. According to other polls, whites also feel very strongly that Negroes have to move much more slowly and to "prove" that they are entitled to more. Do you think that this failure to understand the Negro's legitimate needs and aspirations is generally true of white people throughout the country?

PERCY. Yes, I'm afraid I do. And it's not just a problem of general White and Negro attitudes. It's getting more and more difficult for established leaders of the civil rights movement within the white communities to communicate with the new leadership in the Negro community.

PLAYBOY. Why?

PERCY. I guess it's simply the inability of the white person—even a sympathetic civil rights worker—to walk in the shoes of the American Negro. The Negro just can't believe that a white person can ever understand his problems and his handicaps. And when any person feels another person can't understand his problems, it becomes difficult to communicate.

PLAYBOY. What can be done to open the lines of communication?

PERCY. I think it's a two-way street. There has to be a better understanding on the part of the white community that the American Negro is paying a price for centuries of neglect; but this goes hand in hand with an effort to cultivate in the Negro community a better understanding of the responsibilities of citizenship in a free society. It's not a question of just one community solving its problem and then the other community will have its problems automatically solved. Both have to be worked on simultaneously. In the context of dealing specifically with the problem of riots, I think we could take a giant step toward mutual understanding and peaceful coexistence between the races if the militant new Negro leaders would face the fact that they're not going to win freedom now—or ever—with bricks and Molotov cocktails, that the white support they need to win the black revolution can be regained only with nonviolent perseverance. Whites, on the other hand, must be made to understand that it's not "the Negroes" who are wreaking havoc in the streets. Those who foment and participate in riots are a tiny minority of the Negro population. Most Negroes, in fact, fear crime in the streets even more than most whites—and with good reason. More than 80 percent of all crimes are uniracial: that is, perpetrated on Negroes by other Negroes and by whites against other whites. Since the crime rate among Negroes is higher than among whites, this means that the Negro community is suffering more from crime than the white community.

PLAYBOY. As you know, the crime rate among both races has risen markedly, in proportion to population growth, in the past few years, and many law-enforcement officials—Federal and local—blame recent Supreme Court decisions protecting and extending the rights of defendants in criminal cases. Do you agree with that assessment?

PERCY. Yes; I do, to a very large extent—and I think that these decisions have been in force long enough to prove I'm right. In New York City, for instance, the number of murders the police have been able to solve has dropped about five percent since the new regulations went into effect. They're unable to really question adequately someone whom they strongly suspect was deeply involved in a crime. Unquestionably, the new rulings have eliminated certain bad practices that the police themselves engaged in, so that it's not been a totally negative thing; it's brought some improvement. But I think the time has come—without sacrificing sensible safeguards against police malpractice—to move back in the other direction.

PLAYBOY. How far?

PERCY. Far enough to enable law-enforcement agencies to arrest—and, if possible, reverse—the rising spiral of crime. First of all, I think we've got to institute a nationwide program of better police training and education. I think, for instance, that the investigation procedures developed by the FBI are sufficiently superior to those used by many of our state and local agencies that FBI training of state and local officials, and more money put into training, would perhaps help rectify the situation. Secondly, I think we need a program of legislation designed to facilitate the job of responsible but effective law enforcement that the courts, in their zeal for civil liberties, have unintentionally made so difficult. It's for this reason that after a great deal of soul-searching I have cosponsored and put my staff to work with Senator Hruska in developing what I consider to be a sensible wire-tap bill—one permitting the use of wire tapping by law-enforcement officials in the investigation of major crimes but outlawing any kind of wire tapping other than that sanctioned by a Federal court and done under the jurisdiction and authority and regulations of that Federal court. The legal pendulum has swung so far in the direction of individual freedom and liberty that the individual has less freedom or liberty to walk the streets today. Measures like the wire-tap bill will help bring the pendulum back to where we can really operate more effectively against crime. Too much has been done to protect the criminal against society, and not enough to protect society against the criminal.

PLAYBOY. If wire tapping were legalized even with the restrictions you specify, wouldn't there be a danger that the extensive illegal wire tapping now in practice—not only by detective agencies, corporation spies and private citizens but also by many law-enforcement agencies—would continue and perhaps even increase?

PERCY. I think not; because in this bill, we would make it a serious Federal offense to manufacture or transmit any wire-tapping device across state lines to be purchased and used by any individual or company or organization or anyone other than those authorized by a Federal court. We even make it a crime for any local law-enforcement agency to do this without Federal court sanction and supervision. Actually, we stiffen the penalties for private use and make it permissible only under the most stringent types of court control.

PLAYBOY. As documented by Frank Donner in last month's Playboy article *Spies on Campus*, extralegal electronic surveillance has been among the many weapons employed in the mounting campaign of official prosecution and unofficial persecution of those who protest against the Vietnam war. As you know, this trend has been seen by some not only as a concerted attempt to suppress dissent but as an ominous sign of resurgent McCarthyism. Do you think they may be right?

PERCY. We always stand in danger of that, of course, but I doubt if we'll ever get back to the bitterness of the McCarthy period, where you had wholesale resignations from the State Department and other Government offices, and where no one was willing to take a stand on anything that involved any controversy. But I think there has been a good deal of unwarranted condemnation of dissent from the war. And yet, even when the President made his famous "Nervous Nellie" speech, there was enough condemnation of that, too, that the pendulum swung back. And when Robert McNamara went to the campuses to defend the right of dissent in a democratic republic such as ours, I think that helped a great deal; so that I don't see the grave danger that we had during the McCarthy period.

PLAYBOY. Are you concerned about the implications of the Government's indictment of war protesters such as Dr. Spock and William Sloane Coffin for counseling resistance to the draft?

PERCY. I feel that when a charge has been brought, we should leave it to the courts. It's not the American style to try a man ahead of time in the press. Anything officially before a court must be judged in accordance with law, and it is really not proper, particularly for those in the legislative branch, to prejudge a case. Clearly, if the Justice Department believes anyone has broken the law, it has a responsibility to prosecute. Now it's up to the court to decide.

PLAYBOY. Many conservatives have expressed their concern that "Communist influences" are responsible for turning the country's college campuses into hotbeds of protest against the war. Do you share that view?

PERCY. I don't think communism has any more to do with the peace movement than it does with the civil rights movement. It was the young, remember, who were the first to go into the civil rights movement. They were the ones who moved down to Mississippi for voter-registration drives in the summer. They had become disillusioned with the promise of American life for a people for whom they had a deep sense of compassion. They had been struck with the brutality of Little Rock, with the fact that the militia had to be used to protect the safety of a few black children. They saw for the first time—in television films of Southern white police brutalizing helpless women and children—the violence of racial hatred and injustice, and the impact, I think, was very great. Now they have seen what they consider to be the same kind of inhumanity—the mightiest power we can muster raining terror down upon a small nation, forcing a people to submit itself to our will—and they feel ashamed to be associated with it.

PLAYBOY. A number of commentators argue that the Vietnam conflict has somehow polluted the quality of American life today. They report a growing feeling among a large proportion of the public—ranging from uneasiness to the shame you mentioned—that the U.S. shouldn't be involved in the war, and a concomitant decline in national pride. Do you think they're right?

PERCY. I'm afraid I do. You can't have so high a proportion of our young people, so high a proportion of our clergy, so high a proportion of our academic community feel as strongly as it does in condemning what we're doing in Vietnam, and not have an effect on the rest of the country. But this same sense of disenchantment is even more pronounced overseas. No American could travel anywhere in the world today and receive the same feeling from other people that was expressed toward the United States, say, during the time of Eisenhower or Kennedy. In an opinion poll recently taken in western Europe, I think only 2 percent of Western Europeans said that America has achieved greatness under Lyndon Johnson. There is no question that Vietnam is tending to isolate America in terms of world opinion—not only because of our involvement but because we've put our prestige on the line in a conflict that looks increasingly to many people as though it's an unwinnable war. I think the most tragic mistake of this Administration has been its desire to swoop in, take this war over, turn it into an American conflict and promise the American people victory.

PLAYBOY. In order to make the Vietnam conflict less an American venture, you have called for more troops from other countries to fight alongside U.S. troops. But the administration says that it's appealed in vain for such support. How do you propose to persuade sovereign nations to do something that they clearly don't want to do?

PERCY. Well, first of all, I don't think the Administration has tried hard enough. I was disturbed when I heard the statement made by General Taylor and Clark Clifford that they had not asked, on their trip to Southeast Asia last summer, for extra forces and troops from the other Asian countries. It's incredible that this Administration would send two high-level people on a mission and not use it to take a small step toward making this less an American effort and more an Asian effort.

PLAYBOY. What sort of pressures would you propose to put on other Asian countries to get them to join us?

PERCY. I think the President should "reason together" with them. One of the members of the Administration told me, "The reason we can't get them to do it is that politically it's unacceptable back home, back in their home." But I said to him. "When they say that to President Johnson, the President should tell them, 'Our Congress is raising all kinds of hell about it, and so are many others. I said in 1964 and in 1966—and in 1968 they're going to use my words against me—that I was not about to send American boys to do a job that Asian boys should be doing. Time and again, they're going to remind me that I've since sent 478,000 American boys over there. Well, it's time to call a halt; we've gone as far as we're going to. We're not going to send any additional forces. You've got to start sending more of your own boys; we can't fight this war alone.' " I'd say this very strongly to the Japanese, for example. Their constitution keeps them from contributing combat forces, but they have the highest literacy rate in the world; they could help organize schools. They're fine farmers; they could help with the agricultural program. Even General Maxwell Taylor has said that if these problems aren't solved, we can't possibly win the shooting war.

PLAYBOY. Speaking of the shooting war, you have been increasingly critical of U.S. bombing of targets in North Vietnam, but you have also said that you wouldn't halt the bombing without some *quid pro quo* from Hanoi. Yet the Administration says that it has had no indication whatever that Hanoi is willing to give any such *quid pro quo*, and that's why it keeps on bombing. Doesn't your criticism ignore the official facts?

PERCY. What I've said is that we should confine the bombing to supply and infiltration routes. It's been my position—and I've expressed it a hundred times—that the bombing of cities and civilian targets will not weaken the will to resist, which is stated as one of our objectives; it will *strengthen* morale. It will not disunite the country; it will *unite* the country. It will give the North Vietnamese people visible evidence for the belief—however unjustified—that we want to overthrow their government and occupy their country. In any case, with an economy that is only 15 percent dependent upon industry and 85 percent on agriculture, it's impossible for me to conceive that we could destroy their ability to wage war through bombing. The cost-price ratio is so great that I can't see what we're accomplishing by it. So I have long stated that I would limit the bombing to the infiltration and supply routes, and stop bombing population centers, and most certainly stay away from the borders of China. We must stop giving any provocation to China, which for its own reasons may at some point elect to come into this war and need only a provocation such as many of those we have provided in just the recent past.

PLAYBOY. Hanoi indicated in January that it would be willing to undertake negotiations within a few days after the U.S. stops its bombing of the North. As we go to press, the U.S. has not yet responded officially to this offer. If it is accepted, what negotiating terms do you feel would maximize the chances of an armistice?

PERCY. I would agree to negotiate directly with the Viet Cong as well as with the North Vietnamese—which the South Vietnamese have so far refused to consider. Even if the North Vietnamese did sign an armistice with us, the V.C. would carry on anyway, in my judgment; so we've got to deal with them. We've got to offer them assurances not only that they won't be exterminated but that they will have a chance to gain some degree of political support in free elections. You certainly cannot expect them to think that we are making serious negotiating suggestions when we say that six months after you withdraw all of your forces, we will withdraw our forces. It's *their* country, after all. Can you imagine what our reaction would be if Ho Chi Minh said to us, "You draw all your forces out and six months later we will draw ours out"? When we put forward such proposals, is it any wonder that they laugh at us in Hanoi and take it as a further indication of our insincerity? We know from people who have gone in and talked to them that high North Vietnamese officials have said, "How do you expect us to believe the Johnson Administration in its representations to us when most of the people in your own country don't even believe it?"

PLAYBOY. Do you agree with the many correspondents and foreign diplomats who have said that the Administration has rejected peace feelers from Hanoi that might have carried some hope of success?

PERCY. All you can do in a situation like this is to listen to the responsible people who have special knowledge on the subject. In Adlai Stevenson's famous conversation with Eric Sevareid, that belief certainly came through strongly. There was a more recent exchange between the Administration and Harry Ashmore, a vice-president of that wholly disowned subsidiary of the Ford

Foundation [the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara—*Ed.*], that presented the same feeling. Norman Cousins, the distinguished editor of the *Saturday Review*, also holds very strongly to that view and has written long articles about it. But I have no *personal* knowledge of any rejected peace feelers.

PLAYBOY. On your recent fact-finding trip around the world, you certainly acquired firsthand knowledge of the war during your stopover in Vietnam, where you were caught in a Viet Cong mortar attack while inspecting a native village about 70 miles north of Saigon. There have been various versions of just what you were doing there and of what actually took place. Would you care to tell us about it?

PERCY. First of all, let me say that this was not an unescorted flight. No one charters a plane in Vietnam and flies all over at will. I had requested to see a refugee camp at Laithieu, a camp set up for displaced Vietnamese whom our military had told to clear out of the area they lived in. I also wanted to see one where the people were refugees as a result of Viet Cong action and particularly interested in Dakson because it had been the scene of a Viet Cong massacre of 255 natives. We took off for Laithieu from Saigon on schedule; and on the way there, I asked the captain of the plane if he could get clearance for us to see Dakson also. He said he'd check while we were inspecting Laithieu; and when we finished there, he told us we had been cleared for Dakson, that we had time to go there and still get back to Saigon for our next appointment.

As far as I knew, Dakson was a secured area. The armed refugee officer with us said he'd taken other groups there. It was broad daylight and there is a huge U.S. military installation just a few kilometers away. We circled the village five or six times and felt quite sure there was no one there. But just the same, when we took the helicopter in, we left Loraine in the helicopter, with the blades going, while five of us went out to see the burned-out areas and some of the bunkers where women and children had been killed.

I was just getting out of one of the bunkers when the first mortar shell hit. I didn't know where the helicopter was, but I started to run toward where I thought it was; apparently I ran in the wrong direction—toward the jungle. Dennis Smith, the refugee official assigned to us, steered me back and we started running and crawling toward where the helicopter had been. It had taken off with my wife as soon as the firing started. Dennis had a M-2 rifle and he passed me a .38-caliber snub-nosed pistol. We took five mortar rounds—though I counted only three, because I was so busy trying to learn how to operate this snub-nosed pistol—and about 15 rounds of ground fire. I don't know whether we were in greater danger from the mortar shells or from me carrying a pistol—or from my garters. I was wearing an old pair of red garters I'd had about 15 years; they were very comfortable. Well, we were running along after the first shell, and when the second came, Dennis Smith yelled, "Flatten," and when we got up then and started running again, the garters came undone and were flapping around. And I said to myself, "You're going to be pretty sorry if you trip over your own garters because you were such a tightwad you wouldn't buy yourself a new pair." So the next time we hit the dust, I ripped them off; for all I know, Ho Chi Minh is wearing them today.

In any case, I never got lower to the ground than I did then. We didn't know where the ground fire was coming from. I didn't realize the accuracy with which they could zero in on us, nor did I realize that we were that visible or that they would really have under observation a village that had been totally wiped out. Anyway, the shooting was over in about five minutes, and then there was deathly silence and we just lay there looking around, trying to figure out where the firing had come from, and waiting.

The helicopter with my wife had gone over to Song Be to alert them; and within 15 or 20 minutes, they had four or five helicopters providing cover for us; and our own helicopter came back and picked us up and left—with us hanging in the open door. It was the most comforting feeling I've ever had, seeing those other whirlybirds hovering around as ours came in.

PLAYBOY. Did you have time to be frightened?

PERCY. Oh, sure. There was plenty of time to realize you could get killed. I can assure you I didn't have to do this to get a feel for the war.

PLAYBOY. Congressman Wayne Hays of Ohio charged that the entire incident was staged in order to attract publicity and make you look like a civilian war hero. What was your reaction to that?

PERCY. I'd be happy to try to stage one for him sometime, or for anyone else who thinks that. My relationship with Ho Chi Minh just isn't that good.

PLAYBOY. Ho has been president of North Vietnam since 1945. In 1954, President Eisenhower acceded to a request from the Diem regime to assist the South Vietnamese government by sending in a team of military advisors. In retrospect, do you feel that the U.S. was wrong to become involved even to this extent?

PERCY. No. I think our first mistake was when Jack Kennedy, after meeting Khrushchev in Vienna, decided to show the Russians that he meant business by gradually escalating our involvement in Vietnam from a few hundred advisors to a military force of more than 15,000 at the time of his death. That took us from a position of being advisors and helpers to the status of semi-combatants. I think that was a difference of kind as well as of degree. And the next mistake came when President Johnson sent in a force of 50,000 that soon became a fighting force. I'd be very interested to know whether this decision had the full support of the entire National Security Council. Then we began that intensive bombing of the North after the Gulf of Tonkin incident; I'd like to ge much more certain than I am that the circumstances surrounding the shelling of our two ships were as they were depicted to us; I wonder whether we might not have been wiser to have waited, as the Soviet Union prudently did after we mistakenly bombed *their* ships in Haiphong Harbor, to discuss the circumstances that surrounded that shelling, rather than to have used the incident emotionally to extract from Congress a resolution that was not thoroughly understood, certainly in the implications of unilateral and almost unlimited authority it vested in the President.

PLAYBOY. Are you suggesting that the Tonkin shelling might have been a contrived incident or a pretext to escalate the war?

PERCY. No, but I think we reacted much too hastily and rashly in the succeeding months by steadily escalating the war.

PLAYBOY. What do you consider our justification for being in Vietnam at all?

PERCY. We've stated so many different purposes and objectives that it's hard to know what our national objective really is. Originally, the Administration argued that our purpose there was to help another people—but now we've moved in and taken over. Then it was to give them the right of self-determination, to ensure them the form of government they wanted—but the arguments outlined recently by Secretary Rusk, and some of the dialog on the Senate floor, indicate that the Administration regards Vietnam as an outpost for the United States in the struggle against China. Maybe it's a combination of all these factors—but it would be nice if some of them coincided.

PLAYBOY. Do you think our present China policy of hard-line exclusion, isolation and nonrecognition is sound?

PERCY. As far as exclusion is concerned, I hope that someday China's 800,000,000 people—maybe a billion by then—will be represented in an international organization and will have a voice and will be heard, but not under the conditions they now lay down, such as the expulsion of Nationalist China from the U.N. Even though Taiwan is not a large country, it does have a population much larger than the populations of many member countries in Africa, Asia and the Middle East. Nor can we accede to China's demand that the United States be branded as an aggressor in Korea. Those are conditions that are unacceptable to us. Nor do I really see that we would gain much even by recognition of China; I don't see why we should put an American embassy in Peking for them to use as a target for scorn, why we should put our prestige on the line and have bombs thrown at it and the embassy sacked as the British embassy was. But I think we could take a modest step toward improving relations with China—by removing the breach between us and certain of our allies who now trade with her, by withdrawing from them the implicit threat that they will be considered our enemies as long as they trade with China. We have nothing to gain, and possibly a great deal to lose, by trying to isolate China completely from the rest of the world.

PLAYBOY. Administration spokesmen argue that if we fail to pursue our policy of isolating and containing China, it will export Vietnam-style "people's revolutions" throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America. Do you think the U.S. has the right, even if it has the ability, to police the world as self-appointed protector of the oppressed from Communist subversion

PERCY. No I think the line has to be drawn where we see that there is sufficient resolve on the part of the people themselves in any given country to wage an all-out resistance against an aggressor—if it really is an aggressor—and to go only into situations where conditions are stable enough to hold some hope of success, much like the tremendous investment we made in western Europe and its recovery program. We were investing in a known quantity—dealing with people who had a history of stable government, people with a will to work and build themselves back up; that's why our helping hand was sufficient to put them over the top. I think we have to gauge very carefully where an assist from the United States can turn the tide from defeat to victory, and that judgment would be based, in my mind, very much upon the demonstrated ability and desire of the people to help themselves.

If the Communists were to present a real threat in the Philippines, for example, I think we could feel justified in offering our assistance and support; we'd be building on something more solid than we are in Vietnam. The British built on something fairly solid in Malaysia; the Malaysians really tenaciously fought that war with the Communists. I wouldn't be a bit surprised if Thailand would, too, if the threat were to become serious. Years ago, I felt that Thailand would sway whichever way the wind blew, but I've been impressed by its continuing stability and independence. If the Thais can solve their problems with Communist infiltration in northeast Thailand—really go after it aggressively—I think they can ward off trouble with the Chinese. I'm not really convinced, as many people are in this country, that China is in a position to wage a great many massive efforts even in that part of the world. Take Burma, for example. Though it shares a 1200-mile frontier with China, for 17 years the Communist Party has had to remain underground in Burma.

PLAYBOY. Are you as sanguine about the

threat of Soviet intervention and subversion in Africa and Latin America?

PERCY. Certainly not sanguine, but the degree of the threat depends on where you're talking about. In Cuba, for example, I think the Russians have had a good object lesson; it's costing them $1,000,000 a day. I think they'd like a way to extract themselves from that situation if they could. And they haven't gotten the return they expected on their investment in the Middle East. They've put two to three billion dollars in there, and I think they're pretty disillusioned about what they've gotten in return. Even with respect to the Aswan Dam, I noticed on the part of the United Arab Republic almost a desire to disassociate itself from the Soviet Union, which leaves the impression that it was almost entirely responsible for the dam's construction. There was a desire to minimize the Soviet role and scoff at it and point out the faults—the lack of spare parts and the broken equipment. So the Russians have run into the same problems with their aid program that we've gotten into with ours.

PLAYBOY. If you feel that Russia and America share some of the same problems, do you agree with those who think that the American and Soviet systems are slowly converging, as the United States becomes progressively more socialistic and the U.S.S.R. more capitalistic?

PERCY. That's a rather oversimplified view, I think, because there is still a vast difference in kind as well as in degree between our two systems. But I was encouraged, when I went through eastern Europe and the Soviet Union in 1966, by the number of questions that came to me about business techniques and management about how the cost system works and how you price your products. They're starting to run their own business more and more in eastern Europe; they're developing more "socialistic incentives." I'm encouraged by that, but it's still a long way from private enterprise. I'm more encouraged by the turnback of small shops and farms in some eastern-European countries to private ownership and management, going away from the collective farms. But I don't think you can really say we're working toward their system and they're working toward ours. We're both simply responding to changing conditions. They're responding because their system doesn't work and it's obvious to them that it doesn't and it's stagnant—but that doesn't mean they're necessarily going to give up and provide freedom of speech and freedom of elections, and so forth. That's a long way off in most of those countries.

PLAYBOY. Do you think the changes in Russia's economic system offer any prospect that it will become less hostile toward the West?

PERCY. What these changes do is shift power gradually; as of now, the political leadership still controls the economy. Just as in this country, we had a quiet revolution when the entrepreneurs and the owners of enterprise—the Mellons and the Morgans—were gradually replaced by professional management. I think the same technological group inside the Communist countries will gradually gain more control over the economy, will realize that the political hacks don't have the comprehension and understanding to run a sophisticated economy. This is really one of the reasons Khrushchev was booted out—and a high-ranking Soviet official told me this himself; he lacked a sophisticated understanding of modern enterprise. He felt you could get people to produce more simply by exhorting them to production.

PLAYBOY. Is there any hope that more economic sophistication in the Soviet Union will make them more sincere believers in peaceful coexistence?

PERCY. Well, as you separate the economy from political control, you begin to put new forces and new pressures to work inside the Soviet Union. They start to divert a percentage of the available raw materials and labor away from space spectaculars and military and anti-ballistic-missile systems toward the production of consumer-type goods. The pressure of the people is already going to work in that direction. I saw Russians stand in Moscow's GUM department store, 15 and 20 deep, waiting to see the display of a wire recorder that was obsolete in this country 20 years ago. I think that kind of pressure, over a period of years, is going to find a responsiveness in the political leadership.

PLAYBOY. Let's discuss the responsiveness of the political leadership in this country. Reflecting the view of those who feel that the Republican Party has lost touch with the people, most public-opinion polls in recent years have shown the G.O.P. becoming a smaller and smaller minority party. Can this trend be reversed?

PERCY. Yes—by making the G.O.P. a more appealing, broadly based party, a party that's attractive for young people because of the excitement of its ideas and its ideals; exciting for ethnic and minority groups because they feel comfortable inside the party; exciting for responsible leadership in the Negro community because they feel that a stronger two-party system will be a way to advance the cause of human rights.

PLAYBOY. That might sound to some like an echo of the Democratic Party program.

PERCY. I think it's the essence of responsibility for a national party to want to become a composite of the ideals and aspirations of the entire country, not just certain economic or social or cultural segments of it.

PLAYBOY. Is there a place for hard-core conservatives in that kind of party?

PERCY. I think there is a place for conservatives in the Republican Party, just as the conservatives of the South have found a place in the Democratic Party.

PLAYBOY. Though your views on law enforcement and fiscal responsibility are decidedly conservative, your position on most public issues—from civil rights to Vietnam—is more liberal than that of many Democrats. Doesn't this place you in conflict with a majority of your own party?

PERCY. I don't think so—not in the deepest sense. I'm a Republican because I believe in the primary thrust and emphasis of our party—which is to strengthen government from the bottom up rather than from the top down. I tend to think that the over-all effort of the Democratic Party has been to place greater faith in Federal Government and centralized authority, and less faith in state and local government.

PLAYBOY. Many moderate and liberal Republicans deplore the fact that you gave your tacit support to the nomination of Barry Goldwater in 1964. How do you reconcile your liberal-leaning philosophy with your failure to oppose him?

PERCY. I made an advance commitment to support whoever might be the nominee favored by a majority of the Illinois delegation. It's as simple as that. If I had it to do over again, I wouldn't have made that commitment. But I did and I felt bound to honor it. I don't think you can begin a public career by breaking a public word that you have given. I supported a man whose integrity and decency I believed in. I didn't agree with many of his views, but at least I knew where he stood. I couldn't vote for a man, Lyndon Johnson, who I felt would say one thing in a campaign and do the opposite after he was elected. That is exactly what happened.

PLAYBOY. Let's ask the question in another form: Do you think the Republican Party should have nominated someone other than Barry Goldwater in 1964?

PERCY. Yes.

PLAYBOY. Would you like to say who?

PERCY. No.

PLAYBOY. Did you vote for Mr. Goldwater?

PERCY. I voted a straight Republican ticket.

PLAYBOY. Rather clearly, Goldwater's poor showing in Illinois helped defeat you in your bid for the governorship. Do you believe that some other Republican Presidential candidate—such as Scranton or Rockefeller—would have helped you win?

PERCY. I lost the governorship because I deserved to lose it. I made certain commitments that I shouldn't have made, and I wasn't as good a candidate as I should have been; I'm rather glad now that I did lose, because I think I learned more in defeat than I would have in victory. And I'm certainly enjoying my work as a Senator.

PLAYBOY. Despite your support for Goldwater and your hard-line views on law and order, you've been the target of a number of highly critical pieces in such conservative journals as the *National Review* and *The New Guard*, a monthly magazine published by the Young Americans for Freedom. How do you account for this conservative hostility?

PERCY. Possibly a lack of understanding on their part of what true conservatism is. Many of them, for instance, are hostile toward me for my espousal of "radical" laws such as state FEPC and open occupancy; but I consider those to be *conservative* measures—measures to conserve American institutions and fulfill the promise of America. I also think it's conservative for us to have enough faith in the free-enterprise system to oppose tariffs imposed abroad on American products or imposed here on products coming in from abroad, and to let the free market run. But that's looked on by some as a liberal interpretation, simply because so many of the economists in this country agree with me on this principle. I also think it's conservative to say we have enough faith in our system that we want to export our ideas, and that the only way to get those ideas across is to be willing to trade in goods. The conservatives—at least those you mentioned—oppose East-West trade because they want to draw the Iron Curtain shut between us and the Communist world and engage in a holy war. But it all boils down to a matter of semantics. Whatever the label—liberal or conservative—none of us is less loyal as an American, though some might cast aspersions in that direction.

PLAYBOY. President Johnson has a reputation as a man who seeks to find a broad consensus of left and right and then shapes his solutions accordingly, rather than one who makes up his own mind and then tries to lead the nation according to the policies he thinks are best. Which do you feel is the proper role for a President?

PERCY. Before he establishes a policy and sets the country on a course, the President has to decide how far ahead of the people he can be. Every President must take into account that he can't get so far ahead that they won't follow him. But the role of any public official is to formulate his own judgment on the major issues and to fight, and fight hard, for the principles for which he stands, even if this sometimes means defeat.

PLAYBOY. There have been almost daily stories for a long time now about the personality of the President: his temper, his love of secrecy, his use of profanity, the way he browbeats his staff and so on. How relevant do you feel his personality is to a judgment of his general performance in office?

PERCY. I think the most important things are his judgment, his capability, his integrity and his qualities of leadership, which must establish a tone and inspire a people. Certainly he's an immensely capable man. He's an exceedingly intelligent man. And he's a hard-working man; no one's ever accused him of being lazy. The problem is that he lacks that intangible ability to inspire people, to give them confidence. The tone of Government has suffered as a result of it and the image of America abroad has suffered,

as well as the attitude of the people toward their Government and even toward their country and themselves. Now, this inspirational ability is an important quality in a President. Jack Kennedy had it in his best days, and so did Eisenhower. Even President Truman, who was maligned a great deal, had high moments when he inspired the people with his guts and his determination. But we haven't seen much of that in this President, unfortunately.

PLAYBOY. Whether because of his personality or his policies, or both, Johnson's popularity dropped so drastically a few months ago that some pundits began to speculate that he might decide not to be a candidate for re-election this fall. Though he's since regained a few points in the polls, some still feel that he may not run. On the off-chance that they're right, do you think Hubert Humphrey or Robert Kennedy would be tougher for the Republicans to beat?

PERCY. If the voting level were 18, Bobby Kennedy would be very tough.

PLAYBOY. Only because of his appeal to young people?

PERCY. Not only that, of course—also because of his ability to organize, the experience he's had in running a national campaign, his ability to be concise in his answers to questions, the support he has from an important segment of the academic community and the empathy that would still exist because of the recent tragedy of the death of his brother. There would be many liabilities he'd have to overcome, too, of course.

PLAYBOY. Such as?

PERCY. The greatest is certainly a reputation—perhaps an undeserved reputation, but one he has to live with—for ruthlessness, for using people to serve his purposes. And, of course, he's always being compared with his brother. Maybe some of his liabilities become his very assets. For example, because he is who he is, there is a large group of people who are willing to offer ideas and to help him, and he can sift through them and discard all but the best. He is an extremely good organizer, a man who demands the best performance. So people are going to keep on saying he is ruthless. On balance, though, I would say he is a very formidable factor in American politics, one of the Republican Party is going to have to contend with for quite a number of years. And behind him is Teddy, who possesses many unique qualities of his own. Republicans and the country are not going to be permitted to forget the Kennedy name.

PLAYBOY. Would you say one of Bobby Kennedy's strengths is that he is less closely identified with President Johnson and his policies than Hubert Humphrey would be?

PERCY. It's not clear yet whether Kennedy's disassociation from the President has been identified in the public mind as one of deep conviction or just political expediency. It's not clear, either, whether the presentations that he has made on Vietnam would be acceptable to the general public. But there may be the feeling—and this would also be true if a Republican were elected—that the enemy might be more inclined to negotiate with a new Administration and a new President. Humphrey, able as he is, would offer more of the same; he'd feel honor bound to carry on the same policies as Johnson, because he would owe his allegiance and his nomination to the support Johnson would give him. Bobby Kennedy might offer to the country the hope that a new approach would be taken to solving Vietnam; and for that reason, he would perhaps have an advantage—especially since, by then, an even more compelling desire to end the war would be prevalent throughout the country.

PLAYBOY. If Johnson runs, do you think he can be beaten?

PERCY. Yes, I think he can—if the circumstances in which we find ourselves then are no better than they are now: a continuing Vietnam conflict, a huge deficit, an increase in taxes, lack of national prestige abroad and lack of unity at home. And Johnson's personality is not such as to weld the country together in times of adversity; there is no cause for inspiration, no apparent ability to create a sense of unity or even a feeling of complete confidence and trust.

PLAYBOY. If the President is able to end the war by November—either by winning a military victory or by negotiating a peaceful settlement—do you think the Republicans can still beat him?

PERCY. In either of those events, I would guess that he'd be re-elected—unless the crisis of the cities and the crisis of the economy are so severe that the country is still in turmoil despite our progress in Vietnam. But if the war is still going on, if we have a continuing inconclusive situation—draining not 25 billion dollars but possibly 30 billion dollars a year from us here—if we have a huge deficit, mounting dissension within the country and mounting casualties abroad, I would say he'd have a very difficult time getting re-elected. This is, of course, assuming we offer a progressive alternative program and constructive, credible alternative candidates on the Republican side.

PLAYBOY. If the war is still unsettled in November, do you think the Republicans can win with a candidate such as Governor Reagan or Richard Nixon, both of whom favor a step-up in the bombing?

PERCY. I think the candidate has to present a logical alternative and a course of action that holds promise of being more successful than that of the existing Administration. And I, for one, would not feel that a program of just continuously escalating the military effort holds any promise of bringing about a settlement of this war. I was pleased when Dick Nixon came out against broadening the war and assigned number-one priority to the crisis of our own cities.

PLAYBOY. Despite the public-opinion polls showing Governor Rockefeller running ahead of both Nixon and Reagan, do you think it likely that the Republican convention will nominate him, in view of the deep hostility of so many conservatives in the party toward him for his stand against Goldwater in 1964?

PERCY. I think it depends very much on the mood of the delegates in 1968—whether they will cling to the past and feel that someone should be punished for his conduct of four years ago or whether they will look to the future and decide that their function is to nominate someone who can win. I think we can have the kind of convention that looks toward the future.

PLAYBOY. So you think that Governor Rockefeller is not necessarily ruled out?

PERCY. No, I don't think so at all.

PLAYBOY. How about yourself? In November 1966, right after your election, you said, "I can foresee no circumstances under which I would be expected to do other than be a good United States Senator for the next six years." Do you now foresee any such circumstances?

PERCY. No. I see a sufficient number of candidates in the field who have the capability of being a good candidate and a good president that there would not be any requirement on my part to enter a Presidential campaign.

PLAYBOY. Still, most politicians seem to regard you as a compromise candidate on whom almost everyone in the party could agree if the front-runners fail. Do you think you might come into the Presidential picture that way?

PERCY. I haven't changed my opinion a bit that the best thing I could be doing to fulfill my existing responsibilities is to be a good United States Senator. I am not one to detract from the present by worrying about some future time.

PLAYBOY. When you talk of some future time, are you referring to some time later than 1968?

PERCY. I think the best thing is to live day by day and do well the job you've been given to do. I can't see that the 1968 nomination will go to someone other than a candidate—and I don't intend to be a candidate.

PLAYBOY. Do you agree with the analysis of some commentators that your only real chance for the 1968 Presidential nomination will come if Nixon or Romney knock each other out in the primaries?

PERCY. I don't know about that, but if either man were to go all the way through the primaries and win all of them and were also able to convince the party that, having won the Republican primaries, he also had sufficient appeal to win a general election by attracting the independent and Democratic votes that would be necessary, I think that that candidate will be the nominee. I don't think it's necessarily true that just winning Republican primaries—with the Republican Party being only 26 percent or whatever it is of the total electorate today—guarantees his nomination, let alone the election.

PLAYBOY. Have you considered entering any of the primaries yourself?

PERCY. I have no intention of going into any primaries.

PLAYBOY. Will you sign the affidavit—saying that you are not a Presidential candidate—that's required to take your name off the ballot in Wisconsin, Nebraska and Oregon?

PERCY. If someone put the affidavit in front of me today and said this is the day it has to be signed, I would sign it.

PLAYBOY. This interview will be published in April. Will your answer be the same then?

PERCY. Well, I made one commitment that bound me in the future [his promise to support the candidate favored by a majority of the Illinois delegation in 1964—*Ed.*]. I'm not about to do the same thing again.

PLAYBOY. Without specific regard to 1968 or even 1972—would you like to be President someday?

PERCY. I've heard it said that I've always had a desire to be President, and I've really wondered where that came from. I even heard someone—an anonymous landlady of mine—quoted as saying that I had told her one time that this was my ambition. Well, I can certify that there is no one living or dead who has ever heard me say I wanted to be President of the United States, including any member of my family. I've talked about wanting to be in public life, but even that was only in recent years. Though I've long wanted to go into government, I wasn't sure that it would be the elective route. However, now that I have gone that route—and won—and now that I've begun to be mentioned in some circles as a prospect for national office, I will someday have to give that possibility very sober consideration; for I think it would be irresponsible to simply want to be President of the United States if you didn't have confidence that you could handle the burden of the office. I think you have to develop that sense of confidence as you start working and grappling with the problems of government. I should think that anyone in public life would feel that he might be qualified to solve some of the problems that would be involved in the Presidency—and yet would also feel a profound sense of inadequacy at the enormity of its responsibilities. But I would not know today of any reason that I would shirk those responsibilities if my party and my country should ever ask me to assume higher office. But I do not seek it and I have a sense of immense satisfaction in the work that I'm now doing in the Senate.

PLAYBOY. Could we put that down as a qualified yes?

PERCY. Yes, perhaps that.

PLAYBOY. You've been mentioned as a likely prospect for the Vice-Presidential slot if

you don't get the Presidential nomination this year. Would you accept it?

PERCY. I think it would depend to a great extent upon who the Presidential candidate was, and whether I felt that I could perform best for the country and the party as Vice-President or as a Senator.

PLAYBOY. Then you wouldn't foreclose the possibility?

PERCY. No, I wouldn't feel that there'd be any basis by which I had the right now to say it should be accepted or rejected. It would depend entirely upon the circumstances and the conditions.

PLAYBOY. During the primaries in 1960, John Kennedy's Catholicism became a campaign issue when critics expressed their concern that his administrative judgment as President might be prejudiced by his religious persuasion. He said it wouldn't, and it is generally agreed that it wasn't. But if you were to become a nominee for the Presidency, it's likely that the religious issue would be brought up again. Would your commitment as a practicing Christian Scientist influence your attitude toward the allocation of Federal funds for medical research, heart-cancer-stroke centers, Medicare, and the like?

PERCY. Not at all. For 17 years, I've been a trustee of the University of Chicago, which operates one of the greatest medical centers in the country. I've also been a strong advocate of cancer research and heart-disease research. In fact, I support a strong Federal program in these areas, because I think it's much more effective and less expensive to have a central source for much of our research rather than have the 50 states each engage in separate research programs. I've never tried to impose my own religious views upon anyone else. And I've never found the slightest inconsistency in my saying to those who put their total reliance in medicine that they should have the best medical attention, the best medical care, the best doctors they can possibly have.

PLAYBOY. Do you use doctors or medication yourself?

PERCY. I've always gone to a dentist and I have a good eye doctor to whom all the members of the family go regularly. And I have always had physical examinations—for the Navy and for insurance. When I came to the Senate, I went over and met the doctor who is the Senate physician. But I don't take medicines or drugs and have not found it necessary to go to a hospital, though on occasion my wife has. When she broke her ankle, she had it set in the hospital; and when she's had a baby, she's gone to a hospital. But I've never found it necessary to take drugs, and I seem to be surviving in good health.

PLAYBOY. But if you or one of your family became seriously ill, would you consult a doctor?

PERCY. I wouldn't hesitate to, if I weren't able to handle it any other way. But I have never known of a family that faced a critical health crisis, the potential death or loss of a member of the family, that did not resort to prayer as well as to medicine. It's just a matter of to what degree you rely upon prayer—in the first instance or in the last instance. I do it in the first instance.

PLAYBOY. Many Christian Scientists have led local fights against water fluoridation. Do you share their attitude?

PERCY. No, I don't. I feel that the position of the Christian Science Church is wrong in this regard. I don't look on fluoridation as a medical additive; I think it's a mineral additive. I feel that if a community decides—in whatever way it makes its decision, through a city council, through a plebiscite, through the directive of the health authorities—that fluoride should be added to the water, if someone doesn't want to drink the water with the fluoride in it, he can always buy bottled water. But since 99 percent of the people want it and are convinced of its proven beneficial effects, I think they should have it. That's why I've supported fluoridated water through the years, despite the official position of my church.

PLAYBOY. You yourself do not smoke and are reported not to drink anything more than an occasional Dubonnet. Do you serve liquor to your guests or permit them to smoke?

PERCY. Yes, of course. I don't try to impose any of my beliefs upon any of my friends or guests.

PLAYBOY. When you were at Bell & Howell, you reportedly started the morning at home with Bible study. Do you and your family still start your day this way?

PERCY. Yes, we try to. I think you have to take time out for the things you think are important—and not just on Sunday.

PLAYBOY. We realize that this is a painful subject, but has the murder of your daughter Valerie changed the way you and your family live? Do you take any special precautions for their safety?

PERCY. Yes.

PLAYBOY. You've had more than your share of misfortune during your life. Has it made you fatalistic about the future, or have you managed to retain your optimism?

PERCY. No, I'm not fatalistic. I've still got a lot to be thankful for—and a lot worth working for. I don't think my life is really any different from anyone else's life in that sense. Everyone has some success and everyone suffers some setbacks; the peaks and valleys may be deeper as you get into something like politics, but every individual story I've ever known in life has a chapter that has both the good and the bad side to it. Along with everyone else, I've simply had my share of both. Both provide an opportunity and a challenge.

PLAYBOY. You said you feel that there's still a lot worth working for in your lifetime. What do you hope to accomplish?

PERCY. I hope that in the course of my lifetime in politics I can contribute to a restoration of the confidence that the American people have a right to expect in their Government—the Executive branch as well as the Legislative—and the confidence the people of the world have a right to expect in American leadership. All the problems this nation faces—Vietnam, urban renewal, law and order, racial equality, fiscal and monetary responsibility—all are subordinate to the overall question of whether leadership can be restored in America. The nation needs a sense of confidence that we in government have the perception not only to recognize these problems but to shape solutions for them, and the courage to take whatever steps are necessary to bring about these solutions. The only way for a nation to be respected—by itself as well as by the rest of the world—is to be respectable, in thought, action and deed. I hope to contribute to the process of restoring that respectability—and to the revival of America's belief in its own destiny and in itself.

Prince Georges County Firemen and Policemen Owed Debt of Gratitude

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the volunteer and paid firemen of Prince Georges County for performing above and beyond the call of their duties by helping fight arson and fire in Washington last Friday and Saturday during the height of our crisis.

I have been informed that more than 200 volunteer firemen and others from Prince Georges County assisted the District Fire Department fight a rash of fires under the most deplorable circumstances where bystanders threw rocks, bricks, and bottles in some instances. Certainly these men are the heroes of this conflict and their work should not go unrecognized.

Mr. Speaker, the Prince Georges County Fire Board told me that the following companies had men and equipment in Washington and I would like to mention their names for the public record. They are the Hyattsville, Cottage City, Mount Rainier, Brentwood, Riverdale, Bladensburg, College Park, Berwyn Heights, Tuxedo-Cheverly, Forestville, Clinton, Morningside, West Lanham, Silver Hill, Landover Hills, Beltsville, Allentown Road, Chillum-Adelphi, Greenbelt, Bowie, and Oxon Hill volunteer fire departments. I think that we all owe them a debt of gratitude.

At the same time, I wish to commend the policemen of Prince Georges County who worked long and difficult shifts to prevent the violence and looting from spreading into our county.

All Citizens Must Get Involved

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, as the pace of modern society quickens so increases the responsibility of citizens to keep informed on the major issues facing our country. One of the best ways to accomplish this is to become actively involved in the political process. In the political arena, group action is more effective than individual action. Therefore, for the individual citizen his most effective vehicle for getting positive results is to join and participate with an organization which has definite goals.

Mr. Speaker, this last weekend was designated by the National Education Association and its constituent State Associations as "Teachers-in-Politics Weekend." It is the NEA belief that through full teacher participation in politics it will allow them to achieve in an orderly fashion the educational benefits that will improve the political climate of communities, States, and our Nation.

Although I am sure teachers would be the first to agree that partisan politics have no place in the classroom, our great Nation needs a strong two-party system to continue to prosper and move forward. The teacher stands in an unique position to develop student interest in politics.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the NEA and its State affiliates for their efforts over this past weekend. By encouraging more people to get involved in the political affairs of our Nation, only one result can occur—better government.

Martin Luther King, Jr.

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, not since November 22, 1963, has our Nation been so shocked by a senseless, a mindless, an insane assassination. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., symbol of peace and nonviolence, equality and brotherhood among men has been taken from us by violence.

Martin Luther King had a dream for America and as he said, it was "a dream deeply rooted in the American dream."

America should rededicate itself to Martin Luther King's dream. As a symbol of that rededication, I am today introducing a bill which would direct the striking of a medal honoring this great American, Martin Luther King, Jr. and the presentation of this medal to his courageous widow.

I first met Dr. King and heard his eloquence at a Freedom Now rally at Forbes Field in Pittsburgh. In later years and on many occasions I worked with him and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference on civil rights legislation. He became my friend.

I have often marveled at his eloquence but particularly in August of 1963 at the Lincoln Memorial here in Washington. The March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom will live long in the memory of those who participated in it and those who saw so much of it on television. It was, perhaps, the single greatest demonstration of unity for justice that this Nation has seen.

Unquestionably the outstanding event that day was Dr. King's speech, "I Have a Dream." The text of that stirring and prophetic speech follows:

I HAVE A DREAM

(By Martin Luther King, Jr.)

I am happy to join with you today in what will go down in history as the greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our nation.

Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came as the great beacon light of hope for millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice. It came as the joyous daybreak to end the long night of their captivity.

But one hundred years later the Negro still is not free. One hundred years later, the life of the Negro is still badly crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination. One hundred years later, the Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity. One hundred years later, the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself an exile in his own land. So we have come here today to dramatize the shameful condition.

In a sense we've come to our Nation's Capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, should be guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check, a check which has come back marked "Insufficient Funds." But we refuse to believe the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation. So we have come to cash this check, a check that will give us upon demand, the riches of freedom and the security of justice. We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of now.

This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice. Now is the time to lift our nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood. Now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God's children.

It would be fatal for the nation to overlook the urgency of the moment. This sweltering summer of the Negro's legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn of freedom and equality. Nineteen sixty-three is not an end but a beginning. Those who hoped that the Negro needed to blow off steam and will now be content will have a rude awakening if the nation returns to business as usual. There will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until the Negro is guaranteed his citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our nation until the bright day of justice emerges.

But there is something I must say to my people who stand on the warm threshold which leads them to the palace of justice. In the process of gaining our rightful place we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again we must rise to the majestic height of meeting physical force with soul force.

The marvelous new militancy which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to a distrust of all white people, for many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny. They have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom. We cannot walk alone.

And as we walk we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back. There are those who are asking the devotees of civil rights: "When will you be satisfied?" We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities. We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro's basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one. We can never be satisfied as long as our children are stripped of their self-hood and robbed of their dignity by signs stating: "For Whites Only." We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro in Mississippi cannot vote and the Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote. No, no, we are not satisfied and we will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like the waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.

I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations, some of you have come fresh from narrow jail cells, some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom left you battered by the storms of persecution and staggered by the winds of police brutality. You have been the veterans of creative suffering. Continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive.

Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to South Carolina, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities, knowing that somehow this situation can and will be changed. Let us not wallow in the valley of despair.

I say to you today, my friends, even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal."

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the State of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice. I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day down in Alabama with its vicious racists, with its Governor having his lips dripping with the words of interposition and nullification—one day right there in Alabama, little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.

I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain and the crooked places will be made straight, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.

This is our hope. This is the faith that I go back to the South with. With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope. With this faith we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. With this faith we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.

This will be the day when all of God's children will be able to sing with new meaning:

"My country 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing:
Land where my fathers died,
Land of the pilgrims' pride,
From every mountain-side
Let Freedom ring."

And if America is to be a great nation, this must become true. So, let freedom ring from the prodigious hill tops of New Hampshire. Let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York. Let freedom ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania. Let freedom ring from the snowcapped Rockies of Colorado. Let freedom ring from the curvaceous slopes of California. But not only that, let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia.

Let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee.

Let freedom ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi. From every mountainside, let freedom ring. And when we allow freedom to ring, when we let it ring from every

village, from every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual: "Free at last! free at last! Thank God almighty, we are free at last!"

The apostle of nonviolence has gone. What must we now do? I submit that this Congress must pass the civil rights bill, with the open housing amendment intact, as a memorial to Dr. Martin Luther King. We must not do this, however, because we have been intimidated, cowed, frightened or out of expediency. We must do it because it is the right thing to do; we must do it because it is our responsibility to help make Dr. King's dream come true.

In Bob Dylan's words:

How many roads must a man walk down before he's called a man?
How many seas must a white dove sail before he sleeps in the sand?
How many times must the cannon balls fly before they're forever banned?
How many years can a mountain exist before it's washed in the sea?
How many years can some people exist before they're allowed to be free?
How many times can a man turn his head and pretend he just doesn't see?
How many times must a man look up before he can see the sky?
How many ears must one man have before he can hear people cry?
How many deaths will it take 'til he knows that too many people have died?

Mortar Attack Kills Army Man

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Capt. Curtis A. Rhodes, a young soldier 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:

MORTAR ATTACK KILLS ARMY MAN—CAPT. CURTIS RHODES LIVED IN GARRETT COUNTY

Capt. Curtis A. Rhodes, a 26-year-old career Army officer from Swanton, in Garrett County, who volunteered for duty in Vietnam, was killed in a mortar attack Monday in Long Binh, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

His wife, the former Mary Belle Simpson, who lives with their three children in Swanton, said Captain Rhodes had been stationed in Vietnam for 67 days before his death.

Captain Rhodes was killed in an attack early Monday morning on his billet in Long Binh, about 15 miles northeast of Saigon, according to a telegram Mrs. Rhodes received from the Defense Department. He was apparently in bed, perhaps asleep, when the attack occurred at 1:30 A.M., Mrs. Rhodes said.

Born in Swanton, Captain Rhodes met his wife while he was a student in West Virginia. They were married January 25, 1962.

Besides his wife, Captain Rhodes is survived by three sons, Lance E., 5½, Chester A., 4, and John B., 3; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John C. Rhodes, also of Swanton; a brother, Michael Rhodes, of Mountain Lake Park, Md.; three sisters, Mrs. Orval Teets, of Swanton, Mrs. Charles Hutson, of Federalsburg, Md., Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Teets, of Norfolk, Va.; and a half-brother, Harry J. Warnick, of Baltimore county.

The Greatness of President Johnson

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker—

Lyndon Baines Johnson . . . made one of the great patriotic moves of American history. He sacrificed himself for his nation.

This is the editorial view of the Houston Chronicle. And it is difficult to find fault with this assessment of what must be one of the most courageous acts in the long and honored history of the American Presidency.

As one who has supported many of the President's policies at home and abroad, I believe that President Johnson has always been motivated by one fundamental consideration—the national interest. And I think that those who have doubted this fact, those who accused the administration of dubious partisanship, must now understand that the man in the White House is, in fact, one of the great patriots in American history.

President Johnson's goals today remain unchanged from what they were 4½ years ago when he assumed office. His goals are a strong and united America in a peaceful world.

We can be assured that in the time remaining to him, Lyndon Johnson will do everything in his power to move America ahead toward the realization of these cherished goals.

I insert into the RECORD this timely editorial from the Houston Chronicle:

L. B. J.'S PATRIOTIC SACRIFICE

Lyndon Baines Johnson Sunday night made one of the great patriotic moves of American history.

He sacrificed himself for his nation.

Regardless of what his motives were, he subjugated his own pride and ambition to the welfare of this nation and the world, hopefully to bring peace in Southeast Asia and unity in the United States.

His renunciation of the Democratic nomination for another term as President eliminates the opportunity for his opponents at home and abroad to construe his actions as political during the remainder of his term in office.

It lends strong conviction to his bid to Hanoi for peace in Vietnam. He can negotiate for an end to war without there being a suspicion by Hanoi that he was doing it to enhance his reelection chances. His order to stop most of the bombing and de-escalate the war puts his opponents, here and abroad, squarely on the spot. Ho Chi Minh will have difficulty explaining to the world why, if he does not accept the offer to negotiate, that he has declined peace again.

Sens. Eugene McCarthy and Robert F. Kennedy, the presidential aspirants, and Sen. J. William Fulbright, the carping critic, will have to do more now than just oppose Johnson's policies. If they want thinking Americans to pay any attention to them they will have to come up with some answers of their own. It's easy to cirticize, but difficult to construct and commit one-self to specific policies as the President has had to do.

Those who have supported President Johnson's policies in Vietnam, and The Chronicle believes this constitutes a majority of Americans, were pleased that although he sacrificed his own political future to offer to negotiate for peace, he warned Hanoi that the United States "will not accept a fake solution to this long and arduous struggle and call it peace". He added that "if peace does not now come through negotiations, it will come when Hanoi understands that our common resolve is unshakable, and our common strength is invincible". It is this attitude of the President's that The Chronicle has so strongly admired and supported. It is the traditional American attitude; it is the sane course for our own national security.

In making the peace offer, the President omitted our previous requirement that we will not make Hanoi give us assurance in advance that the Communists will not use the de-escalation to build up its own forces. He also pledged that if Hanoi will start moving its forces out of South Vietnam, we will begin to move ours. For those who fear that a negotiated peace now will only end in the Communists taking over South Vietnam, the President built a strong case for the Republic's ability to defend itself. He said South Vietnam has 700,000 men under arms, compared with 600,000 from the United States and other allies, and that another 135,000 are being called up. He said South Vietnam has inducted 48,000 new troops since January, half of them volunteers.

At home, the President threw national politics into chaos. Vice President Hubert Humphrey, with whom the President conferred Sunday morning, is almost certain to seek the nomination. It is generally expected the President will support him.

With Sens. McCarthy and Kennedy already in the race, there are bound to be wide splits in the Democratic party. Other candidates may well come to the fore now that the President has taken himself out of it—and his words sounded very much like he meant them, whether or not there should be moves to draft him.

Those close to the President have known for more than a year that he was weary of the burden and deeply distressed by the war in Vietnam and the disunity at home. They have heard him say that he would like to pass the burden on to fresh shoulders, if he could conscientiously do so with assurance that he was not endangering the nation's welfare. How much the current disunity in the Democratic party affected his immediate decision probably will never be publicly known. The Chronicle does not believe that his stepping out will relieve the disunity in the party; it probably will aggravate it.

The Republican nomination race, which has been virtually conceded to Vice President Richard Nixon, undoubtedly will change complexion. Gov. Nelson Rockefeller no doubt will be urged to reconsider; Gov. Ronald Reagan's supporters will step up their activities; and other hopefuls may emerge.

The biggest impact of the President's decision will be in Texas. Politics in this state, already chaotic, will be pretty wild in the next few weeks. The ramifications are almost impossible to predict at this time.

But one thing is certain—most Texans were proud of their native son Sunday night.

Teachers-in-Politics Weekend

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the National Education Association deserves special commendation for its Teachers-in-Politics Weekend which begins today

throughout the country. The Connecticut Education Association plans a statewide meeting tomorrow and the Fairfield County Education Association will also be hosting a clinic for teachers on this subject this weekend.

The political process in this country is one that affects each and every one of us—from the nomination and election of our public officials to their representation of our views in their daily decisions. The active involvement of our teachers in this process is particularly important in view of the great influence they have on our young people, the future political leaders of this country. As our educators well know, example is often the best teacher and the interest and participation of teachers in the governing of the United States can stimulate in our youth, an increasing awareness of their civic responsibilities.

All teachers should be encouraged to exercise their full political rights and it is my hope that this weekend will provide the impetus for enthusiastic and valuable political expression by all our educators.

American Lutheran Church: Equality of Opportunity and Open Housing

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Third General Convention of the American Lutheran Church adopted resolutions on equality of opportunity and open housing as an expression of its conviction and as a stimulus to the thinking and a guide to the actions of pastors, congregations, and individual members of the American Lutheran Church. As citizens of this country, motivated by a commitment to Christian moral principles and political principles of the U.S. Constitution, they express their hope for true justice with these words:

We desire a land in which Negro and white, Indian and Oriental, Puerto Rican, Latin American, or a person of any other ancestry, may cultivate his abilities, develop his strengths, display his creativity, take pride in his heritage, and win appreciation for his contributions to the common good.

This expression of Christian conscience on the most important domestic moral problem of our society deserves our sincere attention. It is imperative for us as legislators to respond promptly to the moral demands of our society when they reflect nothing more than the Founding Fathers' promise of equal justice for all—a promise which made us great.

Under unanimous consent I place these resolutions in the RECORD at this point:

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY—A CIVIL RIGHT

1. The American Lutheran Church believes firmly that equal opportunity for all is a basic civil right which any government must safeguard. To deny equality of opportunity to any person is to deny the revelation of Scripture, the counsel of reason, and the laws of our nation.

2. The American Lutheran Church therefore reaffirms the convictions it expressed at its 1964 convention, based upon earlier affirmations adopted by it in 1961, and by its predecessor bodies in 1958, principles which are incorporated in its Constitution. "The unique task of the churches," said the 1964 convention, "is to seek to bring the power of the Word, the Sacraments, and the corporate fellowship to bear upon individuals, thereby changing their hearts and lives." It added a conviction we now reaffirm:

"Nevertheless, churches, their members, and their leaders need also to exercise Christian social responsibility. They have the duty to protest against and to act responsibly, beginning in their own communities, to correct those cruelties and injustices which deny basic human freedoms. Christians, both personally and corporately, have the duty to press for and to support measures which insure that all persons, regardless of color, economic position, national origin, or ethnic grouping, have fair and equal access to education, housing, employment, voting, and public accommodations."

3. Both reason and law support these imperatives. By its Constitution the United States—

Guarantees that "the citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states";

Assures all persons within its jurisdiction the freedoms and protections of the first ten amendments known as the Bill of Rights;

Confers federal and state citizenship upon all persons born or naturalized in the United States; and

Declares that no state has a right to "abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States," nor shall any state "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The American Lutheran Church rejoices that in the providence of God men were moved to write into the law of the land such powerful protections for human freedom and dignity. Our generation must make these civil liberties a living reality experienced equally by each person within the jurisdiction of the United States.

4. As a church concerned for the total well-being of every person, we deplore and condemn the racial hostility and antagonism symbolized in the terms "black power" and "white backlash." Separation, alienation, and rejection along racial lines can become the means by which demonic and alien forces may destroy our nation. We desire a land in which Negro and white, Indian and Oriental, Puerto Rican, Latin American, or person of any other ancestry, may cultivate his abilities, develop his strengths, display his creativity, take pride in his heritage, and win appreciation for his contributions to the common good.

5. We call upon members of The American Lutheran Church to examine honestly and openly before God our attitudes and actions toward our fellowmen of another race. We ask that we examine ourselves as to what we are thinking, saying, and doing to establish the point that all persons are entitled to equal opportunity in the social order. In so far as we as congregations or individual members may be remiss in this obligation, we should seek the Lord's forgiveness.

6. Pastors and congregations need to take vigorous, skillful, and patient measures to build bridges of communication and understanding between alienated segments of our society. We need to heed and act upon cries of distress, evidences of exploitation, discouragement of initiative, and denials of opportunities. Rather than limit our involvement to condemning the demonstrations which bring injustices to public attention we need to ask ourselves why we have been so inattentive to and so tolerant of injustices needing correction. Participating with and within the several power structures of our communities, our pastors, congregations, and members need, in their quest for civic righteousness, to work for a social order in which each person has equality of opportunity to develop his potential and to participate constructively in society.

7. We may differ in our judgments as to which measures or which laws can best guarantee equality of opportunity. Some may argue that conformity cannot be coerced, that it can only be effected by the inner compulsion of the heart. This gives the church two opportunities: (1) through the power of the Holy Spirit to change men's hearts so they will desire to do what is good in the eyes of God, and (2) to win support and respect for laws and ordinances which seek to curb stubborn men as well as others who unthinkably do what is evil. In these times of domestic stress and strain over the civil rights, The American Lutheran Church has no unique wisdom to prescribe the form and content of legislation which may be needed. This remains the task of civil legislators. The church insists, however, that each person is entitled to his birthright of equality of opportunity and equality of protection under the law. No member of The American Lutheran Church, faithful in his commitment to Jesus Christ, can be of an easy conscience before God unless he is actively working to give full effect to this revelation of Scripture, this counsel of reason and these laws of the nation.

OPEN HOUSING

Resolved, That the American Lutheran Church in convention assembled places itself on record as favoring "open housing," the right of each individual to live where his economic means makes it possible for him to live, without any restriction as to race, creed, color, or national origin.

The achievement of this goal is best accomplished when men of good will voluntarily agree to sell or rent their property to any financially qualified purchaser or tenant.

Where voluntary cooperation is resisted, we believe it lies within the province and responsibility of government—municipal, state, and federal to adopt such legislation as will discourage prejudicial practices and insure "open housing."

Teachers in Politics

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, last Friday marked the first day of the National Education Association's Teachers-in-Politics Weekend, a very noteworthy program to encourage teachers to become more active in the political life of their community, State, and Nation.

I heartily approve of this program, and I commend the National Education Association for it. I have long believed that teachers should put their education and their knowledge of human nature to practical use by taking an active part in the American political process.

Educators have been among the leaders of society throughout recorded history. From the ranks of teachers have come such influential men as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle; St. Augustine and Thomas Acquinas, and in modern times, Horace Mann, John Dewey, and Woodrow Wilson. Our own great president, Lyndon B. Johnson, began his career as a teacher in Texas.

Our Nation cannot help but benefit from an organized and widespread movement to enlist the mind and energies of our teachers into the political activity which is the very essence of grassroots democracy.

Let's Close Ranks on the Home Front

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by General Eisenhower appeared in the April issue of Reader's Digest. I commend this very timely and superb article to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to every American citizen:

LET'S CLOSE RANKS ON THE HOME FRONT

(By Dwight D. Eisenhower)

In a long life of service to my country, I have never encountered a situation more depressing than the present spectacle of an America deeply divided over a war—a war to which we have committed so much in the treasure, in honor and in the lives of our young men. What has become of our courage? What has become of our loyalty to others? What has become of a noble concept called patriotism, which in former times of crisis has carried us through to victory and peace?

If in the desperate days of World War II we had been torn by this kind of discord, I doubt that we and our allies could have won. Looking back, I think how disheartening it would have been to those of us who commanded forces in the field if we had been called home to make speeches and hold press conferences—to shore up a wavering solidarity on the home front. Nothing of the sort happened then. But it is happening now. And how the enemies of freedom throughout the world—from Hanoi to Moscow—must be rejoicing!

In our war against the Axis powers a quarter of a century ago, we were fighting for the cause of freedom and human dignity, just as we are now. And in the long-range sense, we were also fighting for our own salvation, for a way of life we hold dear, just as we are now. In that war the American people understood this, and it was inspiring to see the single-minded way this country faced up to the job of fighting two first-rate military powers simultaneously.

We had a few slackers and draft dodgers, of course, but they were objects of scorn. We grumbled a bit about rationing and sometimes accused our draft boards of partiality, but these minor irrationalities were mostly a way of letting off steam. Essentially, we were united, and nearly everyone found some way of helping in the war effort. As a nation, we were dedicated to the job of winning completely and swiftly. And we did win—at least a year earlier than the most optimistic military timetables had forecast.

As commander of the Allied armies in Europe, I can testify that this solidarity, this upsurge of patriotism on the home front was a wonderfully encouraging thing. Neither I nor any other military leader had to lie awake nights wondering whether the folks back home would stick with us to the end. It never occurred to us that they might not. We knew that the American spirit had rallied to the cause, and this knowledge buoyed us up immeasurably—all of us, right down to the private in the ranks.

Today the reverse is true. We have "chosen up sides," as youngsters say in lining up their ball teams, and we call ourselves hawks and doves. This terminology in itself is inaccurate and ridiculous. A hawk is a bird of prey, a dove the helpless victim of predators. We are neither. We covet nobody's territory or property, want no dominion over others. On the other hand, we have always shown ourselves capable of self-defense. I trust we always shall.

No one who believes in our democratic processes can object to honorable dissent. This is part of the American credo, part of our birthright. There are those who now sincerely believe that we have no business being in Vietnam. I think they are terribly and dangerously wrong, but they have the right to state their views.

The current raucous confrontation, however, goes far beyond honorable dissent. Public men and private citizens alike take a stance and defend their positions angrily and unreasonably, often substituting emotion for logic and facts.

Not long ago, for example, a young U.S. Senator was quoted as saying that if we are fighting in Vietnam to protect ourselves, then we must concede that we are being selfishly immoral. To me this seems the height of tortured reasoning, if not worse. Certainly, we are fighting to defend ourselves and other free nations against the eventual domination of communism. In my opinion it would be grossly immoral *not* to resist a tyranny whose openly avowed purpose is to subjugate the earth—and particularly the United States of America. The Senator was indulging in sophistry, and I suspect his purpose was political rather than patriotic.

A ludicrous, and dangerous, aspect of this bitter quarrel is the large number of public men who regard themselves as military experts. One large defeatist group proclaims loudly and positively that "we can never win the Vietnam war." Others insist, contrary to the best military judgment and to clear evidence, that our air strikes "do no good" and we must cease all bombing of targets in the North. Still others want our troops to sit down in "defensive enclaves" and drop all offensive action—presumably until a tough enemy gets tired of looking at our military might and goes quietly home.

Instead of giving faith and backing to the men who are responsible for the conduct of the war, these armchair strategists snipe at every aspect of the conflict. Moreover, they never seem to lack a rostrum for their pronouncements. They are quoted endlessly and prominently in the press and on the airwaves, and of course their words give aid and comfort to the enemy and thus prolong the war.

A tactic of some dissenters—and this alarms me more than all the empty shouting—is their resort to force in open defiance of the laws of the land. They try to prevent recruiting officers from doing their job, and sometimes succeed. They try to halt the work of personnel recruiters from industries which manufacture war matériel. They lie down on the pavement in front of draft-induction centers; they jeer at the inductees and try to keep them from answering their call to service.

Some young Americans publicly burn their draft cards and state they will never go to war. The "peaceful" anti-war demonstrations frequently get out of hand and become bloodily violent. Dissenters of this type insist on their own right to free speech, but are unwilling to grant the same right to others. How often lately we have been subjected to the shocking spectacle of some distinguished speaker being smuggled in the back door of a lecture hall to avoid physical harm from the demonstrators out front!

These militant peace-at-any-price groups are a small minority, but all too often they get away with such illegal actions—and also get away with the headlines. There is no reason to tolerate this arrogant flouting of the law. It could be stopped—and should be stopped—at once. Their action is not honorable dissent. It is rebellion, and it verges on treason.

In the midst of this disgraceful public uproar, the dissenters continue to demand that we negotiate. I am a firm believer in constructive negotiation, provided both sides come to the conference table with honest and reasonable intentions. Thus far, North Vietnam has made it emphatically clear that it wants no negotiation—except on terms which would mean our complete capitulation. Listening to all the anti-war sound and fury on our home front, Hanoi obviously prefers to wait it out in the hope that public opinion in the United States will eventually compel our withdrawal. It is probable that the behavior of the dissenters themselves is making honorable negotiation impossible.

Those who oppose the Vietnam war and insist on our unilateral withdrawal have said over and over that the American people have never been given a sound reason for our presence there. If they believe this, it must be because they refuse to read or listen to anything they don't like. There are reasons why it is critically important to fight the communists in Vietnam, and they have been stated often.

The first and most immediate reason—so obvious that it shouldn't have to be explained—is that we are trying to save a brave little country, to which we have given our solemn promise of protection, from being swallowed by the communist tyranny. We want the people of South Vietnam to have their chance to live in freedom and prosperity, and even in the midst of a bitter war we are already doing much to help them build up their economy.

If anyone doubts the determination of the communists to subjugate this small country and take it over by sheer savagery, let him read the accounts of the Vietcong's impersonal butchery of whole villages of innocent people. The communists' tactic of conquest by terror, their callous disregard for human life, their philosophy that the end justifies the means—no matter how barbarous and immoral the means may be—are precisely the same in Vietnam as they have used in gobbling up other countries and other free peoples of the world. Their objectives have not changed or softened over the years. The only language they understand is force, or the threat of force.

There is a larger reason for our military presence in Vietnam—and that is the urgent need to keep all Southeast Asia from falling to the communists. Some of our selfappointed military experts discount the "domino theory"—which, as applied to Southeast Asia, simply means that if we abandon South Vietnam to communism, the other countries of that area will also topple. In my opinion, the domino theory is frighteningly correct. I suggest that the peace-at-any-price advocates who scoff at this threat study the behavior of communism over the past two decades.

Here at home, this is election year, and I hope we do not permit the Vietnam war to become a divisive political issue. It is right and proper to advocate a change of leadership and to discuss the conduct of the war. But it is improper, and I think unpatriotic, to voice dissent in such a way that it encourages our enemies to believe we have lost the capacity to make a national decision and act on it. Meanwhile, I state this unequivocally: *I will not personally support any peace-at-any-price candidate who advocates capitulation and the abandonment of South Vietnam.*

As any citizen does, I deeply regret the necessity of pouring the blood of our young men and our treasure into this faraway war for freedom. But it is a necessity. This is an hour of grave national emergency. It is time that we do more thinking and less shouting; that we put our faith in our democratic proc-

esses and cease the dangerous tactic of deciding which laws we will and will not obey.

We should also ponder the previous successes and sacrifices we made in checking the advance of communism: how we helped save Western Europe through the Marshall Plan; how we checked aggression in Korea, on the free Chinese islands of Quemoy and Matsu, in Lebanon and the Dominican Republic. How we saved Formosa, and are successfully helping the South American nations resist the Cuban conspirators. These things we must continue to do, even when we stand alone—even when so-called friendly nations criticize our actions.

Sometimes I find comfort in going back even further in history. At one time during the Civil War, a profound spirit of defeatism developed in the North. A considerable portion of the people, discouraged and fearful, cried: Let the South go its way; we can never win this horrible war. Abraham Lincoln was reviled; draft laws were defied; hundreds were killed in resisting recruiting agents. The pressure on the government to acknowledge defeat was intense.

Lincoln, however, saw two things clearly. He knew that the successful secession of the South would fragment America and deny it its great destiny. And with a clear-sighted evaluation of the manpower and resources of both sides, he also knew that the North could win. He stood steadfast, and before long the courage and common sense of the people revived, the defeatists subsided, and the Union was saved.

It is my hope and belief that history will now repeat itself. I still have abiding faith in the good sense of the great majority of the American people. It is unthinkable that the voices of defeat should triumph in our land.

Riots and the Revolution: A Second Front

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an interesting documentary by Frank Capell predating the battle of the District of Columbia supplies an insight into who and what are behind the inflamed passions, burnings, and anarchy. If there is white racism here it is provoked, manipulated, and created, and whites and the poor blacks involved are but the catalyst stooges.

Like the Vietnam, the "Ameri-Cong" infiltration and battle in the United States is undeclared and the taxpayers are not only losing their sons and their property but are footing the bill for both fronts.

I include the Herald of Freedom for April 5 following my remarks:

REVOLUTION, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 1968

We have had the "Warren Commission," the "Crime Commission" and now the "Riot Commission." None has brought forth an honest report, but Americans are asked to accept their "findings" as the truth. These phony commissions serve only to further the objectives of the powers operating behind the scenes in the Black Revolution now approaching its climax. The ultimate objective seems to be the crushing of the honest, law-abiding middle-class (the bourgeoisie in Communist lingo) which is being burdened with taxes (more to come). Their right to own and enjoy private property and to protect it with arms if necessary is constantly under attack.

Coddled are the law-breakers, the rioters and revolutionaries. So-called "Civil Rights" bills are pushed through Congress, taking away the civil rights of a great percentage of the population. The newest one contains a so-called "anti-riot" provision which sounds good but which would actually take away the right to own and maintain firearms. The liberal mentality is shown in all its glory here—stop riots by taking away the guns with which citizens can defend themselves against them. Of course this would get the riots over faster as there would be no opposition—the police wouldn't want to be "brutal" and private citizens would be helpless.

A recent newscast gave the details of an armed hold-up of a storekeeper in which the robbers made off with his money. As they were running out of the store after robbing the man at gunpoint, the storekeeper pulled a gun out of hiding and shot one of the robbers. Guess who was arrested! The storekeeper, of course.

The likes of H. Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael can roam the countryside at will calling for killing and revolution. Occasionally we read of them being arrested but these things are always taken care of and never seem to interfere with their activities. This can only happen because important people want it to happen. The huge wealthy foundations and the Government itself are financing and encouraging the revolutionary activities which will culminate this coming summer in more terrible riots than ever before. In an editorial by William Loeb, publisher of the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, entitled "The Terror Begins," we read:

"The Communists have decided on guerrilla-type warfare right here inside the United States. They are counting on this type of shock treatment to bring the U.S. government and the people of the United States to their knees in surrender, without the need of a nuclear attack. . . .

"Likewise, in the United States we can expect the Communists and their allies, both white as well as black, to perpetrate shocking atrocities. Some of the most prominent people in the nation will be assassinated. Some of the most supposedly secure areas of our nation will be invaded and attacked. All of this will be for the purpose of making the average citizen feel that he and his home are completely insecure and at the mercy of the Communist mobs."

The U.S. Government is helping by financing the mobs, providing lawyers when individual revolutionaries get into trouble with local authorities and disarming Mr. Average Citizen who likes to obey the law. No gun laws will deter criminals to whom the law is unimportant. The so-called War on Poverty has provided the framework through which the financing and protection of revolutionaries takes place. Tax-exempt foundations also help with funds such as a $200,000 grant from the Ford Foundation to Martin Luther King and his Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

King has formed a "working agreement" and cooperative program with Stokely Carmichael. Carmichael, in turn, has formed a coalition of militant black nationalist organizations into what is called the "Black United Front." This "United Front" includes leaders who are members of the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM). The entire organization of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNICK), headed by H. Rap Brown, will be utilized to promote the coming disorders. Some of the details of the "Black United Front" were outlined in the Communist newspaper, People's World, of February 24, 1968:

"'A strategy for black survival' based on a 'Black United Front' was the line laid down by militant leaders of the recently merged Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee and The Black Panther Party for Self-Defense before a cheering, chanting largely black crowd of 6,000 in the Oakland (Calif.) Auditorium last Saturday (Feb. 17).

"The program outlined by Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap Brown, James Forman, and Bobby Seale . . . calls for:

"International solidarity with the national liberation movements and colored peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

"Recognition of the white power structure and its racist institutions as the main enemy. . . .

"Armed protection of black communities . . ."

The plan for international solidarity resulted from the Tricontinental Conference held in Havana January 13–15, 1966 at which Communist officials and guerrilla leaders from Africa, Asia and Latin America were gathered to formulate plans to promote guerrilla warfare in the United States and Latin America. This led to a permanent organization which maintains an office in New York City. It is known as the Tricontinental Information Center and is located in the St. James Building, 1133 Broadway, N.Y.C., Telephone: 212: 242–6512.

From July 31 to August 10, 1967 a conference of revolutionaries, Communists and guerrilla leaders was held in Havana by an offshoot of this group, called the "Latin American Solidarity Organization." Stokely Carmichael delivered an address and was given a standing ovation. A resolution of the meeting stated that "Armed struggle is the fundamental path" and that the guerrilla forces were the rightful leaders of the revolutionary war behind which all other forces should unite. This data was outlined in a U.S. Senate report of the Sub-committee on American Republican Affairs, entitled "Insurgency in Latin America" (Jan. 15, 1968).

The average American says, "All this is very interesting, but it can't happen here." Unfortunately it is happening here. The Black Revolutionary Program for the U.S. calls for a United Front of all the militant Negro organizations as well as the so-called moderate and "non-violent" groups such as Martin Luther King's well-financed organization. For the coming summer violence the Negro revolutionaries will be able to utilize the trained personnel of a large number of Negro groups united together. King alone has three thousand trained Negroes who will begin activities in Washington, D.C. April 22, 1968.

The Allen-Scott Report of January 3, 1968 stated that there are "disturbing reports from several police departments that black militants in their cities have drawn up lists of local and federal officials to be executed in 1968." The informative British Intelligence Digest of March 1968 warns that "Arming by black militant groups is steadily increasing." It states:

"Supporting this internal warfare against the American social, political, and economic structure, an all-time high volume of propaganda is pouring into the United States—unchecked by the postal authorities—from Peking, Hong Kong, Tokyo, London, Moscow, East Berlin, Prague, Tirana, Algiers, and elsewhere in an unending stream. Much of it is disseminated among Negroes." . . .

"Black Liberation Committees have been organized by the pro-Peking 'Progressive Labor Party' in Harlem, Cambridge, Philadelphia, Rochester, Washington, D.C., San Francisco, and Los Angeles."

While the Negroes are being excited by this kind of inflammatory propaganda, they have been given the green light for their revolutionary activities by the report of President Johnson's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (Riot Commission). The Shreveport Times of March 5, 1968 states in an editorial entitled "Riot Study May Incite Riots":

"The Johnson (Riot) Commission, when it comes to racism, refers only to 'white racism.' Fundamentally, it seems to contend throughout that blame for everything involved in

the 1967 riots rests on the shoulders of whites. The endless incendiary preachments of Rap Brown, Stokely Carmichael—and Martin Luther King in indirect ways—are not given space, much less importance.

"For this reason, the Johnson Commission report is dangerous; perhaps the most dangerous document of its kind ever drawn up. It implies to the Negroes that murder, arson, anarchy, physical attack with guns on law enforcers, and any other kind of violence in 1967 was all right when committed by Negroes; that only whites were wrong.

"It thus can become incitement to carry on in 1968 what took place in 1967, and on a larger scale if so desired by the rioters."

With the climax of the Black Revolution just around the corner, it was no surprise to have Adam Clayton Powell return to the limelight. Clutching a copy of the "Riot Report" he toured the streets of New York City urging the Negroes to revolution. In spite of an outstanding warrant for his arrest Powell was able to return to New York to take his rightful place in the vanguard of revolution through the courtesy of Judge Arthur Markewich also went out of his way to pave the way for Powell's triumphant return to his faithful followers. Some years ago Judge Markewich also went out of his way to castigate the management of the Hotel Commodore when they refused to allow a fund-raising dinner for a Communist-front to be held in the hotel. Judge Markewich was quoted as calling this action "indecent and un-American."

Powell, who said he had returned home to purge Harlem of "Uncle Toms," was quoted as stating that he will call for a world youth revolution when he speaks at England's Oxford University in May. He said the list of "Uncle Toms" in Harlem was so long it would take him all day to name them but that "the soul brothers will take care of them one way or another."

Rev. Martin Luther King was in Harlem at the same time as Powell, installing the Rev. Wyatt T. Walker as pastor of New Canaan Baptist Church, 132 W. 116th St. At the door as King spoke were five helmeted Harlem Mau Maus with their leader Charles Kenyatta carrying a machete with a Bible and a copy of the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders report impaled on it. We would suggest that this be done to all copies of the report.

The Chicago Tribune of March 2, 1968 had this to say about this misleading report:

"The report of the Kerner commission on the 1967 riots is awash with tears for the poor, oppressed rioters. The disorders, said the report, 'were not caused by, nor were they the consequence of, any organized plan or "conspiracy."' No evidence was found, said the commission, 'that all or any of the disorders or the incidents that led to them were planned or directed by any organization or group, international, national, or local.'"

The Tribune editorial went on to discuss the official "findings" of a New Jersey commission appointed to look into the riots in Newark and Plainfield, N.J. It stated:

"After the Newark riot a commission appointed by the governor of New Jersey found 'no evidence' of conspiracy and said the violence was spontaneous. The police, who were on the firing line during the disorders, disagreed fervently. The New Jersey State Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, which has 16,000 members, set up a bi-racial commission of its own to study the riot, and found much evidence of conspiracy. This evidence was ignored by the governor's commission and by the Kerner commission.

"Before and during the Newark riots sniper classes were conducted in various parts of the city, according to John J. Heffernan, president of the police association. Agitators printed thousands of leaflets giving detailed instructions on how to make a Molotov cocktail, he said. . . .

"Heffernan said the police investigation showed that agitators who had come to Newark before the riot later went on to Plainfield, N.J., and to Detroit after order was restored in Newark."

Dominick A. Spina, Director of the Police Department of Newark had this to say concerning his frustration with the New Jersey Riot Report:

"On a personal request I testified for four days before this so-called august body of reputable and outstanding citizens of New Jersey. I documented every bit of testimony either with a police report, newspaper article, etc. You cannot imagine my consternation, disbelief and dismay when picking up the newspaper and reading the findings of this so-called investigatory committee. Not a word was said about the thousands of leaflets that were handed out indiscriminately by racists and subversives in this city. I gave the commission at least 15 copies of these leaflets to no avail. I also cited the number of speeches made before the Newark Planning Board and the Board of Education containing obscenities, . . . inciting people to shed blood. Not a word was said in this entire report about this situation. They then drew a fine line by innuendo concerning so-called corruption in the Police Department. . . . If you read the report it appeared that the Newark Police started the riot and the corruption was one of the reasons for same.

"I don't know how far we are going in this country and how much we can tolerate, but I have a feeling that a line must be drawn very soon before it is too late . . . ."

Congressman John Ashbrook disagreed with the President's Riot Commission in its "white racism" accusation. He stated on March 4, 1968:

"Presumably, 'white racism' alone drove Jesse Gray, an identified Communist, at a rally prior to the riots in Harlem to call openly for 'guerrilla warfare' to stop 'police brutality.'

"And one might surmise from the Commission's report that for the same reason Bill Epton, the revolutionary, stated 1 hour before the Harlem riots began that: 'We will not be fully free until we smash this state completely and totally.'"

The aforementioned Jesse Gray is supported by the U.S. Government. An article in the N.Y. Times of August 21, 1967 stated:

"Sargent Shriver said today that he had tried, without success, to stop Jesse Gray, the controversial Harlem leader, from getting antipoverty funds. . . .

"He said local officials had refused his request to have Mr. Gray removed as a $50-a-day adviser for a Harlem youth group partially supported by the Federal Office."

That the U.S. Government has been actually aiding the Communist-inspired revolutionaly Negro rioters bent on overthrowing it was established by Barron's Weekly of March 4, 1968 in a searching study on the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity's Legal Services Program. The article stated:

"In suits financed by the War on Poverty, lawyers for the 'poor' have sought to persuade U.S. district courts in Newark and Philadelphia to appoint federal receivers to run the local police departments as a means of eliminating 'police brutality.'

"The Philadelphia suit also asked the court to nullify state laws against carrying concealed deadly weapons, sedition, riot, conspiracy, loitering and obstructing justice. . . .

"FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover views the legal moves as part of a scheme to undermine and destroy local law enforcement and to substitute a national police force. . . .

"The cases are just two of a good many questionable moves that have been made under the Legal Services Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In virtually every riot-torn city, LSP lawyers have devoted an extraordinary amount of time and money to defending alleged rioters. . . .

"LSP personnel also have advocated noncooperation with police, organized rent strikes, defended alleged dope addicts and challenged statutes aimed at discouraging immorality. . . Today some 1,800 lawyers, and numerous assistants, operate out of 850 offices in 48 states. No fees are charged; salaries for all are paid by OEO. It spent $27 million on LSP in fiscal '67 and has budgeted $36 million for it this fiscal year (and $42 million for next year . . . .

"In Indianapolis the local LSP (Indianapolis Legal Services Organization) distributed several thousand cards in the city's low-income neighborhoods giving advice on the art of non-cooperation with the police.

"In California, the LSP, known there as California Rural Legal Assistance, has been helping the leftist United Farm Workers. That's a union headed by Cesar Chavez. . ."

Oliver Lofton is director of the Newark, N.J. LSP and had previously been legal assistant to Nicholas Katzenbach in 1961 and 1962. The Barron's article states:

"In an investigation of the role of the LSP in the Newark riots, the Committee on Law and Poverty of the New Jersey Bar Association found that, 'The entire resources of the Newark LSP and the Public Defender of the state of New Jersey and Mr. Howard H. Kestin, (New Jersey) director of legal services of the OEO, were thereafter marshaled to provide legal services for those persons who had been arrested in the course of the Newark riots. . . ."

Assisting the Government and the tax-exempt foundations in their encouragement of revolution are the collaborating clergy. The National Council of Churches has been active with its Delta Ministry and now we have a new "interfaith coalition" known as "Operation Connection." An article in the Denver National Register of March 24, 1968 states that the organization will make $10 million available over the next eight months to Negro leaders in selected urban centers, presumably not to be used to support violent activities. The announcement of this new project was made by Bishop John E. Hines, presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the Rev. Albert Cleage, Jr., pastor of Central Congregational Church, Detroit, who are co-chairmen of the project, along with Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum of the American Jewish Committee and Rabbi Abraham Heschel of the Jewish Theological Seminary who are vice chairmen. Other vice chairmen are Archbishop John F. Dearden of Detroit, Auxiliary Bishop Harold R. Perry of New Orleans, Bishop John J. Wright of Pittsburgh and Bishop George H. Guilfoyle of Camden, N.J.

The most important Negro activist clergymen are Adam Clayton Powell and Martin Luther King with Albert Cleage, Jr. coming up fast. King has reportedly stated that Powell will play an important role in his coming Washington demonstrations. The Allen-Scott Report quotes Powell as stating in a letter, "my return to Washington in April will help rock the entire country." Communist Herbert Aptheker has written a booklet in praise of Martin Luther King which should alert all thinking Americans to King's value to the Communist cause. The booklet states:

"Now that A.J. Muste has died, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., is outstanding spokesman for classical Christian values in the United States; for several years he has been the pre-eminent leader of the civil rights movement; his decisive contributions to the theory and practice of peace have been recognized with the outstanding award open to man—the Nobel Peace Prize.

"As DeBois picked up the torch from the hands of Douglass, so it seems likely that future historians will conclude that King has carrried forward the torch from DuBois."

Only the gullible and brainwashed will believe the claim that there is "no Communist involvement in the riots." DuBois finally admitted he was a Communist by officially joining the Communist Party in his old age. But he had worked with the Communists

for many years while pretending not to be one of them. The Communist influence in the Negro Revolution is hidden but powerful. U.S. Sen. James Eastland has stated:

"The Communists now have substantial footholds in several leftwing organizations in which substantial numbers of Negroes are participating, as well as in various other organizations which are either ostensibly all Negro or ostensibly Negro controlled."

There is danger ahead for America. The coming Negro violence is but one of many knives aimed at her heart. The War in Vietnam is killing off the cream of the young Americans, leaving a void to be filled with the dregs unacceptable for military service or unwilling to serve their country. The financial situation is bad with a depression in the offing which will make the 1930's look like the good old days.

We suggest you support your local police and law enforcement authorities and be prepared to protect your families should it become necessary.

Ed Ball Honored on 80th Birthday

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with much interest the recognition given to Florida's great industrialist and philanthropist, Edward Ball, on the occasion of his 80th birthday. It is an exciting thing to realize that this leading exponent of private enterprises continues to be hale, hearty, active, and in full possession of his faculties. I have been privileged to enjoy his company in very recent weeks and I can attest to all of this. We in Florida realize his important contributions to our State's development and the value of his counsel to its continued progress. I take pleasure in submitting for reprinting in the RECORD a very fine statement from All Florida weekly magazine, a Sunday supplement which is published as a part of some of the State's leading newspapers. The article is entitled "A Castle for Ed Ball," but what should be understood is that his castle is in the hearts and minds of the people of Florida who honor him for his work. The article follows:

A CASTLE FOR ED BALL

Florida's Ed Ball, who has built the biggest financial and industrial empire in the history of the Sunshine State, turned 80 Thursday, March 21.

This man of millions who has done more for the state than such famed Florida figures as Flagler, Plant, Ford, Edison, and Firestone, also retired early in February—at a dynamic 79.

What will he do, this giant among industrial giants, in retirement? At 80 years of age?

"Have you ever dreamed of sleeping in a castle?" is his question to the questions.

That is one thing Ed Ball will do: sleep in a castle, for as long as it pleases him. Ballynahinch Castle in colorful County Connemara, Ireland, a towering structure overlooking majestic mountains and tranquil lakes in this land of his forefathers, is a Ball-bought mecca for international visitors and sportsmen.

But no matter how often he commutes to the castle in Ireland, Ed Ball will forever be a part of Florida.

Because financier Ball, a soft-talking ex-Virginian who quit school at 13 and at 20 was earning $20,000 a year selling office furniture on the West Coast when a dollar was worth more than today's 46 cents, has another first on the Florida scene too: tightlipped, he carefully gives away $10,000 a day to charities.

Every penny of the money stays in Florida where in 1966, some 559 schools, churches, hospitals and charitable institutions received a total of $3,720,167—and 20 cents.

But that's not all the story. For in the past three decades, more than $55 million has been donated to needy persons and worthy causes ranging from a ballet in Utah and the whaling museum in New Bedford, Mass., to a statue for Winston Churchill and the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, Greece.

Giving away the money from his Jacksonville headquarters as part of the benevolence of the Alfred du Pont estate, financier Ball has never taken time to mention the almsgiving. In fact, for the first time in 30 years the estate released the list of its charities this year.

Yet, industrialist Ball is an enigma. His name is commonly heard from Miami, the southern terminus of his Florida East Coast Railroad, to the state's northern panhandle, where in an area 40 miles wide and 170 miles long, he has built a million-acre domain. He controls 30 banks with a billion in deposits. And his paper-manufacturing complex extends from Port St. Joe in the panhandle's Big Bend to 19 container plants, including two in Ireland. But in the center of this empire, as chief administrator of the du Pont estate, industrialist Ball, shy of the press, has remained, in spite of close dealing, far from mid-stage. Just as with his business affairs, he has been stony silent concerning the charities.

Actually, the career of Florida's Ed Ball is strange in the annals of American finance. He has devoted a lifetime to build an estate created by the will of another who in his last years was preoccupied with helping crippled, but curable, children and also elders in need of food and shelter.

The will was written by his brother-in-law, Alfred du Pont, who left the Brandywine of the Delaware du Ponts and, after marrying school teacher Jessie Ball following the death of his previous wife, came to Florida to try his hand in banking.

At his death he left an estate valued, after taxes, at $27 million. Assuming control and carefully carrying out the tenets of the will by providing for charities on a dollar shrunk by a 73-cent tax bite, financier Ball has expanded the du Pont empire far beyond any expectations his brother-in-law might have had for it.

The Nemours Foundation to help crippled children was established years ago by the du Pont will in Delaware. The first patient was a girl who could not walk because of deformed legs. After operations, with all costs paid by Nemours, she walked away to have, later, her own healthy family. Thousands of crippled children since have been aided at Nemours as they have been helped in 14 other states.

Why has financier Ball worked to expand an estate whose earnings finally will go completely to charity? He never has said, remaining as silent about motivation as about earnings and donations.

Yet his imprint has been made on the Florida landscape. He has specialized in taking wobbly properties and restoring them to healthy profit-making roles. He began, as a trusted lieutenant of Alfred du Pont, by keeping open family bank doors when the boom of the 'twenties collapsed and caused bank after Florida bank to fold.

The pattern was the same in Northwest Florida where acres had been stripped of virgin pine in lumber operations and then, covered with scrub oak, left useless and frequently unclaimed even for taxes. On these cutover acres, he planted pine to produce paper pulp, and from an economic wilderness built a thriving pine-tree economy providing work for thousands.

In a more recent move, industrialist Ball, after buying stock at six cents on the dollar, took control of the Florida East Coast Railroad, a carrier which had wallowed in bankruptcy for nearly 30 years and which, in mid-Twentieth century, still used Morse dot-and-dash to transmit messages from Jacksonville to Miami. Other railroads considered buying the East Coast but, after studying the property, left the line to banker Ball with the firm conviction that he had made the first big mistake of his career and that the end would be a financial fiasco.

The Florida East Coast weathered the nation's longest of all rail strikes, and the flatlands from Jacksonville to Miami echo yet with purple charge and countercharge, but now, the carrier is rolling freight and doing what other rail managers said could never be done—making a profit.

For all his efforts with the railroad, chairman Ball receives pay of $1 a month, or $12 a year.

Always close-vested in business dealings, financier Ball has followed the same pattern in charity too. Though through the estate he gives away thousands each day, he studies the donations as carefully as corporate earnings, and any cause which receives largess will of a certainty merit help.

All this he does in silence, for by nature he is a close-mouthed man. Giving away $10,000 a day—tightlipped he can afford to be.

The Law

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I have the "Soliloquy of a Great Institution" that I would like to have reproduced in the RECORD.

Some understand, others may be caused to think and reason, but others care not because over the centuries there have always been destroyers of civilization—and no civilization can long endure without respect and compliance with society's greatest institution. The soliloquy follows:

THE SOLILOQUY OF A GREAT INSTITUTION

I was ordained in the beginning as God's protection for His children.

It was the disregard of me that was man's original sin, and brought his first downfall.

I was God's greatest gift to Moses for without me, inscribed on the Tablets of Stone, he could not lead his people.

When the cries of the crowd cast me aside, a Man was crucified; but under my divine decree He lived, and a world was saved.

It was I that Jesus came not to destroy but to fulfill.

In the debacle that was the fall of Rome, I was the sole survivor, and was that nation's one lasting contribution to succeeding civilizations.

I tamed a despot at Runnymede, and was the armor and arsenal of the Barons in winning the Great Charter.

I accompanied the conquering Napoleon through the Alps of Italy, across the rivers of Australia, and the frozen tundras of the North, and when his Empire crumbled, I alone, as the Code Napoleon, was his only prideful prize of war.

In Philadelphia, in 1787, I scaled the final heights and became the defender of freedom from tryanny for every human being subject to my precepts; and made living reality of the rights of man.

I have made of every man's house his castle. I have lent purpose to his life and hope to his future.

Where I am not, the land is as the original chaos; and blood is the price of all things.

Where I am, there is peace and happiness, and little children grow toward the image of their Creator.

I am the Law.

Charles County Group Re-Creates Lewis and Clark Expedition

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of the frontier and scientific inquiry have combined forces to motivate a group of citizens from the Charles County, Md., Community College to canoe the original Lewis and Clark Expedition route this summer testing navigability and water pollution along the route.

The expedition was described recently in the February 1968 edition of Environmental Science and Technology magazine, and I insert the article, "Along the Lewis and Clark Trail," in the RECORD:

ALONG THE LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL

In a period of renewed interest in the Lewis and Clark Trail, a crew from Charles County Community College's biology department plans to canoe—and to make pollution measurements—along the length of the explorers' water route from St. Louis to the Oregon coast.

The Lewis and Clark Commission, established in 1965, is making detailed studies of historic sites, campgrounds, and recreation areas along the 4,000 miles of the Lewis and Clark Trail. These efforts are directed mainly at hiker, horseback rider, and auto driver. But, Lewis and Clark moved mostly on water, and that is the route that interests a group at the Charles County Community College, La Plata, Md.

This summer they plan to canoe the original route, from St. Louis to the Oregon coast, determining how much of the route is still navigable. They will also make water analyses along the route, providing a uniform pollution survey to compare with conditions described in the Lewis and Clark journals.

The community college's expedition is related to its program in pollution abatement technology that has been evolving during the past three years. "We feel community colleges have an important role in the educational scheme of things," says Mrs. Belva L. Jensen, head of the CCCC's biology department. "But many schools, we feel, spread themselves too thin. We want to specialize in a few areas, and try to do them particularly well. Pollution abatement technology is one of those areas."

According to Mrs. Jensen, in mid-June four men and two canoes packed with portable sampling equipment, emergency rations, and some camping gear will leave St. Louis and move west toward the coast. Because the 3,000-mile journey must be completed by early September, the canoes will be equipped with 5-hp. motors. Actual traveling time for the original expedition required about 12 months—spanning the time from early spring in 1804 to late summer in 1805.

Every day or so, the canoeists will rendezvous with a large, truck-mounted sports van to replenish supplies and to do complete analytical tests that cannot be done in the canoes. The vehicle will carry additional scientific equipment and also provide living facilities for the support crew. Included in the support crew is a fifth canoeist, to permit rotating canoe crews.

Among the several aims of the expedition is a project to compare the present flora and fauna with descriptions in the Lewis and Clark journals. Making these observations will be the job of the support crew.

HELPING HANDS

When Mrs. Jensen started planning the expedition last fall, the first problem was to assemble the necessary equipment. The college could contribute only salaries for Mrs. Jensen and the other faculty members on the expedition. So she looked to manufacturers and suppliers for help. "The responses we've received have been very gratifying. We have promises of more than $10,000 worth of supplies and equipment, and now lack only a few items, mostly scientific equipment," Mrs. Jensen points out.

The rest of the crew, meanwhile, has been studying the Lewis and Clark journals, as well as topographic maps of the U.S. Army's Corps of Engineers. In addition to the obvious need to know the territory through which they are traveling, the adventurers need to arrange rendezvous points. A major concern has been arranging for the canoeists to meet the support van frequently.

The canoes should make 50-80 miles a day, but bad weather or rough water could cut this figure down. The canoeists decided against attempting a particularly rugged 300 miles in what is often called the Wilderness Area of Montana and Idaho. This portage, as well as shorter ones around some dams, will be managed by the van.

The crew has been hard at work all fall and winter developing its skills at the sampling and analytical procedures. Plans call for about a dozen analyses to be made about every 50 miles. Among the analyses are: pH, temperatures, and nitrate, phosphate, free oxygen, and coliform concentrations. This spring the canoeists, all experienced outdoorsmen, will work on polishing their skills with their new equipment on the nearby Potomac River.

GROWING PLANS

The college's decision to develop a program in pollution abatement technology dates to just about three years ago. A number of students in Mrs. Jensen's biology department were inspectors for the county health department. From their questions on health, sewage, and similar problems, she came to feel there was a great need for ways of providing additional training for these people.

Mrs. Jensen soon found that the Maryland State Department of Health agreed. At that time, in the entire state, there were only three certified sewage plant operators—and 800 positions requiring operators. In 1966 a state law passed requiring that all operators be certified by mid-1968.

Last fall, Charles County Community College offered a one-year course in waste water management to 51 operators. It had to turn many more away. Next fall, it hopes to begin planning to start a two-year pollution abatement technology program leading to an associate-in-arts degree. The college has applied to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration for a grant under FWPCA's new program on junior college grants. The program is aimed at increasing manpower supplies at the subprofessional level.

The college feels that with its experience it can present a strong curriculum. Other advantages: its new campus is surrounded by waterways. Only a 30-minute drive from Washington, D.C., the college can bring in experts for short courses and seminars. It also plans a cooperative program with the Naval Ordnance Station in nearby Indian Head.

According to Mrs. Jensen, the college would like to use at least part of an FWPCA grant for planning a curriculum. "A good curriculum can't be developed in a professor's spare time—which is how it is frequently done in this kind of situation. If we're to turn out semiprofessionals ready to step in and do a competent job right off, we have to give careful thought to the curriculum," Mrs. Jensen notes.

Next fall is the target date for the college, with its 500 students, to move to its new campus. After spending its first 10 years in an old Nike missile base, the college will occupy three new buildings already under construction on the 173-acre site.

One building still in the planning stage is a $600,000 sewage treatment facility for training and research. The plant will treat the college's sewage, plus a limited amount from nearby residential areas to provide sewage more typical of that found in a community. Although the plant is larger, more sophisticated and, consequently, more expensive than needed to treat the area's sewage, the facility is necessary for an adequate and effective training program.

In the fall of 1969 a $1.3 million building will be ready to house the pollution abatement technology and data processing departments. The pollution abatement facilities will be able to handle about 300 full time students, plus 1000 in continuing education.

Oklahoma Legislature Recognizes Needs of General Aviation

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma has passed a concurrent resolution spelling out very clearly the needs of general aviation. "General aviation" is a term used to designate the people who use airplanes—and our airways—for business and personal reasons, and who are not a part of the great scheduled air services of this country's transportation network.

Mr. Speaker, the Oklahoma State Legislature is concerned about the future of general aviation, and this resolution outlines the very real reasons for their concern. Some of the problems which the legislature outlines are the direct responsibility of a Federal Government.

Under unanimous consent I submit this resolution for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

ENROLLED SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 56

A concurrent resolution expressing concern with the Interim Report of the United States Senate Aviation Subcommittee; requesting that greater consideration be given to the rights and needs of general aviation; and directing distribution

Whereas, there are 10,000 registered pilots in the State of Oklahoma, and 3,400 aircraft—almost twice the number of airplanes flown by the airlines of this Nation; and

Whereas, these pilots and their aircraft are as much entitled to use of public airports built with public funds as are the airlines of the country; and

Whereas, the airlines consistently schedule their flights at peak hours so that airlanes are dangerously congested, thereby overtaxing

the FAA facilities for handling air traffic control; and

Whereas, the airlines are seeking to restrict public use of public airports so as to usurp these facilities for their own use and profit; and

Whereas, the interim report of the United States Senate Subcommittee proposes to levy exorbitant and discriminatory taxes on general aviation aircraft, and use the revenues derived therefrom for building terminal facilities for the airlines; and

Whereas, such terminal facilities should be built by the airlines and the cities or states themselves; and

Whereas, the airlines have caused great anguish to the general public through the use of aircraft making excessive noise; and

Whereas, the interim report proposes to use public funds for research into this problem despite the fact that it should be the responsibility of the manufacturer and the airlines themselves to solve the problem of abating such noise; and

Whereas, the Federal Aviation Administration has already restricted general aviation by elimination of visual flight rules at major public airports; and

Whereas, general aviation appears to be increasingly penalized while the airlines are increasingly subsidized by public funds.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the second session of the thirty-first Oklahoma Legislature, the House of Representatives concurring therein:

Section 1. That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Second Session of the Thirty-first Oklahoma Legislature do hereby express concern with the interim report of the United States Senate Subcommittee on Aviation; and do hereby respectfully request that in the future greater consideration be given to the rights and needs of general aviation.

Section 2. That a duly authenticated copy of this Resolution be prepared and forwarded to the Honorable Mike Monroney, United States Senator, Washington, D.C.

Adopted by the Senate the 21st day of March, 1968.

FINIS SMITH,
Acting President of the Senate.

Adopted by the House of Representatives the 25th day of March, 1968.

REX PRIVETT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

BASIL R. WILSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

An Aroused Nation

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Friday, in the wake of the tragic and violent death of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, the editorial voice of responsible newspapers chorused sincere and deep distress. At the same time, those same editorial voices spoke anew for justice and the realization of Dr. King's noble goals through the use of his nonviolent means.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD editorials from the Long Island Press and from Newsday. I commend these editorials to my colleagues' attention as outstanding examples of an editorial voice that speaks for the American people in urging an end to violence, injustice and discrimination in our society.

[From the Long Island Press, Apr. 5, 1968]

WE MUST OVERCOME

The killing of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. ranks as one of the most sickening and senseless crimes in our growing history of sickening and senseless violence.

For more than a decade this man of peace led the fight for justice for his people while always—always struggling to contain the violence he knew was building up so explosively in our midst.

But he understood as too few men of our time understand that violence is no answer to that injustice, that all men, regardless of color, must live together on this crowded planet, if not in love, at least with respect for each other's rights as human beings.

He understood so profoundly and tried so desperately to make others understand that there is no sane alternative. But too many blacks and too many whites have stopped listening.

And now he is a victim of that violence he so devoutly and passionately tried to defuse through the democratic outlets that are supposed to be the roots of our national safety and our national pride.

If this man's inspired struggle in which he gave his life is to have any meaning to men of all races, then men of all races must pledge in his memory these three words:

"We shall overcome."

[From Newsday, Apr. 5, 1968]

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

The violence that the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. abhorred has claimed him as a victim. An assassin's bullet killed him last night in the prime of his life and at the peak of his career. He was only 39 years old and yet he already had set his people on the path to equality. Acclaimed worldwide for his fight against racial injustice, he was awarded the Nobel Prize for his achievements through nonviolence.

The outpouring of sorrow for the Rev. Dr. King springs from the deepest wells of the nation's spirit. Violence, however familiar it becomes, always will be essentially alien to America. The death of the Rev. Dr. King, like that of John F. Kennedy, will send waves of revulsion across this land and will shock the entire world.

It would be a bitter legacy for the nation if the Rev. Dr. King's death provokes exactly the sort of violence he worked so diligently all his life to prevent. In the face of every provocation, he counseled against violence, just as he inveighed against prejudice. "Nonviolent protest is the most effective weapon of an oppressed people," was his favorite maxim. And he summed up his goal in life by saying, "I will not be satisfied until segregation is dead in America."

The Rev. Dr. King, who pioneered in the civil rights movement, spoke to the conscience of America. Few could help but be moved by his speech at the Lincoln Memorial in 1963 when he told a massive civil rights demonstration: "I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but the content of their character."

To bring his dream to reality, the Rev. Dr. King led boycotts, marches and demonstrations and drove hard for civil rights legislation. He went to jail at least seven times, always in the cheerful uncomplaining spirit of a clergyman who had deep reservoirs of faith to draw upon. In 1963, while the Rev. Dr. King was in a Birmingham, Ala., city jail, a group of white clergymen wrote a letter to him criticizing him for "unwise and untimely" demonstrations. The Rev. Dr. King's reply stands as a classic expression of the sense of the Negro revolt:

"We have waited for more than 340 years for our constitutional and God-given rights," he wrote. "The nations of Asia and Africa are moving with jetlike speed toward the goal of political independence, and we still creep at horse and buggy pace toward the gaining of a cup of coffee at a lunch counter. I guess it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say 'wait.'

"But . . . when you suddenly find your tongue twisted and your speech stammering as you seek to explain to your six-year-old daughter why she can't go to the public amusement park that has just been advertised on television, and see tears welling in her eyes when she is told that 'Funtown' is closed to colored children . . . then you will understand why it is difficult to wait." The Rev. Dr. King did not wait, and when he died he was again preparing to lead a protest to dramatize the plight of the poor and to demand jobs and better schools.

He saw the planned Washington march as a test. Writing in the current issue of Look, he declared, "We believe that if this campaign succeeds, nonviolence will once again be the dominant instrument for social change, and jobs and income will be put in the hands of the tormented poor. If it fails nonviolence will be discredited, and the country may be plunged into holocaust . . ."

The Rev. Dr. King spoke to the conscience of America. He disturbed the conscience of the nation. But the nation did not always hear or heed him. Perhaps, in his death, others will achieve the last, great service denied him by life—the reconciliation of the races.

Teachers in Politics

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation many teachers will be observing a Teachers-in-Politics Weekend. I am in full agreement with this program and urge 100-percent participation by our teachers in Ohio and throughout the Nation. In fact, one can hardly be a good and effective teacher if he shirks his duties of citizenship. Politics, like it or not, is one of the prime responsibilities of citizenship.

Many people get scared when the word "politics" is mentioned. This is foolish. Politics is nothing more or less than the American process of decisionmaking. There is a difference between politics and partisanship and while I also advocate that teachers become active in the party of their choice, they cannot possibly avoid politics even if they choose to avoid party politics. Why? Politics, as I have already noted, is self-government and it is their government.

I often use this means of showing the importance of politics. Everyone has ideas. There are ideas in medicine, ideas in teaching, ideas in theology, ideas in business—literally no end to the ideas that are circulated. In one area, however, ideas take on a particular significance. I am speaking of politics. In the field of politics, legislators take ideas and translate them into the law of the land. At that point they have application to everyone—not just people in the field of their endeavor. No other class of people have so much power over our lives as

those public servants we call politicians. In the decisions they make, our future is at stake.

Horace Mann and John Dewey had ideas in the field of education. Many of these ideas were decades in coming into fruition. Politicians by a single vote can make the time for their ideas right now. At that point it becomes the law of the land. If it takes billions of dollars to make it work, they have the further power to take from the people that much money and spend it for that purpose. They also have the power to stamp on their product the label "law of the land," and if disobeyed, prosecution may result with possible fine and imprisonment. You can readily see how significant politics is.

Add to this awesome power the scope of authority that politicians have. It is virtually impossible to think of any area on this earth that is not affected by political decisions. Every thing from the draft to education, from the ghetto to the penthouse, from taxes to subsidies, from Appalachia to Nigeria.

Yes, the power over our lives that comes from political decision is tremendous. In our system of self-government, it is a cardinal principle that the citizen must participate. Not in a defensive way—which is often the case—but in an affirmative way. Teachers are better equipped than most citizens to affirmatively participate in politics. I not only urge them to do so but candidly tell them that their own professional self-interest as well as their welfare as a taxpayer and citizen might well depend on the level of their participation. Salaries, accreditation, curriculum, school building programs, sanctions—these are but a few of the matters that will be affected by political decisions made through the political process, both legislatively and administratively. Teachers have more than a small stake in these, and their Teachers-in-Politics Weekend should find them willing, not reluctant, participants.

President Johnson's Announcement

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by President Johnson that he will not seek, nor accept, the Democratic nomination for President was a truly historic event.

His was an act of statesmanship seldom equaled in the history of our Nation, and bears testimony to the stature of the man who has led this Nation for the past 4½ years, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

I, myself, early committed myself to *President* Johnson's reelection to the Presidency in 1968. To that end, I accepted the chairmanship of the Citizens for Johnson-Humphrey in the Wisconsin primary election.

My decision to do so has been reaffirmed by President Johnson's own statement of withdrawal. America has need of men like this—and I am proud to have cast my support early and energetically to his banner.

Although he has decided not to seek the Presidency, he has won the hearts of millions. I believe that this support and good feeling will help dispel the dissonance which has beset American society in recent months and bring into focus for all to see the tremendous accomplishments of President Johnson's administration.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I issued a statement today to the press, in my role as chairman of the Citizens for Johnson-Humphrey organization in Wisconsin. The statement follows:

The day prior to the Wisconsin Presidential Primary, the announcement of decision of the President not to seek the nomination and not to accept it if it were offered came not only as a complete surprise, but indeed as a shock and disappointment.

The President's action dramatically underscores his sincere desire to bring unity to our Nation. His action, however, presents a serious decision for the Wisconsin Voters. The fact is, the President's name is on the ballot. The outcome of the election will be subjected to varied interpretations in the U.S. and abroad. In my opinion, most of the news media, particularly in the international press, will interpret a small vote for the President as a rejection of his policies, domestic and international. This would be tragic. I therefore ask the people of Wisconsin to cast an overwhelming vote of confidence in the President.

I want to commend the President for taking this courageous step and for putting the unity of the people ahead of his personal and political interests. This action clearly demonstrates his sincerity in trying to obtain a just and lasting peace.

Long-Term Arrangement on Cotton Textiles

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it was contemplated at one time that the Long-Term Arrangement on Cotton Textiles would be an effective method for restraining the tremendous flood of cotton textile imports entering the United States. It held out the hope that the United States and the trading nations of the world could develop orderly international commerce which would not disrupt our domestic textile industry.

The LTA has had some restraining effect on what some importing might have done had it not existed, but the agreement has fallen far short of what was expected. It has fallen short because it has not been effectively administered. While it was originally contemplated that imports would increase at a rate of about 5 percent per year, the increase has been more than double that. In actual volumes, imports of cotton textiles have grown under the LTA from 720 million square yards to 1.5 billion square yards.

Mr. Herman Ruhm, Jr., president of Greenwood Mills, discussed the long-term arrangement recently in a speech before the textile section of the New York Board of Trade. He pointed out how our State Department has failed to protect the hundreds of thousands of people employed by the textile industry in this country.

Those in the Congress who believe, as I do, that the long-term arrangement has not measured up to expectations will find Mr. Ruhm's speech of interest and, under unanimous consent, I place it at this point in the RECORD:

What's wrong with the Long-Term Arrangement?

There are so many things wrong with the Long-Term Arrangement that I do not know where to begin. Wherever I start I am sure that someone will say, "Yes, but where it really is a sieve. . . ." and go off in some other direction.

The Long-Term Arrangement preamble states that its purpose is to promote trade between nations in cloth and apparel.

This is a statement that rolls off the well-oiled tongue of the State Department with sanctimonious impressiveness. The American manufacturer does a slow burn in awkward silence. He knows that there is a virtual embargo against US-made textiles in 52 nations of the world. He hopes no one is listening, for fear the preamble might be believed.

There is no consumer market in the world the equal of the American. The smart importer with cash in the bank, a knowledge of what Americans are buying, a knowledge of how to exploit the so-called "undeveloped countries," can plunder the American market in a way to make a pirate blush.

So—a pirate gets going in a particular class of goods, be it ginghams or blouses or something in any of the 64 categories of LTA. First he finds, for example, that the cloth for butcher aprons can be made in Korea and sold in the United States at cents below the American market because of cruelly-paid labor, cheaper cotton, new plants built with American give-away money, and the chance for terrific profit on reinvesting the American dollar for something like fertilizer badly needed by Korea. In short, the American importer has a field day.

The American manufacturers of enameling duck—the trade name for standard butcher's apron cloth—begin to scream their heads off. In due course the Interagency Textile Administrative Committee that manage the LTA are impressed, and the State Department is asked to negotiate a "bi-lateral" with Korea for a restraint level (or a quota, if you dare use the word) for enameling duck from Korea. Such a procedure takes a minimum of several months, sometimes two years. The level is usually set at the highest rate for a few months, extended to a yearly level. Never is a country rolled back. By the time the restraint is arrived at and in working order, that country has an irrevocable license to plunder a fair-sized percent of the American consumption.

This, however, is only the beginning. Our pirate (the importer) moves down to, say, Hong Kong and repeats on a larger scale. By the time the rate of plunder from Hong Kong is leveled, another big slice of the American market has been donated in perpetuity to another foreign country. Lovely country, Hong Kong. A second, a third, and a whole bevy of pirates join the game.

Then a new level of pirating—the real McCoy this time—realizes that the juiciest way to plunder the American market is to make the cloth into garments right there in the undeveloped country. The resulting prices from the 18¢ per hour wage and most modern machinery makes the American consumer bug-eyed and the American manufacturer cross-eyed.

Now the original pirate importers, already assuming a role of dignified, respectable, vested interests, are joined and to some de-

gree shoved aside by the large American chains and retailers joining the picnic right at the source. Jackals at a feast.

By this time ITAC (the Interagency Committee) and the State Department have "bilateraled" a very sizable percentage of the American market away. There is no end to it, however, as our enterprising pirates continue to bring in new countries, even new hemispheres, each of which must have its quota—or diplomacy, sir, will be sullied.

Each restraint level has its automatic 5% annual built-in growth factor. The restraint levels of Japan and Hong Kong are each right at the 400-million-yard equivalent of yarn, cloth, and apparel. Together these two countries alone have more than 5% of the American cotton goods market, and with other overseas sources added in, the foreigners are supplying 10% of the U.S. cotton goods market. Fantastic. The level increasing at 5% annually means that the present high level of imports will double in 14 years, two months, two weeks, and one day. This is a minimum figure, because there are always diplomatic accidents in the popular categories. The Japanese really excel in these always-favorable-to-Japan "mistakes." They "didn't use the same conversion factor as the United States Custom House." They "had no idea canvas uppers were textiles." And so on. So our liberal (with someone else's money) State Department magnanimously forgives the sin, terms it a "one shot," and we roll not so merrily along with a new, larger base to which the 5% growth factor is applied.

Then, to compound the felony, the size of the American all-cotton cloth and garment market begins to shrink rapidly in relation to the total represented by all fibers. This, of course, is due to the dynamic growth of the polyester-blend fabrics. Does the 5% growth factor for all-cotton go into reverse? Oh, no! It is irrevocable—it marches forward no matter what happens to the American market. Even if the restraint levels had not been subject to a growth factor, they would have automatically represented a larger share of the cotton goods market as it gave ground to polyester blends. What raise would you have in mind for a salesman who negotiated this deal for your company?

Did I hear you ask the amount of the restraint level for blends and other fibers such as wools? I regret—I deeply regret to inform you that there are none. Cloth and garments made of blends or wool are wide open. Lord knows we tried to get them under the LTA at its birth. We have never stopped contending that they are substitutes for all cotton, and so should come under the LTA. But with our own, our very own State Department saying that such is not the case, one cannot be too surprised that the governments of the undeveloped countries feel the same way. The EEC countries all have bilaterals with Japan. These people know what they are doing. Their agreements cover cotton, synthetics, and wool. Their salesmen do indeed deserve a raise.

As Senator Talmadge says, it's like damming half the creek. If it is right to dam cotton goods, why is it wrong to dam blends and wools! Alice in Wonderland made more sense.

I suppose some need for support might arise that would make the administration want to extend LTA to all fibers as a trade. If the restraint levels were not lower than the flood levels of today, it would not be much of a trade for us.

So now—let's step off and look at our picture as dispassionately as we can.

Do we indeed have any right, divine or otherwise, to protection from this flood of foreign goods? Do the two million Americans and their families working in the apparel and textile industries, and the $20 billion of American money invested in its plant and equipment, have any case to ask for consideration? I am not enough of a student of philosophy, social justice, or what-have-you to answer this question *per se*. Perhaps any industry that cannot pay the $1.60 an hour minimum U.S. Government-decreed wages, live with the 40-hour U.S. Government-decreed week, or pay the higher-than-world price for Government regulated cotton would better liquidate its people and plants and steal into the night. As I say, I cannot myself answer this *per se*, but I do have the normal feelings of a human being. I did see America restore the bombed-out Japanese textile industry; U.S. textile industry taxes helped to do it. I did see us adopt the Marshall Plan for the benefit of Europe. U.S. textile taxes were used in this, too.

I see enormous Federal welfare contributions. I see pleas for appropriations for the war on poverty in the very Piedmont areas where the only sizable employers of labor are the apparel and textile plants of the region. No other industry employs as many of the so-called hard-core unemployed as does the textile and apparel industry. And no other industry can begin to offer the job potential, given a healthy and expanding future.

If the two million people and the $20 billion of investments were asking for a handout of money, I don't think we would deserve one. After all, we are a part of the American free-enterprise system. But we are not asking for a handout of money that would further unbalance the budget. We are simply asking for reasonable controls that will enable us to live and prosper under the civilized wage, hour, and raw material restrictions, imposed by our Government, when we are in competition with cruelly exploited labor and the Government subsidies of the undeveloped countries.

I therefore conclude that it is neither unfair nor selfish to ask for conservation in the form of quotas.

Let me take a minute to refer to a remedy frequently proposed by the *New York Times* and the *Wall Street Journal*, and recently espoused publicly by Under Secretary of State Katzenbach. The *Daily News Record* quoted him as telling us to "conduct a more aggressive export policy." I presume he means to make up our losses to imports with exports.

That statement puts him in the same knowledgeable boat as the head of the American delegation negotiating the Japanese bilateral at the Kennedy Round who let the Japs slip in an innocuous-looking minority wool/synthetic blend for the full Kennedy round 50% reduction, that happened to represent practically the entire tropical suiting business left in America. I asked him if he knew he was giving away a large block of American business when he did it. "Certainly not," he replied.

Mr. Katzenbach talks more like a graduate of Harvard Law School than of Harvard Business School. As far as the State Department is concerned, it has not even taken out first citizenship papers when it comes to helping the American apparel and textile industries export their products.

It is a lot of trouble to look up the non-tariff barriers as well as impossible tariff barriers such as the 300% *ad valorem* that Mexico imposes on synthetic cloth. Very recently the State Department made a partial discovery of how the chips were stacked against American textiles and apparel in twelve countries. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce made mention of ten in his speech to the Apparel Research Foundation. And again in his speech on Feb. 7th to AATT he went up to eleven countries. He found Japan had the same global quotas the Mills Bill calls for. He also came to the conclusion that the non-tariff barriers of the world forced more goods to seek the American market. We take half of Japan's apparel exports, half of Korea's, 60% of Taiwan's, a third of Hong Kong's.

I do not know whether these recent incidents are indicative of action to come or not, but they are the first even meager crumbs of awareness I've seen. We can hope it will lead to their adopting the tough trade policy all countries use against us. In the Kennedy Round they should have made it a condition of trade that all nations match our textile duty schedules and freedom of quantitative restrictions before offering to lower textile tariffs still further to accommodate Mr. Katzenbach and IBM.

I am not a student of the economics of world trade, but I do not see how lowering our tariffs to Hong Kong or even buying Hong Kong textiles helps IBM.

There has never been any interest on the part of the State Department in helping the American textile and apparel industry to lower trade barriers against us. It is interesting to speculate why this is so. To begin with, it is hard to find a business man in the State Department. The people there simply do not have any feel for business. The reason could be as simple as, "Let's promote Martin St. Martin because he gets along terribly well with the Japanese (or with the English or with the Brazilians)." How did he acquire these good relations with the foreign country? He must have done favors for them, and run errands for them. To the limit of his authority he must have acted as their agent. He got a raise in salary, not because he favored Americans, but because he favored the foreign country. It must be the way to promotion and pay in the State Department. There is nothing seditious about this. I am sure the top secretaries believe they can communicate better and get along better doing it this way. It is just tough on the American work force, dependent families, communities, and plant investments to be the victims of alleged American diplomacy! Oh yes, we get a chance to testify before the GATT trading gets under way. The panel seldom listens, but there is a transcript of the testimony. You hope they read it. However, when the negotiations start, all is secrecy. They don't even admit that they are negotiating on textiles. We have to hear it from some chance foreign manufacturer whom we know and who may be on his country's negotiating team against us. No wonder we take a beating. No wonder we give away in one ignorant bob of the head the remaining tropical suiting business we have. No wonder our counterparts in Japanese industry think we are nuts.

I suppose if asked why they won't let a business man on the negotiating team, the State Department would go off into a sanctimonious dissertation on the possible conflict of interest—the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, the chance of collusion between Government and individual company. This is pure poppycock on the face of it, when you consider that it is the American textile industry versus the Japanese or Hong Kong textile industry. There are no known regulations against it, but it is just never done.

In addition to the artificial barriers which Mr. K. could try to help us lower, we have a modernly equipped competitor with 18c per hour wages. A large American shirt manufacturer just purchased a quantity of shirts in Hong Kong for less than half what they would have cost him to make at his American factories. I just do not see the possibility of our replacing the imports with exports.

Let's get back to the problem of damming the flowing tide. The Mills Bill in the House when last heard from had 197 signatures. The Hollings Bill in the Senate had 68 signatures plus the support of others who do not make a practice of signing. Both bills set quotas by categories in a completely orderly way. There is nothing evil about a quota. It is not the complete barrier with which we are faced around the world. It shares our wealth.

In total we have given 10 percent of our textile and apparel business to the rest of the world—a great deal more in many spe-

cific items. It will be 15 percent before you can say "Jack Robinson." The largest retail chain predicts that a third of the garments they will sell in 1968 will come from overseas. Many of the 64 categories have run well over the 10 percent mark, but there is no category so small that 10 percent of its American market would not make a bonanza for the pirate-managed foreigners to shoot at.

In the January 9 *Daily News Record*, Under Secretary of State Rostow was quoted, "The President feels passionately that the question should not be resolved this way. The President has made it abundantly clear how he feels about quota restrictions, and there has been no change in his attitude."

The finality of that statement is mighty discouraging. On previous occasions—original LTA, two-price cotton—the President has shown fighting interest in and compassion for the two million people in the textile and apparel industries. Mr. Rostow's statement indicates a complete flip-flop in attitude by the President. It is very hard for me to believe that the President has forsaken so many friends so absolutely. The President is first and foremost a patriotic humanitarian, and secondarily he is not the type to ignore the vote represented by two million people and their families.

In his famous speech of Oct. 26, 1964, in Macon, Georgia, the President said, and I quote: "When this administration took office it recognized the importance of the textile industry and the special nature of its problems. . . . We worked hand in hand with the Congress to develop a 7-point program for textiles. . . . We must now focus on the remaining weak spots and implement the rest of the program . . . in the best interest of all America. I intend to pursue it to a successful conclusion." We have never heard the President himself contradict his 1964 statement.

We are asking for a fair share of the American market of which we are a part and which we have helped build. A quota is a fair share, according to Webster's dictionary. If we limited each of the 64 categories to 10% of the American market, I don't think even Betty Furness could object. She is reported to have said that if the quota laws are enacted, $3½ billion of imports now coming in would not come in. How wonderful if she were right! Americans might live, and the gold deficit be reversed. However, she probably doesn't realize that textiles and apparel are now at the $1½ billion level, and even the quota laws won't roll them back.

She's worried about the consumer not getting the benefit of the low foreign prices. The competition for the 10% quota on a first come, first served basis would make for the lowest prices ever for the pirate agents or the American chains and retailers.

Our customs service is the one really efficient arm of Government I've seen function. There is no doubt in my mind of their ability to administer the 10% first come, first served by category via the airplane ticket reservation system.

In future GATT negotiating, we would have the medium in which to trade that other nations are most accustomed to; namely, artificial barriers. Quota percentages are a universally understood coin of the realm for international bartering.

We have our heads in the sand using tariffs. As such, they mean little or nothing in the field of low wages and government subsidies. The recent proposals to tax imports by a small percentage means no more to Hong Kong than a small bounty to export means to us.

Tariffs are a time-honored means of raising revenue. A 10% tax on the $1½ billion of textile and apparel imports would produce $150 million of revenue, with no deterrents to imports. However, I am not arguing for this proposition; I am addressing myself solely to imports. Balancing the budget is another subject. The same applies to the loss of dollars or gold or whatever it is that seems to be worrying Mr. Johnson into asking us not to travel abroad. The difference between the value of our imports and the value of our exports in fiber, yarn, cloth, and apparel is $900 million. This gap figure is beginning to increase with the speed of light. You would think that this side benefit from the quota bills would have some appeal to the administration when it is wearing its concern-for-the-dollar hat. Perhaps pride goeth before a fall!

We've got to work hard to get these pending textile import control bills passed and laid on the President's desk for signature, or we ourselves may well pass to the nether-nether land. If the bills fail to pass, we face attrition in many directions. Will the large garment manufacturers take it lying down, or will they move offshore in order to keep serving our own American market? Already the Mexican side of the border is beginning to look like Miracle Mile. The wetbacks that were shut out of gathering U.S. crops are busy making clothes at Mexican wetback wages. Several of the larger cutters have settled plants abroad to capture foreign markets. They can easily turn this production toward the United States. Many others are contracting experimentally with foreign factories in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and elsewhere to experiment with the "made in Hong Kong" notation on the label of the national brand itself.

Personally I think they are wasting their time with this experiment. The administration has so undercut the "Buy American" psychology that it presently simply does not exist. The public ignores it, and so the stores ignore it. This is the compelling factor that will cause those, financially able, to move offshore. Their unions may raise hell—strike their American plants, picket the stores selling the goods, maybe refuse to truck the stuff—but the offshore movement will continue until the great American consumer market begins to shrivel because everyone has left. The employees of IBM are not sufficiently numerous to hold the buying power on a rising level. England is back to "Buy British," but they were a long time getting there and may be way too late.

Now what's going to happen to the cloth mills? Can they get the cloth business of their former customers who have moved offshore? They will be up against non-tariff barriers, distance, and price. My guess is that the handicaps will be too great.

However, gentlemen, I predict we will pass the Mills-Hollings Bills. The stakes are high. We are a football team named Desire. The team that won't be beaten cannot be beaten. Our two million people and their families, our $20 billion of investments are not going to give up our livelihood and 150 years of American tradition just because Katzenbach, Rostow, and Betty Furness want it that way.

African Unity

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have noted with pleasure the increasing evidence of a universal desire among the developing nations of Africa to attain a high level of African unity.

Regardless of geographic separation, of language barriers, and of political and philosophical differences, the African nations have so much in common, and their joint contrbution to the world of tomorrow can be so enlarged by unity, that it is encouraging to all the well-wishers of Africa that more and more the Africans are placing the emphasis on those matters on which they agree and less attention to the matters in which they are in disagreement.

By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the March 1968 number of Réalités Ivoiriennes, the official publication of the Ivory Coast:

After the official visit of Congo Kinshasa's President Mobutu, who stated "you are much more revolutionary than the Congo", Ivory Coast received President Massemba-Débat of Congo Brazzaville, and President Nyerere of Tanzania. Such visits are evidence of the keen desire to work together, in spite of the differences between the socialist attitudes of the visitors and the pragmatic approach of the President of Ivory Coast.

This will to stand together was expressed several times in speeches by both Presidents Massemba-Débat and Nyerere, and President Houphouët-Boigny.

Welcoming the President of Congo-Brazzaville on his arrival in Abidjan on February 5, President Houphouët-Boigny went straight to the point by speaking of "the growing feeling in Africa that an end is coming to the period when young African countries too often indulged in the bitter delights of ideological confrontation and that the page is being turned and a new exciting chapter is to begin. The new period is concerned with satisfying the deep-rooted aspirations of African peoples who are sated with ideas, dreams and words, and are now asking more than ever for true peace, liberty and dignity, well-being and progress, in some concrete, tangible form for everyone. Personal contacts will count for a lot in the writing of this new chapter.

"Of course, it would be vain and foolish to attempt to disguise the fact that our countries frequently differ in the methods they use in the attitudes they adopt, in their approach and choice in organizing their relations. But countries are often like men: each one works towards happiness in his own way, depending largely on time and circumstances, and this every politician must realize.

"Can and must that African unity, which we all so heartily desire, be reduced to a simple question of fusion? Surely it must be obvious how much richness of diversity Africa would lose if suddenly she became one and uniform, when what she has to say can be said just as well by a chorus of several voices".

The tone was set, and in his reply, President Massemba-Débat eagerly took up the theme of African solidarity. Here are the main points from his speech:

"Dear Mr. President, to me Ivory Coast is essentially the noble meeting-place where the struggling Africa of yesterday came together and marched courageously toward freedom under the banner of the RDA of which you were the uncontested head. One cannot think back to those days without remembering the brutal repressions which so nearly cost you your life.

"I can see that stubborn, untiring leader that you were in the past—the past counts for much, and the present must not dim, still less efface it—and the subtle strategist that you are today in the battle against under-development, with the fiery energy of your youth now replaced by a rare intelligence and great wisdom which alone can produce confirmed maturity, a healthy outlook, and a perfect mastery of self.

"Your ideas based on dialogue, understanding, justice and peace, which you so eloquently defend, have been heeded by my

people who have adopted them as their political theme.

"We must follow the ways of our elders, and see that the spirit of brotherhood impregnated our discussions for Africa".

The visit of Tanzania's President Nyerere was an important occasion for Ivory Coast's African policy. It was in fact the first time that the head of an English-speaking African country had paid an official visit to Ivory Coast. In the words of President Houphouët-Boigny:

"This event is highly symbolic to us, for it has occurred at a time when Africa is more than ever feeling the need to unite, and realizing the existence of certain factors which can already contribute to understanding, cooperation and unity".

The same idea was expressed by President Nyerere during his visit to Bouaké on February 25 when, in reply to the welcoming speech of the mayor of Ivory Coast's second town, he stated how much all Africans had in common, and how necessary it was for all Africans, from both East and West, whether English or French-speaking, to get together and know one another.

"I am very surprised and disappointed to know that I am the first head of an English-speaking African country to visit Ivory Coast . . . None of us is doing enough to become acquainted and to make a concrete effort toward that unity to which we all aspire".

At a reception he gave for President and Mrs. Houphouët-Boigny, on the eve of his departure for Monrovia, Mr. Nyerere described the lesson he had learned from his stay in our country. Guarding against making too long a speech "a pupil asks questions and listens; he does not take the place of the person from whom he has come to learn" he made clear that his attitude toward relations between African countries was similar to President Houphouët-Boigny's:

"The fact that we are tackling problems of development in different ways does not alter our basic unity. Nor does it prevent our various nations from working together to a common end. We are all separate, sovereign states, but we can and must work together.

". . . Our different philosophies can only enable us to help one another, and will do nothing to affect our African sense of brotherhood.

"It is no use waiting for our differences in approach and political beliefs to disappear before we start thinking about working for African unity. Unity can be achieved in diversity".

Education in a Bombshell

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the advance publicity for an educational rally was fliers in the shape of a bomb and on a background of red flame the question, "Is Washington burning?"

When known revolutionaries can be given permits to use playgrounds for their seditious riot training schools, the people in Washington, D.C., should not be surprised at fire, death, and pestilence in the District.

But the trouble with our liberal friends is that facts and the truth only confuse them. They are not flexible in their goals nor in their thinking.

Tell the man responsible—Earl Warren. He would find no trouble manipulating the law to forbid prayer or evangelical gospel preaching on the playgrounds.

I insert in the RECORD the release from the April 5 Evening Star, of Washington, D.C.:

PERMIT FOR RIGHTS RALLY IN GEORGETOWN GRANTED

An application to hold a civil rights rally at a Georgetown playground raised concerns that went all the way up to the mayor before the permit finally was granted, it was revealed yesterday.

The Washington Ad Hoc Committee on Urban Problems was granted permission by the Recreation Board Wednesday to use the playground at 34th Street and Volta Place NW, for an "educational rally" April 13.

The group had applied for a permit March 26, but officials held up the permit because of the speakers listed to appear and because of flyers the group planned to use for publicity.

MILITANTS TO SPEAK

Scheduled to speak are militant Negro comedian Dick Gregory; the Rev. James Groppi, a militant Milwaukee priest, the Rev. Malcolm Boyd a controversial Episcopal priest; Tom Hayden, a founder of Students for a Democratic Society, and Arthur Waskow, of the Institute for Policy Studies.

The publicity flyer is in the shape of a bomb with the names of places where riots have appeared written on it, including Detroit, Watts and Memphis. On a background of red flames is the question "Is Washington Burning?"

Recreation Supt. Joseph Cole took the matter to Mayor Walter E. Washington, who reportedly expressed concern. And councilwoman Mrs. Polly Shackleton questioned holding the rally in Georgetown.

But the applicants said they wanted to establish a dialogue with the affluent citizens of the area.

SET TO FIGHT DENIAL

And they contacted the National Capital Area American Civil Liberties Union to fight the issue in case of denial. The group also received permission from the National Park Service to hold the rally at another site.

The Recreation Board, in a special meeting Wednesday voted to grant the permit, with members William Waters abstaining after expressing reservations about the action.

One official said the whole matter had been handled "very poorly." He said that according to department policy the permit had to be granted.

He said the policy is to permit use of recreation facilities by all citizen groups. A provision prohibits permits to anyone inciting riots or not acting for the general welfare. But the spokesman said such a denial would be difficult to defend in court.

Progress Report, Second Session, 90th Congress

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1968

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I will soon send to the constituents of Nebraska's First Congressional District my third progress report of the second session of the 90th Congress. For the information of my colleagues, I submit that report for the RECORD:

DEAR FRIEND: It seems increasingly clear that the farm and rural vote can make a critical difference in this election year. Some people forget that there are at least 40 districts in rural America where the farm vote may determine the majority in the House of Representatives.

I encourage this segment of America to use not only its voting strength but to acquire and use its potential bargaining power in the market place. Unless it does and unless the federal government allows farmers to enter as full partners of the free markets, young men such as the Future Farmers of America I recently addressed in Nebraska City will not remain on the farm. I told them I believe in less dependence on begging and more power in bargaining; in leadership from ourselves and respect from others.

It was with great pleasure that I accepted an FFA plaque as an honorary chapter farmer.

DEADLINES IN SIGHT

A reminder of the new voter registration law affecting many First District citizens: New registration is required in Burt, Butler, Cedar, Colfax, Cuming, Dakota, Dixon, Fillmore, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Nemaha, Otoe, Pawnee, Pierce, Polk, Richardson, Saline, Saunders, Seward, Stanton, Thayer, Thurston, Wayne and York counties.

Primary election registration deadline, May 3.

Primary election, May 14.

General election registration deadline, Oct. 25.

General election, Nov. 5.

NEBRASKANS ON CAPITOL HILL

Recently William Galbraith of Beemer was in Washington to present the American Legion legislative program for the coming year. It was my privilege to introduce the National Commander to the House Veterans Affairs Committee.

Of interest to all veterans is the House-approved legislation to increase the government guarantee behind veterans' home loans from $7,500 to $12,500 and to remove the six per cent interest ceiling in an effort to make more private money available for such mortgages. I was strongly behind this measure.

Later, I introduced Warren Fairchild, executive secretary of the Nebraska State Soil and Water Conservation Commission, to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. Mr. Fairchild and other Nebraska witnesses testified in opposition to a cutback of funding for soil and water conservation programs, and I, too, am opposed to these cutbacks.

The Nebraska 4-H sponsored two groups to Washington within the last few weeks and both of them met with the Nebraska Congressional delegation.

Senator Carl Curtis and I are pictured on the right with participants in the 4-H Leaders Forum.

The second program was a 4-H Leadership Short Course.

HUMAN RENEWAL FUND

I support the basic concept of the Republican-announced Human Renewal Fund whereby $6.5 billion in Federal expenditures would be cutback and $2.5 billion of the savings used in such programs as rural revitalization, vocational and technical education and crime prevention and control.

Specifically, I support budget deferrals in non-military research, highway beautification, supersonic transport, government public relations, moderate to high income apartment construction, defense supported arms sales abroad, the civilian space program, National Science Foundation, the Appalachia program and the President's contingency reserve fund.

I agree that we should not increase foreign aid, that we can have a partial cutback of

military personnel in Europe, leaving an ample force to maintain treaty commitments, and that we should freeze the number of civilian government employees at its present level.

While we are spending $30 billion a year in Vietnam, low-priority programs must be deferred. Then we can responsibly plow back a portion of the savings into urgent human needs such as the rural development, voc-tech education and crime prevention I already mentioned.

RECENT BILL INTRODUCTIONS

Since my last Progress Report, I have introduced a bill to extend the life of radio and television licenses from the present three years to five years. A five-year license period would benefit the broadcasters who spend hundreds of hours making out the lengthy application and would reduce the administrative overhead of the Federal Communications Commission. With less paper work to face, the FCC also might find more time to concentrate its attention on the minority that are known mis-users of their licensed trust. I am confident this will help the nearly 20 television and radio stations in the First Congressional District. They are responsible broadcasters and deserve to have this maturity recognized and their application work load reduced.

I've also co-sponsored a bill to establish a Countryside Development Study Commission. We need more facts on the ironic situation we see of crowded cities and un-used rural resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, April 9, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The Lord is my strength and my shield; my heart trusteth in Him and I am helped.—Psalm 28: 7.

Eternal Father of our spirits, whose still small voice calls us to turn away from the foolish and feverish ways of a wayward and a worried world, help us to draw near to Thee in all humility of mind and with all reverence of heart. With the power of Thy spirit alive within us may we face the duties of this day with clear minds and clean hearts, without pretense and prejudice, in the assurance that the best service we can render our country in these trying times is based on understanding, truth, and love.

Standing in the tradition of our Nation with our faith in freedom for all, may we become united in purpose and strong in spirit as we face this day when plots are made to destroy our birthright by a revolt against the laws of our land and by a rebellion against the kingly virtue of nonviolence.

May we lay aside partisan allegiances that with a deeper loyalty to our country, a broader love for our fellow man, and a greater faith in Thee we may go forth to battle for the good of all Thy children.

In the name of Him who made goodness His aim in life we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 1418. An act to make several changes in the passport laws presently in force;

S. 2015. An act to amend section 11-1902, District of Columbia Code, relating to the duties of the coroner of the District of Columbia;

S. 2496. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into and renew reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia with the local governments in the Washington metropolitan area; and

S. 2884. An act to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad.

CONGRESS IS NOT STAMPEDED ON CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. OLSEN. 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 Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is, of course, mourning on the lips of everyone for the loss of a very wonderful Christian person, Dr. Martin Luther King. More than 2 weeks ago I was certain the House of Representatives would approve the civil rights legislation which we are considering tomorrow. I am equally sure today that it will be approved and I do not think the success of this legislation should be credited to the shameless and senseless act of an assassin.

The civil rights bill has already been passed by the Senate and it had been scheduled for floor action this week and before the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King.

Martin Luther King was a truly great and outstanding Christian American. His life helped to inspire this country and helped to inspire this Congress toward moving this bill. He deserves much of the credit for the impetus which had developed behind this bill, but I think it is important to emphasize to all Americans and to the President of this country that the great contribution Dr. King made to passage of this legislation resulted from the work of his life; it did not result from his tragic death. That tremendous loss is not causing a stampede in the House. That is why I take the floor at this time.

The plan for floor action is exactly the same as it was 2 weeks ago. The legislative machinery was ready then and House consideration was scheduled for this week at that time.

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

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. What the gentleman is saying is true. This bill was programed before any of the incidents of the weekend took place.

The program is being followed precisely, as far as we have jurisdiction over it, as previously announced.

Mr. OLSEN. In that regard, I have been planning my visit to Montana during the Easter vacation. I called the majority leader's office more than 2 weeks ago about those plans and the question of scheduling the civil rights bill had been decided that long ago.

The Speaker of the House, JOHN W. McCORMACK, advised me some time ago that he was assured of the votes necessary for House passage. This is not a stampede that is going to be taking place tomorrow. Tomorrow is simply a conclu sion—and I think a very successful conclusion—to the American process of democracy. I am hopeful all Americans will remember this legislation as a tribute to Dr. King's productive and Christian life, not to his untimely and tragic death.

EMOTION PACKED LEGISLATION SHOULD BE DELAYED

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the good citizens of America who believe in law and order as opposed to mob rule sincerely abhor the violence which has engulfed much of our Nation.

Dissents, no matter how valid, cannot be settled by murder, burning, and pillage. Such conduct is expected only of wild beasts and paranoid creatures completely devoid of conscience. Unfortunately, it has erupted from activistic jungle urgings.

The present climate of great grief, unbridled irresponsibility and disgust with such irresponsibility is too charged with emotion for the production of well reasoned, well debated legislation. Measures passed at such time would be tainted with their own legislative history and fail to do credit to the deliberative body that produces it.

We must have law and order first and calm consideration afterwards.

Mr. Speaker, the peaceful, law-abiding, reasonable, responsible people of this Nation are getting angry, too, and are becoming disgusted, alarmed, and impatient because of the pressures being built up to influence the votes of their Representatives.

All emotion packed legislation should be delayed for the voice of reason to be heard.

RIOTING AND LOOTING MUST BE STOPPED

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