

and Culture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 17607. A bill to establish a joint underwriting association to provide fire, extended coverage, and essential property insurance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 17608. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to unremarried widows and widowers, and certain single other persons, who maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLLICK:

H.R. 17609. A bill to convey to the city of Kenai, Alaska, all interests of the United States in certain land located therein; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 17610. A bill to authorize the payment of a variable reenlistment bonus in the case of certain members of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Service.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 17611. A bill to establish a Commission on Malnutrition; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 17612. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to release certain use restrictions on a tract of land at Camp Dodge, Iowa, in order that such land may be used as a site for the construction of buildings or other improvements for the Iowa Law Enforcement Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 17613. A bill to amend section 48 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the \$50,000 limitation on the used property which may be used for investment credit purposes shall not apply in the case of machine tools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 17614. A bill to establish a Commission on Hunger; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.J. Res. 1285. Joint resolution to provide that it be the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on Aging be called by the President of the United States in 1970 to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist the States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H.J. Res. 1286. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Con. Res. 783. Concurrent resolution to convey to the Government of France the sense of Congress with respect to the responsibility of France in connection with the payment of its World War I debt to the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. VANIK, Mr. BROCK, Mr. MORRIS, Mr. BELL, Mr. PELLY, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. HOLFIELD, MTS. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. McDADE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. YATES, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. CASEY, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. STRATTON, and Mr. POLLICK):

H. Res. 1201. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States enter into an agreement with the Government of Israel for the sale of military planes, commonly known as Phantom jet fighters, necessary for Israel's defense to an amount which shall be adequate to provide Israel with a deterrent force capable of preventing future Arab aggression by offsetting sophisticated weapons received by the Arab States, and on order for future delivery, and to replace losses suffered by Israel in the 1967 conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 17615. A bill for the relief of Adriana Ferrante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17616. A bill for the relief of Rosa Magro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 17617. A bill for the relief of Ruggiero Gonino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 17618. A bill for the relief of Miss Anna Ferrari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 17619. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ambroiso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17620. A bill for the relief of Francesco Grimaudo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17621. A bill for the relief of Antonino Mazzamuto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17622. A bill for the relief of Antonino Tarantola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 17623. A bill for the relief of Pnina Haibi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 17624. A bill to provide for the free entry of a peal of eight bells and fittings for use of Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 17625. A bill for the relief of Antonio Capasso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17626. A bill for the relief of Wuen Yeung Hung and King Hung Luk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17627. A bill for the relief of Michele Simonetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARSTEIN:

H.R. 17628. A bill for the relief of Pauline H. Belmonte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17629. A bill for the relief of Zenaida C. Delco G., and Marivi Macias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 17630. A bill for the relief of Domenico La Spisa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 17631. A bill for the relief of Sylva G. Brazzale and her infant son, David R. Brand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 17632. A bill for the relief of Eftycia Katzambis Chagaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 17633. A bill for the relief of Fortunato Foronda Evangelista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 17634. A bill for the relief of Amerigo Vespucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.J. Res. 1287. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to Maria Mercedes Riewerts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H. Res. 1202. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 16609) entitled "A bill for the relief of Sea Oil & General Corp., of New York, N.Y." to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

331. By Mr. FRASER: Petition of the Minnesota State Council of the Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, relative to retirement under social security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

332. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of Contra Costa County, Calif., relative to public assistance payments for nonresidents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

333. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Madera, Calif., relative to public assistance payments for nonresidents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

334. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Tuolumne, Calif., relative to supporting the bill S. 2919 concerning water resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

335. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Yolo, Calif., relative to public assistance payments for nonresidents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

336. Also, petition of Mrs. Selma B. Lokitz, New York, N.Y., relative to enactment of The President's programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OUR 25 YEARS IN VIETNAM

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, there is a feeling among Americans that the Vietnam problem suddenly burst upon the

world scene and that we became involved in 1965. Many other myths or misconceptions exist regarding this terrible and unhappy conflict in Vietnam. Chalmers Roberts, in a revealing article published in the Washington Post of June 2, sets straight the record on Vietnam. I learned, or was reminded, of many facets of the problem which I had overlooked or forgotten. I wish that every American could review the events in Vietnam

stretching back to the 1930's. I ask unanimous consent that the Roberts' article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

OUR 25 YEARS IN VIETNAM

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

Like the moth for the flame, the United States has found some irresistible attraction in a faraway land long known as French

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 3, 1968

Indochina and now all too familiar as Vietnam.

This extraordinary attraction has existed for a full quarter of a century. The United States surely has been singed but its ultimate fate in that small land is not yet clear.

The story can be divided into six acts, beginning in 1943, with the latest act now being played both at the Paris conference table and on the Vietnam battlefield. Whether the sixth is the last act no man can say with certainty, but that seems the probability.

Most Americans were totally unaware of their Government's involvement on their behalf in much that has gone on. Some awoke during the second act, more began to see what was happening by the fourth. But not until the last two acts has the majority turned its eyes to that corner of Southeast Asia. Yet, in retrospect, there has been a pattern, if not a plot, in all that has happened.

Here, in capsule form, is the story of the six acts of Vietnam.

I. ROOSEVELT VERSUS DE GAULLE

Three days before he flew off to Paris this May, Ambassador W. Averell Harriman remarked in a New York speech that "I recall hearing President Roosevelt on more than one occasion state categorically that he had no intention of permitting the French to return to Indochina."

Harriman's remark is well documented by the official record. Equally well documented is the determination of Charles de Gaulle to see France return to Indochina, to which the French had gone in 1858 to create, in time, a colony comprising what today is North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

When France fell to Hitler, the white man's days in Indochina were numbered. The Vichy regime granted expansionist Japan a "pre-eminent position" in the Far East. In late 1940 Japanese troops arrived from then occupied China.

One of the French forts attacked by the Japanese was at a place known as Dong-Dang. A widely quoted American newspaper editorial of the time was captioned: "Who wants to die for dear old Dong-Dang?" The answer then in still isolationist America was clear: no one.

After Pearl Harbor, Indochina was far behind enemy lines. Not until victory over Japan began to loom did President Roosevelt begin to think about the future of the French colony. By 1943 he was making, in private, the remarks to which Harriman referred.

F.D.R.'s trusteeship idea

President Roosevelt spoke to Britain's Anthony Eden in 1943 of a future trusteeship for the colony. He told Joseph Stalin in Tehran that "after 100 years of French rule the inhabitants were worse off than they had been before . . ." Winston Churchill objected but Stalin agreed, saying that he "did not propose to have the Allies shed blood to restore Indochina, for example, to old French colonial rule . . ."

On Jan. 24, 1944, FDR wrote Secretary of State Cordell Hull that he had told the British Ambassador that "Indochina should not go back to France but that it should be administered by an international trusteeship." He added that "France has milked it for one hundred years. The people of Indochina are entitled to something better than that."

Indochina, however, was but a minute problem for the wartime President. He did little more than to put obstacles in the way of small French forces trying to make their way to the Far East via the French enclaves in India. At FDR's request, Vice President Henry Wallace told Chiang Kai-shek that FDR was offering him all of Indochina as an outright grant. In a display of wisdom, Chiang turned down the offer, saying rightly that the Indochinese were "not Chinese."

They would not assimilate into the Chinese people."

FDR's approach may have been humanitarian but it certainly was cavalier and showed his scant knowledge of Southeast Asia. The President died in April, 1945, with Indochina still under Japanese control.

De Gaulle's vow

Charles de Gaulle, today the host for the Paris talks, was the wartime leader of the Free French, a role which brought him into bitter disagreements with FDR and the United States on many issues, including Indochina.

De Gaulle wrote in his memoirs that during the war Indochina "seemed like a great ship out of control," adding: "As I saw her move away into the mist, I swore that I would one day bring her in."

By 1945, with France cleared of the Nazis, de Gaulle, "aware of the hostility of the Allies—particularly the Americans—in regard to our Far Eastern position," resolved that "French blood shed on the soil of Indochina would constitute an impressive claim" to regain the colony.

FDR's death eased de Gaulle's problem. During a Washington visit in August, 1945, President Truman told him that the American Government "offers no opposition to the return of the French army and authority in Indochina."

The atomic bomb had been dropped in Japan just before de Gaulle's trip to Washington. He recorded his "bitter visions" of the bomb's meaning but quickly added that the collapse of Japan removed "the American veto which had kept us out of the Pacific. Indochina from that day became accessible to us once again."

At the wartime Tehran and Potsdam conferences, it had been agreed that, after the fighting ended, Vietnam would be occupied by Chinese Nationalist troops down to the 16th parallel, with British Commonwealth forces taking over the southern half of the peninsula.

That was in fact done for a while. And as the French returned to reassert authority, they found that Ho Chi Minh already was leading an insurrection. He seized Hanoi before the French could get there, proclaiming the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

De Gaulle worked for a French Union, with some autonomy for Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, and he recorded that "I intended to go to Indochina myself to settle matters . . ." He never did. In the end, negotiations between Ho and Paris were aborted by French diehards, fighting ensued and France regained control of her colony. De Gaulle retired from office in January, 1946, not to return until 1958.

The first act in Indochina was over. FDR failed in his aim. A European colony was re-established in Asia but the auguries for its success were not good. Nationalism was the new power, with Communist Ho exploiting it.

II. HO AGAINST FRANCE PLUS EISENHOWER AND DULLES

Five months after the Japanese collapse, Bao Dai, emperor of Vietnam, wrote de Gaulle telling him to "abandon any thought" of reasserting French sovereignty, adding that if he attempted to do so "every village would become a core of resistance." But neither de Gaulle nor his successors saw the truth of that advice.

Ho's efforts to reach an accommodation with Paris was defeated by French officers in control in Indochina and by the French Communist Party in France, aided by the Soviet Union. The Communists played Paris's game against Ho in the hope that France itself would go Communist, sweeping Indochina into the Communist world without resort to war.

When Ho sent an emissary to Paris, Maurice Thorez, the French Communist, told him that he did not intend in any way "to be con-

sidered the eventual liquidator of the French positions in Indochina." French Communists did not block the Indochina war budgets in the Assembly.

But France did not go Communist. And the Indochina war escalated as Ho fought on to the climactic battle at Dienbienphu in 1954.

By December, 1950, the French were sounding alarm in Washington. At that moment, the United States was heavily engaged in Korea against both the Communist Chinese and the North Koreans.

Under Truman, a Military Assistance Advisory Group (MAAG) arrived in Vietnam in July, 1950. But Korea had the priority and it was not until the advent of the Eisenhower Administration and the end of the Korean war that the United States became deeply involved in trying to prop up the French and save their position in Indochina, meaning essentially in what is now the two Vietnams. Why?

The United States had no economic interests in Indochina worth mentioning; its anticolonial attitude, both governmental and public, had pressed in the postwar years for the British to give up India and for the Dutch to free Indonesia. But the pressure on France was limited, halting, less than effective for so long.

Answer lies in Europe

The answer lies in American policy in Europe. What Washington did to aid Paris in Indochina was a function of its European policy and a derogation of its basic anticolonial thrust in Asia. If Paris then had been as stable as London or The Hague, there probably would have been no aid and Ho would have triumphed. Retrospectively, it appears that in larger world terms it would have made little or no difference to the United States. Washington would have been satisfied with being an offshore Pacific power, as was the general intention even to the point of withdrawing troops from Korea in 1949.

But Paris, and France, were not stable. American policy centered on rebuilding Western Europe economically with Marshall Plan aid and in creating a viable defense community through NATO. These were the years when the Communist coup succeeded in Czechoslovakia and Stalin tried to force the Western powers out of Berlin by a blockade.

Stalin died six weeks after Gen. Eisenhower's inauguration as President, setting off what was to be polycentrism in the Communist world. But that was not to be apparent for some years. Meanwhile the Korean war had alarmed the United States. When it was over, the fear was that the Communists' next thrust would come in support of Ho in Vietnam.

By late 1953, with American dollar and arms aid to the French mounting rapidly in Indochina, a Senator on a study mission to Indochina concluded his report in words that expressed the temper of the times:

"The need to stay with it is clear because the issue for us is not Indochina alone. Nor is it just Asia. The issue in this war so many people would like to forget is the continued freedom of the non-Communist world, the containment of Communist aggression, and the welfare and security of our country."

The author of those words was Sen. Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.).

Berlin Conference, 1954

In the rubble of Berlin in early 1954, the United States, the Soviet Union, France and Britain held their first postwar conference, ostensibly to discuss the future of divided Germany and of then partially divided Austria. Nothing was accomplished on either issue.

But the French Foreign Minister, Georges Bidault, pressed the American Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, to agree to what was to become the Geneva Conference on both Korea and Indochina.

"We had to have this conference," Bidault wrote in his memoirs. "France was fighting alone and was only being given financial aid. We were fighting 7000 miles away from home and the war was costly in human lives. The war came under heavy criticism in France and in the United States. Acts of treason and sabotage were committed in France."

Dulles was tugged two ways by Bidault's plea. On the one hand he desperately wanted French ratification of what then was the keystone in American policy in Europe: the creation of the European Defense Community, under which a unified armed force would be created, submerging German arms forever in a supranational command. French ratification was needed for success.

On the other hand, Dulles wanted to keep clear of Indochina, where he could easily smell failure—which to him meant the loss of territory to the Communists. Furthermore, he did not want to have anything to do, at least directly, with the Communist Chinese, although he recognized they would have to be at Geneva, too. (Indeed, during the week he did subsequently spend at Geneva, Dulles sat stonily behind Chou En-lai, then Peking's foreign minister, without a word or a handshake between them.)

The American attitude toward China was so bitter at the time that Dulles felt impelled, on his return from the Berlin meeting, to say in a radio-TV report that he had dramatically held out until 60 minutes before adjournment to win Soviet Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov's acceptance of the Dulles demand "that I would not agree to meet with the Chinese Communists unless it was expressly agreed and put in writing that no United States recognition would be involved."

With this safeguard politically at home and in hopes that the French would accept the European Defense Community, Dulles agreed to the Geneva Conference.

The falling domino

Twenty-three days after the Berlin Conference organized the Geneva meeting, Ho's forces made their first major attack on the French fortress of Dienbienphu in western North Vietnam near the border of Laos. Ho had begun his "fight and negotiate" tactic now being repeated while today's talks go on in Paris.

Eisenhower's view of the importance of keeping Indochina out of Communist hands was essentially that expressed by Sen. Mansfield. The President wrote in his memoirs that "if Indochina fell, not only Thailand but Burma and Malaya would be threatened, with added risks to East Pakistan and South Asia as well as to all Indonesia."

It was Eisenhower who publicized what he called "the falling domino principle." He also was concerned, as he said at the time and later wrote in his memoirs, about the possible "loss of valuable deposits of tin and prodigious supplies of rubber and rice" in Southeast Asia, comments to which the North Vietnamese now in Paris have called attention in an effort to sustain a Marxist view of American actions.

Kennedy-Johnson views

American leaders were divided in 1954 on what to do about Indochina. Sen. John F. Kennedy castigated the French for not giving more ground to the non-Communist Vietnamese. Sen. Lyndon B. Johnson declared that he was "against sending American GIs into the mud and muck of Indochina on a blood-letting spree to perpetuate colonialism and white man's exploitation in Asia."

But neither was yet in power in the White House; Eisenhower was and to him came proposals for military aid to the French. From Berlin in January and February to Geneva beginning in May, "the ever-present, persistent, gnawing possibility was that of employing our ground forces in Indochina" as Eisenhower recorded it.

The crisis in Washington came in April as Ho's general, Vo Nguyen Giap, tightened his stranglehold on Dienbienphu while the world watched. In March, the French Chief of Staff had visited Washington to say that unless the United States intervened, Indochina would be lost.

On Saturday, April 3, Dulles met secretly with eight congressional leaders and told them the President wanted a joint resolution by Congress to permit him to use air and naval power in Indochina. If Indochina fell, said Dulles, the United States might be forced back to Hawaii as in World War II.

Adm. Arthur W. Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, proposed using planes from two American carriers then in the South China Sea, plus land-based aircraft from the Philippines, for a single strike to save Dienbienphu. He conceded that the three other members of the Joint Chiefs disagreed with him.

Of the legislators in that room, only two are still in Congress; Sen. Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.) and Rep. John W. McCormack (D-Mass.), now the House Speaker. The other man still in power was Sen. Lyndon B. Johnson.

L. B. J.'s crucial question

It was Sen. Johnson who asked the critical question about allies in such a venture. He said he knew that the then Senate majority leader, William F. Knowland, had been saying publicly that in the Korean War up to 90 per cent of the men and the money came from the United States. The United States had become sold on the idea that that was bad. Hence in any operation in Indochina, we ought to know first who would put up the men.

Sen. Johnson asked Dulles whether he had consulted nations which might be allied in any intervention. Dulles said he had not. In the end, all eight members of Congress agreed that Dulles had better first go shopping for allies.

So Dulles did. And Gen. Giap's men moved closer and closer into the fortress at Dienbienphu. Within a week Dulles talked to diplomatic representatives in Washington of Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand and the then three Associated States of Indochina: Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. He ran into a monumental rock of opposition from the British.

The British attitude, given that of the congressional leaders, forced a shelving of immediate intervention. Instead, Dulles began planning the creation of a "united front" for "united action" in what was later to emerge as SEATO, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

While Dulles was doing this, Vice President Richard M. Nixon, in an off-the-record speech that was quickly divulged, declared in Washington on April 16 that ". . . if to avoid further Communist expansion in Asia and Indochina, we must take the risk now by putting our boys in, I think the Executive has to take the politically unpopular decision and do it."

While Eisenhower was trying to keep the Nation calm, Nixon's remarks caused alarm. A rider to a House appropriations bill was introduced requiring prior congressional approval before the President could send troops to Indochina or anywhere else. Eisenhower was prepared to veto the bill but the rider failed to pass.

Unattainable or unacceptable

In answering a press conference question, the President described his 1954 dilemma much as Lyndon Johnson might describe his 1968 dilemma. Said Eisenhower: "You are steering a course between two extremes, one of which, I would say, would be unattainable, and the other unacceptable."

The "unattainable," he said, was a completely satisfactory agreement with the Communists. The "unacceptable" was "to see the

whole anti-Communist defense of that area crumble and disappear."

In Paris on April 23, three days before the Geneva Conference opened (initially on the Korean issue), Bidault pleaded with Dulles for a massive air attack, using the American carriers then stationed in the Tonkin Gulf as their successors are today. Bidault has written that he pointed out to Dulles "that he had told me and the rest of the world that the U.S. would not tolerate the advance of communism in Southeast Asia; if he wanted, he could reconcile theory with practice by helping us in Dienbienphu."

Bidault also claimed in his memoirs that Dulles asked him "if we would like the U.S. to give us two atomic bombs." This has been denied on the American side and no evidence has been presented to support Bidault's statement. Bidault wrote that his answer was that with the use of atomic bombs the garrison "would be worse off than before."

Despite last-minute efforts by Dulles and Adm. Radford, Eisenhower would not agree to intervention without allies and without congressional approval, which he never publicly asked.

Gloom at Geneva

Thus the Geneva Conference opened in a mood of deepest American gloom. Dulles disassociated himself as much as possible from what he saw as the coming disaster. Dienbienphu fell and Pierre Mendes-France became the French Premier on a promise to negotiate peace in Geneva within a month. The Anglo-American-French relationship was in a shamble.

The shooting ended in Indochina on July 21, 1954, the day after Mendes-France's self-proclaimed deadline, but from most of the French other than embittered military there were only cheers for him.

The first Indochina war, which had lasted 7½ years, was over but in such a way as to invite the second Indochina war and, most importantly, to invite American intervention.

III. DULLES AND DIEM VERSUS HO CHI MINH

Geneva ended with a cease-fire agreement between the French and the Communists and a Final Declaration of all the conferees. The former ended the fighting and provided for a political regroupment of opposing forces; the latter sketched out the political future, declaring that the agreed "military demarcation line" at the 17th parallel, which now separates North from South, was to be considered "provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary."

The Declaration also said that consultations should be held between the authorities of "the two zones" beginning on July 20, 1955, leading to "general elections" which "shall be held in July 1956"

The elections, of course, have never been held, a fact that has aroused bitter dispute as to who was to blame. What did happen was that John Foster Dulles decided to make what became South Vietnam a viable state on its own.

Saigon disassociates self

The Saigon government, of which Ngo Dinh Diem became the head two weeks before the conclusion at Geneva, disassociated itself from the agreements. Diem's representative in Geneva who did so was Tran Van Do, until recently the Foreign Minister in the current Saigon regime.

Despite Soviet pressure to back the agreements, the United States limited itself to a declaration that supported unity of Vietnam through "free elections" under United Nations supervision to assure their fairness and a statement that it would view any renewal of aggression in violation of the agreements "with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security."

The common expectation in Geneva was that the results would have the effect of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 3, 1968

getting the French out and preventing the Americans from intervening. It was presumably on this basis that Molotov and Chou En-lai convinced Ho Chi Minh to accept less than full control of Vietnam.

Although there is no direct evidence, the two key Communist leaders must also have argued that in due course South Vietnam would easily fall into Ho's control. In recent years there have been comments from Hanoi which indicate that, retrospectively, the North Vietnamese Communists believe they were sold out by the Soviets and the Chinese. Many consider this a key factor in Hanoi's evident determination not to repeat the process in any new form at the current Paris talks.

But South Vietnam did not fall as the ripe apple to Ho and the Communists. Two men worked together to prevent that: Dulles and Diem.

Something to salvage

Lt. Gen. Andrew J. Goodpaster, now on the Harriman delegation in Paris and named by President Johnson to be the number two American military leader in Vietnam after Gen. William C. Westmoreland returns home, was then the top White House military aide to Eisenhower.

In a 1966 statement for the Dulles Oral History Project at Princeton, Goodpaster recalled that after the Geneva settlement "Dulles thought that it was perhaps not quite down the drain" although, said Goodpaster, "everyone else, I think, felt that it was." Dulles "felt that there might be something in this that would be worth trying to salvage, trying to sustain."

To assess the prospects, Dulles got Eisenhower to send Gen. J. Lawton Collins, suggested by Goodpaster, to South Vietnam in late 1954. Collins recalled, also for the Oral History Project, that when he was leaving Washington Dulles said to him: "Frankly, Collins, I think our chances of saving the situation there are not more than one in ten."

But some months later, after visiting Saigon himself and hearing Collins' report after the general's return to Washington, Dulles commented that it now looked more like a 50-50 chance. Added Collins: "And he was very well pleased."

Role of Diem

By now Stalin's successors in the Kremlin, and the men in Peking as well, were talking up "peaceful coexistence" between the Communist and non-Communist worlds. But Dulles remained unconvinced of any change of heart and he determined to hold the line at the 17th parallel in Vietnam as well as at the 38th parallel in Korea, the two fringes of what he considered Communist power centered in Peking and perhaps directed from Moscow.

It would take a leader in Saigon, however, to make such a holding operation work and that man was Diem. A Vietnam nationalist and a Catholic, Diem had been living in the United States since 1951, mostly at Maryknoll Seminary in Lakewood, N.J., with occasional trips to Washington to discuss Vietnam with such men as Sen. Mansfield and Rep. John F. Kennedy. He also frequently met with Francis Cardinal Spellman in New York.

Diem had wanted the post in Saigon and it had been offered to him by Emperor Bao Dai. But each time Diem demanded a total end of French control and a free hand for himself. This he finally got when he took over the government on July 7, 1954. He had, by then, powerful friends in Washington who were to sustain him in the years ahead as he fought the Communists.

Twenty-six days after the Geneva accords were signed, Eisenhower transferred aid directly to Vietnam rather than through France. But the French were unhappy with Diem and wanted someone they felt would be more amenable to protection of their

economic and cultural interests in Vietnam.

Dulles balked and his associates called on Mansfield for help. The Senator stated, on returning from a Vietnam trip, that "in the event that the Diem government falls . . . the United States should consider an immediate suspension of all aid to Vietnam and the French Union forces there." The French officers in those forces were soon to leave but Diem was long to stay.

Eisenhower letter

The French reluctantly agreed to back Diem. And on Oct. 23, 1954, President Eisenhower sent a letter to Diem in response to Diem's request for aid. The President said the aid was to assist South Vietnam in "developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." Eisenhower also expressed the hope that Diem's government would be "so responsive to the nationalist aspirations of its people, so enlightened in purpose and effective in performance, that it will be respected both at home and abroad and discourage any who might wish to impose a foreign ideology on your free people."

The letter, drafted by Kenneth Young in the State Department, is the one President Johnson has often cited to show that the current American involvement was begun by Republican President Eisenhower. Eisenhower has complained in private about this use of his letter but has never done so publicly.

By July, 1955, when the consultations for the elections in all of Vietnam were to begin under the terms of Geneva, Diem was in a strong position internally. His government has absorbed the nearly 900,000 refugees from the North, 250,000 of which had been evacuated and brought South in American naval vessels.

Diem said he was for unification and for free elections "to achieve this unity." But he was "skeptical" about holding them in the North, where "a regime of oppression" was in power. Furthermore, his government did not sign and was "not bound in any way" by the Geneva accords. Hence "nothing constructive will be done" as long as the Communists deny democratic freedoms.

The North objects, called for a renewed Geneva Conference by Moscow and Peking paid little attention. Indeed, the Soviets seemed so satisfied with the division that in 1957 they proposed admitting both Vietnams to the United Nations along with the two Koreas. But the United States opposed admission of the two Communist states.

Votes for Ho

In the wake of the first Indochina war, the probability is that, given a free election throughout all of Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh would have been the winner. That Dulles probably believed this is indicated by a comment in Eisenhower's memoirs:

"I have never talked or corresponded with a person knowledgeable in Indochinese affairs who did not agree that had elections been held as of the time of the fighting, possibly 80 per cent of the population would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader rather than Chief of State Bao Dai."

Diem gained support in his own country and in the United States as well. Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey declared in May 1955, when Bao Dai tried unsuccessfully to put a rein on Diem, that "Premier Diem is the best hope that we have in South Vietnam. He deserves and must have the whole-hearted support of the American Government . . ."

To Washington it looked as though Dulles was right and that economic aid and some military training help to Diem would indeed produce a viable state and result in a stable line at the 17th parallel.

Furthermore, Dulles had constructed SEATO and used it to put an umbrella of international support over South Vietnam as

a "protocol state." Along with Dulles, two Senators signed on behalf of the United States. One of them was Mansfield.

U.S. problems elsewhere

The United States had greater problems elsewhere in the final Eisenhower years, notably with Nikita Khrushchev over the U-2 and the Soviet Sputnik and ICBM developments. Few other than those directly concerned paid attention to Vietnam; it all seemed to be going well.

Ho Chi Minh seemed absorbed in rebuilding the North. Despite an abortive coup, Diem seemed well in control in the South and there was talk of a "miracle" of postwar development. And there were no American battle casualties.

Yet the United States was, in fact, sliding into what was to become the second Indochina war. The U.S. understood the Communists' aim but of their plans and strategy it was woefully ignorant.

IV. KENNEDY'S INTERVENTION

The 1954 division of Vietnam was geographic but the regroupment of forces after Geneva was political. Not only did about 900,000 come South but from 90,000 to about 150,000 Communists troops including their families went North, many of them on Polish and Soviet ships.

Most importantly, as Bernard Fall has written, a small group of Ho's elite guerrillas "quietly buried its well-greased weapons, hid its portable radio transmitters and simply returned for the time being to the humdrum tasks of sowing and harvesting rice."

The relative calm in the South was short-lived. By the end of 1958, Vietcong activity had begun to stir in the South and security in the countryside became a serious problem. By 1959, the North was recuperating from the war and it was evident that unification would not come through elections. Diem grew oppressive in the face of opposition and attempted coups. It was time for the Communists to act.

Infiltration in 1959

According to an American appraisal (released in May, 1968) the Lao Dong (Communist) Party in the North decided in May, 1959, or even earlier, that the time had come "to push the armed struggle against the enemy," a sentence U.S. officials found in a captured document. Furthermore, at that time, according to the American appraisal, the "Southern part of the Communist apparatus" had "become restive" and some elements were taking action on their own initiative.

Border crossing teams were created and infiltration began by mid-1959, both across the Demilitarized Zone separating the two Vietnams and by way of Laos. Southerners who had gone North and been formed into units were now sent back. Those who had remained in the South dug up buried weapons and appeared in the form of the Vietcong.

The struggle in the South against Diem was formalized at the end of 1960 and the beginning of 1961. On Sept. 10, 1960, the Lao Dong Party adopted a resolution declaring that one of its tasks was "to liberate South Vietnam from the ruling yoke of the U.S. imperialists and their henchmen . . ." And on Jan. 29, 1961, Hanoi announced the establishment of the National Liberation Front, formed the previous December as the political arm of the insurgent Vietcong in the South.

In Kennedy's hands

All this had occurred in the final phase of the Eisenhower Administration but it was the new President, John F. Kennedy, who had to deal with it. Much that is known about Communist plans and movements, however, was unknown then and the Kennedy-Eisenhower discussion about the world's problems on the day before the

Kennedy inauguration did not touch on Vietnam. There was, however, considerable discussion of neighboring Laos, which the outgoing President considered so much the key to Southeast Asia that he said he would favor unilateral American intervention "as a last desperate hope" to deny it to the Communists.

Laos was indeed Kennedy's first critical problem in the area and he came close to intervention. In the end, at the Vienna meeting in 1961 with Nikita Khrushchev and in the subsequent Geneva Conference on Laos in 1962, Kennedy was able to put Laos aside as the adjunct to Vietnam that it clearly has been.

But shunting Laos aside did nothing about Vietnam itself. Kennedy had been struck by a Khrushchev speech about "wars of national liberation" and from this was to come great emphasis on counterinsurgency, including the rise of the Green Berets.

Grievances in south

That there were just grievances in the South against the Diem regime is beyond dispute. Critics of American policy contend, as one book puts it, that the insurrection against Diem was "Southern rooted" and that "it arose at Southern initiative in response to Southern demands." The American Government view is that, despite the grievances, the insurrection was effectively Northern inspired and directed, though using Southerners to carry it out for the first years.

The civil war view was rejected by the Kennedy Administration. By November, 1961, the new Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, was speaking of "the determined and ruthless campaign of propaganda, infiltration and subversion by the Communist regime in North Vietnam to destroy the Republic of Vietnam" in the South.

Kennedy had qualms about further involvement. Still, the weakness he had shown in the Bay of Pigs debacle in Cuba, many now feel, led him to fear another seeming retreat from communism and thus forced him to up the American ante in Vietnam.

In late 1961, two emissaries he had sent to Vietnam, Gen. Maxwell Taylor and Walt W. Rostow, came back with a recommendation for sending an American military task force of perhaps 10,000 men for self-defense and perimeter security and, if the South Vietnamese were hard pressed to act as an emergency reserve.

That report, as much as anything, let the new President to take the irreversible steps into the second Indochina, or Vietnam, war. But Kennedy stopped short of the Rostow argument for a contingency plan of retaliation against the North graduated to match the intensity of Hanoi's support of the Vietcong, as Arthur Schlesinger Jr. has described it.

Johnson's tour of area

In the Kennedy era, the Americans were in Vietnam as advisers, about 16,000 of them by the time of the President's assassination. The first American soldiers was killed on Dec. 22, 1961, and by the time of Kennedy's death about 150 Americans had died in Vietnam from hostile action and other reasons.

Vice President Johnson visited Vietnam in May, 1961, and proclaimed Diem the Winston Churchill of the area, although he had some private criticisms. On his return he told Kennedy that "we must decide whether to help these countries to the best of our ability or throw in the towel in the area and pull back our defenses to San Francisco and a 'Fortress America' concept." He recommended "a major effort" to help the area, citing as critical the American word to live up to its treaties and stand by its friends.

The Taylor-Rostow mission backed the Vice Presidential view in large part. Kennedy at the time was trying to find new agreements with the Soviets but Moscow seemed in a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

truculent mood. The President knew that the Communist world of Stalin's day was finished; still, he worried lest an American retreat in Asia upset the world power balance. So more military advisers were sent to Vietnam, Diem was fully backed and the United States became inextricably involved in the Second Indochina War.

The Vietcong terror campaign mounted but Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara declared on his 1962 visit that "every quantitative measurement we have shows that we're winning this war" and Rusk said the next March that the struggle was "turning an important corner."

How do we get out?

By fall, however, the innocence and self-delusion had been somewhat shattered after Diem's attack on the Buddhists. The President had evidenced his doubts in May, 1963, during a visit to the United States by Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson.

As Pearson told it in April, 1968, after leaving office, the President asked his advice about Vietnam. Pearson said the United States should "get out." The President replied, "That's a stupid answer. Everybody knows that. The question is: How do we get out?"

By this time the shape of the Communist world had changed massively from what it had been when Dulles decide in 1954 to pick up the pieces after the Geneva Conference. Ho Chi Minh remained a Communist but by 1963 it was apparent he was no simple tool of Moscow or Peking, or both, but acting largely on his own. Yet Kennedy, who saw the polycentrism of communism, could not escape Vietnam.

His last act was to help push Diem from office, in part by public criticism of his relationship with his notorious brother and sister-in-law, Ngo Dinh Nhu and Mme. Nhu. In October, the generals struck and Diem and Nhu were murdered, setting off a period of political instability in which a dozen governments were to come and go.

It is their war

Kennedy had said a month earlier that "In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it . . . All we can do is help, and we are making it very clear. But I don't agree with those who say we should withdraw. That would be a great mistake." Earlier, the President had said that he subscribed to Eisenhower's "domino" theory on the effect of the loss to the Communists of Vietnam.

Kennedy had the tiger by the tail and did not know how to let him go. There has been much speculation on what he might have done had he not been assassinated on Nov. 22, 1963, but much of it has been self-serving and all of it fruitless.

The young President's legacy was 16,000 American troops in Vietnam, some in actual combat though not formally so, a continuing American commitment and no plan of escape. Like Eisenhower, he had underestimated the enemy.

V. JOHNSON'S ESCALATION

When Lyndon Johnson moved into the White House, he remarked, as he told it later, that the United States was involved in only one war and "let's win it." And he had said, Tom Wicker has reported, that "I am not going to be the President who saw Southeast Asia go the way China went."

Like Kennedy, Johnson had accepted Eisenhower's domino theory. He saw the war in Cold War terms, although he was to come to appreciate how much the Communist world had changed since Stalin. Like Kennedy, he saw Vietnam in terms of the world power balance. And like both his predecessors, he underestimated the enemy.

Johnson inherited Kennedy's key men: Rusk, McNamara, McGeorge Bundy, Rostow, Gen. Taylor and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As

Kennedy had accepted advice from his elders that led to the Bay of Pigs, so Johnson accepted advice from the Kennedy holdovers.

The advisers were full of optimism and plans and they had their way as the new President concentrated on his domestic program and the coming election.

Less than two months before Kennedy's death, McNamara had returned from Vietnam to announce that "the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel." It was announced that 1000 Americans probably could be withdrawn by the end of 1963.

The 1964 campaign promises

In such a euphoric atmosphere, Johnson campaigned that fall against Barry Goldwater, asking voters to judge who should have the "finger on the button" of nuclear weapons. While Goldwater was talking about a "no win" policy in Vietnam, Johnson was saying that "we don't want to get involved" with China "and get tied down to a land war in Asia."

Johnson promised to be "very cautious and very careful." He declared that "I have not thought that we were ready for American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys," a phrase that came to haunt him. There were qualifications in many of these statements but few seemed to note them.

Once elected in a massive triumph, Johnson began to look more closely at the war. It turned out that things were a lot worse, perhaps even as bad as some of the newspaper correspondents in Saigon had been reporting.

Sen. Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.) visited the LBJ Ranch and then commented that "we either have got to get out or take some action to help the Vietnamese. They won't help themselves. We made a great mistake in going in there but I can't figure out any way to get out without scaring the rest of the world."

Gen. Taylor, asked whether the war was being lost, replied that "the main issue is very much in doubt." He advocated strikes at infiltration routes and "the training areas" in North Vietnam.

Why no negotiations?

Many Americans and others have often pondered why the Communists did not in the winter of 1964-65 propose negotiations. The South Vietnamese army was close to breaking and American intervention was still relatively minor, about 25,000 men of all services. The North had not yet been bombed, except for the single Tonkin raid, and Saigon's regimes were in a revolving-door phase.

There are two answers. Remembering their 1954 experience, the North Vietnamese leaders were determined not to accept less than victory this time. Second, they may have thought from the President's campaign remarks that he would liquidate the war after the election. But they discovered that he had no such plan.

United Nations Secretary General U Thant tried to bring the two sides together in 1964-65 in Rangoon, Burma, but the effort aborted. In retrospect, Hanoi was prepared to come only to accept an American surrender, if Johnson would offer it, but the President had no such intention. Washington knew it would be bargaining from weakness at such a meeting and breathed a sigh of relief when it failed to come about. The stage was set for the Johnson escalation.

Plans for striking the North had long been drawn up in case they should be needed. Carriers had been moved into the South China Sea. Johnson later told newsman Charles Roberts that he had decided in October, 1964, to bomb the North. Whatever the pre-planning, the first raid came on Feb. 7, 1965, in what was called retaliation for Vietcong attacks on American installations,

especially at Pleiku, where Bundy saw the bloodshed.

At the moment the new Soviet Premier, Alexei Kosygin, was in Hanoi. Khrushchev had opted out of Southeast Asia but the new leadership, probably sensing a Communist victory, wanted to be in on the triumph. The Chinese later charged that Kosygin said in Hanoi that he would help the United States "to find a way out of Vietnam." Subsequent Soviet peacemaking efforts were limited by Hanoi's posture and Chinese allegations of collusion with the United States. Moscow and Peking then stepped up their aid as the major suppliers of vital arms and other material for North Vietnam.

"Retaliatory" strikes quickly became regular policy. Air attacks seemed the easier choice to prevent the collapse of the South Vietnamese. Eisenhower had agonized 11 years earlier over sending ground troops. Kennedy had sent 16,000 but tried to limit their roles. Johnson recalled Gen. Douglas MacArthur's advice to him to avoid a land war in Asia.

Hanoi adopts to strikes

The bombing did, at first, cause "great difficulties and confusion" in the North, as Hanoi's deputy chief of staff stated in a 1966 speech captured by the Americans. But, he added, "after some months we acquired experience and have strengthened our national defense forces."

The Administration denied the bombing was designed to force Hanoi to the conference table. The motives were an amalgam but that was the desirable end. It did not work. Nor did the President alter Hanoi's determination by declaring that the North was engaging in "a deeply dangerous game" by stepping up infiltration.

Because there were no quick results, pressure mounted to extend the bombing to more targets. Chairman Earle G. Wheeler of the Joint Chiefs of Staff commented in 1958 that the military differences with McNamara had been "a question of tempo. The Chiefs would have done things faster. They didn't coincide with McNamara on the conduct of the air war."

This is a view echoed by Richard Nixon in his current presidential campaign. He said last March in New Hampshire that the Johnson Administration had "wasted the Nation's military power by using it so gradually. If it had used at the start the power it is using now, the war would be over."

But Johnson, who made the decisions Wheeler ascribed to McNamara, was constrained by many factors: his recollection of Chinese intervention in Korea when American troops threatened to destroy the Communist regime in the North; advice from experts on Soviet affairs to avoid abrupt action that could force Moscow to react strongly, if only not to be outdone by Peking; the President's own tendency toward compromise between advice from hawks and doves in and out of his Administration.

The bombing failed to halt infiltration from the North or to deter the Vietcong in the South. More ground troops had to be sent.

Combat units land

The President had been granted sweeping authority, psychologically if not legally, in the August, 1964, Tonkin Gulf Resolution passed by near unanimous vote of Congress. Under Secretary of State Nicholas deB. Katzenbach was later to call the resolution "the functional equivalent" of a declaration of war and the President treated it just that way.

The bombing began in February. The Marines came ashore in March. Before sending the Army in large numbers, the President offered "unconditional discussions" in his April speech at Johns Hopkins University. But Hanoi also could read his declaration that "we will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either

openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

Each side, in fact, wanted victory. The war was non-negotiable. By June, American troop levels were on the rise. In the fall of 1965, McNamara moved 100,000 men to Vietnam in less than four months, an action of which he was to say on retiring from the Pentagon: "It was very clear we either had to do that or accept defeat."

The odds were improved but Hanoi sent more men from the North and the Vietcong recruited more in the South. The 37-day bombing pause of December, 1965, to January, 1966, reflected doubts in Washington about the value of continued escalation as well as the growing dissent over the war. But it was fruitless; both sides still wanted victory.

In his letter to Ho Chi Minh during the pause, the President demanded an end to infiltration if he were to halt the bombing. Ho rejected the idea of reciprocity, declaring then, as his representatives at Paris continue to declare, that Hanoi would pay no price for an end to the American "aggression" against the North.

North's army enters

On the basis of captured document's prisoner interrogations and other information, the United States this May declared that "the first complete tactical unit of the North Vietnamese Army" had left the North in October, 1964, and arrived in the South in December. By this ex post facto accounting, three regiments had started moving south prior to the regular bombing of the North.

By the fall of 1965, when McNamara was moving 100,000 men to Vietnam, ten Northern regiments totaling 17,800 men were either in or on their way south. And by the end of the 37-day pause, five more regiments comprising another 10,000 men were moving south, again according to the recent American calculation.

Johnson continued to demand reciprocity for a halt in the bombing. But the formulation was gradually watered down. In private and then in public at San Antonio, Johnson sought some sign of reciprocity. But Hanoi would have none of it. Escalation continued on both sides, and the casualties mounted as well.

High point of optimism

The high point for the optimists came in the fall of 1967 and it was to last until January, 1968.

Gen. Westmoreland came home in November to tell the Nation that "whereas in 1965 the enemy was winning, today he is certainly losing." Furthermore, said Westmoreland, with the American in-country forces now approaching half a million, "we have reached an important point where the end begins to come into view." In the final phase ahead, Westmoreland added it would be possible for American units to "begin to phase down as the Vietnamese army is modernized and develops its capacity to the fullest."

While the critics were not silent, for the moment the Administration still had the upper hand. The dissenters found a champion when Sen. Eugene McCarthy in late November announced for the Presidency. But few gave him, or his anti-war platform, much of a chance. Other dissenters wished him well, but no more. Sen. Robert F. Kennedy said he was still backing the Johnson-Humphrey ticket for re-election.

VI. FIGHT AND NEGOTIATE

Exactly when Lyndon Johnson began to have the gravest doubts about the direction of the Vietnam war is not yet evident. But events were to solidify those doubts and produced the historic decision Johnson announced in his speech of March 31, 1968.

Military, political and financial problems spiraled during 1967, especially in the latter months. The climax was to come with the Communists' Tet offensive on Jan. 31, 1968.

The war in 1967 consisted of more slogging and more indecision, with heavy casualties. During the year, 11,058 Americans died in Vietnam from all causes compared to the 8,155 who had died in the previous five years of the American military involvement. American forces, with great mobility and massive firepower, could go anywhere they wished but at a cost. Yet the enemy could not be destroyed—and that was Westmoreland's objective.

The spiraling cost of the war had thrown the Federal budget out of kilter, robbed domestic programs of needed funds and created worldwide doubts about the value of the dollar.

At home dissent continued to grow. The President found it close to impossible to appear in public without facing massive demonstrations.

Within the Administration, Rusk and Rosow grimly asserted that the old policy was right and needed no changes. But McNamara was disheartened. In the spring of 1967, he proposed limiting the bombing of the North to the area south of the 20th parallel but he was overruled. He publicly deprecated the effect of the bombing. In public, McNamara remained loyal to the President but by December he was out in a bizarre combined firing-and-resignation.

At the Capitol and across the Nation, dissent reached a new high by year's end. Most importantly, the President began to put new stress on negotiations, especially on the possibility of some form of agreement between the Saigon government and the Vietcong's National Liberation Front. As he did so, the Thieu-Ky government worried that the United States would try to force it into a coalition with the Communists so the Americans could leave.

Johnson went no further in public than to urge that Saigon begin talking with "members" and "representatives" of the NLF. Back in early 1966, Sen. Robert F. Kennedy had called for admitting the Communists to "a share of power and responsibility" in Saigon but Vice President Humphrey had compared that to letting a fox in the chicken coop. The Administration line was that it would not "impose" a coalition government on South Vietnam.

If frustration was rampant in Washington, Hanoi had developed a scenario for the war. A massive "winter-spring offensive" had been decided on back in mid-1967 and there was talk of 1968 as the "decisive" year. Thousands more North Vietnamese troops headed south. The NLF issued a new political platform designed to appeal to dissenters and the war-weary. New "front" organizations were created to make it easier to desert the Thieu-Ky government, which had been elected in September along with a new Assembly.

The blow came in the dark of the night on Jan. 31, 1968. It came to be known as the Tet Offensive.

The self-proclaimed Communist objective of a "general uprising" of the population and Southern army against the Saigon government, if indeed that was the true objective of Hanoi, was a failure. But Tet was not a failure. It brought the war to the cities, put the allies on the defensive and gave Communists control of more of the countryside.

Where Tet succeeded most of all was in the United States and in the mind of the President.

In Vietnam, Gen. Westmoreland's response to Tet was more of the same: he asked for 206,000 more troops for a "maximum effort." At home, the voters of New Hampshire on March 12 showed their discontent when McCarthy came within a few votes of topping the President in the New Hampshire primary.

The President's speech

The outcome of the Administration's post-Tet review was the March 31 speech. It had two key parts.

On the military side, the President rejected Westmoreland's call for still more troops. He began to throw more of the burden on South Vietnamese forces and he halted the bombing of the North above the 20th parallel, as McNamara had recommended a year earlier. In short, he moved to stabilize and begin to de-escalate.

On the political side, Johnson gave great force to these changes by announcing he would not run for re-election, in hopes of ending the national divisiveness rooted in the unpopular war.

The North Vietnamese, who apparently had been planning some peace initiative of their own, within three days accepted the President's call for a conference even though part of their country was still being bombed. This was a considerable switch of position after years of demanding an end to all bombing "and all other acts of war" against the North before any talks.

For the first time it appeared that the war might be negotiable. Both sides had moved into a "fight and negotiate" posture and each side tried to improve its military position as the Paris talks got under way in May.

EPILOGUE

Twenty-five years of American involvement in the Indo-Chinese peninsula during five Administrations began in a mood of political romanticism, became an adjunct of Cold War policies in Europe and turned into the high tide of American involvement around the world. There was no plot of "imperialism," no grand design. There was a consistency of motive: the right of people to run their own lives.

Different Presidents reacted differently but for the most part they reacted rather than planned in advance. There was never a formal declaration of war; much that was done was done in secrecy. America slid into a war it never wanted without adequate public debate about what it was doing and what might be the consequences.

The end is not yet in sight; Act VI is likely to be the finale but even that is not certain today. What is certain is that Vietnam for years to come will have a major effect on American thinking about its relationships with the rest of the world. And the way that is resolved will have an effect, perhaps a major effect, on the future of the world.

PANAMA CANAL MODERNIZATION: NOTABLE RESOLUTION BY PANAMA CANAL ZONE DEPARTMENT, AMERICAN LEGION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most gravely important questions before Congress is that of the Panama Canal; for the modernization of which identical measures are now pending in both the House and Senate: S. 3108, introduced by Senator THURMOND; H.R. 13834, by Representative FLOOD; and H.R. 14179, by myself.

These measures have aroused the interest of many employees of the Panama Canal, including experienced engineers and various canal experts in the United States.

The latest significant development in these regards was the adoption at its April 27 to 28, 1968, convention by the Department of the Panama Canal Zone of the American Legion of a notable res-

olution supporting the enactment of the proposed legislation.

As the indicated resolution will be helpful to all Members of the Congress in connection with the previously listed bills, I include it and the text of the bills as part of my remarks, as follows:

THE PANAMA CANAL

Whereas, under the treaty of November 18, 1903, with the Republic of Panama, the Canal Zone territory was acquired in perpetuity by the United States, the Panama Canal constructed, and subsequently maintained, operated, sanitized, protected¹ and defended² in one of the most forbidding areas of the world, all in fulfillment of the United States' long range commitment in the 1901 Hay-Pauncefote Treaty with Great Britain and as a mandate of civilization, including the security of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas, full control and ownership of the Canal Zone Territory and property therein were obtained by the United States through the grant by Panama of all sovereign rights, powers, and authority over said strip and through purchase of the United States of all privately owned land and property in it from individual owners as indispensable prerequisites for assuming the responsibilities involved; and

Whereas, the total investment of the United States in the Panama Canal enterprise from 1904 through June 30, 1966, including defense, was \$4,889,050,000; and

Whereas, the proposed new Panama Canal treaties, announced by the Presidents of the United States and Panama on June 26, 1967, as having been negotiated, would (1) abrogate the Treaty of 1903, (2) give Panama sovereignty over the Canal Zone, (3) make Panama a partner in the management and defense of the Panama Canal, and (4) ultimately give to Panama, without the slightest reimbursement for the investment of the United States, (a) the existing Canal and/or (b) any new Canal that may be constructed in the Canal Zone or in Panama to replace it at enormous cost to the United States; and

Whereas, the proposed new Canal treaties have aroused strong opposition in both the United States and Panama, features by (a) some 150 members of the U.S. House of Representatives introducing and supporting resolutions calling for their rejection and (b) large numbers of the Panamanian people demanding their repudiation; and

Whereas, the results are that the proposed treaties have neither been signed by the respective Executives nor transmitted to the U.S. Senate or to the Panamanian Assembly for ratification; and

Whereas, United States negotiators for the proposed treaties (1) entirely ignored the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty as regards tolls, arousing strong opposition from important foreign and domestic shipping interests that use the Panama route, and (2) wholly disregarded the 1914-22 Thomson-Urrutia Treaty between the United States and Colombia, causing the government of Colombia to assert its intention to defend its treaty rights as to the Panama Canal; and

Whereas, the resulting blocking of the indicated treaties has cleared the way for constructive action by the United States under current treaty provisions toward the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing Panama Canal, now approaching saturation, in line with the program for modernization developed in the Canal organization during World War II and approved by the President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as a post-war project, known as the Terminal Lake Third Locks Plan; and

Whereas, this lake-lock proposal being an enlargement and improvement of existing

facilities, requiring no additional lands, waters or authority, does not require a new treaty with Panama and would serve the best interests of the United States and Panama; and

Whereas, the expenditure of \$76,357,405 on the original Third Locks Project suspended in May 1942 and an estimated expenditure of \$81,257,097 on the enlargement of Gaillard Cut to provide a two-way ship channel in the summit level, scheduled for completion in 1970, together, represent substantial commitments by the United States for the modernization of the existing Canal; and

Whereas, any new treaty or treaties between the United States and Panama that would extinguish United States control and ownership of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal would inevitably result in a complete communist take over of any Isthmian Canal and the Government of Panama itself, with like takovers in other countries of Latin America; and

Whereas, The American Legion has long had the Canal problems under study and on August 31, 1967, adopted resolutions on the subject at its Annual National Convention in Boston, Massachusetts; and

Whereas, proposed legislation to provide for the modernization of the Panama Canal has been introduced in the 90th Congress by Senator Strom Thurmond and Representatives Daniel J. Flood and John Rarick, S. 3108, H.R. 13834, and H.R. 14179, respectively; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By The American Legion Department of the Panama Canal Zone, in Department Convention assembled at France Field, Canal Zone, April 27-28, 1968:

(1) That this Department re-affirms its full support of the basic and still existing provisions of the 1903 Treaty and the continued, undiluted and indispensable sovereign control by the United States of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and

(2) That it supports the enactment of legislation proposed in the Thurmond-Flood-Rarick bills, 90th. Congress, S. 3108, H.R. 13834, and H.R. 14179 for the increase of capacity and the major operational improvement of the Panama Canal in accord with the principles of the Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan; and

(3) That it urges that all further negotiations with the Republic of Panama be deferred pending action by the Congress on these measures; and

(4) That it respectfully urges the Congress to take prompt action on the pending bills; and

(5) That it requests that copies of these resolutions be furnished the National Organization of the American Legion for such action as may be required in the premises; also to such other organizations and individuals as may be desirable.

H.R. 14179

A bill to provide for the increase of capacity and the improvement of operations of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That this Act may be cited as the "Panama Canal Modernization Act of 1968".

SEC. 2. (a) The Governor of the Canal Zone, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized and directed to prosecute the work necessary to increase the capacity and improve the operations of the Panama Canal through the adaptation of the Third Locks project set forth in the report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, dated February 24, 1939 (House Document Numbered 210, Seventy-sixth Congress), and authorized to be undertaken by the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), with usable lock dimensions

¹ Police power.

² Armed forces.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 3, 1968

of one hundred and forty feet by one thousand two hundred feet by forty-five feet, and including the following: elimination of the Pedro Miguel locks, and consolidation of all Pacific locks near Miraflores in new lock structures to correspond with the locks arrangements at Gatun, raise the summit water level to approximately ninety-two feet, and provide a summit-level lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal, together with such appurtenant structures, works, and facilities, and enlargements or improvements of existing channels, structures, works, and facilities, as may be deemed necessary, at a total cost not to exceed \$850,000,000.

(b) the provisions of the second sentence and the second paragraph of the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), shall apply with respect to the work authorized by subsection (a) of this section. As used in such Act the terms "Governor of the Panama Canal", "Secretary of War", and "Panama Railroad Company" shall be held and considered to refer to the "Governor of the Canal Zone", "Secretary of the Army", and "Panama Canal Company", respectively, for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a board, to be known as the "Panama Canal Advisory and Inspection Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

(b) The Board shall be composed of five members who are citizens of the United States of America. Members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows:

(1) one member from private life, experienced and skilled in private business (including engineering);

(2) two members from private life, experienced and skilled in the science of engineering;

(3) one member who is a commissioned officer of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army (retired); and

(4) one member who is a commissioned officer of the line, United States Navy (retired).

(c) The President shall designate as Chairman of the Board one of the members experienced and skilled in the science of engineering.

(d) The President shall fill each vacancy on the Board in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) The Board shall cease to exist on that date designated by the President as the date on which its work under this Act is completed.

(f) The Chairman of the Board shall be paid basic pay at the rate provided for level II of the Executive Schedule in section 5313 of title 5, United States Code. The other members of the Board appointed from private life shall be paid basic pay at a per annum rate which is \$500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman. The members of the Board who are retired officers of the United States Army and the United States Navy each shall be paid at a rate of basic pay which, when added to his pay and allowances as a retired officer, will establish his total rate of pay from the United States at a per annum rate which is \$500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman.

(g) The Board shall appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, a Secretary and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities and shall fix their rates of basic pay in accordance with chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The Secretary and other personnel of the Board shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

Sec. 4. (a) The Board is authorized and directed to study and review all plans and

designs for the Third Locks project referred to in section 2(a) of this Act, to make on-the-site studies and inspections of the Third Locks project, and to obtain current information on all phases of planning and construction with respect to such project. The Governor of the Canal Zone shall furnish and make available to the Board at all times current information with respect to such plans, designs, and construction. No construction work shall be commenced at any stage of the Third Locks project unless the plans and designs for such work, and all changes and modifications of such plans and designs, have been submitted by the Governor of the Canal Zone to, and have had the prior approval of, the Board. The Board shall report promptly to the Governor of the Canal Zone the results of its studies and reviews of all plans and designs, including changes and modifications thereof, which have been submitted to the Board by the Governor of the Canal Zone, together with its approval or disapproval thereof, or its recommendations for changes or modifications thereof, and its reasons therefor.

(b) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report covering its activities and functions under this Act and the progress of the work on the Third Locks project and may submit, in its discretion, interim reports to the President and to the Congress with respect to these matters.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of conducting all studies, reviews, inquiries, and investigations deemed necessary by the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Board is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other personnel, of the Board, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpoena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Board may deem relevant or material to the performance of the functions and activities of the Board. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 6. In carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants or organizations thereof in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not in excess of \$200 per diem.

SEC. 7. Upon request of the Board, the head of any department, agency, or establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government is authorized to detail on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, for such period or periods as may be agreed upon by the Board and the head of the agency, or establishment concerned, any of the personnel of such department, agency, or establishment to assist the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 8. The Board may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

SEC. 9. The Administrator of General Services shall provide, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services for the Board as the Board may request.

SEC. 10. The Board may make expenditures for travel and subsistence expenses of members and personnel of the Board in accordance with chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, for rent of quarters at the seat of government and in the Canal Zone, and for such printing and binding as the Board

deems necessary to carry out effectively its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 11. All expenses of the Board shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Board or by such other member or employee of the Board as the Chairman may designate.

SEC. 12. Any provision or provisions of the indicated Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409) or of any other Act inconsistent with, or opposed to, any provision or provisions of this Act, are hereby repealed and shall be of no effect.

SEC. 13. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities under this Act.

S. 3108

A bill to provide for the increase of capacity and the improvement of operations of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Panama Canal Modernization Act of 1968".

SEC. 2. (a) The Governor of the Canal Zone, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized and directed to prosecute the work necessary to increase the capacity and improve the operations of the Panama Canal through the adaptation of the third locks project set forth in the report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, dated February 24, 1939 (House Document Numbered 210, Seventy-sixth Congress), and authorized to be undertaken by the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), with usable lock dimensions of one hundred and forty feet by one thousand two hundred feet by forty-five feet, and including the following: elimination of the Pedro Miguel locks, and consolidation of all Pacific locks near Miraflores in new lock structures to correspond with the locks arrangements at Gatun, raise the summit water level to approximately ninety-two feet, and provide a summit-level lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal, together with such appurtenant structures, works, and facilities, and enlargements or improvements of existing channels, structures, works, and facilities, as may be deemed necessary, at a total cost not to exceed \$850,000,000.

(b) The provisions of the second sentence and the second paragraph of the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), shall apply with respect to the work authorized by subsection (a) of this section. As used in such Act, the terms "Governor of the Panama Canal", "Secretary of War", and "Panama Railroad Company" shall be held and considered to refer to the "Governor of the Canal Zone", "Secretary of the Army", and "Panama Canal Company", respectively, for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a board, to be known as the "Panama Canal Advisory and Inspection Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

(b) The Board shall be composed of five members who are citizens of the United States of America. Members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows:

(1) one member from private life, experienced and skilled in private business (including engineering);

(2) two members from private life, experienced and skilled in the science of engineering;

(3) one member who is a commissioned officer of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army (retired); and

(4) one member who is a commissioned officer of the line, United States Navy (retired).

(c) The President shall designate as Chairman of the Board one of the members experienced and skilled in the science of engineering.

(d) The President shall fill each vacancy on the Board in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) The Board shall cease to exist on that date designated by the President as the date on which its work under this Act is completed.

(f) The Chairman of the Board shall be paid basic pay at the rate provided for level II of the Executive Schedule in section 5313 of title 5, United States Code. The other members of the Board appointed from private life shall be paid basic pay at a per annum rate which is \$500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman. The members of the Board who are retired officers of the United States Army and the United States Navy each shall be paid at a rate of basic pay which, when added to his pay and allowances as a retired officer, will establish his total rate of pay from the United States at a per annum rate which is \$500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman.

(g) The Board shall appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, a secretary and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities and shall fix their rates of basic pay in accordance with chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The secretary and other personnel of the Board shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

SEC. 4. (a) The Board is authorized and directed to study and review all plans and designs for the third locks project referred to in section 2(a) of this Act, to make on-the-site studies and inspections of the third locks project, and to obtain current information on all phases of planning and construction with respect to such project. The Governor of the Canal Zone shall furnish and make available to the Board at all times current information with respect to such plans, designs, and construction. No construction work shall be commenced at any stage of the third locks project unless the plans and designs for such work, and all changes and modifications of such plans and designs, have been submitted by the Governor of the Canal Zone to, and have had the prior approval of, the Board. The Board shall report promptly to the Governor of the Canal Zone the results of its studies and reviews of all plans and designs, including changes and modifications thereof, which have been submitted to the Board by the Governor of the Canal Zone, together with its approval or disapproval thereof, or its recommendations for changes or modifications thereof, and its reasons therefor.

(b) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report covering its activities and functions under this Act and the progress of the work on the third locks project and may submit, in its discretion, interim reports to the President and to the Congress with respect to these matters.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of conducting all studies, reviews, inquiries, and investigations deemed necessary by the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Board is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other personnel, of the Board, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpoena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the pro-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

duction of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Board may deem relevant or material to the performance of the functions and activities of the Board. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 6. In carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants or organizations thereof in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not in excess of \$200 per diem.

SEC. 7. Upon request of the Board, the head of any department, agency, or establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, for such period or periods as may be agreed upon by the Board and the head of the department, agency, or establishment concerned, any of the personnel of such department, agency, or establishment to assist the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 8. The Board may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

SEC. 9. The Administrator of General Services shall provide, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services for the Board as the Board may request.

SEC. 10. The Board may make expenditures for travel and subsistence expenses of members and personnel of the Board in accordance with chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, for rent of quarters at the seat of government and in the Canal Zone, and for such printing and binding as the Board deems necessary to carry out effectively its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 11. All expenses of the Board shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Board or by such other member or employee of the Board as the Chairman may designate.

SEC. 12. Any provision or provisions of the indicated Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409) or of any other Act inconsistent with, or opposed to, any provision or provisions of this Act, are hereby repealed and shall be of no effect.

SEC. 13. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities under this Act.

H.R. 13834

A bill to provide for the increase of capacity and the improvement of operations of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Panama Canal Modernization Act of 1968".

SEC. 2. (a) The Governor of the Canal Zone, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized and directed to prosecute the work necessary to increase the capacity and improve the operations of the Panama Canal through the adaptation of the Third Locks project set forth in the report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, dated February 24, 1939 (House Document Numbered 210, Seventy-sixth Congress), and authorized to be undertaken by the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), with usable lock dimensions of one hundred and forty feet by one thousand two hundred feet by forty-five feet, and including the following: elimination of the Pedro Miguel Locks, and consolidation of all Pacific locks near Miraflores in new lock structures to correspond with the

locks arrangements at Gatun, raise the summit water level to approximately ninety-two feet, and provide a summit-level lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal, together with such appurtenant structures, works, and facilities, and enlargements or improvements of existing channels, structures, works, and facilities, as may be deemed necessary, at a total cost not to exceed \$850,000,000.

(b) The provisions of the second sentence and the second paragraph of the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), shall apply with respect to the work authorized by subsection (a) of this section. As used in such Act, the terms "Governor of the Panama Canal", "Secretary of War", and "Panama Railroad Company" shall be held and considered to refer to the "Governor of the Canal Zone", "Secretary of the Army", and "Panama Canal Company", respectively, for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a board, to be known as the "Panama Canal Advisory and Inspection Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

(b) The Board shall be composed of five members who are citizens of the United States of America. Members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows:

(1) one member from private life, experienced and skilled in private business (including engineering);

(2) two members from private life, experienced and skilled in the science of engineering;

(3) one member who is a commissioned officer of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army (retired); and

(4) one member who is a commissioned officer of the line, United States Navy (retired).

(c) The President shall designate as Chairman of the Board one of the members experienced and skilled in the science of engineering.

(d) The President shall fill each vacancy on the Board in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) The Board shall cease to exist on that date designated by the President as the date on which its work under this Act is completed.

(f) The Chairman of the Board shall be paid basic pay at the rate provided for level II of the Executive Schedule in section 5313 of title 5, United States Code. The other members of the Board appointed from private life shall be paid basic pay at a per annum rate which is \$500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman. The members of the Board who are retired officers of the United States Army and the United States Navy each shall be paid at a rate of basic pay which, when added to his pay and allowances as a retired officer, will establish his total rate of pay from the United States at a per annum rate which is \$500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman.

(g) The Board shall appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, a Secretary and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities and shall fix their rates of basic pay in accordance with chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The Secretary and other personnel of the Board shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

SEC. 4. (a) The Board is authorized and directed to study and review all plans and designs for the Third Locks project referred to in section 2(a) of this Act, to make on-the-site studies and inspections of the Third Locks project, and to obtain current information on all phases of planning and construction with respect to such project. The

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Governor of the Canal Zone shall furnish and make available to the Board at all times current information with respect to such plans, designs, and construction. No construction work shall be commenced at any stage of the Third Locks project unless the plans and designs for such work, and all changes and modifications of such plans and designs, have been submitted by the Governor of the Canal Zone to, and have had the prior approval of, the Board. The Board shall report promptly to the Governor of the Canal Zone the results of its studies and reviews of all plans and designs, including changes and modifications thereof, which have been submitted to the Board by the Governor of the Canal Zone, together with its approval or disapproval thereof, or its recommendations for changes or modifications thereof, and its reasons therefor.

(b) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report covering its activities and functions under this Act and the progress of the work on the Third Locks project and may submit, in its discretion, interim reports to the President and to the Congress with respect to these matters.

Sec. 5. For the purpose of conducting all studies, reviews, inquiries, and investigations deemed necessary by the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Board is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other personnel, of the Board, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpœna witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Board may deem relevant or material to the performance of the functions and activities of the Board. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

Sec. 6. In carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants or organizations thereof in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not in excess of \$200 per diem.

Sec. 7. Upon request of the Board, the head of any department, agency or establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, for such period or periods as may be agreed upon by the Board and the head of the department, agency, or establishment concerned, any of the personnel of such department, agency, or establishment to assist the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act.

Sec. 8. The Board may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

Sec. 9. The Administrator of General Services shall provide, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services for the Board as the Board may request.

Sec. 10. The Board may make expenditures for travel and subsistence expenses of members and personnel of the Board in accordance with chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, for rent of quarters at the seat of government and in the Canal Zone, and for such printing and binding as the Board deems necessary to carry out effectively its functions and activities under this Act.

Sec. 11. All expenses of the Board shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Board or by such other

member or employee of the Board as the Chairman may designate.

Sec. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities under this Act.

THE PERSECUTION OF INTELLECTUALS IN THE UKRAINE

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the most steadfastly patriotic organizations in the State of North Dakota is the Ukrainian Congress Committee, headed by its very capable and effective president, Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, of Steele, N. Dak. This organization, like many groups of foreign origin, is fiercely loyal to the United States; at the same time, its members continue to battle for freedom and justice for their countrymen still in the Ukraine.

A series of mass rallies were held April 28, 1968, in North Dakota and around the country, protesting the persecution of intellectuals in the Ukraine. One such terrible instance occurred when a 15-year-old boy was sentenced to 20 years in prison merely because he was the son of a general.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a letter I have received from Dr. Zukowsky, an editorial published in the New York Times, an article, and resolutions adopted by the North Dakota Ukrainians. These all call attention to the protests and efforts of these people to correct a terrible wrong.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC., STATE BRANCH
OF NORTH DAKOTA,

Fargo, N. Dak., May 10, 1968.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
U.S. Senator, U.S. Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: This is to advise you that on April 28, 1968 mass rallies were held throughout the United States including North Dakota protesting the persecution of intellectuals in Ukraine. For more than a year now the unconfirmed news of attack upon Ukrainian intellectuals has been filtering out of Ukraine.

A manuscript entitled "Portraits of Twenty Criminals" written by a 30-yr. old Vyacheslav M. Chormovil, a Ukrainian TV Journalist who attended the trials in his official capacity and witnessed the flagrant violation of human rights by the Soviet courts and secret police has been smuggled out of Ukraine.

Over 200 Ukrainian professors, poets, writers, scientists, and literary critics were arrested on charges of anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation. These intellectuals were tried behind closed doors under Article 62 of the criminal code of the Ukrainian SSR in open defiance of the Judicial and Constitutional system. These Ukrainian intellectuals did not commit a crime since they were defending their culture and language against forced Russification imposed upon the Ukrainian people.

June 3, 1968

Those arrested are kept in slave prison camps in Mardovian Republic under conditions which defy human imagination. This real "Pogrom" of the Ukrainian intellectuals in scope and intensity surpassed the trials publicized by the Kremlin of Sinyawsky and Daniel.

Recently the International press has been providing a vast amount of documentation on the suppression of Ukrainian culture. Several factual and penetrating articles by Peter Worthington published in the Toronto Telegram; articles in the New York Leader of N.Y.; London Times in Feb. 7, 1968; New York Times and others devoted extensive coverage on the subject. There were articles that featured extensive coverage on penetrating Ukrainian injustices and suppression of freedom in manuscripts from France, Germany, and Italy. In the United States the articles on the subject appeared in the Register of Santa Ana of California; the Star Ledger of New Jersey; and in the Minot Daily News in North Dakota.

We give you this information so that it may be brought to the attention of the United States Congress on the persecution that now exists in the Ukraine.

Enclosed you will find additional informative material and Resolutions adopted at mass rallies.

We wish to point out that this material contains the names of arrested intellectuals namely, Catherine Zarytska, Odarka Husak, and Halyna Didyk, all of whom were Ukrainian Red Cross workers. They were sentenced to twenty years at hard labor.

Yury Shukhevych at the age of 15 years was sentenced to twenty years just because he was the son of a General.

Therefore, on behalf of all Americans of Ukrainian descent I urgently request that you use your position and influence on the judicial measures and the International Control through the United Nations Human Rights Division for the protection of political, civil, economic, social, and cultural rights of the Ukrainian people.

Thank you in advance, I remain
Respectfully,

DR. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1968]
FERMENT IN UKRAINE

The infamous judicial frame-ups of dissident literary intellectuals in Moscow in recent years are apparently only part of a broader revival of Soviet secret police activity and ruthlessness.

That is the clear meaning of the recent revelations about the persecution of independent-minded Ukrainian intellectuals who have learned the hard way that today's KGB has forgotten none of the tricks of Stalin's old NKVD. And the Ukrainian heretics have also had to learn at high cost that slave-labor camps like those in which Solzhenitsyn's Ivan Denisovich underwent his ordeal belong to contemporary Soviet life, not merely to history.

But an important element distinguishes the Ukrainian terror campaign from that in Moscow. The secret police is hounding the Ukrainian intellectuals because of their nationalism, a sentiment which has been reborn in a generation conceived and raised under Soviet rule. A Ukrainian does not have to be very perceptive to grasp the fact that the vaunted equality of peoples in the Soviet Union is a sham.

In great Ukrainian cities like Kiev, Khar'kov and Odessa, Ukrainian language and culture occupy the role of poor relations to the Russian language and culture. Moscow obviously fears that sensitivity to such affronts may make some Ukrainians reflect that if Ukraine were independent its rich natural resources, highly developed modern industry and educated population would put it on a par with nations like France and West Germany.

Outside the Communist bloc Moscow's propaganda seeks to inflame nationalism as a force against the West, cheering on Arabs against Israel, Angolans against Portugal, and Hong Kong Chinese against the British. Can there be any surprise then that intelligent non-Russians in the Soviet Union see the aptness of this anti-colonial propaganda to their own situation, problems and aspirations?

DESTRUCTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN UKRAINE

For the past three years the Soviet government has been conducting an unpublicized but nonetheless ruthless campaign of arrests, trials and convictions of Ukrainian writers, poets, journalists, professors, students and other men and women of intellect.

Unlike the trial of Sinyavsky and Daniel and the recent trial of Ginzberg and Dobrovolsky in Moscow, the arrests and trials in Ukraine have never been publicly acknowledged by the Soviet government. Literally, not a word has appeared in the Soviet press about the arrests, trials and convictions and, in many cases, the relatives of the victims have not been notified officially.

And yet the extent and depth of the repression of Ukrainian intellectuals by Moscow has amounted to a veritable pogrom. Beginning in August, 1965, hundreds of Ukrainian intellectuals have been arrested in such Ukrainian cities as Kiev, Lviv, Odessa, Ivano-Frankivsk (Stanyslaviv), Lutsk, Zhytomyr and Ternopil; a series of secret trials have subsequently been held at which Ukrainian intellectuals have received long sentences at hard labor. At these trials, all the basic processes of law have been violated or ignored by the Soviet courts and the KGB (the Soviet secret police), which body frequently has acted as accuser, prosecutor and judge. Most of those arrested are young men and women, almost all of them reared under the Soviet system, and possessing no connections with the Ukrainians outside Ukraine.

All of them have been charged with "anti-Soviet" nationalist writings, "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda," and the like. In many cases, too, these Ukrainian intellectuals have been accused of glorifying the Ukrainian past, reading prerevolutionary books by Ukrainian authors banned in Ukraine, and copying and disseminating secretly speeches of Western leaders, as for example, an encyclical of Pope John XXIII and the address of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower which he delivered at the unveiling of the Taras Shevchenko monument on June 27, 1964, in Washington, D.C.

None of these arrested have either been saboteurs or anti-government "wreckers." As Edward Crankshaw, the noted British Sovietologist, puts it, they discussed among themselves and among their friends, ways and means of *legally* resisting the forcible Russification of Ukraine and the continued destruction of its culture. Some of them protested against the unbridled persecution of the national minorities, notably the Jews; they accused the Soviet government of inhuman deportations of the Baltic people and the "liquidation" of such ethnic groups as the Crimean Tatars, Volga Germans, Chechen-Ingush and Karachais. They assailed the systematic influx of Russians into the Ukrainian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, Byelorussian and other non-Russian cities, where they occupy well-paying and preferred positions at the expense of the native non-Russian inhabitants.

The Ukrainian press in the free world has been replete with information regarding the persecution of the Ukrainian intellectuals, and in 1966 the international press broke its silence by reporting the arrest and trial of two Ukrainian poets, Ivan Svitlychny and Ivan Dzyuba.

By the beginning of 1968 the international press was providing a vast amount of documentation on the suppression of Ukrainian culture in Ukraine by Moscow.

Now, a *White Book* on the trials and convictions of Ukrainian intellectuals has been smuggled out of Ukraine and published in Ukrainian by the Ukrainian publication *Ukrainske Slovo* (Ukrainian World) in Paris. The book provides irrefutable proof of the veritable *pogrom* of Ukrainian intellectual life in Ukraine conducted by Moscow. Entitled, *Portraits of 20 'Criminals'*, it was written by 30-year-old Vyacheslav M. Chornovil, a Ukrainian TV journalist and himself a member of the Comsomol organization. In his official capacity he attended the trials of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists" in Odessa, Lviv and Kiev and witnessed the flagrant violations of human rights on the part of the Soviet courts and secret police. He gathered material, made transcripts of secret trials, and collected depositions and petitions from prisoners whom he considered innocent. He then wrote official protests, demanding rectification of the injustice in Ukraine. For his pains, he was arrested and tried in Lviv, and condemned to 3 years at hard labor on November 15, 1967.

On the basis of Chornovil's manuscript, a series of articles have appeared in the world press. Several factual and penetrating articles by Peter Worthington have been published by *The Toronto Telegram*. *The New Leader* of New York in its issue of January 15, 1968 published the petition of *Svyatoslav Y. Karavansky*, which was sent to the Council of Nationalities of the USSR. On February 7, 1968, *The Times* of London carried a long article on Chornovil's revelations. *The New York Times* devoted extensive coverage to the subject on February 8 and 9, 1968, including an editorial on February 10, 1968. On February 11, 1968, *The Observer* of London featured an extensive and penetrating analysis of the Ukrainian cases by Edward Crankshaw. Also in London appeared an article by Gabriel Lorince in the February 23, 1968 issue of *New Statesman*. Penetrating articles and commentaries on the plight of the Ukrainian intellectuals appeared in *Die Welt* of Hamburg, *Die Sued-Deutsche Zeitung* of Munich, *Le Monde* of Paris and *L'Osservatore Romano* of Rome.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, working closely with the Secretariat of the World Congress of Free Ukrainians, has designated April 28, 1968 as a *day of protest* against the inhuman and brutal violation of human rights in Ukraine committed by Communist Russia. Mass rallies, manifestations, public meetings and gatherings will be held in all major American cities, as well as in other countries with Ukrainian populations.

Special petitions and memoranda are being prepared for submission to the International Conference on Human Rights (which will be held from April 22 to May 13, 1968 in Teheran, Iran, to the U.N. Human Rights Commission, as well as to the U.S. Government and other governments of the free world.

U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Arthur J. Goldberg, in a debate in the U.N. Human Rights Commission on March 8, 1968, assailed the Soviet Union for its violations of Art. 19 of the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which says:

"Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinion without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers."

Ironically enough, the Soviet constitution speaks eloquently on the same subject:

"In conformity with the interests of workers and for the purpose of strengthening the Socialist system of the USSR, the law guarantees: a) Freedom of speech; b) Freedom of the press; c) Freedom of assembly and meetings; d) Freedom of processions and demonstrations on the street."

Yet Art. 62 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, under which Ukrainian intellectuals are being tried and convicted, inescapably contradicts both the U.N. Universal

Declaration of Human Rights and the Soviet constitution: it provides punishment for "agitation or propaganda for the purpose of undermining the Soviet rule . . ."

Communist Russia's violation of human rights in Ukraine constitutes also a crass negation of the sovereignty Ukraine's "enjoys" in terms of the Soviet and Ukrainian constitutions. Art. 14 of the Soviet constitution and Art. 17 of the Ukrainian SSR constitution provide the Ukrainian SSR with the right to secede from the USSR and to conduct its own life independently.

This right, like the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is treated by the Russian Communist leaders as a mere scrap of paper.

The overwhelming abundance of evidence demonstrating Communist Russia's violation of human rights in Ukraine and the vehement denial to the Ukrainian people of the right of self-determination prove that Ukraine is still a captive nation, ruled more harshly than ever by colonialist Russia, perpetrator of genocide and violator of human rights on a subhuman scale.

RESOLUTIONS

Adopted April 28, 1968, North Dakota.

(1) This year, in which the entire world is observing the 20th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which has been proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly as "International Human Rights Year," and which is to be devoted to the realization of decisions and enactments regarding human rights—we raise our voices in the defense of those fundamental human rights of Ukrainians which have been trampled upon by the Soviet Russian regime, as well as in the defense of the Ukrainian nation, enslaved by Soviet Russia and subjected by it to a process of systematic destruction.

(2) The so-called Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, in theory an independent state with a separate government, is in reality a mere colony of Russia which rules Ukraine with an iron hand, without a genuine consent of the governed. Ukraine is rigidly subordinated to the central government in Moscow; all Ukrainian ministries are controlled by the Moscow Government. The bulk of the industrial and agricultural production of Ukraine is destined to other parts of the Soviet Union or for export, to compete with the United States and the free world; Ukraine receives little in return.

(3) Despite provisions in both the Soviet and Ukrainian Constitutions for a "free exercise of religion," Communist Russian persecution of all churches in Ukraine is unmatched in ruthlessness in the history of mankind. In 1930 Moscow destroyed the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church by executing over 30 archbishops and bishops and imprisoning over 20,000 priests and monks. In 1945-46 the Moscow government destroyed the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine by imprisoning its 11 bishops and over 2,000 priests, monks and nuns. Furthermore, Moscow persistently harasses and persecutes other religious groups in Ukraine: Jews, Baptists, Lutherans, Seventh Day Adventists and Moslems. It deprives over one million Ukrainian Jews of their traditional religion by closing synagogues and terrorizing worshippers.

(4) The Communist Russian regime is guilty of outright genocide in Ukraine. In the periodic man-made famines which ravaged Ukraine in 1922, 1932-33 and 1946-47 no fewer than 7,000,000 Ukrainians perished from starvation. The 1932-33 famine was organized and sustained by the Kremlin as a means to force Ukrainian farmers into collective farms. By systematic deportations as punishment for "crimes" several million Ukrainians have perished in the wilderness of Siberia.

(5) The Soviet Russian government, following in the footsteps of its predecessors,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the Russian Czars, relentlessly pursues a policy of cultural russification aimed at the creation of a "soviet man" who in essence is a Russian. Thus, the Moscow government is progressively curtailing the use of the Ukrainian language. Most schools in Ukraine are russified, including the eight universities at which most subjects are taught in Russian. Moscow has established a network of Russian schools in Ukraine, while at the same time it denies the right to set up Ukrainian schools to some 8-9 million Ukrainians living in the Russian USSR.

(6) In the last few years some voices of protest against this state of affairs have begun to be heard in Ukraine, long before the arrest of a few Russian intellectuals such as Yull M. Daniel and Andrei Sinyavsky. These are the voices of writers, poets, journalists, professors, students and other intellectuals, all young people reared under the Soviet system and without any connections with Ukrainians in the western world. The Moscow government has reacted with its typical ruthlessness and is at this very time engaged in wholesale arrests and trials of these young Ukrainian intellectuals. They are being tried and given severe sentences for such crimes as "anti-Soviet nationalist writings," glorification of the Ukrainian past, distribution of books by pre-revolutionary Ukrainian authors now banned in Ukraine, and secret circulation of speeches of Western leaders. Since 1965 many intellectuals have been sentenced to long prison terms on such charges, among them: Vyacheslav Chorovil, a journalist; Mykhaylo Horyn, a literary critic; Ivan Kandyba, a writer; Lev Lukyanenko, a lawyer; Svyatoslav Karavansky, a poet and literary translator; Stepan Vyrun; Opanas Zalyvachka, an artist-painter, and about 200 others. One of the well-known prisoners is Yury Shukhevych, who was arrested in 1948 at the age of 15 and is spending his 20th year in the Soviet Russian jails. His crime: being the son of a prominent Ukrainian underground leader who was killed by the Soviets in 1950.

(7) In reality, these young intellectuals demanded and are demanding recognition and respect for the Ukrainian language and culture in Ukraine. As stated by Ivan Kandyba, one of the imprisoned, they have come to the conclusion that "for the normal development of the Ukrainian nation and its statehood, Ukraine should secede from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, according to Article 14 and Article 17 of the Constitutions of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, respectively, and should become an absolutely independent and sovereign state."

In this International Human Rights Year, we, the Ukrainians of North Dakota call the attention of enlightened public opinion to the cruel persecution of these Ukrainian intellectuals for demanding for Ukraine the very human rights proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Despite all declarations, human rights have meaning only if they are available equally to every man regardless of his nationality or citizenship.

We express our solidarity with the stand of the brave Ukrainian intellectuals in defense of human rights in Ukraine, and call on all fellow Minnesotans and fellow Americans who believe in human rights to join us in this solidarity.

In addition, we strongly urge the United Nations International Human Rights Conference to institute an immediate investigation of the violation of human rights by the Soviet government in Ukraine. We also appeal to the United Nations to prevail upon the Soviet Union, as a signatory to the United Nations Human Rights Declaration, to adhere to its principles and rectify the gross injustice committed against the Ukrainian

people in violation of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

TAINTED MEAT—TAIN'T NECESSARILY SO

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the National Observer in its May 20 issue contains a lengthy article which indicates that the U.S. Department of Agriculture conducted a biased survey and prepared doctored reports in order to press Congress into passing the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967.

This article by writer Joe Western was included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD May 28 at the request of Representative CATHERINE MAY, of Washington.

An editorial in the same issue of the Observer points out that the same fraudulent tactics could be used at any time by the Agriculture Department or any other of the powerful bureaucracies within the U.S. Government.

The unethical manipulation of the truth used by the Agriculture Department in this case can only destroy the public trust in the Government. I commend the Observer editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

A HOAX OVER MEAT

There is more involved than an indiscreet Government memo; there is more involved even, than the problem of adequate meat inspection. What is involved is no less than the proper functioning of the democratic process.

It is now painfully clear, from reporter Joe Western's story beginning on Page One of this newspaper, that the U. S. Department of Agriculture conducted biased, quickie "survey" and prepared doctored reports in a high-pressure effort to push a new meat inspection law through Congress. If this were not appalling enough, officials now try to justify what they did by saying they already knew that conditions in non-Federally inspected meat plants were poor, and that they were simply complying with congressional requests for fresh "evidence."

In other words, they already knew what was good for the public; the Agriculture Department needed no new studies nor current evidence, but would supply vivid facsimiles of both if that was what Congress wanted. After all, the good end would justify the fraudulent means. Surely none would speak of a hoax.

Yet there is no other word for it. Further, the same thing can happen again, in the Agriculture Department or in any of the other, and powerful, bureaucracies that have been set up to serve, not deceive, the public.

In a democracy, the public should be able to trust its elected and appointed government officials—trust them to tell the truth, and trust them to enact and enforce the laws without bias. If these officials choose to divorce themselves from the public to lie to the public they deceive themselves as well by pretending they serve the public interest. They do no such thing.

It is now up to Congress, through its appropriate committees, to open a formal investigation into "Special Project Quick, Quiet, and Confidential"—to keep the Federal bureaucracies honest, and to show the people that their lawmakers do not like being taken in by hoaxes.

June 3, 1968

NATIONAL MARITIME POLICY

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, while visiting Newport News, Va., recently, it was my pleasure to meet a young man named Dennis Lee Napier, a student at Warwick High School, who won first place in an essay contest sponsored by the Propeller Club of Newport News and who was among the national winners in a competition of the Propeller Club of the United States. It is noteworthy that this is the 13th time a student from Newport News has been a national winner of the contest.

His paper, entitled "The American Merchant Marine—Key to Defense and Trade," cogently expresses the need for a revitalization of our merchant marine. I ask unanimous consent that the essay be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—KEY TO DEFENSE AND TRADE

For the United States of America, as for any industrial nation that relies on trade and commerce with foreign countries for its economic strength, the need for a strong and efficient merchant marine is of utmost importance. The United States has achieved a level of economic prominence never before reached in the history of the world. To insure the continued achievement of the United States, we must maintain a strong and efficient merchant marine, for both economic stability and for our national security and defense.

Rear Admiral Gordon McLintock recently stated, "A nation without a strong merchant marine is a one-legged athlete in today's race." The danger of relying on the shipping of foreign countries lies in the fact that we are then at the mercy of foreign competitors who could boost freight charges and drive American manufacturers out of foreign markets. For any industrial nation, this is living very dangerously.¹

The American merchant marine is a vital part of our national defense. Often referred to as the "fourth arm of defense," the merchant marine is also "capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war."² In wars against France from 1798 to 1800, against the Barbary pirates from 1783 to 1805, and against Britain in 1777 and again from 1812 to 1815, the American merchant marine proved it was a vital part of our national defense.

Many present merchant marine sailors are veterans of World War II. During the war the merchant marine again proved it was a vital part of our national defense by serving as a fighting unit. Merchant sailors fought with guns between 1941 and 1945, and 5,600 of them gave their lives in devotion to the United States.

At the present time the American merchant marine is supplying our fighting forces in Vietnam, again proving the vital part the merchant marine plays in our defense.

Unfortunately, the present condition of the American merchant marine is not as

¹ Morril, George P., "The United States Merchant Marine," *Holiday*, 23: 64-68, September 1963.

² Hicks, John D., *The American Nation*, p. 589.

strong and efficient as it should be. "The United States should have shipping adequate to maintain its normal flow of water-borne commerce at all times"—yet, in the year of 1967, United States flag ships carried only 7.9 per cent of the total United States commercial sea trade.⁴ For any industrial nation, this is living dangerously.

"The merchant marine should be composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels"—yet, 72 per cent of the existing merchant fleet is "composed of obsolescent, inefficient, and uneconomical ships."⁵ These ships are obsolescent in the fact that they are over twenty years old—the accepted retirement time for any vessel.

In total number of ships, the United States is ranked second to Great Britain, with 3,416 ships with 21,527,349 tons. Of this total, some 9,500,000 tons of shipping are in the reserve fleet of inactive vessels. This places the United States fourth, behind Britain, Liberia, and Norway, on the list of active merchant fleets.⁶

The United States ranks even worse in building new vessels. In 1966, the United States was ranked fourteenth with only 45 vessels under construction or on order.⁷

How could this happen to the American merchant marine—the pride of the oceans only twenty years ago?

We are in this situation because our ship-lines cannot compete with low wage crews on foreign ships, and our shipyards cannot produce ships as cheaply as foreign shipyards. With the prosperity that we enjoy in America, we must accept the fact that American merchant sailors and shipyard workers will expect more pay than foreign crews. The average crew on an American merchant ship receives more than three times as much pay as a foreign crew.⁸

Japan can build a ship for one-half the cost in the United States—but they pay their workers only one-third of what American workers receive. This means that American shipyards are almost twenty percent more efficient in building ships, and are not "stagnated, obsolete, and lacking in initiative."⁹

H. Lee White, a member of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee, said, "shipbuilding and shipping should be recognized for what they are—two separate industries."¹⁰ For this reason, many politicians advocate building ships abroad. Can we sacrifice one industry for the other? Operating shipyards in the United States are just as important as an active merchant marine. No, we cannot sacrifice either industry, and we must enforce the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 concerning this matter.

How can we build a strong merchant marine? First, we must continue Government subsidies to American shiplines to keep them operating. At present, fourteen American shipping lines hold contracts with the Government for financial help in operating ves-

³ Hicks, John D., *The American Nation*, p. 589.

⁴ *The Americana 1967 Annual*, p. 603.

⁵ Hicks, *op. cit.*, p. 589.

⁶ Remarks of the Honorable Edward A. Garmatz, Chairman, House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, before the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of Newport News, Virginia, at Maritime Day Celebration May 24, 1967, page 5.

⁷ *The World Book Encyclopedia, Year Book 1966*, p. 545.

⁸ "U.S. Shipbuilding: Mighty No More," *U.S. News and World Report*, 60:87, June 27, 1966.

⁹ House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, "Hearings in Labor-Management Problems of the American merchant marine," pp. 946-50.

¹⁰ Velle, Lester, "Let's Take Our Ships Out of the Bottle," *The Reader's Digest*, 90: 132-36, February, 1967.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sels on the essential world trade routes. In 1967, the Budget Bureau allocated \$85 million to the Maritime Administration for subsidies to ship builders.

Another hope for the American merchant marine is the container cargo concept. The present cost of loading and unloading a vessel constitutes more than half the total cost of transport. Container cargoes save time in ports, allow more time at sea, prevent damage, and cost less, and the container ships can operate without Government subsidies.

Another hope for the future is the use of atomic power in ships. Edward A. Garmatz proclaimed, "The new container ships now being produced, if combined with nuclear power plants, are the answer to restoring the merchant marine."¹²

The United States must have a strong merchant marine—it is our duty to see that she has one.

MARYLAND MEDIC AND SAILOR KILLED IN ACTION

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. William E. Cassidy and PO2 Ronald Wayne Durbin, two fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their bravery and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

MEDIC AND SAILOR KILLED IN ACTION—BALTIMORE AND CUMBERLAND MEN ON VIETNAM LIST

An Army medic from Baltimore and a Cumberland sailor who had been commanding a river assault craft have been killed in recent fighting in South Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

The Baltimore casualty was identified as Pfc. William E. Cassidy, 21, son of Francis E. Cassidy, of the 500 block Walker avenue, and Mrs. Madlyn Mullens Cassidy, of the 5800 block Halwyn avenue.

Private Cassidy was one of 28 soldiers killed May 24 during a Vietcong mortar attack near A Shau Valley.

HOME IN CUMBERLAND

The second casualty was identified as PO2 Ronald Wayne Durbin, 21, son of Walter Durbin, of the 100 block West Elder street, Cumberland, and Mrs. Mary B. Durbin, of the 300 block Decatur street, Cumberland.

Petty Officer Durbin died May 16 when his assault craft was hit by rocket, recoilless rifle and automatic-weapons fire.

A boatswain's mate, the dead sailor had been commanding the assault craft in Gieng Trom district of Kien Hoa province, in the delta regions of Southern South Vietnam.

According to his mother, Private Cassidy enlisted in the Army last October. She said he wanted to complete his military service, return to college and then enter the construction business.

ST. MARY'S SCHOOL AND POLY

A native of Baltimore, the youth attended St. Mary's School and was graduated from Poly in 1964.

He then attended the University of Maryland for three years, leaving last June to go to work for an uncle in the construction business.

Mrs. Cassidy, who said her son "was always busy," said he began working as a newspaper delivery boy when he was 9.

Later, he worked part time for his uncle and ran a grocery store in the 5800 block

¹² Garmatz, Edward A., *op. cit.*, p. 9.

York road when the owner went on vacation or went out of town.

ENLISTED IN OCTOBER

Private Cassidy enlisted in the Army on October 11 and, after training in Texas and Louisiana, left for Vietnam in April.

Mrs. Cassidy said she received a letter from her son last Friday, the day he was reported killed.

"He told me things were bad and that he didn't see how 'any of us will ever get out alive.' He wanted me to send him a cold drink," she said.

Besides his parents, he is survived by a brother, John L. Cassidy, and his maternal grandparents, Mrs. Merrell Mullens, of Baltimore, and Ezra E. Mullens, of Brownsville, Texas.

HIGH SCHOOL, NAVY RESERVE

Petty Officer Durbin, a native of Cumberland, was graduated in 1965 from Fort Hill High School in Cumberland.

While in high school he served in the Navy Reserve. He went on active duty shortly after graduation.

After serving aboard the U.S.S. Gainard, a destroyer based in Newport, R.I., he re-enlisted in April 1967, and volunteered for river assault duty in South Vietnam.

Surviving besides his parents, are his stepmother, Mrs. Delores Durbin, and a sister, Miss Beverly Ann Durbin, both of Cumberland, and two stepsisters, Mrs. Carol Lashbrook and Mrs. Doris Wirtley, both of Cape Kennedy, Fla.

THE MULE IS BEING EXPLOITED

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, many of us in Congress have had some experience in working on farms, at least in our youth, and I am happy that I was one who had this opportunity. Mr. Pope Haley of the editorial staff of the Florida Times Union has written an excellent editorial which I think everyone should read in connection with a modern exploitation of the mule under the circumstances which we are experiencing today. The editorial, which is a classic, reads as follows:

THE MULE IS BEING EXPLOITED

For the incurable optimist who is able to find good in anything, there is some encouragement in the fact that in the current social turmoil, a minor bit-player in the drama is returning, if only briefly, to the spotlight.

The mule, foremost symbol in American folklore of the stubborn beast of burden who pretends to be much more stupid than he really is, and who will perform a prodigious amount of work if allowed to do it in his own way, is back in the news in words and pictures to a degree unequaled since the onset of mechanization on the farm and in the armed forces.

Already well on its way to join the dodo bird and the auk in the oblivion of creatures which once were but are no more, the mule is seizing the moment of social and political turmoil to be seen by millions of city-bred people old and young who never before saw one in the flesh and who wouldn't know "Gee!" from "Haw!"

Half a century ago, there were about six-million mules in the United States, most of them pulling plows and wagons on the nation's farms, but with the arrival of the gasoline tractor and electric power lines, their number plummeted. More than a decade ago, the total on farms became so inconsequential

that the Agriculture Department quit counting them. The best guess now is that there are fewer than half a million left in the entire country.

But there is much to be learned from the nature and character of this much maligned creature, and the individual who has never attempted to bend the mule's steadfast independence to his own will has missed one of life's greatest character-building experiences.

The mule is a freak of nature, the hybrid offspring of a jackass and a mare, which has been valued as a work animal for more than 3,000 years. It is predictable only in its stubbornness and its determination to follow its own designs if it senses weakness of will in its master.

There is much truth in the old story of the farmer who, in teaching his young son the art of mule management, took a two-by-four and hit the beast soundly on the head, explaining that it was necessary "to get his attention."

But there is basic error in the current effort to exploit the mule as a "poverty symbol." It is nothing of the sort.

It is a dumb, four-legged, thick-skulled caricature of those characteristics of independence, initiative and determination which every American once honored. It is a 1,600-pound bundle of concentrated power and tenacity that pulled the settlers' wagon trains westward, that cleared the forests and pulled the stumps, that pulled the plow that broke the plains, that powered the canal boat, that helped thrust the rail lines across the continent and build the highways, and that took time out from its Paul Bunyan labors to go to war when the nation's liberty was threatened to pull the artillery and haul the ammunition.

The mule was the active partner of the pioneers who dreamed of a better world and a better life, and went to work to create it by muscle and sweat. It is completely out of place being ridden to Washington in a demonstration for a guaranteed living.

BUM RAP

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as a member of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee I have had many occasions to engage in some interesting and stimulating dialog with the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Orville Freeman. While I have taken him to task at times, I rise now to express my agreement with an editorial from today's issue of the Chicago Tribune. The editorial points out that Secretary Freeman is the victim of a "bum rap" from the so-called Poor People's Campaign officials and I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

BUM RAP

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman thinks he is getting a bum rap from the so-called poor people's campaign in Washington, and he is right. The Department of Agriculture is one of the government agencies the campaign leaders have singled out as warranting particular pressure to achieve their demands.

Groups under the Rev. Ralph Abernathy have called on Freeman demanding that he do something about what they call the problem of food surpluses on the one hand and starvation on the other. The secretary has promised the government will move as soon

as possible between now and July to get food distribution programs started in 331 poor counties now without them. The main reason the programs have not been operating in these counties is that local officials have been resisting them.

Altogether, upward of 30 million persons, more than two-thirds of them school children, are receiving some free or subsidized food at a cost to the government of one billion dollars annually. The total includes 5.8 million persons who are getting food free thru donations or at bargain prices thru stamps. The agriculture department says these two programs soon will cover 6.1 million persons in 2,400 counties, nearly double the 1960 figure.

Freeman has been extraordinarily patient in pointing out to the campaign leaders that there are limits to which he can go in distributing food. These limits are imposed by Congress both in appropriations and in guidelines written into the law. Congress, not the Department of Agriculture, is the place to appeal for new programs.

Yet, the Rev. Jesse Jackson, one of the campaign leaders, has accused Freeman of being "incompetent and insensitive" for refusing to set up new programs that can be authorized only by Congress. To "dramatize" his point that Freeman should do more, the Rev. Mr. Jackson led about 150 persons thru the agriculture department's cafeteria line the other day and walked out on a \$292.66 bill for meals.

Altho the bill was paid on demand a day later, this action by the poor people was a prime example of biting the hand that feeds them. For it is the Department of Agriculture that is supplying three meals a day free of charge to the more than 2,000 inhabitants of Resurrection City, the poor people's campsite. The Rev. Mr. Jackson, until the other day manager of Resurrection City, should be the last to call anyone "insensitive."

CURBS ON DIRECT INVESTMENTS EVENTUALLY HARM BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the May 27, 1968, issue of the Journal of Commerce has an interesting article reporting on a study just completed by the Institute of Finance of the New York University's Graduate School of Business Administration.

The study states that as much as \$400 million a year in current-account earnings could be eliminated as the result of the Government curbs on direct private investment overseas. The loss in revenues is estimated at \$4 billion over the next 10 years.

The authors of the study fear that implementation of the investment curbs by the United States may lead to retaliation abroad and the decline of free trade as well as of free capital movements.

Many major U.S. corporations derive a substantial share of their sales and profits from international business—a share which could decline due to curtailed investment overseas.

This article is another in the continuing series of studies showing that the Government's direct controls on U.S. business operations abroad will ultimately be self-defeating.

The article follows:

INVESTMENT CURBS SEEN COSTLY TO UNITED STATES

The United States could lose as much as \$400 million a year in earnings from exports and other current-account entries on the plus side of its balance of payments as a result of curtailed investment overseas today, a study released here over the weekend says.

Warning that the U.S. may be paying a high price for balance of payments economies realized by control of capital investment abroad, the study says: "A program that either reduces direct investment or diminishes the profitability of overseas investment operations can be expected to result in an eventual slowing down in the growth of current-account receipts."

PRELIMINARY CALCULATIONS

"Our own preliminary calculations suggest that cumulative losses in the current-account sector could be substantial after eight or 10 years."

One favorable result could come if a greater proportion of U.S. direct investments go to the developing countries, the New York University study says. "U.S. direct investments have enjoyed a higher return in the form of exports and remitted earnings from less-developed areas than from Western Europe and Canada."

"Therefore, a shift of direct investment away from Western Europe and Canada toward Latin America, Asia and Africa should tend to increase current account earnings in subsequent years."

The study, prepared by the Institute of Finance of New York University's Graduate School of Business Administration is entitled "Foreign Investment, Capital Controls and the Balance of Payments." Authors are Dr. Nicholas K. Bruck of the Inter-American Development Bank and Prof. Francis A. Lees of St. John's University.

The authors conclude that, although they are unable to measure in advance, over a 10-year period the annual loss in current account earnings is likely to average about \$400 million as a result of curtailed investment overseas today.

OFFSETTING DRAIN

Even today, they note, there is an offsetting drain as capital controls on direct investment have caused a shift toward greater overseas financing of direct-investment operations.

"The higher the level of interest rates overseas, the smaller the cash flow available for remittance to the U.S. These effects on cash flow are cumulative in nature."

Most important, say Dr. Bruck and Prof. Lees, is the fear that the short-term success of the program may invite retaliation and the decline of free trade as well as of free capital movements.

While controls on direct capital investment abroad have been effective—reducing the current balance of payments gap by about \$800 million to \$1 billion—the study holds that "the possible long-run negative effects in the current-accounts sector of the U.S. balance of payments should not be ignored."

The authors have compiled data showing that major industrial corporations in the U.S. derive a "substantial share" of their sales and profits from international business—a share which may decline ultimately due to reduced investment abroad.

They note that one-sixth of the 500 largest firms (as listed by Fortune magazine) conduct at least 25 per cent of operations overseas and more than two-fifths of the 500 firms conduct at least 10 per cent overseas.

30 PAGES OF TABLES

The study includes some 30 pages of tables on the foreign content of U.S. business operations by company and by industry.

For example, 69 per cent of Burroughs earnings originated in foreign operations and the over-all office equipment and computers industry has a foreign content of 21 per cent.

The nation's industrial sector in general has an over-all foreign involvement of about 11 per cent.

One-fourth of all U.S. manufacturing plant and equipment expenditures are made by over-seas affiliates and half of this total (about \$3 billion a year recently) is financed by capital outflows from the U.S., the rest internally by the overseas unit.

"Given this significant dependence of large U.S. corporations on overseas business and given the fact that direct investments account for a major part of U.S. overseas business, the impact of direct-investment operations on the balance of payments is important," Dr. Bruck and Prof. Lees state.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE TO MEET THE NEEDS OF "HUNGRY" PEOPLE?

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, so many Members have inquired of me as to the status of legislation dealing with the distribution of food and aid to "hungry people" that I have felt that it might be of interest to many of my colleagues if I would insert a copy of a letter which I recently wrote to one of the Members of this House in which I reviewed this subject.

The letter is as follows:

MAY 28, 1968.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Let me thank you for yours of the twenty-fourth, which was not delivered to me until this morning. In it you refer to the CBS report entitled "Hunger in America" and ask my advice "as to the accuracy of the report and the steps being taken to correct these distressing conditions." You did not mention it, but this TV report was but a follow-up of a written report issued some time earlier under the auspices of the United Auto Workers and entitled "Hunger U.S.A.". Both of these reports are, in my judgment, quite inaccurate and misleading.

As I see it, the basic premise in each case is political, not factual. It has always been good "politics" to talk of "feeding the needy". I believe in feeding the needy. I believe in helping all of those who need help. I believe in providing work for those who want to work, but I don't believe in feeding those who could but won't work. Most of the difference of opinion about "feeding the hungry" seems to actually revolve around the question as to who are unavoidably hungry.

That there is some hunger might be admitted for the sake of argument. That there is rather extensive malnutrition seems to be well established, but that the malnutrition exists because of inability to secure a better balanced diet does not seem to be established, and there seems to be little evidence that any substantial hunger in this country is the result of the refusal of assistance agencies, public and private, to give needed aid to those who are unable to work.

Last fall there was a great deal of talk about establishment of a third Federal food distribution system to care for what was vaguely described as some kind of "need" in the State of Mississippi. The Agriculture Committee took evidence on this question. We heard testimony from the representatives of the Department of Agriculture who stated that they had all of the authority needed to feed hungry people anywhere in the United States and, secondly, they had all of the funds they needed to achieve this objective. (See pages 5 and 6 of Serial X, 90th Congress, Hearings before the Committee on Agriculture.) In view of this unchallenged testimony, our Committee felt that we should

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

not attempt the passage of any new legislation until new facts were presented. We have been seeking any facts which would indicate any real need for a third federally financed program of food assistance. We had not developed such evidence but before we could do more than start any comprehensive study another Committee of the House assumed jurisdiction of a similar bill and, so far as we have been able to ascertain, without any more evidence of need than we had, approved an additional food distribution system. This legislation is now known as Public Law 90-222.

About a month ago, an unofficial group sponsored by the United Auto Workers and calling themselves the "Citizens' Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States" published their report in which they stated that there were 256 counties in the United States where hunger was so severe as to create an emergency situation. As Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I have written to the Health Officer of every one of these counties. A little more than half of them have to date replied. Not one knows of any starvation and not one knows of any critical hunger that has been occasioned by inability of the victim to secure either work or relief in any one of these counties.

When questioned about the manner in which their investigation was conducted, the "Citizens' Board" admits that they made few, if any visits to any of these counties and, in most instances, they failed to even make direct contacts with anyone locally. They simply accepted some existing formulas here in Washington which they thought would indicate hunger. I don't believe this is a very factual or informative method of approaching a serious question of this kind.

Next came the CBS program, to which you made reference, entitled "Hunger in America." It seems to me that this program was deliberately calculated to avoid outright technical misstatements but was intended to convey misunderstandings to the listeners. For instance, it gave a good deal of attention to Bexar County, Texas (San Antonio). It showed a dying child but showed no connection between the death and a breakdown of our food programs, but it implied that there was such a connection. It blatantly suggested that if Bexar County had not spent so much public money on this HemisFair that the county would have money to feed these people. In the first place, Bexar County has the money to feed hungry people and does feed them. In the second place, the expenditure of the \$30 million for the HemisFair has created more good jobs in San Antonio than have ever before existed in that city.

Another example of the misleading implications of this CBS program centers around the statement of a mother of a number of children that she could not plant corn to feed her children because of the government farm program. Actually, an investigation by the Department of Agriculture shows that this mother lives with her husband who works in a nearby town and with her children in a house on the edge of a small town in Alabama with approximately two acres of land surrounding it. They pay \$5 per month rent for the place. She says she grows a garden. As far as the farm program is concerned, she can put the whole two acres in corn. There is no prohibition against the planting of corn in our present farm program, although it is true that the government does make payments to certain farmers for retiring acreage which has historically been planted in corn. This is not, however, compulsory, nor does it apply to this two acres as the CBS program indicated.

Since you wrote your letter Secretary Freeman has made a public statement regarding this TV program and pointed out a number of additional inaccuracies, but the Office of Economic Opportunity, the agency to which Public Law 90-222 assigned the new third

food program mentioned above, obviously felt that it must take some action to at least give the appearance of meeting the supposed needs of these people. That agency, therefore, urged various counties that were listed as suffering from emergency hunger conditions to accept special grants of funds to be used by the county to feed "hungry people". Apparently this agency made little or no investigation of its own as to the actual need in the county. So far it seems to just boil down to a case of giving out some money because that looks good.

I know that such a gift was made to one of the counties I represent. I have personally talked with the County Judge of the county involved. He tells me that no request was made for this money until the Federal representatives approached the county and suggested that they would be glad to make the gift if the county would but sign the application which they had prepared. It happens that because this county was in my district I had previously written every physician in the county and inquired as to the problems of starvation and hunger. Only one physician reported any knowledge of any starvation in his whole experience of practice in the county. In this case a number of years ago there were ten small children of feeble-minded parents who were discovered and cared for, but there was definitely no breakdown of public assistance. The OEO program is clearly a duplication of existing programs.

That you may know that the United States Government, the Department of Agriculture and the Agriculture Committee of the House have not been entirely unconcerned about these matters, I would like to point out that the information I received shows that about 36½ million people in the United States, or nearly one out of five, now share in some manner in one of these programs of food distribution. The recipients reside in every State.

During this current fiscal year the Department of Agriculture estimates that it will distribute over a billion pounds of food, worth just under a billion dollars (\$938,000,000 to be exact) to needy people.

School lunch programs maintained with the assistance of the Federal Government are available in schools having three-fourths of the national enrollment. An estimated 19.6 million children share in the benefits. The cost of a school lunch today averages 57.3 cents. The average maximum payment by the children in participating schools is 29.7 cents, with the difference made up by federal and local contributions. About 2,280,000 of these youngsters get meals free or at a price less than the subsidized rate, the amount of reduction varying with the different school systems. The more needy children pay nothing. The participant who gets meals free or at prices below the 29.7 cent figure are those whose parents or guardians have applied to local school authorities, certifying as to financial need. Under the program the Federal Government this year is supplying \$280 million of foods, plus \$160 million in cash contributions. The total Federal outlay for the school program therefore is close to half a billion dollars.

Approximately six million people are receiving assistance either through the Food Stamp Program or through direct distribution of foodstuffs. About 2,600,000 participate in the Food Stamp Programs and about 3,400,000 in the Direct Food Distribution Programs. Of the 309 counties in the United States nearly 2400 participate in either the Food Stamp or Direct Distribution Programs. A county chooses which program it wants. It may not participate in both.

Some of the areas in which the Food Stamp Program is available include Chicago (Cook County), Illinois, with a population of 3,400,000 and 100,000 participating; Los Angeles, California with a population of 2,800,000 and 100,000 participating; St. Louis, Missouri with a population of 862,000 and

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 3, 1968

23,500 participating; the State of Mississippi with a population of 2,300,000 has 180,000 participants in the program. The value of donated food is estimated at \$150 million with \$185 million Federal contributions to the Food Stamp Program, bringing the total Federal expenditures on these two programs to \$335 million.

The Department of Agriculture has submitted a request for an additional \$20,000,000 to be added to the presently authorized \$220,000,000. I introduced such a bill several months ago. The Senate has passed a similar bill. Our Committee has set hearings on these and all similar bills. I do not know what action the Committee will take but there has never been any disposition to refuse any funds which are shown to be needed for either the Food Stamp or any other Food Distribution program, and certainly there is no disposition to deny any group an opportunity to present its views and any facts it may have to support those views.

School breakfasts will be served to approximately 160,000 children this fiscal year. This aid will go to children in low income areas and to children who come long distances to school. The cost of the new program will be about \$3.5 million this year.

Food donations to charitable institutions and summer camps involve another 1,300,000 people—almost entirely children—at an estimated cost of \$23.1 million.

Finally, the School Milk Program is available to children in schools having 90 percent of the national school enrollment. No precise estimate as to the number of children sharing this program is possible for it is utilized by children at recess and at other periods of the day and many times a child will buy milk more than once a day, but it is estimated to reach at least 17 million school children. This program makes milk available to school children at an average cost of three to four cents per half pint. The cost of the program in fiscal year 1968 is put at \$104 million.

All of these expenditures are charged to the budget of the Department of Agriculture and form the basis of much undeserved criticism of "extravagant expenditures" on behalf of farmers when as a matter of fact it is clear that they are primarily a benefit of needy consumers.

I hope that this will give you some idea as to the magnitude of the work being done by the Department of Agriculture and the Agriculture Committee of the House in behalf of "hungry people".

Thanking you for your inquiry, and with best wishes, I am

Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE, Chairman.

TUNISIA'S NATIONAL DAY, JUNE 1

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, Tunisia celebrated its National Day. France recognized Tunisian independence on March 20, 1956, with the signing of a protocol which ended the French protectorate, and on July 25, 1957, the Tunisian Constituent Assembly voted to abolish the monarchy and to establish the Tunisian Republic. A constitution was drafted by the Assembly and promulgated on June 1, 1959.

Tunisia has not formally aligned itself with the West or the East, but believes that maintaining relations with both best serves Tunisian interests. Tunisia has been a firm friend of the United States and we were recently honored

with a state visit to Washington of President Bourguiba, who led his country's struggle for independence. During his visit to the United States, President Bourguiba addressed the United Nations General Assembly and outlined a proposed plan for settlement of the crisis in the Middle East. President Bourguiba is not only a great leader in his own country but he is recognized as a great and respected world leader and statesman.

It is a pleasure for me to extend best wishes and congratulations to the people of Tunisia, to her great President, and to her Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Rachid Driss, on the occasion of its National Day.

SOMETHING FOR NOTHING?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, just how this country can have a guaranteed annual income or a negative income tax or what-have-you in the line of something for nothing in massive amounts beats me. We are in debt and going more so each passing day. Dollars cannot hold their purchasing power if government is managed so that debt is permitted to increase.

Yet the concept of the guaranteed annual income involves paying people who do not produce. True, certain portions of the present welfare system do essentially this, but not on a guaranteed basis, and with the reservation that if a job is available it must be taken. Furthermore, money to pay those who do not earn must be taken from those who do work and earn and they should have a great deal to say about it.

In the interest of seeking to better understand what are the real objectives of the "Poor Peoples' Marchers" I urge the reading of an interesting and challenging editorial appearing in the Sun City-Youngstown News-Sun of May 29, 1968:

POOR PEOPLE'S MARCH

The only concrete goal, that we can see, of the Poor People's March on Washington, is legislation to provide a minimum annual income.

It is passing strange how the march leaders claim that any pressure they exert will be nonviolent—but in the same breath they disavow responsibility for any violence which may accompany their demonstrations.

We take this as a strongly implied warning that life, limb, and property of innocent citizens will be placed in jeopardy if the marchers are denied.

The poor people have acquired allies in Congress, representatives and senators who will submit minimum annual income legislation and attempt to see it through to a successful conclusion.

Some of these backers are sincere in their belief that this is important social legislation in the best interest of the nation from a humanitarian standpoint. Others look on it as a form of tribute—buying insurance, in the same manner which merchants "bought insurance" against bombing of their establishment from racketeers in the Prohibition Days, to prevent looting, arson, and physical violence during the long, hot summer ahead.

The program looks a lot better from the

short-range viewpoint than it does from a long-range standpoint.

We only need to look at the Arab refugee camps surrounding Israel to get a glimpse of the America of the future under a guaranteed annual income program. The Arabs stay right in their camps as wards of the United Nations Relief Administration. They get their periodical dole from the U.N. They don't work. And they grow substantially in number. They constitute a never-ending parasitic society.

Perhaps it's old-fashioned to hark back to the pioneer era of the United States. But Americans traditionally have credited the perseverance, gumption, and independence of their forefathers with carving out of the wilderness the nation which ultimately was to reach the pinnacle in world leadership.

We question whether the United States can continue as a strong nation if it smothers individual incentive, and we believe that will be the natural result of a guaranteed annual income program.

We believe Congress should examine carefully all the possible ramifications of such a program, looking beyond the immediate and transitory problems of the day.

THIS FIGHT MUST GO ON

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, our dependence upon sea lines of communication has often been demonstrated, and it is a clear lesson from our Nation's history that the ability to support and protect our seaborne commerce is vital to our national interests. Nevertheless, we find ourselves today dependent upon foreign shipping for over 90 percent of our imports, as well as a large percentage of our shipments to Vietnam. Our "Fourth Arm of Defense" is suffering atrophy from the neglectful policies of recent years.

The Navy League of the United States has expressed its concern over this grave problem in an editorial in Navy magazine for May 1968, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

THIS FIGHT MUST GO ON

More than three years ago, President Johnson solemnly pledged to Congress and the American people a new national maritime program and policy, one which would help reverse the dangerous trend toward the virtual disappearance of U.S. flag ships from the commercial sealanes of the world. Tragically, the President has failed to deliver. Moreover, with the present session of Congress rushing toward a close and the 1968 national conventions and election campaign just ahead, no new legislation from the White House on maritime policy appears likely to be presented.

The maritime industry, labor and management, spokesmen for the United States Navy, and patriotic and defense-minded organizations, such as the Navy League, have spoken out loudly and longly for the reconstitution of the American Merchant Marine, something which needs the moral and financial support of the U.S. government. But the pleas have failed to win a positive response. Lip service, yes; action, no. It has done little good to warn that the Soviet Union has embarked on what Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, Chief of Naval Operations, has called an "explosive" maritime buildup. Soviet merchantmen now carry 75 per cent of the foreign trade of the USSR. U.S. flag ships, our

"Fourth Arm of Defense," move less than 8 per cent of American exports and imports.

"GOING DOWN THE DRAIN"

Vice Admiral Lawson P. Ramage, Commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, in an article in this issue of NAVY, points out that the U.S. Merchant Marine has plunged from a World War II high of 5,600 ships to fewer than 700 today. And James G. Gulick, acting Maritime Administrator, told Congress earlier this month that the Merchant Marine was in danger of "going down the drain" and that the main problem was a lack of ships. Everyone knows that there is something wrong but no one seems to be able to solve the problem of decision-making paralysis in the White House on maritime matters. It has been worse than "too little and too late," like the Federal responses to the riots, arson and looting in Detroit and Washington. It has been, for the Merchant Marine, more of a case of "no higher level of help—period." It appears clear now that the Fourth Arm of Defense will have to await the incoming administration and hope for the best from it.

But the Navy League, for its part, will not await the change at the White House in silence. The delegates representing the 41,000 members of the organization took a firm and clear cut stand in convention in Honolulu on April 26, 1968 with the adoption of the following resolution on national maritime policy:

"Whereas the welfare of the United States and the entire Free World is solidly tied to the sea and to the untrammeled flow of trade; and

"Whereas in the words of the Vice President, 'The United States must have a maritime policy if it is to remain as a maritime power,' and

"Whereas a progressive and competitive posture for a modern U.S. Merchant Marine is necessary to the total sea power requirements of the United States; and would enhance the potential of the Navy-Marine Corps team to serve as a key instrument of national policy; and

"Whereas the long-term prosperity of the nation is dependent upon the attainment of a competitive posture at sea and the carrying of the major portion of our own domestic and world trade in American flag ships;

"Now therefore be it resolved that the Government of the United States at the earliest practicable date formulate and execute a formal, dynamic and aggressive maritime policy in furtherance of the national interest."

This is what we in the Navy League believe and this is what we will continue to fight for. We call on every uncommitted American to join us and like-minded organizations to attain this goal for the well-being of these United States, now and forever.

JOE CRUMP PROVIDES SERVICE IN "LOW DOWN"

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joe Crump of Coopersville, Mich., is providing a valuable service by authoring a newspaper column titled "Low Down", which is an unbiased, objective report on matters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

By circulating his report Mr. Crump is contributing to the education of the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

American people by providing them with details in the RECORD which they might otherwise not read.

I salute and congratulate Mr. Crump for his efforts to contribute something of value to our society.

THE DEATH OF HELEN KELLER

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, death has ended the long and distinguished career of one of the world's most noble citizens, Miss Helen Keller.

Miss Keller, who was born June 27, 1880, in Tuscumbia, Ala., which is in the district I now represent, has been an inspiration for the potentials of the handicapped the world over. Her personal victory over blindness and deafness has given hope and guidance to the afflicted of many lands.

The people of Alabama are proud to claim her as one of the State's most beloved native daughters.

For 2 years after her birth in Tuscumbia, Helen Keller led a normal life. She was then stricken with a brain fever that left her blind and deaf. No longer being able to communicate with her family she became as a savage animal, wild and unruly. For 5 years, life had no meaning to Helen until her father wrote Perkins Institution for the Blind asking for help in teaching his child.

On March 3, 1887, Anne Sullivan arrived in Tuscumbia to educate Helen. Miss Sullivan did not realize that her entire life would be devoted to teaching and being a constant companion to this child. The best description of the teacher's work can be found in the comment that Albert Einstein once made to Miss Sullivan:

Your work has interested me more than any other achievement in modern education. You not only imparted language to Helen Keller, but you unfolded her personality; and such work has in it an element of the Super Human.

Yes, this deaf and blind child learned that through the touch of her fingers and hands that life did have meaning.

At the age of 20, Helen could read, write, and speak. Due to much work and determination, she entered Radcliffe College from which she was graduated in 1904 cum laude after mastering Greek, Latin, German, and French. This was the first time that a blind and deaf person had graduated from a college.

After college, Miss Keller became interested in helping other handicapped people. She joined many organizations to help the blind and served on the Massachusetts Commission for the Blind. She organized the great concert at the Metropolitan Opera House to raise funds for starting the American Foundation for the Blind. In 3 years, she addressed 250 meetings all over the country to help raise money. She started the Helen Keller Endowment Fund of \$2 million. As

counselor to the American Foundation for the Blind and the American Foundation for Overseas Blind, she has traveled both hemispheres, revitalizing programs for the handicapped everywhere and leaving behind her a trail of new schools, new printing presses, and new workshops for the blind. During World War II, she brought hope to men blinded in action. She visited them in hospitals and danced with them to prove that the ordinary pleasures of life were still within their reach. She told them:

Look the world straight in the face, and never think of your limitations.

Through writing books and magazine articles, Miss Keller was able to support herself and Miss Sullivan. She had learned through the years to reject pity. She said:

Pity is the chief stumbling block of the sightless.

Due to her courage, willpower, and work for the blind, Helen Keller is known throughout the world. The French made her Chevalier of the Legion of Honor. She has been received in the White House by 10 Presidents. Kings and queens of countries have honored her. Even the poets, Whittier, Holmes, Sandburg, and Robert Frost were drawn to her. Mark Twain called her "a new fragrance in the human flower."

The people of Alabama are justly proud of "Ivy Greene," the Helen Keller Shrine in Tuscumbia, Ala. Each year, thousands of Americans visit the Star-maker Playhouse's presentation of "The Miracle Worker," which is performed on the grounds during the summer months. This dramatic play tells the life story of this remarkable woman who has devoted over half her life to helping the handicapped.

Through this, and the monumental work established by Miss Keller, her story of personal triumph over adversity will continue to inspire and give hope to the afflicted.

To her family I extend my deepest sympathy.

KENAI, ALASKA

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to clear the title of remaining Federal interest in a parcel of land at Kenai, Alaska, which is owned by the city of Kenai. I ask that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The bill involves a small parcel of about 1.88 acres which was originally conveyed from the Federal Government to the State of Alaska in 1961 under the Alaska Public Works Act of 1949, as amended. The State then reconveyed the land to the city of Kenai by quitclaim deed last September. The problem which my bill would resolve is to remove a restrictive covenant which now prohibits efficient and proper use of this property.

CASEY LOWERS THE BOOM

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1968

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, while commanding the 60th Airlift Wing Command at Travis Air Force Base in my congressional district, Brig. Gen. Maurice F. Casey was recently declared by a nationally syndicated columnist as one of this country's 10 outstanding Americans for 1967.

Unfortunately, all good things usually come to an end and so it goes with General Casey, considering the Air Force announcement last week that shortly the general would be deployed to McGuire Air Force Base.

Casey has had an extremely successful tour as wing commander at Travis where he simultaneously lowered the boom for efficiency and friendship 3 years ago. Casey's objective was first to satisfy the most demanding airlift requirement in history in excellence and dispatch and secondly to make Travis Air Force Base the friendliest base on the Pacific.

He succeeded on all counts: a happy base is an efficient one and so it goes.

Over the past several years, I have had occasion to call the attention of the Secretary of the Air Force to a number of firsts for Casey and Travis Air Force Base. As a practical matter, as Casey moved into the fray to satisfy our Vietnam airlift requirements while ships had their problems, he could have been cited for excellence and record performance every month. The airlift of our time—taking cargo and men to the front, and returning battle casualties to Travis, sometimes 5 days off the frontline—is now still unfortunately going on, but due to Casey's leadership, we take this performance as a matter of course.

Casey will be missed on the Pacific; his standards of friendly excellence are hard to compete with. McGuire Air Force Base fortunately has better things to come as Casey heads east with his boom.

I reiterate a recent record I cited last year to this House:

OUTSTANDING UNIT AWARD EARNED BY THE 60TH MILITARY AIRLIFT WING, TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

(By Hon. ROBERT L. LEGGETT, of California, in the House of Representatives, Monday, January 29, 1968)

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I call the attention of the House to the third consecutive Air Force Outstanding Unit Award earned by the airmen of the 60th Military Airlift Wing, Travis Air Force Base, which is located in my district, at Fairfield, Calif.

The award is for exceptionally meritorious achievement for the period from July 1, 1966, to June 30, 1967, and is based on their unparalleled airlift support of American forces in Vietnam. For example, during the period in question, the 60th Military Airlift Wing—

Scored new levels of airlift in speeding red ball express shipments to the combat zone, transporting 28 million pounds of this high priority cargo within the year;

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Responded quickly to the emergency caused by a national airline strike which stranded thousands of returning servicemen at the base between July 9 and September 11, 1966, by working around the clock to convert the entire north wing of the base passenger terminal into a stateside travel area. Using this improvised facility they helped move 54,669 stranded troops through Travis.

Played a leading role in the aeromedical evacuation of more than 17,000 patients from the Pacific during the year.

In moving outsize cargo to Southeast Asia, C-133 turboprops attained an unprecedented daily utilization rate. This feat included such critical items as huge Navy propeller shafts and Army helicopters while slashing surface delivery time.

The wing's newest C-141 squadron, the 86th, became fully combat ready a month ahead of schedule and the entire Travis-based jet fleet attained an 8-hour average utilization 60 days prior to the Military Airlift Command program schedule. The wing's force of C-141 and C-133 planes consistently overflew scheduled commitments.

These are just some of the accomplishments of this fine organization. I wish to commend Brig. Gen. Maurice F. Casey and all base personnel for their continued diligence and high performance of duty in support of American Forces in Vietnam. They certainly exemplify their motto—"Friendliest and Finest."

CRIMINAL JUSTICE—THEN AND NOW

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on April 5 and 6 I had the privilege and the pleasure of attending the annual meeting of the Virginia Trial Lawyers Association held at the Golden Triangle, Norfolk, Va., and listening to a very able and inspiring address by Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz, of the Supreme Court of New York.

The Virginia Trial Lawyers Association is composed of members of the Virginia bar whose practice leads them into the active trial of cases in the courtroom. The membership of this organization is composed entirely of lawyers who specialize in trial work.

The secretary and treasurer of this association is Prof. J. Westwood Smithers, of the T. C. Williams School of Law of the University of Richmond, and the president of the association is Mr. Don P. Bagwell, a senior member of the firm of Tuck, Bagwell, Dillard & Mapp, of Halifax, Va. The president-elect is Mr. Ralph H. Ferrell, Jr., a member of the well known and highly respected law firm of Hunton, Williams, Gay, Powell & Gibson, of Richmond, Va.

Judge Leibowitz, before ascending the bench some years ago, enjoyed a national reputation as a trial lawyer of extraordinary distinction and ability. As a member of the Supreme Court of New York, he has established himself in the esteem of the American people as an outstanding judge. In his address, Judge Leibowitz advocates a firm and resolute

June 3, 1968

adherence to law enforcement, a subject which is a grave concern to all right-thinking Americans, particularly at this time when we are experiencing such a nationwide laxity of law enforcement. The Supreme Court of the United States in many of its decisions has hampered and impeded the police in their effort to suppress public mischief and to protect persons and property. In some of the cities, including our Nation's Capital, the streets may be safe for the criminals, but not for the law-abiding citizens. I deplore and deplore such a situation.

Under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the very able and forceful address of Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz, which is as follows:

CRIMINAL JUSTICE: THEN AND NOW

Mr. Levine, thank you for your flattering introduction. You may think this will help you in the courtroom by "buttering up" the Judge, but it won't do a bit of good.

Mr. President, members of this great Association of Trial Lawyers of Virginia, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your kind invitation to visit with you.

I have no prepared script. So, please forgive me if I just speak to you "off the cuff." In plain Brooklyn English.

The average non-lawyer citizen has a distorted notion of what really goes on in the courtroom. The other evening Mrs. Leibowitz was deeply absorbed with a Perry Mason play on the television screen. I just can't stomach these phony courtroom burlesques, so I went into another room where we have another set and I turned to the wrestlers. Phony they are, but at least they don't seriously pretend that they are on the up and up.

Tired of the wrestlers, I switched to the Merv Griffin show. Then at eleven on came the news. The screen was crowded with politician after politician campaigning for his party's nomination for the presidency. Each candidate was spouting on some college campus accompanied by plenty of screaming, almost what you hear from adolescents when the Beatles are performing.

Ever since I mounted the Bench I never used the gavel, but on television the judge is always armed with a gavel. Until he raps three times, nothing happens. There, the convicted murderer is standing before him about to be sentenced to the chair. Before the judge pronounces the fateful words, he pounds the gavel three times. But here comes the thrilling moment. The swinging doors to the courtroom fly open. In the entrance is an intruder who cries out, "Halt! I am the man who committed the murder." The judge says to the prisoner, "You are discharged. Bring this other man up here before me." And he immediately sentences the newcomer to the chair.

I had never seen a picture being made, so one day I visited a Hollywood studio. They escorted me to a building that resembled a huge garage. Outside on the wall an electric sign flashed the word "Silence." I entered backstage and went through a door of the set and right into the place where the play was being filmed. Where do you think I found myself? In a courtroom. Everything to a T was just so, an exact replica of the courtrooms in the old New York City General Sessions Courthouse of years ago—even to the dirty window panes and the cigarette butts that littered the floor of the spectators' benches.

Ah! The lawyer! He was cross-examining the lady defendant. If her answer was not to his liking, he would turn to the jurors in the box and say, "Gentlemen, she is lying." If that ever happened in a real courtroom, the learned judge would order the bailiff to

take the barrister by the seat of his pants and toss him out into the corridor, but there this Hollywood studio lawyer was pirouetting around like a belly dancer, pointing with his finger. You know. Well, they went over the act time and time again until I would recite the lines by heart. Finally, the director was satisfied and called out "Cut!" The scene was over. He came over to me on the side lines and said, "Judge, tell me, is the flag in the right place?" I replied, "The flag is just where it ought to be, to the right of the presiding judge, as he faces the audience. But, please, tell me where in hell you got this cluck of a lawyer, this kook, this oddball?"

Tonight, may I take a few minutes to picture for you some of the oddballs you and I have seen in the real courtroom, oddballs that the Hollywood studios might use to perfection.

May I present oddball number one, "Mr. Milquetoast." He expresses his gratitude to the bailiff at the door for permitting him to enter. He is always bowing and scraping. There he is with his arm across the shoulders of his opponent. Everyone is his friend. Of course, he worships the judge. "Why, your Honor knows the law better than poor me," as he curtseys by bowing from the waist. This is the "Henpecko" of the courtroom.

Here is another oddball, "The Peacock," the great "I am." His opponent is perhaps a younger man. "To save time," says the young chap, "I will concede that the exhibit you are offering in evidence is correct." The "Peacock" looks down his lordly nose. "Don't you tell me, young man, how to prove my case." This character reminds one of a curvaceous female in a Turkish bath on ladies' night, trading around to show off her fine points.

Here is a beaut: This oddball is the "Judge Baiter." He is engaged in continuous verbal fisticuffs with the man on the bench. He is driving the poor judge out of his mind trying to maintain a judicial calmness while he is struggling to cope with this hell raiser. The "Baiter" does this with malice aforethought. Perhaps, he can get the judge to lose his patience and blurt out something in anger. Ah! That's it! Point number one of his brief in the Appellate Court will be, "The Court was unfair and prejudiced against my client." This oddball doesn't realize that the customers in the jury box will later take it out on his client in the jury room.

Well, here and there you will also find a judge who, too, is an oddball. I recall an old crank who presided in one of the high criminal courts of our city. He was a bald headed gent who always wore a barber's jacket under his gown. The prosecuting witness was being questioned by the district attorney. This gent would lean over toward the witness and drink in every word that he uttered. But the moment the witness was turned over to defense counsel for cross-examination, his chair would swing around and facing the opposite wall, he would start to rock and rock. The damned chair would go, "Squeak, squeak, squeak." And oh! How nasty he was with the lawyer defending his client. The evidence was overwhelming in establishing the guilt of the accused, but the jury wound up in disagreement, eight for acquittal and four for conviction. Later, when everyone cleared out of the courtroom the twelve jurors surrounded the defense counsel in the corridor. "Your client was as guilty as hell," they chorused, "but we could not stomach what that s.o.b. did to you during the trial, and we were not going to let him ram a guilty verdict down our throats." So thereafter this judge died. A dog had bitten him. However, the dog died first. This story is the gospel truth.

Here is another oddball of the courtroom, the "Objector." All you hear is, "I object!

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

I object! I object! The counsel is leading the witness." "I object—inept, irrelevant, immaterial." If you ever took these phrases away from this barrister, he would have to quit trying cases and go into the plumbing business.

Now, have you met the "Ripper" in the courtroom? This oddball tackles the six-foot cop on the stand. He gives him a rough going over. He tears him to pieces. But the little old lady that follows to the witness stand gets the same rough treatment. This fool doesn't realize that he antagonizes those jurors by these stupid tactics.

Then you will discover the chronic "Finger Pointer" and the "Table Pounder."

There is a certain inoffensive oddball, "The Gazer." Until he gets his inspiration by gazing at a particular spot on the ceiling he is dumbstruck. How handicapped he would become if the courthouse janitor would swab that sacred spot off that ceiling. "The Gazer" has a relative in the person of "The Miner." His favorite inspirational spot is somewhere on the floor.

Now meet "The Buzzer." He propounds a question and receives an answer. Bingo, he hustles over to the counsel table and goes into a huddle with his assistants. Then back again to face the witness. Then again to the table for another huddle. It brings to mind what happens after each down on the football field. Buzz! Buzz! Buzz! You certainly have seen this performer in the courtroom.

Well, here is a well known oddball. We will label him "The Fumbler." He lugs into the courtroom a bulging brief bag and an armful of law books and the table is buried by all of this paraphernalia. A certain paper is called for as evidence. Then he and his assistants start to rummage through this heap of stuff. They search and search and finally come up with a scrap of paper that has nothing to do with the problem.

Most attorneys wear eyeglasses, but there is an oddball among them whom we can describe as "The Swisher." The attorney asks the following question "What is your name?" Swish! Off come his spectacles. The witness replies and the swisher replaces his glasses to his nose. The attorney asks the following question: "Where do you reside?" Swish! Off come the specs, and so, they go on and they go off throughout his inquiry. The irritated jurors in the box wish they had available a hammer with a long handle, so they could reach over and nail the — pair of glasses to his proboscis.

One of the oddball nuisances in the courtroom is "The Trotter." He simply cannot stand in a given place for a moment. He is all over the place, at the witness stand, over near the jury box, at the spectator's rail, at the clerk's desk, at his table—everywhere. He is just like a pony. And all the time the juror's head is swivelling about trying to focus his sight on "The Trotter."

This oddball we shall call "The Professor." His favorite words are two, "prior" and "subsequent" and it doesn't make any difference to him who is on the witness stand. For instance, he has Mr. Slobodski on the stand. He is a native of Poland and is struggling to master the simple words of the English language. Questioned by the learned counsel: "Where were you prior to the occurrence on Main Street?" Mr. Slobodski turns a blank expression to the examiner and finally stammers: "What?" The judge tries to help out. "What the lawyer is asking is where were you before the accident?" "Oh," replies Mr. Slobodski, I was by McGinty in the saloon." Then counsel proceeds: "Subsequent to the occurrence where did you proceed?" Slobodski again stammers, "What?" And the judge again must come to the rescue. "What he wants to find out is where did you go after the accident?" "Oh," says the witness, "I went back to McGinty's." Just clip the words "prior" and "sub-

sequent" from the lawyer's vocabulary and he is a dead pigeon.

A word about "The Low Brow." He is the type of lawyer, for example, that pleads with the jury to "Give my client a fair shake of the dice."

Here is a pip, "The Lover Boy." He is making eyes at juror number six.

Then we have "The Orator" always reciting poetry. He is always reminded of what some famous author or political figure of long ago had said. He is enraptured by the "rock-ribbed shores of Maine" and the "Sun-kissed shores of the Rio Grande," "the storm-tossed waters of the Atlantic and the grandeur of the lofty peaks of the Rockies."

I could go on and on about some of the oddballs, few in number it is true, I have seen in my courtroom. But the champ of champs of all the oddballs is "The Bore." He drones on and on in his monotone. Every question is preceded with an "Ah, ah, ah," or an "Er, er, er." He hasn't the faintest idea what he is driving at by his (pardon the expression) cross-examination, or how to get there. So, he resorts to his old standby. He is particularly interested in time and distance, although they are meaningless in the case. Pretty soon the heavy-set man in number eight seat in the jury box goes into heavy breathing. His head slowly drops on his chest. He is in slumberland. Juror number two is gazing fitfully up at the courtroom clock. "For heaven's sake, won't one o'clock ever come so I can leave for lunch and get rid of this bore?" Another juror gazes out of the window. His attention is fixed on a cloud and he is trying to figure out whether the cloud is shaped like a horse or cow. As far as he is concerned, the trial is a million miles away. The bore reminds one of a trip across the Sahara Desert on a rainy, dreary day.

Enough tonight about the oddballs. I am confident that no lawyer of this great organization fits any of these categories.

Let us turn our attention to more serious but unpleasant business and that is the terrible crime wave that has engulfed many of the large cities of our nation and the agonizing problem of how to cope with it.

Come with me into my courtroom and witness just two of the many similar cases.

Here are three defendants, the oldest in his middle thirties. He is already a Sing Sing graduate. The two younger ones are in their teens, but both have already had contact with the police. The older one makes it a business of renting out guns and sharing in the loot that the young hoodlums collect in their stick-ups.

The complainant, the victim of this dastardly crime, is a middle aged clothing salesman, family man, with a wife and son attending medical school. This boy is the jewel of this couple. He had to cut short his career because of what happened to his dad.

On this fateful day he was on his way home from his job and had stopped his car to purchase some cigarettes. As he emerged he was accosted by the two hoods. "Boss, can you let us have a dime?" The technique is that when the victim goes to his pocket, the robbers then know where he keeps his money. As the victim reached for his pocket one of them pulled out a loaded pistol and shot the man through the head.

And so, soon after the trial had started, two attendants led this victim into the courtroom stone blind. They lifted him to the witness stand. The tragic figure about to be sworn, would have torn your heart out. And there sat the three criminals sneering and enjoying it all as if they were at a vaudeville show. Nice picture?

Next case. There is a small liquor store in a certain neighborhood in Brooklyn. The robber is driving around in his car. On the seat is a sawed-off shotgun. However, there is a policeman standing there, near the store. So he patiently drives around the vicinity until the policeman disappears. The proprietor of

the store has a wife and seven children. The robber enters and raises the shotgun to his shoulder. The victim falls to his knees. He begs: "Please don't kill me. I have seven kids. Take the money in the cash register. I won't say a word." The bandit fires one blast. The shot goes astray. The man, on his knees, is still pleading. "Don't kill me. Don't kill me." He fires the second shot and blows the man's head off. Then he calmly looted the cash register and sauntered out of the store.

This wild beast in human form was convicted by the jury and was later executed in the electric chair at Sing Sing. But this was before Miranda. Lord knows how many similar killers are now loose because of Miranda.

In sum, the crime rate is not only sky high but the depredations have become more vicious and cannibalistic as the years go by. They call our New York City the "Fun City" a fun city, indeed. A nice "Fun City" where a woman doesn't dare to walk out into the street after sundown for fear of being raped or murdered. A "Fun City" that is rapidly turning into a jungle.

But we have our Bar Association committees and other committees and committees, and millions are spent on researchers and reports, until they literally run out of your ears. They tell us what all of us already know, namely, that today we are living in a lawless society where there is little or no respect for parents, for teachers, for the policeman on the beat, or even for the judge on the bench.

The other day, Dr. Martin Luther King was mowed down by an assassin's bullet. His body was hardly cold when Mr. Stokely Carmichael was on television urging his "soul brothers" to arm themselves and "take to the streets." The law, somehow just can't catch up with this creature who incites people to rob, to burn, and to pillage. Why?

Behold the picture of some campuses of leading universities. There are chaplains openly urging students to violate the law and to refuse to serve when our country calls. Open rebellion and anarchy! A dean at one university promised to welcome them back to the campus after they have served terms in prison.

Never mind the law! To hell with the law! If you disagree with it.

The other evening you looked at television depicting the riot in Harlem. You saw the rioters before your eyes, burning, smashing store windows and looting. You saw them brazenly lifting out television sets, carting away loads of groceries. One woman was there pulling out a large stuffed chair from a ruined furniture store. These law breakers did it calmly, they didn't run, and many of them were chuckling as they went about their business. Standing by helpless was a group of police officers, without lifting a finger. The word had been spread to them to "cool it."

Without respect for law and order only anarchy must result and our democracy must die.

I heard a funny story. To many unthinking people the law is an ass. They tell of one Londoner saying to his friend: "Charlie, you look downhearted. What is troubling you?" His friend replied: "Why shouldn't I be down in the mouth? The upstairs maid in my house had me in paternity court. She swears that I am the father of her child. My wife, on the other hand, sued me for annulment on the ground that I am impotent. Can you beat it, I lost both cases. The law is an ass."

Let us compare some notes, now that I have referred to London. Not so long ago I sat with the head of Scotland Yard, Sir Richard Jackson, in his office. London, like New York City, has its poverty, slums and ethnic groups. It has its dope addicts and homosexuals. The population figures of both cities run about eight million inhabitants. Sir Richard pointed to the statistics of London's

homicides. Over the years they numbered between thirty-five and forty per year. "Yearly, in New York City, how many homicides do you have?" Sir Richard asked with a puckish twinkle of his eye. My face must have turned red because I was embarrassed. But I had to confess the facts. "Last year New York City had about seven hundred homicides." Why this amazing difference?

Consider the interminable court proceedings that are required to even approach a final conclusion of a criminal case. You recall that it took eleven long years to bring the Chessman case to a close. By comparison, no one points an accusing finger at the fairness of the British courts of justice. If a murderer is convicted and he is sentenced to death within only a few weeks his appeal is heard by the Criminal Court of Appeals sitting en banc. After oral arguments the judges retire to deliberate. Arriving upon a conclusion they return to the bench and either affirm or reverse the conviction. If affirmed, shortly thereafter the Home Office, which is the pardoning agency, determines whether the death sentence shall be commuted to life imprisonment or the execution should be carried out. The case is closed. Finis! Again, who has ever complained about the fairness of British justice? Where the calendar is jammed with criminal cases, the trial courts are confronted with another headache. In our city judges sit in one numbered part of the court during one month and are assigned to another part of the court for the following month. The criminal's case remains in the one part and he is fully aware of the system. Thus, every trick is used in order to steer the case away from the judge that the criminal considers "tough" to the judge who follows, hoping that he will then be handed the courthouse. If he doesn't succeed in "steering the case" he is ready with his numerous phony appeals and writs crying to the high heaven that his "constitutional rights" have been invaded. It will open your eyes as to what is going on if you will only read the opinion of the United States Court of Appeals Judge Leonard Moore in United States *Exrel Davis vs. The Warden* reported in 386 Fed. 2d 611.

Do you know that only a few years ago the prisons of New York State were crowded to the limit? Do you know that these same prisons are now being emptied? I hold in my hand the current statistics. Here is proof positive:

Sing Sing Prison, 1,850 cells with only 1,510 prisoners.

Clinton Prison, housing the most desperate, inveterate felons, 2,200 cells with only 1,373 prisoners. Every prison of the State for both male and female criminals is likewise being emptied.

Since I was admitted to the bar I have lived all these years in the criminal courts. I was defense counsel in so many of the most serious cases, including some of the most notorious denizens of the underworld, including Scarface Al Capone on a charge of murder. Since 1941, as a judge of our highest criminal court, countless felony cases have appeared before my bench for plea, trial and disposition. I have passed sentence on more than eleven thousand defendants. I believe I know the psychology of the criminal. First offenders, where the crime was not a vicious offense, have been treated with compassion and leniency. The enemy of society, however, has been packed off to a prison cell. Most of these, if not all, were psychopaths. Prisons are a failure, for they accomplish little reformation of the convict. However, while he is behind these prison walls he cannot do further harm to the defenseless people of the community. You just don't turn a tiger loose. You cage him.

Over the years we have been brain washed by the drum beaters, by the do-gooders and bleeding hearts. "Don't traumatize the poor dear by sending him to prison because he is

not to blame. It is society that is at fault." So the thug and his buddies in crime just laugh up their sleeves at what are now impotent law enforcement agencies—the police, the prosecutor and the court.

Lawyers know full well that in some places it is almost impossible to get a trial in a civil case in less than four to five years because of the crowded calendars. The criminal cases, however, must be moved without delay, and so it is, as I have said, the criminal can dictate the terms of the settlement of his case, the plea he will accept, and usually the sentence he demands. Unless his terms are met, he calls for a trial—and that means clogging up the criminal calendar which cannot be tolerated unless chaos is to be the result.

If convicted, whether by plea or trial, there is usually no end to the case. There are appeals after appeals. The criminal cries out that, "Everybody done me wrong. The judge was unfair and coercive. The prosecutor reneged on his promise of a light sentence; my counsel was incompetent." These are but a few of the points he raises. There are others so bizarre that they border on Alice in Wonderland.

When his appeals are finally at an end the convict is now armed with other weapons that have become par for the course. In every prison in our State there is a well-stocked law library. There, the jailbirds are conning over the volumes, especially those dealing with petitions for *coram nobis* and *habeas corpus*. You would be amazed if you read some of these petitions, pages and pages of them, citing every decision of the State and Federal Courts, whether apposite or otherwise. In many cases the petition alleges a factual question and the court is bound to grant him a hearing and so he is transported, accompanied by prison guards, from prisons that are sometimes hundreds of miles away from the courthouse—at a considerable expense, of course, to the taxpayers. Lawyers are assigned, but if the petitioner loses, again endless appeals follow.

I had one convict before me thirteen times. On each occasion he set forth a new complaint. The other day when after a long hearing I denied his petition, and as he was being escorted back to his cell, he looked over his shoulder at me and said, "Hey, judge, I will have another one for you before the sun goes down." I have lost count of the number of his appeals that are now floating around the various appellate courts.

Ladies and gentlemen, the last blow to proper and effective law enforcement has been the Miranda decision. We have the utmost respect for the integrity and sincerity of all of the justices of our highest court. However, I feel that the majority of five in this case were in error and that the four dissenters who were violently in disagreement with the majority are in the right. What is wrong with Miranda, is most clearly set forth in the dissenting opinions. May I quote? Here in part is what Mr. Justice Harlan said:

"I believe that the decision of the Court represents poor constitutional law and entails harmful consequences for the country at large. The new rules are not designed to guard against police brutality or other unmistakably bad forms of coercion. Rather, the thrust is ultimately to discourage any confession at all. The aim, in short, is towards voluntariness in a Utopian sense. Or to take it from a different angle, voluntariness with a vengeance."

"In conclusion, nothing in the letter or the spirit of the constitution or in the precedents squares with the heavy-handed and one-sided action that is so precipitately taken by the court in the name of fulfilling the constitutional responsibilities."

"The foray which the Court takes today brings to mind the wise and far-sighted words of Mr. Justice Jackson in *Douglas v. Jeannette*.

"This Court is forever adding new stories to the temples of constitutional law, and the temples have a way of collapsing when one story too many is added."

Miranda lays down hard and fast rules. Let us consider some of the provisions. When a suspect is arrested the cop must immediately warn him of his rights. He must be told that he need not say a thing for if he does it may be used against him in court. He must be told that he has the right to the immediate advice of a lawyer and if he has none and is indigent, counsel will immediately be provided for him without charge.

Since this decision, it has gotten so that the cop can't say, "Boo," to the suspect. It may be that to be de rigueur the cop must carry a counselor in his police car to advise the suspect to keep his mouth shut. Confessions have been practically ruled out because of Miranda and many a serious case either stands or falls on a confession.

Here is what Mr. Justice White had to say:

"There is, in my view, every reason to believe that a good many criminal defendants who otherwise would have been convicted on what this Court has previously thought to be the most satisfactory kind of evidence will now, under this new version of the Fifth Amendment, either not be tried at all or acquitted if the state's evidence minus the confession is put to the test of litigation. In some unknown number of cases, the Court's rule will return a killer, a rapist, or other criminal to the streets and to the environment which produced him to repeat his crime whenever it pleases him. As a consequence, there will not be a gain but a loss in human dignity."

How prophetic were these words of this learned Justice. I cite two cases. Each one came before a colleague of mine who before he mounted the bench was a brilliant criminal defense attorney. I refer to Mr. Justice Michael Kern who is now one of the eminent jurists of our Supreme Court.

A little child had wet its bed. This friend of a mother pasted some tape on the little child's mouth. The child was only four years old. Then she took a broom handle and a piece of rubber hose and she beat the brains out of this poor little thing. She was arrested. Nobody claimed that any police officer had laid a hand on her when she blurted out a confession. However, she was not advised of her right to counsel. Mr. Justice Kern was compelled, because of Miranda, to dismiss the indictment, for she could not be convicted solely on her own confession—and there were no eyewitnesses to this horrible murder.

Here is another example of what Miranda has done to our criminal law. The killer stabs his wife some thirty times. He then stabs and kills the little baby in bed with her. Then he proceeds into the next bedroom and he slaughters three other children. He is arrested. There is no claim of the third degree. There is no claim that he was insane at the time of the act, for he had been examined by psychiatrists in the Kings County Hospital and was found to have been of sound mind. Again, the jurist had to dismiss the indictment and to turn him loose. He went back to Puerto Rico. The last that was heard of him was that he was having one hell of a time—free as a bird, with the blood of his wife and his five children still dripping from his hands.

When Mr. Justice Kern dismissed the indictment, here is what he said: "This is a very sad thing. It is a repulsive thing to turn this murderer loose. It makes any decent human being's blood run cold. It makes a stomach turn to have let a fiend like this out on the streets."

"Justice due to the accused is due to the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained until it is narrowed to a filament." This was said by the immortal Judge Benjamin Cardozo some years ago and so we can well understand why our people are

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

heart sick because of what has happened to the administration of our criminal law.

I am sorry that I have detained you so long. I hope I haven't bored you. I have no complete panacea for this deplorable condition. Time will not permit me tonight to deal with detailed suggestions of how to grapple with the problem, but I urge one fundamental, basic remedy, without the programs bandied about.

Lord knows, our prime need is for men of courage and guts in Congress and in the White House, in the state capitols and in the city halls of our nation. People must wake up and not be beguiled by the vote seeking politician who mouth platitudes about law enforcement on the one hand and is at the same time catering to this group and that group for votes. In short, what this country is crying for are men, spelled with a capital M.

You lawyers have been such a wonderful, patient audience, in a spirit of appreciation for your attention to the—not very pleasant observations—may I make you a promise? If you have a case in my court of a guilty thug, I guarantee you right here and now that I will get him out for you—when his time is up.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S IMPRESSIVE RECORD IN HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently the Senate overwhelmingly passed the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. This milestone program—the most comprehensive housing legislation in the history of our Nation—is a fitting capstone to the efforts of our President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, to provide decent homes and lives for all Americans.

The President's dedication to this goal has been obvious and his successes numerous. Recognizing the importance of housing and urban problems, one of his first steps after becoming President was to seek legislation establishing the Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development. This was followed by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 that established, among other things, the rent supplement program to provide private housing for low-income families. In 1966 the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act launched the monumentally important model cities program that concentrates government and private efforts to rebuild whole neighborhoods socially and economically as well as physically. Now we are moving toward enactment of his latest new programs to promote homeownership among low-income families and to abolish substandard housing within the next 10 years.

Accomplishments in the field of housing during President Johnson's term of office have been impressive. In the past 4 years:

Low-rent housing approvals increased 27 percent—representing decent living quarters for an additional 654,000 low-income persons.

Under the rent supplement program, funds have been reserved to enable an

other 130,000 persons of low income to enjoy better housing.

Private housing for low- and moderate-income families, financed with FHA mortgage insurance assistance, increased about 2½ times.

Some 2 million families bought homes under the FHA plan—some 28 percent above the level of 4 years ago.

Approvals of specially designed housing for our older and handicapped citizens under the low-rent housing program increased by more than 1½ times, providing apartments for an additional 150,000 persons of lower income.

Approvals of specially designed housing for older and handicapped citizens under the Federal loan program increased by more than 2½ times, providing comfortable housing for 35,000 persons of modest means.

In addition, new heights have been reached in virtually every urban development program including urban renewal, urban planning, open space, neighborhood facilities, and urban mass transit.

The record of the past few years is impressive. Serious problems remain. The legislation passed by the Senate will move the Nation toward solutions to them.

NEED FOR MORE PRIVATE INITIATIVE GOVERNMENT TRAVEL PROMOTION EFFORTS INCREASING THE TRAVEL DEFICIT

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, with the House having just voted last week to increase the appropriation for the U.S. Travel Service from \$3 billion to \$4.5 billion for fiscal year 1969, I think a good look back at what the Government has done in fiscal 1968 in travel promotion with its funds is in order. Regrettably this look was not taken carefully enough before the budget for the USTS was voted on.

Government programs, through sheer ineptitude, are rapidly increasing the travel deficit this year. This point is all too well made in two recent editorials by Joel M. Abels in Travel Trade magazine.

The script of this scenario goes as follows:

First. Early this year the administration decided that American tourists were contributing substantially to the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

Second. The McKinney Travel Task Force hastily compiled a report and made a suggestion that discount cards be issued to foreign visitors to lower the cost of their trips to the United States.

Third. With the threat of the travel tax hanging over its head, the travel industry started discounting everything in order to help ward off the travel tax.

Fourth. The Visit USA program was ruined. Why? Most things being discounted had already been discounted for years on low-cost group tours of

the United States. Europeans were not advised of this and they demanded discounts from rates already agreed upon. Since this could not be done, Europeans decided to wait and see. In the words of Mr. Abels:

Since the percentage drop in Visit USA travel is even more substantial than the loss in outgoing travel, chances are that the Government's year-end balance sheet will find a bigger travel dollar gap than ever before. . . . The travel discount card has proven to be a hasty hoax indeed.

The "travel gap" thus will probably prove larger than ever this year.

The only encouraging development recently in the travel business is that the travel industry is beginning to talk about taking coordinated action in the private sector. Mr. Abels called for the travel industry to form its own working committee to formulate a plan of action.

As a result of my editorial in the April 29, 1968, issue of *Travel Trade* magazine calling for increased private initiative in promoting tourism to the United States, rather than relying on the U.S. Travel Service, I have had a gratifying response. The main tenor of the letters is that the travel industry itself can do a better job of promoting travel to the United States than can the Federal Government. What is needed though, many point out, is the need for greater coordination of various segments of the travel industry and putting aside of professional jealousies. One writer, James H. Hall of the East Michigan Tourist Association, suggested to me the creation of a super travel organization cutting across all facets of the travel industry with professional staff funded by the industry itself. This seems like a good idea at least as a basis for discussion.

I hope that the U.S. travel industry, which already is doing a commendable job of advertising and promoting travel to the United States will continue and redouble its efforts and not leave the field open to Government travel promotion, which as has been described before, can have disastrous results.

The editorials follow:

[From *Travel Trade*, May 6, 1968]

THE HASTY HOAX

(By Joel M. Abels)

The presidentially directed demand that the travel industry start bringing more visitors to American shores, and in a helluva hurry, as part of an overall effort to reduce the so-called travel dollar gap, has now backfired on the United States and on everyone who had been playing a role in Visit USA efforts, before the administration made it patriotic to do so.

The McKinney Travel Task Force which was so speedily banded together to find a fast answer to the perplexing question as to why more Americans visited Europe than did Europeans visit our own shores, was compelled to find answers at any price. Our industry was asked to overnight uncover solutions to problems which defied the laws of economics and the McKinney committee came up with dozens of ideas and suggestions. Basically the whole affair was a sort of barter arrangement whereby the travel industry was told, with a gun at its head, that unless it proved its good will by promoting Visit USA it would lose its right to freely send American tourists abroad. In haste and in horror the industry was compelled to act.

The most immediate action called for by

the whole long McKinney report was the suggestion that a discount card be issued to foreign visitors which would allow them to lower the cost of their American visit. To prove their good will individual travel industry members chipped in everything but the kitchen sink and before you knew it the discount card could give a visitor anything from a discounted hotel room to a half priced shoeshine. Everyone was willing to pay a price to ransom the freedom to sell travel to American citizens wishing to travel abroad.

In this scare environment, which incidentally is still with us since we continue to have the threat of future per diem taxes weighing over us, a monster of a card was created. This card which sounds so good and relieves so many consciences in government and in industry has become the wrecker of the Visit USA programs which had so painstakingly been established in prior years.

In the anxiety to do something, anything, a Frankenstein has been created, one which leading Visit USA operators claim has ruined sales. Why? Amid the hullabaloo about the discounted hotel rooms and discounted car rentals and discounted sightseeing, someone forgot that while a discount card might prove beneficial to those few foreigners who traveled independently, these items of merchandise had been discounted for years by those in the Visit USA tour business and that already low group tour prices could not be discounted any further. But Europeans were never advised of this and the result is that they demanded discounts from both operators and hotels on rates previously agreed upon. Since this could not be done and because the discount card was so widely ballyhooed, Europeans decided to wait and see. You know what happens when people wait and see—nothing—and that is what has happened to Visit USA business—practically nothing. The 1968 Visit USA season has been ruined even more thoroughly than was the travel industry's market for Americans traveling to Europe. Since the percentage drop in Visit USA travel is even more substantial than the loss in outgoing travel, chances are that the government's year-end balance sheet will find a bigger travel dollar gap than ever before. Will this bring government after us more heavily to prevent a further outgo of Americans? I don't know, but there's a good chance that it will.

The travel discount card has proven to be a hasty hoax indeed, a hoax for Europeans who believe that it will lower group costs within this country and a hoax to those who contributed to its creation in the hope that it would spare further governmental pressure and interference.

We would be playing a hasty hoax on ourselves if we believed that we can sit back now and not be bothered again by threats of governmental interference. In this election year of political indecision the travel industry would be wise to form its own working committee, not wait to be pressured into another McKinney-type task force, and to formulate a program of action, one which would be both politically expedient while at the same time productive of increased business both to and from the United States.

[From *Travel Trade*, May 13, 1968]

WHO'S ON FIRST

(By Joel M. Abels)

There's a hollow tin ring by now to the sound of the words Visit USA because we have all been beaten over the heads with a variety of statements telling us how important it is to the travel industry to support government efforts to bring more foreign visitors to the United States. While we may all be in favor of the idea, it is patently obvious that only carriers and tour wholesalers and a limited number of local ground operators are in any sort of a position to

play an active role in the whole affair. There simply is little or no place in the Visit USA scheme of things for the average retail travel agent and everybody in the travel industry knows it.

Unfortunately, our government doesn't know this to be so and refuses to recognize that fact; and as a result we are all saddled with the burden of proving that we as an industry are patriotic and will cooperate with Visit USA efforts. If we don't, Lord knows what the President or the Congress is liable to pass in the way of legislation which would restrict our ability to send Americans outside of the Western Hemisphere. Since this is the climate of the day we must face up to it.

Last week's editorial, *The Hasty Hoax*, explained some of the reasons why the travel discount card for foreign visitors, conceived in panic by the President's Travel Task Force, has badly backfired and is proving ruinous to the Visit USA market. In following up on that editorial to see if any progress had been made to remove the doubts in the minds of Europeans about the credit card and the whole Visit USA effort, *Travel Trade* stumbled across a broad trail of inept, bumbling, clumsy, almost too incredible "redtapesmanship."

If you recall, a special Visit USA emergency meeting was held less than three weeks ago under ASTA auspices in order to draw up an industry resolution urging the U.S. Travel Service to release press notices abroad to the effect that the much publicized travel discount card did not offer discounts off already discounted special Visit USA group tour, hotel and sightseeing arrangements. The ludicrousness of having to gather 25 leading airline and tour operator executives to draft such an obvious suggestion is appalling in itself.

But—and here is the real rub—when the USTS was called to find out what action had been taken to implement the resolution and start Visit USA business moving once more, we learned that the resolution (which presumably had been drafted) had never reached USTS offices. Officials did admit however that they had read about it in *Travel Trade*. We then asked why, since they realized the urgency of the situation, the Travel Service hadn't simply gone ahead and released the necessary information in Europe and cleared up the mess which had been created. We were told that even if the resolution had reached them, no action could be taken because the Travel Discount Card was an idea of the President's Task Force and only that committee could tell the USTS to act one way or another on a program which the committee had introduced.

Shaking our heads in horror at this example of government ineptitude we then called ASTA headquarters to find out for ourselves if it was possible that the emergency resolution, debated and discussed for three full hours of their valuable time by 25 top executives, could somehow not have reached the proper hands at the Travel Service. Believe it or not, we were told by ASTA that this emergency resolution, discussed over two weeks before, would probably be written up and approved later this week and then submitted.

Upon hearing the Visit USA people pass the ball back and forth to the Task Force, I began wondering, "Who's on first?" and after hearing that ASTA was taking a minimum of three weeks to write a simple resolution it occurred to me that we were all playing in different ball parks. Meanwhile, the whole ball game is rapidly slipping away from all of us because Visit USA business is continuing to go down the drain, nobody is doing a darn thing about it, except to point to some other agency or group, and the only certainty is that the travel agent industry will be left holding the bag when Treasury officials uncover the sorry fact that the difference between incoming and outgoing travel receipts is greater than ever in '68.

ABOLISH OR REFORM ELECTORAL COLLEGE?

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, there has repeatedly appeared in the press speculation that no candidate this fall would receive a majority of electoral votes and consequently the 1968 presidential election would ultimately have to be decided by the House of Representatives. This has quite naturally rekindled interest in electoral college reform.

An editorial appearing in the Owosso, Mich., Argus-Press on Monday, May 20, 1968, offered its readers a particularly timely and cogent discussion of this matter and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

Because I share the concern of many about the workability of our electoral machinery today, early this session I joined in sponsoring a resolution, House Joint Resolution 1164, to amend the Constitution, which if acted upon promptly by the majority leadership could be ratified by a sufficient number of the States following the November election if necessary. It would simply provide, that each State would have as many votes in electing the President as it does Representatives, contrary to the present one-State, one-vote provision in effect since the adoption of the 12th amendment in 1804. In this way the election of the President by the House would more properly reflect the views of the people. For years I have been concerned about our archaic electoral college and, in fact, back in 1961 I sponsored legislation to have a special commission review the whole question of electoral college reform. However, the majority leadership has apparently been of the opinion that no changes are needed. It is my hope that current speculation about the possibility of the coming election being decided by the House will prod some action. The editorial follows:

ABOLISH OR REFORM ELECTORAL COLLEGE?

Nearly everyone who has written on the subject for the last 180 years or so has called for doing away with or drastically altering the Electoral College method of choosing the nation's president.

The criticism has been especially vigorous this year because of the possibility that the third-party candidacy of former Alabama Gov. George Wallace could throw the election in the House of Representatives. The wheeling and dealing that might accompany that eventuality gives some people nightmares.

There are 538 electoral votes, which is the total of the representatives and senators of the 50 states, plus three for the District of Columbia. When John Q. Public votes in November, he votes not for the presidential and vice presidential candidates of the party of his choice but for a slate of electors. The elected electors in turn meet in their respective state capitals in December and are morally—but not legally—bound to vote for the candidates they represented on the ballot.

The Constitution provides that when no candidate receives a majority (270) of the electoral votes, the House of Representatives

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

must choose the president from the top three candidates, with each state's delegation casting one vote. (Senators vote as individuals for one of the top two vice presidential candidates.)

There are two main proposals for reform. One is to abolish the Electoral College outright and elect the president and vice president by direct vote, like every other elective federal official. The other proposal is to retain the college, but make its votes proportional to the popular vote in each state.

The Electoral College is not lacking for defenders, however, who argue that is not the unmitigated evil its opponents say it is.

For one thing, it has spared the United States from the divisive and paralyzing bane of splinter parties. The electoral system gives the candidate with the most popular votes all of a state's electoral votes, even if his popular majority was one. (It also gives the more populous states a deservedly greater weight in the election than the less populous.)

This winner-take-all system, because it maximizes the victory of the winner in a close election, has undoubtedly served to reconcile the voters whose candidate lost.

In 1960, John F. Kennedy had a popular majority of a mere 118,000 out of 68 million popular votes, but in electoral votes he defeated Richard Nixon by 303 to 219. There have been 14 other presidents, including Abraham Lincoln, who did not receive a majority of the popular vote, yet who won decisively in the Electoral College.

Even if the president were elected by direct popular vote, there would still be the possibility, whenever there were more than two candidates, of no one receiving a majority.

The Electoral College is not ideal by any means. Yet, except for two or three elections, it has served the nation well.

If there must be a constitutional amendment, one legally binding electors to vote as the people instruct them and stating simply that the candidate receiving the most, not the majority, of the votes in the Electoral College be declared president would correct the most serious deficiencies of the system while preserving its desirable features.

A SOLDIER SPEAKS OUT

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, the serious troubles that plague our country are eloquently described in a recent letter to the editor of the San Bernardino Sun in my district in California. I wish to take this opportunity to bring this American soldier's feelings to the attention of my colleagues because of its poignancy and heart-rending mood:

My God, how can it be:

That one boy lies rotting from malnutrition and torture in a jungle prison camp in North Vietnam—and another boy spits and tramples on the flag of this country on the steps of a university of learning.

That one boy lies sightless in a U.S. Naval Hospital from Communist-inflicted face wounds—and another boy uses a Communist flag to drape himself in defiance of the laws of this country.

That one man of medicine begins his 13th straight hour standing over an operating table in pursuit of life for men serving this country—and another man of medicine implores crowds of young men to refuse to serve their country.

That one Negro holds the face of his dead white comrade in his arms and cries pitifully in a dirty mudhole in Vietnam—and another Negro screams with hate against his white brother in the streets of countless American cities.

That one boy lies in a coffin beneath the ground because he believed in duty to country—and another boy lies on a dingy cot giving blood to the enemies of his country.

That one man of God shields a wounded boy from an enemy bayonet with his body and dies—and another man of God uses his cloth as a shield to preach hate, dissension and lawlessness.

My God, how can it be?

Sgt. JAMES R. SMITH,
Third Marine Division.

VIETNAM.

GEN. JIM FARLEY CELEBRATES HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on May 30, as the Nation appropriately paused to honor its dead, many Americans also took the opportunity to pay tribute to one of the country's truly great and distinguished citizens. I refer, of course, to the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and Democratic National Chairman; confidant of Presidents, acquaintance of foreign notables and dignitaries, and friend of all mankind.

Last Thursday Jim Farley celebrated his 80th birthday—that four-score mark to which we all aspire. But unlike most who have attained that age, Jim celebrated the occasion not in leisurely retirement but as just another event in a 75-hour workweek.

No other living American has played so great and influential a role in shaping the course of this country's history over the past half century. For more than 50 years, since his election as town clerk in the rock-ribbed Republican town of Grassy Point, N.Y., Jim has given unstintingly of his time and energies in behalf of his party, his country and the common good.

Much has been written and said about Jim Farley, but I believe that one of the best tributes to this great man was contained in an editorial in the July 17, 1944 issue of the New York Enquirer shortly after his resignation as chairman of the New York Democratic State Committee:

It is not necessary to restate Jim Farley's record. It is known the length and breadth of the land. Thousands can testify to his political ability and his genius for organization. But more thousands will rate Farley eminent not so much for these attributes—for others have them—but because through the years despite hard blows, despite disappointments, despite temptations, he has held fast to the virtues of patriotism, loyalty, honesty, and has demonstrated moral integrity and spiritual qualities of the highest order.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that every Member of this body joins with me today in acknowledging the Nation's debt to Jim Farley. The struggling youth of our country could well look to him as an example of a great American who has made it all the way from humble beginnings to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the greatest heights without losing the common touch. We can take comfort in the knowledge that his wisdom is still in our midst and, hopefully, will remain with us for many years to come.

HOUSING TRIUMPH FOR PERCY

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the omnibus housing bill approved May 28 by the Senate contains, as one of its major elements, a provision which will bring homeownership within the reach of a large number of less affluent Americans who heretofore have had no hope of owning their own homes. I believe it is noteworthy that this portion of the housing bill was the creation of a man in his first term in the Senate, the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois, CHARLES H. PERCY.

In an editorial May 31, the Chicago's American called inclusion of the homeownership program "a remarkable personal triumph" for Senator PERCY. I include in the RECORD the text of the editorial which so aptly places the credit for this legislation where it is due:

HOUSING TRIUMPH FOR PERCY

What President Johnson called "the largest and most comprehensive housing bill in the history of our country" swept thru the Senate Tuesday and seems headed for approval in the House, where a banking subcommittee has already approved an even bigger measure. Its record in the Senate was remarkable: The omnibus housing bill is 300 pages long and carries a 5-billion-dollar price tag the next three years, but it went thru on a thumping 67-to-4 vote after only 3 days of debate.

All this seems to us very good news, indicating that the coming slashes in federal spending at least won't be made in the vital area of housing. This measure is meant to provide 1.2 million units of new or rehabilitated housing to low-income families over the next 3 years; it also provides for a wide range of less pressing but still essential needs—programs for urban renewal, mass transit, campus housing construction, and so on. The bill has been trimmed down by 2.5 billion from President Johnson's version, but the cuts were made principally by shortening its term from 5 years to 3, rather than cutting out parts of the programs.

The Senate vote on this bill is in a way a remarkable personal triumph for Sen. Charles H. Percy [R., Ill.]. One of its key provisions—perhaps the most important in the whole bill—is a program developed by Percy, federal subsidies to help poor families meet mortgage payments.

The plan works this way: A low-income homeowner would have to pay 20 per cent of his income for his mortgage, including principal, interest, and taxes. If this was not enough to meet monthly mortgage payments, the government would pay some of the interest charges—up to 99 per cent, in some cases. The effect will be to bring home ownership within the reach of vast numbers of poor families who now haven't a hope of buying a home of their own.

To originate a piece of legislation as important as this, and see it passed by such a hefty margin, is quite a feat for a freshman senator. The achievement does not dim Percy's chances for the Vice Presidential nomination.

DAY OF PRAYER

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Northport Christian Church of Newport, Tenn., set aside Memorial Day, May 30, 1968, as a Day of Prayer and has sent out a letter which was mailed into all 50 States and 30 foreign countries.

What a wonderful thing to do, and my sincere and heartfelt congratulations to the pastor, Rev. Olin Badeaux, Mrs. Badeaux, Miss Lynn McKnight, and to the membership and friends of this church for holding this Day of Prayer services, which were conducted every hour, beginning at 12, midnight, Wednesday, and continuing through 12, midnight, Thursday—around the clock on Memorial Day.

At the invitation of the church, I attended one of the hourly Day of Prayer services—it was a most rewarding experience. I shall long remember my visit to this church, and I am honored that I was asked.

The services were not only fitting, but were very appropriate to be held on Memorial Day as we pay tribute to those who lie beneath the crosses row on row. During these troubled times, I know that it will have a great effect on the moral fiber of this country. I hope the appeal for others to do the same thing was received and carried out in the same spirit.

At this point, I would like to make the Day of Prayer letter available to the readers of the RECORD:

DEAR FELLOW AMERICANS: These are perilous times! If we are not awakened from our indifference, history students of tomorrow will be studying about the "Rise and Fall of America"; but this is not the first time in the life of America that she has faced a crucial time.

Abraham Lincoln felt that the Civil War was a Divine Judgment visited upon this nation because of her haughtiness, pride, indifference, the rejection and deliberate forgetting of the Almighty God.

Mr. Lincoln saw a direct connection between his perilous times and the pride and sin of this nation, and declared on March 30, 1863, the only remedy—a National Day of humiliation and prayer. It was the only answer then and it is the only answer now!

In II Chronicles 7:14 we read: "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven and will forgive their sins, and will heal their land." How do we know this is the answer? When God told Joshua to march around Jericho seven times in order to take the city he did not know how this plan could bring about victory, but in faith he did what God instructed him to do. Then God took over and completed the victory.

God has asked us to humble ourselves (to recognize that all things come from Him); to pray (talk to God and then accept His answer); seek His face (to search His Word); and turn from our wicked ways (repent of our sins—sin is anything that separates us from God.) And then, God will do His part. He will hear from heaven, forgive our sins, and heal our land. To be able to claim this promise of God, everyone of us will have to

June 3, 1968

fulfill these conditions, both individually and as a nation.

Will you join with us in this plan:

1. Will you set aside Memorial Day, May 30, 1968, and spend this day in prayer for your nation and encourage members of your family to do the same.

2. Will you be responsible for seeing that there is a planned public day of prayer in your church on this day.

3. Will you ask your employer to participate in this Day of Prayer as fully as possible and permit his employees time to participate.

4. Will you use your influence as a citizen to contact local officials, school officials, newspapers, radio and TV stations and ask them to promote and participate in this Day of Prayer.

"The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." (James 5:16).

YOUR FRIENDS IN CHRIST.

NEWPORT, TENN.

ILLINOIS: EXPORT CAPITAL OF UNITED STATES

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as I have warned my colleagues in the past, they can expect to hear me speak out from time to time in behalf of my beloved home State of Illinois as we celebrate our 150th year of statehood this year. However, the State continues to speak for itself and really requires no persistent advocate to tell her exciting story of growth and progress.

In that regard let me report that a recent report from the U.S. Department of Commerce points out that Illinois is now the Nation's largest exporter, not merely of agricultural commodities, mind you, but the largest total exporter of all our 50 great States.

An editorial from the Peoria Journal Star, May 27 issue, tells the story in fine fashion and I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

ILLINOIS: EXPORT CAPITAL OF UNITED STATES

Illinois is the nation's largest exporter—the largest exporter of agricultural commodities, the largest exporter of manufactured products, the largest total exporter.

This fact, pointed up once again in the latest U.S. Department of Commerce report, is significant.

It is significant because exports play a vital role in the nation's economy. In a word, we the people have the highest standard of living in the world basically because of our big edge in exporting.

It is significant to Peoria, of course, because Caterpillar is Illinois' biggest exporter—and there are a number of other large exporters in this metropolitan area. Indeed, exporting is the name of the game in Peoria.

Sometimes we overlook the vital role that exporting plays in the nation's economy, but it is crystal clear when you spell it out. Exports are:

A great source of income for American citizens and businesses.

The biggest part of our balance of payment return.

A motivation for greater innovation and diversification in industry and agriculture.

A stimulus to large scale production with lower per unit cost.

Producers of greater employment for Americans through the production, transportation, and servicing of them.

We could go on, but the point is clear: Without exports our economy would be much closer to the line and money wouldn't be as free and easy as it is today. It is the margin which puts us, relatively speaking, on Easy Street.

And this is the state and the area that is producing that margin. Illinois produces about 9 per cent of all exported manufactured products, and it grows a whopping 27 per cent of all the agricultural commodities that are exported.

Significant too, is that this aspect—exporting—is growing here by leaps and bounds. Illinois registered the fastest growth rate among the principal exporting states. Among U.S. metropolitan areas, Chicago ranked first in foreign sales of manufacturers.

It is evidence, too, of something we have long held in these editorial columns: The power of the U.S. is moving inexorably from the East Coast to the Middle West and to Illinois in particular. The New York establishment, which once regarded Midwesterners as quaint rubes, are now saying, "Better check with Illinois." It is finding that a nation's center is being superseded by a world center.

That is the significance of the export picture, pointed up once again in the U.S. Commerce Department report. Exporting is what makes our economy thrive, and Illinois is the export capital of the world.

LOWER VOTING AGE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my opinion that a progressive step in our election system would be a lowering of the voting age to 18.

In Illinois voters this fall will be asked to hold a constitutional convention. It is my hope that such a convention will be proved and that as it produces needed adjustments for the State one major change would be an 18-year-old voting clause.

Therefore, I am very pleased to note an editorial carried on Tuesday, May 21 over radio station WBBM, Chicago, as follows:

LOWER THE VOTING AGE

The U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments has an important measure before it. This is a proposal to permit all Americans to vote at age 18. Because the proposal takes the form of a constitutional amendment, it would take years for ratification of the amendment by the required three-fourths of the states. Minority Leader Everett Dirksen of Illinois is one of 46 co-sponsors of the measure.

The Constitution now leaves the question of a minimum voting age to the states. Until 1943, all states had a minimum voting age requirement of 21 years. Then Georgia lowered it to age 18 and Kentucky followed suit.

Alaska and Hawaii have set 19 and 20 year requirements in their respective states. Nationwide polls have indicated that 64% of today's voters favor a lowering of the voting age. And we also support this proposal. From the 77th to the 89th Congress, no less

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

than 86 joint resolutions to grant voting rights to 18 year olds were introduced. In the 89th Congress alone, there were 25 such measures in the House and 2 in the Senate.

It seems to us that the time has arrived to act on this issue. We believe that today's 18 year old is better equipped to vote than any other time in history. More is demanded, more is expected of today's 18 year old. We send our 18 year old youths to fight wars, but we deny to them the right to legally express their views with their vote. It simply does not make sense.

We believe that if Illinois voters should agree to hold a constitutional convention, one of the acts of that group should be to establish a new voting age limit. And we are convinced that the new voting age limit should start at 18 years of age.

A NEWSLETTER FROM MR. LONG OF MARYLAND

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker in my June Newsletter, I am polling my constituents to determine what they think this Government's policy on riot control should be. The maintenance of law and order is one of the most pressing responsibilities at all levels of government today, and I think the voters should have the chance to express their views on how it should be done. Under unanimous consent I insert my Newsletter in the RECORD at this point:

NEWSLETTER FROM MR. LONG OF MARYLAND, JUNE 1968

HOW TO STOP RIOTS

The next riots must be stopped. Without bloodshed. But stopped. Here's how, from experts:

Get plenty of police there, *fast*. Organize residents to help police. Disperse the curious and the pilferer. Photograph looters for later arrest. Stop the violent with tear or nausea gas. Infiltrate agents to search out leaders. Provide police with gas dispensers and masks, walkie-talkie radios. Never bluff!

PENNY FOR YOUR THOUGHTS—ON RIOTS

The following questions do not necessarily indicate my views. Your answers will, however, help guide legislative action. Check "Yes" or "No."

Yes No

1. Is the solution to riots—
Better housing, jobs, education?
2. Would you support substantially higher taxes to finance such programs?
3. Do you want prompter and stronger action to control riots?
4. Would you support higher taxes, if necessary, to finance stronger action against riots (and everyday crime)?

MARCH OR MENACE?

"Have you come to petition—or to threaten?" your Congressman asked the Rev. Ralph Abernathy at a recent meeting with leaders of the Poor People. "Statements such as 'We'll turn the country upside down,' especially in the context of recent riots, are losing you the sympathy of the American people. Without that public sympathy, it is difficult for Congress to help."

ATOMS FOR ABERDEEN

Aberdeen's \$2.5 million nuclear reactor—a major element in the Baltimore area's growing science-industry complex—will be dedicated this month by your Congressman, who led the fight to win it for Harford County.

KEEP PORNOGRAPHY OUT OF YOUR MAIL

A new law entitles you to return pornography to your postmaster and insist that no more be sent you from the same source. Call me if you need help.

DOUBLE DEAL ON A DOUBLE BRIDGE

The people voted down the parallel Bay bridge. Agnew is going to build it anyway—and raise your toll taxes on other roads to pay for it! Working people who use the Harbor Tunnel and the Susquehanna Bridge will pay \$2 million a year to finance a duplicate Bay bridge mainly for use of out-of-state vacationers on a few summer weekends. A poll just taken by WMAR-TV finds 82% of the people opposed to this.

SOMETHING WRONG? SEE LONG!

At these post offices on Saturday:
June 15, Edgewood, 10 a.m.

June 22, Perry Hall, 10 a.m.; White Marsh, 11 a.m.

Yes No

P.S.—Do you get my regular newsletter?
If not, would you like to be put on the mailing list?

AID SCORES SUCCESS WITH COLOMBIAN FARMERS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a successful Alliance for Progress must benefit people. Ultimately, our assistance through AID and other agencies is aimed at improving the life of the common man in Latin America.

It is reassuring then, especially when our aid programs are under attack, to hear of the positive and productive programs generated with U.S. assistance. One such program is currently enjoying success in Colombia, a prime recipient of U.S. aid. President Carlos Lleras Restrepo and his young, energetic Director of Agrarian Reform, Enrique Penalosa, are providing the impetus for a comprehensive program based on supervised credit, which is providing help to thousands of struggling Colombian farmers.

We can point with pride to this AID-supported project. I would like to submit for publication in the RECORD an article by Joseph R. Slevin that appeared in the Baltimore Sun Saturday, May 25, 1968, in which the writer describes specific successes of this Colombian program.

The article follows:

INSIDE THE ECONOMY: DESIRE TO LEARN AIDS COLOMBIA

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

MEDELLIN, COLOMBIA, May 24.—Three years ago. Samuel Botero had one cow, an unlighted tumble-down house and a mortgaged, largely uncultivated 75-acre farm for

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 3, 1968

which he had paid \$900. Today, the lithe, bright-eyed Colombian has fifteen cows, a horse, a milking shed, two profitable potato crops a year, and more than an acre of fruit trees. He has repaired and electrified his house, and his farm is worth a solid \$9,000.

Botero's hilly, green acres are at the side of a one-lane dirt road that winds out of El Retiro, slightly more than 30 mountainous miles from Medellin. He has done even better than the typical Colombian who operates under the dramatically successful Agrarian Reform Institute, or Incora as it is known by its Spanish initials. Incora provides credit and technical help to almost 25,000 poor farmers, and the average family triples its assets in three years.

FINANCED BY AID

Muscular Guillermo Bedoya at nearby La Ceja is another Incora success story. He was an impoverished farm laborer three years ago, but today he has 28 cows, rents a farm, is worth \$6,000 and is looking for a farm to buy.

Incora is financed by loans from the Agency for International Development. It is one of the many AID projects in Colombia of which the United States can be deeply proud.

Enrique Penalosa, Incora's charismatic, hard-driving director, plans to have 50,000 supervised credit farms by 1970 and to be adding and "graduating" 10,000 farm families a year.

COMPARISON URGED

"The only way to appreciate supervised credit is to see how the families were two to three years ago and how they are now," the 38-year-old official declares. Penalosa is one of President Carlos Lleras Restrepo's bright young men. Incora was founded in 1961 but it didn't start to take off until after Lleras was inaugurated in August, 1966.

The supervised credit program is a success because Colombia's small farmers want to learn. Incora's loans make it possible for Gotero, Bedoya and the rest to get the improved seeds, fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides that Penalosa's local technicians, his dedicated "development missionaries" recommend.

PROGRAM GETS TEETH

Incora expropriates land and buys it from big holders. It sells land to squatters and sharecroppers and gets them the clear titles that they must have to obtain credit. Lleras put teeth in the program two weeks ago and the prediction now is that 200,000 more campesinos will own the land they are working within another few years.

Incora has big development projects, too. It is opening up fertile, virgin lands, is playing an important role in developing Colombia's new beef cattle industry, and is just beginning to exploit the potentialities of farming along Colombia's lush, tropical coasts.

Penalosa enthusiastically forecasts that a huge 50,000-acre Atlantico project near Barranquilla will yield 200,000 tons of tomatoes a year to be processed into paste and catsup for export. He figures that 3,000 men will be needed at Atlantico, and that 20,000 jobs ultimately will be created.

THE "PUEBLO": HOW LONG, MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 133d day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

AN INTERVIEW WITH HERBERT H. MCADAMS

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the February 1968 issue of Southern Banker featured an interview with the Honorable Herbert H. McAdams, the chairman of our Arkansas Industrial Development Commission.

The article is prefaced by a brief account of Mr. McAdams that tells in a few words some of the splendid things about this active Arkansas citizen.

Because of my own high esteem for this man and the excellent work of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission, it is a privilege to bring this interview to the attention of the Members.

The article follows:

AN INTERVIEW WITH HERBERT H. MCADAMS, CHAIRMAN AIDC

Question—Mr. McAdams, Arkansas has been extremely successful in promoting and building industry in the past few years. To what do you attribute this mainly?

Answer—The continuing industrial progress achieved in Arkansas during the past 12 months reflects the cumulative results of years of work. And this progress has been accomplished through the collective efforts of many individuals and groups.

The Arkansas Industrial Development Commission was created by Act 404 of the 1955 General Assembly to bring labor, industry and agriculture into the closest and fullest possible accord for the development of the State's resources and the furtherance of its industry. Since that time, members of the AIDC staff have presented professionally-prepared factual information to more than 30,000 important prospects. The success of this program is attested by a decade of impressive industrial growth.

This growth in industry has been a team effort. No one person can influence, to a high degree, growth of this type. The Arkansas Industrial Development Commission, however, can exert a significant influence. And with the cooperation of local communities the job can be accomplished—sometimes spectacularly.

There was a 78.4 percent increase in the number of workers since March 31, 1955. During the same period the number of employers increased only 15 percent, reflecting healthy economic expansion within the state.

Manufacturing payrolls increased from \$243.7 million to \$645 million since March 31, 1955, a gain of 164 percent. Value added by manufacturing rose from \$585 million to \$1,330 million, a boost of 127 percent.

Question—Would you give us some facts and figures on the industrial change you mention?

Answer—The Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce annual inventory of Arkansas' Industrial Growth further emphasizes the state's tremendous growth. In 1955, investment in new and expanded plants was \$20.9 million. Investment by utilities for improved services was \$38.2 million and estimated total outlay for industrial growth was \$59.2 million. In 1966, there was an estimated total outlay of \$395.3 million for industrial growth.

Since 1951, when the State Chamber conducted its first industrial growth inventory more than \$2.4 billion has been programmed by private companies for new and expanded industrial facilities in Arkansas. This includes \$1.4 billion for 1,082 new manufacturing

and processing plants and 1,514 expansions to existing plants, plus \$965.4 million programmed by major utility, transportation and communications firms for improvement and expansion of systems and services within the state.

Among manufacturing industries, the most dramatic overall growth since 1957 has been in electrical equipment and supplies. Employment is up 380.2 percent and total payrolls 472.2 percent.

In early 1967, Arkansas had 46 plants producing electrical equipment; these plants totaled 11,520, a gain of 9,121 jobs since September 1957.

In the actual number of new jobs created during the decade, manufacturers of food and kindred products led all manufacturing industry groups in payroll gains and was the third largest producer of new jobs. The payroll increase was 165 percent and the employment gain was 58.7 percent.

Thus, in both numerical and percentage gains, Arkansas' industrial growth has been outstanding. Progress in the past 12 months points up a continuing expansion of Arkansas' vigorous economy.

During this time, 43 companies announced plans to build new plants in Arkansas. These new plants have an estimated potential employment of 6,148 persons. Expansion of existing plants was announced by 62 companies, with an expected increase of 4,633 new jobs.

Question—Can you tell us something about financing of new industry in Arkansas?

Answer—Arkansas offers two 100 percent financing plans for both new and expanding industries. This financing plans for both new and expanding industries. This financing may include land, buildings, machinery, and equipment. During the term of bonds issued under these plans, title to the property is vested in the municipality or county issuing the bonds. Under new legislation, Act 173 of 1967 provides for guaranty of amortization payments of these industrial revenue bonds. Since July 1966, these flexible plans have made it possible for the issuance of bonds totaling \$69,851,000 under Act 9 and \$4,658,000 under Amendment 49.

These financing plans helped Arkansas show a 3.7 percent increase of 5,344 manufacturing jobs during the 12-month period ended March 31, 1967. The national gain during the identical period was 2.6 percent.

Question—What is the role of Arkansas Industrial Development Commission?

Answer—At the forefront of this industrial expansion in Arkansas, the AIDC continues to stay abreast of new and changing needs in the area development field. The Electronic Data Retrieval System has been further expanded to include automatic typing from punched cards and tapes. This system is utilized in the preparation of preliminary reports, for special promotional and informational mailings, and for presentations to industrial prospects. The Electronic Data System includes extensive information on communities and industries throughout the state.

Question—We have heard a great deal about the great Arkansas River Development Project. What will its impact be on the future economy of the state?

Answer—As Arkansas looks to an unlimited future, a major project lends tremendous impact to future growth—the \$1.3 billion Arkansas River Development Program. Upon its completion in 1970, this, the largest civil works undertaking ever assigned to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, will provide an important mid-continental artery of commerce and trade.

This program will make seaports out of river towns along the Arkansas. And the entire state will see and feel the effects of a navigable Arkansas River. In addition to obvious industrial advantages, the Arkansas River will offer increased water recreation

and more tourist trade to help insure continued expansion of Arkansas' economy.

Question—What roll have the bankers of Arkansas played in these tremendous efforts?

Answer— Bankers of Arkansas have devoted unlimited time and effort to progress of the state by taking leading roles in local industrial development projects, Chambers of Commerce activities, and all other civic and economic planning. At the state level the Arkansas Bankers Association has followed a theme of economic development for Arkansas in the past three years. This theme has been brought into every program whether it be an instalment credit conference, the Bank Management Seminar at the University each year, efforts of the Public Relations Committee, or an industrial financing paper written and sponsored jointly by the University and the association.

As a result bankers of the state are keenly aware of the state's aims and goals. They are playing a great role in this undertaking.

HELEN KELLER IS DEAD; HER COURAGE REMAINS AN INSPIRATION

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, with sincere regret I call to the attention of my colleagues the death of Helen Keller of Easton, Conn. She was certainly my most courageous constituent.

Although deaf and blind, she became an American institution and was honored the world over for her accomplishments in the face of adversity.

If ever there was an era of frustration, of disillusionment, of discouragement and hardship, albeit outweighed by opportunity for wealth, education and achievement by those who would overcome the obstacles to attainment, we are a part of it. All the more reason why the indomitable spirit and unflinching courage of Helen Keller will live on as an inspiration to all who would be undaunted by problems seemingly impossible to overcome, and would rise effectively to the challenge.

Mr. Speaker, Helen Keller was especially beloved in Easton, Conn., where she had made her home for many years prior to her death. She would have been 88 years of age on June 27 and I am certain that her birth date, as well as her achievements, will long be remembered and honored in the beautiful Fairfield County area she chose to call home.

I have today read two editorials which impressed me and I would include them as part of this tribute. They are "The Helen Keller Miracle" which appeared in the Washington Post of June 3 and "Helen Keller's Vision" from the New York Times of June 3.

The editorials follow:

[From the Washington Post, June 3, 1968]

THE HELEN KELLER MIRACLE

Mark Twain's comment that "the two most interesting characters of the 19th century are Napoleon and Helen Keller" has an element of humor because the two were so different. Yet Miss Keller's conquest of the spirit was as striking in its way as the military conquests of the dashing French general. Her life was truly one of the remarkable phenomena of our time, and her death just

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

short of the age of 88 years leaves the whole world poorer.

Miss Keller would doubtless have been a notable figure if illness had not left her blind and deaf at the age of 19 months. But her attainment of the status of eminent writer and lecturer, known throughout the world, despite these usually crippling handicaps, clearly falls into the category of the miraculous. And for this generation her achievement is the more meaningful because it was centered in the area of personal struggle and spiritual triumph.

The blind and deaf girl who found a way to express the "sweet strange things that were locked up in her heart" had an enormous appeal to the imagination. She came to reflect in a very real way the finest aspects of the American spirit. Her indomitable will was akin to the motivation behind our pioneers and empire builders. Her relentless pursuit of goals that once seemed impossible was a dramatic example of the restless questing which is characteristic of this country. Yet her courage and skills were channeled into intensely human endeavors that are well understood and appreciated by this generation. She will long be remembered not only as a remarkable individual but also as an inspiration to all those who have gigantic problems or handicaps to overcome.

In this age of disillusionment and easy surrender to hardships and discouragement, the world can ill afford to lose the shining example of Miss Keller fighting her way through every adversity to a rich and satisfying life in which she became, despite her handicaps, a source of help, comfort and strength to her generation.

[From the New York Times, June 3, 1968]

HELEN KELLER'S VISION

"I slip back many times," Helen Keller wrote of her college years. "I fall, I stand still. I run against the edge of hidden obstacles. I lose my temper and find it again, and keep it better. I trudge on, I gain a little. I feel encouraged. I get more eager and climb higher and begin to see widening horizons."

Stricken as an infant with an illness that left her blind, deaf and mute, Miss Keller became—through her unquenchable zest for life and learning—a font of strength and courage to hundreds of millions. "Love" and "joy" were her favorite words and "war" perhaps her most despised. She saw a better world for the blind and—if man would only respond to the better angles of his nature—for everyone.

NATIONAL ANTHEM FOR STUDENTS

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Miss Camille O'Neill of Lake Worth, Fla., has been active in civic affairs in her community, and has taken a special interest in the young people of this Nation.

She has composed a song which expresses her feelings in this endeavor and I insert it here for the benefit of others:

NATIONAL ANTHEM FOR STUDENTS

(Words and music by Camille O'Neill of Lake Worth, Fla.)

This is our day to mold our world

In beauty not yet known,—

To search with faith for laws of life

That we ride but do not own.

Each one his loving life pours out

To leave his deathless mark

Upon our vital, glowing land

That men may heed, and hark.

We walk, and work, and travel on,
Our faces to the light.

We play and feast, but never cease

To strive to reach the height.

One hand stretched out to touch the robe

Of God, our hope, our might—

Our other hand shall lift the load

Of those who stand in night.

MEMORIAL DAY REFLECTIONS

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, returning to Washington following Memorial Day, it is well for all of us to reflect on the true meaning of the occasion, and reflect on the application of the lessons of Memorial Day. Mayor Gil Colnot, of Lauderdale-by-the-Sea, Fla., did just that in an article in the Tribune, a weekly newspaper in central Broward County. His words are important and to the point, and I include his article at this point in the RECORD:

MEMORIAL DAY REFLECTIONS

(By Mayor Gil Colnot)

As we approach another Memorial Day, its purpose should certainly be more meaningful than ever. To the list of those who paid the supreme sacrifice, suffered lifetime wounds, or just served their Country to the best of their ability and were fortunate enough to return unscathed in the wars since 1865, we are adding daily precious names from the cream of our youth as they drop in far distant places amid stench and rubble. God knows we need these fine young men at home to help preserve the dignity and stature of this great land.

If you have passed the time away one Memorial Day after another over recent years and not thought seriously of the true meaning and the debt you owe to those who have died to preserve our freedom, please sit down and think seriously of the past as it applies to the present. Oh! yes, the trend is to forget the past and instead "go-go" with the new way of life, get hep to the modern jive, minimize the glories of the past, rebel and riot over what we think are our constitutional rights, question many of the basic truths that have been a part of our lives down through the years.

Isn't it time for us to reconsider, asking our selves if this new way of life is really so "cool"? True we have the greatest prosperity, the highest living standard, the highest wage standard, many two-three car garages, \$100,000 homes, palatial yachts, million dollar churches and clubs, an automobile in nearly every home. On the contrary it is a condition that must puzzle the world when they read the cover page of Time Magazine headlining: Poverty In America—Its Cause and Extent, or when they read all the ballyhoo over our money crisis, and look at our record breaking public debt or our record of disappearing gold.

The conditions are more prevalent and more serious than at any time in the history of our nation. If the guidance we are following, and the policies endorsed are responsible for this condition along with our apparent loss in world leadership, then isn't it time we sit down and maybe think a little about the "olden days?" Thinking about them must include recalling the terrific sacrifices of American manhood through the years in an effort to preserve exactly what we are now losing. Maybe we should get out our pencil and study some figures printed recently in a popular magazine, giving the

source to be Agency for International Development. These figures show that in the 21 years between 1945 and 1966 our Government "gave" or "loaned" to a list of 136 nations to total sum exceeding 122 billions of dollars. The largest "loan or gift" went to France in an amount approaching 10 billions of dollars. (Mr. DeGaulle; how about a payment on account?)

The above figures included only the accounting through 1966, and even though our source of the dollars was by borrowing them at interest to give or loan, resulting in our current record breaking public debt, yet, we continue the same old practices. What does it take to teach us a lesson? This is further emphasized when we scan the list of 136 nations trying to find a few staunch friends of America, for we must admit our foreign friends are at an all time low.

Lest the martyrs of 1865 through 1968, slumbering in distant places after paying the supreme sacrifice for Love of Country, arise in horror to see our mess, let us Make Memorial Day a memorable day by determining to revive the Spirit of 1776—1863—1917—1942 when love of Country inspired our efforts, when Law and Order was a part of our unified effort to make certain that "This Nation Might not Perish from the Earth." Our sleeping heroes deserve a better reward for the efforts they put forth than what today's chaos in America reflects.

WHAT ABOUT THE OTHER FELLOWS?

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn that one of my constituents, L. C. James O. Holloway, Jr., of Newark, was recently killed in action by mortar fire in Vietnam. This valiant marine's own words express, more nobly than I possibly could, the selflessness and dedication we are proud to see and support in our fighting men. I want to share with my colleagues one of James' letters, addressed to Mr. Jerry Leopoldi, president of Local 447, IUE-AFL-CIO. The letter follows:

MARCH 19, 1968.

DEAR MR. LEOPALDI AND ASSOCIATES: This is just a couple of short lines to thank you for the transistor. I really appreciated what you are doing for me and the other fellows.

You expressed that you would like to know some of my experiences while being here. Well, I've been wounded twice and seen a lot of action. But . . . that's just a small part. What about the other fellows that won't make it home? The Marine Corps, Army, Navy and Air Force are all doing a fine job here and my opinion is that all of this will be over soon.

I am so proud to be an American citizen and serving in one of its forces, and till it's all over I'm expressing that we will all stay to keep the American people *Proud and Free*.

Thank you all for the enjoyment that you have brought to me and others. And please excuse the spelling and writing for at *Khe Sanh* you have to keep low in a fox hole. (Smile)

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. HOLLOWAY.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Dorothy Holloway is the first member of local 447 to lose a son in Vietnam, and she is bearing her

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tragic loss with admirable courage and faith. I am sure every Member of the House will join in her prayer that we will soon be blessed with the peace for which he gave his life.

THE DEMO PRIMARIES

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, well, tomorrow we have the last major primary with the voters of California going to the polls to express their opinions with respect to the merits of the various candidates. Literally millions of words have been written and spoken about the spirited contest for the Democratic presidential nomination, however, an editorial appearing in today's edition of the Peoria Journal Star outlines the situation in a nutshell so to speak and under unanimous consent I submit the editorial for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

THE DEMO PRIMARIES—YOU CAN'T KILL CARCASSES

Well, for all practical purposes, the fun and games are over, now, with Oregon finished and California coming to a "climax" tomorrow.

Doubtless most of us in the press and broadcast media will have to play out the game and beat the drums over the "race" still formally in progress in California—but as a practical matter, it really doesn't make any difference now.

Kefauver ran from "outside" the organization, swept all the primaries, and never had a prayer in the convention—which chose Adlai Stevenson. Remember?

In 1960, John F. Kennedy, with only one foot in the organization, swept the primaries and the convention.

Bobby Kennedy and Eugene McCarthy have been in the Kefauver boat, and it is foolish to talk of them "killing" each other's candidacies. You can't kill carcasses.

What both have been trying to do is create life in a candidacy by "going to the people," and to do that it is necessary to come out looking like a champion, a world-beater.

The plain fact is that neither one has managed to do this.

They have both looked to be doing what they are doing—struggling for life.

And the balance of that struggle is so indecisive that it doesn't now make much difference what happens in California. It can't help either one much.

Sen. McCarthy, who can be amazingly candid about some things and amazingly crude about others, almost laid bare what his only real hope is—and the same would go for Kennedy.

He said "There is a long, hot summer ahead," and events may change some delegate votes.

Translated, this means plainly that as it stands neither of them has a prayer, but they are—should we say "hoping"?—for some dramatic and disastrous events between now and July to so thoroughly disenchanted the public with this administration as to ruin Humphrey's candidacy.

But if they are counting on outside events to alter the political picture, they are overlooking a significant reality.

If that happens, they will not benefit from it.

June 3, 1968

The signs, and experience of the past, both suggest that if the American people are shaken to the core by events—they will demand more than a change of presidents. They will want to sweep out all the Democrats.

And if that happens, no Democrat can divorce himself from the people and approaches with which he has been associated so many years.

Meanwhile, in any case, Sen. McCarthy's long hot summer is going to be cut short, very abruptly, in August.

For that is when the convention meets—not next Fall.

Hot or cold . . . it will be a short summer for the candidates.

ROBERT GRUENBERG—FIRST RECIPIENT OF THE JAMES P. McGUIRE MEMORIAL AWARD SPONSORED BY THE ILLINOIS DIVISION, AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pride that we learned that Robert Gruenberg, a reporter for the Chicago Daily News, has been named the first recipient of the James P. McGuire Memorial Award, established by the Illinois Division of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. Gruenberg was selected for his "dedicated services to the highest standards of journalism and to the principles and ideals of civil liberties and human dignity."

The award is named for James P. McGuire, a Chicago Sun-Times reporter who died in 1955.

Mr. McGuire and Chicago Sun-Times reporter, Jack McPhaul received a national award from Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic society, for their efforts in establishing the innocence of a Chicago man wrongfully sent to prison for murder.

Mr. Gruenberg's citation praises his "numerous thoughtful, incisive, and influential articles on the racial unrest and civil disturbances, excessive bail, censorship, corruption in government, dissent in the society, and the problems of migratory workers."

Many of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives will remember Robert Gruenberg when he covered Congress for the Chicago's American and later returned to the Chicago Daily News.

It has been my privilege to know Bob Gruenberg for the last two decades, and I can say without any fear of contradiction that he is one individual whom we can honestly describe as a "humanitarian".

Throughout his journalistic career, Bob Gruenberg has engaged in that tireless search for truth. He is a newspaperman's newspaperman.

Gruenberg has never run from an issue, but he is one of those newspapermen who can pride himself in the fact

that he has discharged his responsibility with the highest degree of dignity, honesty, fairness, justice, and has exemplified the highest spirit of fair play.

Mr. Gruenberg well recognizes the enormous power of the printed word and he has never abused that power.

He continues to be one of the most unrelenting foes of oppression and despotism. His entire life has been dedicated to the highest principles of human dignity.

Every day Robert Gruenberg demonstrates that one can be an incisive, decisive and productive reporter-writer without ever trespassing on the rights of others.

At a time when modern journalism is undergoing serious criticism for lack of objectivity and integrity, Bob Gruenberg can hold high the award given him by the Illinois Division of the American Civil Liberties Union and say to himself and to his children that he at least, has upheld the highest traditions and responsibilities of a free press.

God grant there will be many more like him.

A MEMORIAL DAY POEM

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday our Nation honored those brave Americans who have given their lives in defense of their country. Few are untouched by this sacrifice, and Rosemary Breckler, who works as a secretary for the San Fernando Valley's largest newspaper, is no exception.

Last year, while watching the daily list of Vietnam casualties grow on the bulletin board of the city room of the Van Nuys News and Green Sheet in my district in California, Miss Breckler was moved with a desire to write something to bring some solace to the hearts of the mothers, wives, and other grieved ones who came into her office with pictures of their boys who had died.

As a result, Miss Breckler, an ex-World War II WAC, wrote a Memorial Day poem—a poem of such beauty and pathos that the Valley News and Green Sheet published it and the Army's 82d Airborne Division read it at their D-day anniversary dinner and later printed it in their magazine.

Capt. Ferdinand Mendenhall, U.S. Naval Reserve, publisher of the Valley News and Green Sheet, has kindly granted permission for republication of Miss Breckler's poem, and I would like to share it with my colleagues in the House, as follows:

MEMORIAL DAY

(By Rosemary Breckler)

Mute not the bugles on this day,
Flow full their clarion sweet call,
That all who weep to mourn a lad
Might solace find in deep recall
Though years may flit with breezy mists
Memory dwells forever where fighters fall.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Though names, faces, figures . . . shadowy things

May fade with passing moons and suns,
Still tall forever stand the facts

That cost a country cherished sons
And no ground is ever hallowed more
Than blood-won battle runs.

An ounce of immortality may
Be all a fighter wins but yet . . .
No one can ever say he lived in vain
Or on him the sun will ever set!
So blow sweetly, tenderly today
The calls to honor those we debt.

EVENING UP THE ODDS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the FBI has reported a steady increase in the intensification of Soviet-bloc espionage operations and any daily newspaper reveals a parallel increase in Communist-instigated revolutions, so-called.

Writing in the *Veterans of Foreign Wars* magazine, Donald J. Miller comments that in the corps of agitators, propagandists, and organizers the Communists have an advantage of something approaching 6,000 to 1.

For each one of our training centers, they have 6,000 turning out agents trained in every skill from agitation to guerrilla attack.

He concludes with the logical statement that while we are meeting the Communists on other fronts and matching or excelling their threats with counterdefenses, we have yet to institute a Freedom Academy to counter the threats of indigenous and other Communist agents and propaganda.

The full purpose of such a Freedom Academy has been stated to be "to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States and other nations in the global struggle between freedom and communism; to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge; and, also, to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge."

Action along these lines it to be preferred over our present course of inaction or reaction.

I include the article from the VFW magazine at this point:

ALONG THE RED FRONT

(By Donald L. Miller)

There's an old military saying that the general always needs two more cavalry units and the admiral two more frigates.

Something much more rare is needed now. We need more civilians trained to out-think, out-plan, out-maneuver and out-fight Communist agitators, propagandists, and organizers.

In this field the Communists have almost a 6,000-to-1 advantage over us. For each one of our training centers, they have 6,000 turning out agents trained in every skill from agitation to guerrilla attack.

Trybuny Ludu, a Polish Communist newspaper, noted on January 21 that "Asian, African and Latin American nations are producing more and more forces to struggle against foreign domination, against the recently intensified offensive of American imperialism."

A North Korean terrorist captured near Seoul in January was more direct. He said the North Korean Reds have 2,400 special forces trained to infiltrate, gather intelligence, assassinate, terrorize and stir up revolution.

How do they stir up revolution? They settle in a community, pick out an emotional issue, organize a few people who are sympathetic, then move into the public arena with protests, demonstrations and demands. As these grow, demonstrations become disruptions, then riots and eventually guerrilla warfare.

We have some signs of this process in the United States. Some of those involved have visited Communist capitals. Some claim training in Havana and elsewhere. One group, we know, gave instructions on making molotov cocktails just before one major urban riot.

If this much can be done here, how much more agitation, terrorism and revolt can highly trained agents do in the villages of Southeast Asia, Africa and Latin America?

Soviet Communist Party Chief Leonid Brezhnev calls these agents "revolutionary detachments opposing imperialism." They're revolutionary because they don't wear uniforms; they are natives of the nations they attack, and they use the skills of inciting revolution.

While we can match the Communist world with nuclear weapons, with conventional weapons and, probably, in guerrilla warfare, we are not equipped to counter their revolutionary warfare.

We have turned this problem over to the police, the National Guard or the armed forces. They can't act until after the violence begins. The time to counter revolutionary detachments is when they start to build support—not after they have incited a riot or launched a guerrilla attack.

At only one center—the Freedom Center in Seoul, Korea—civilians are now being trained in this vital area, which might help to account for why revolutionary infiltrators are caught in Korea and are not in Southeast Asia. A measure to create a Freedom Academy in America to encompass such training is now before Congress. It would seem that such training is needed if we are to win the pacification war in Vietnam or anywhere else.

COOPERATIVE EFFORT HELPING TO BUILD NEEDED FERTILIZER PLANT IN INDIA

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Cooperative News Service of Chicago recently published a dispatch which tells how members of American cooperative organizations made it possible for cooperatives in India to begin construction of a much needed fertilizer plant:

COOPERATIVE FERTILIZER PLANT IN INDIA IS "ALL SYSTEMS GO"

Indian and U.S. cooperatives—assisted by private capital and a government guarantee—are working together to build a \$119 million nitrogen fertilizer plant in India.

The project is believed to be the world's largest international business transaction by cooperatives.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 3, 1968

It has been in development for more than two years, but because of the complex and many-sided negotiations involved, only fragments of its story have heretofore been made public.

Parties to the project are: in India, the National Cooperative Union of India, the Indian government, Indian AID (U.S. Agency for International Development) Mission, Indian Farmers Fertilizer Cooperative, and other cooperatives; and in the United States, U.S. AID in Washington, the Bank of America, and some two dozen cooperative organizations.

For one of the principal participants, the Cooperative League of the USA, Chicago, the project marks a major fruition of 13 years of joint effort with the Indians to develop and strengthen cooperatives in their country. The League has maintained an office in New Delhi since 1955.

The Indian Farmers Fertilizer Cooperative, formed to own and operate the new plant and distribute its products, was inaugurated at a ceremony in New Delhi, April 11. Donald H. Thomas, president of Cooperative Fertilizers International of Chicago, new U.S. organization brought into being because of this project, was one of the speakers.

Following this inauguration, at which Jagilvan Ram, India's prime minister for food and agriculture, was the principal speaker, Thomas and Allie C. Felder, Jr., head of the Cooperative League India office, said that the project could be described as "all systems go."

The proposed plant will produce 1,000 tons of anhydrous ammonia (83% nitrogen) per day—an estimated (depending somewhat on formulas) 800,000 tons of finished fertilizer products a year.

One pound of nitrogen is computed to produce up to 10 pounds of additional wheat or rice. Thus, on the basis of 300 days' operation, this single plant could account for more than 80 million bushels of additional wheat or rice in a year.

This would mean a 3% to 5% increase in India's total annual grain production. It also is equivalent to nearly one-third of the wheat and feed grain the United States sent to India in 1967, peak year of its shipments under the "Food for Freedom" program.

The homemade fertilizer also will represent a saving of foreign exchange for India, which imports about \$400 million worth of fertilizer a year.

Of the estimated plant cost of \$119 million, 10% (\$12 million) is to come from the Indian cooperatives, 20% (\$24 million) from the Indian government in the form of redeemable stock, 23% (\$27 million) from the Indian government as a loan, and 47% (\$55 million) from a loan to be obtained in the United States.

The investment is projected to pay off in 12 years. In that time the plant will, according to computations, pay \$128 million in principal and interest; redeem the Indian government's \$24 million in shares and pay it \$12 million in dividends; save farmers \$165 million in cost of fertilizers; save the country \$350 million in foreign exchange, and represent a net worth of \$49 million. All of this is apart from the increased value of crop production resulting from the fertilizer.

Ram said in his April 11 speech that the plant is expected to reduce fertilizer prices from current levels by 10%, 20%, and 30% in its fourth, sixth, and eighth years of operation.

The plant will be built at Kandla, a port city on the Gulf of Kutch in northeast India. Construction is expected to begin in 1969, with completion targeted in 1971.

Development of this "India fertilizer project" is a many-stranded story.

In 1953 the American International Association for Economic and Social Development (AIA)—founded by Nelson Rockefeller and active principally in Latin America—estab-

lished a supervised agricultural credit project in India. The man in charge, Thomas B. Keehn, found himself working primarily with the Indian cooperatives.

In 1955 Jerry Voorhis, executive director of the Cooperative League from 1947 to 1967, made the League a partner with the AIA in the India project. Felder went to India for the League in 1956 as an agricultural credit specialist. In 1961 both Keehn and AIA left India and Felder took charge of the League's India office.

In 1961 Nationwide Insurance companies of Columbus, Ohio, a League member, sent a five-man team to India to study the possibilities of further assistance to cooperatives. This group recommended fertilizer production as part of an overall cooperative development plan.

In 1964 Howard A. Cowden, president of the 1-year-old International Cooperative Development Association, visited India and, as the result of talks with Indian co-op leaders, strongly recommended a fertilizer program.

Felder, working closely with the Indian co-op leaders, Indian government, and AID Mission, developed a comprehensive plan of cooperative development. The Indian government asked the Cooperative League to send a team to study the feasibility of the cooperative part of this plan.

On September 5, 1966, this team left for India, where it worked three months, returning in December.

The team members were Howard H. Gordon, retired general manager of Southern States Cooperative, Richmond, Va.; William Mitchell, manager of the plant food department of Tennessee Farmers Cooperative at La Vergne, Tenn.; and Albert J. Soddy, process engineer of Mississippi Chemical Corporation, Yazoo City, Miss. Ferris S. Owen, administrator of AID projects for the Cooperative League, recruited the men; their trip was financed by the League's overseas-assistance contract with AID.

The team found the fertilizer project feasible and recommended a go-ahead.

At that point the Cooperative League referred the project to the International Cooperative Development Association, Washington, D.C., which had been formed by U.S. cooperatives in 1963 for the express purpose of promoting international cooperative business operations. Herbert C. Fledderjohn, who had succeeded Cowden as president of the ICDA, then took the lead in developing the plan, which ICDA's board approved in January, 1967.

A dramatic and perhaps decisive moment in development of the project came on January 19 at a meeting in the Jung hotel in New Orleans. ICDA called the meeting on short notice because representatives of most U.S. cooperatives in the fertilizer business were there for the annual meeting of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

Fledderjohn presided. Kenneth F. Lundberg, president of the Central Farmers Fertilizer Company, Chicago, and Owen Cooper, president of Mississippi Chemical Corporation, both ICDA member organizations, presented the plan for a cooperative fertilizer plant in India.

One after another, on a rising wave of enthusiasm, the men present expressed themselves in favor of helping Indian farmers get a fertilizer plant. They left the meeting having pledged themselves to seek from their organizations \$1 million—not as invested capital expected to bring any return, but as a contribution to the costs of getting the plant going; travel to India, economic studies, and such.

In April Fledderjohn, Owen (who also had been on the 1961 Nationwide team), Lundberg, Cooper, and Gordon went to India to present the plan to the Indian cooperative and government. Felder and the India AID Mission were party to the talks.

The Indians liked what they heard, and on May 26 the government asked the ICDA,

also a contractor with U.S. AID, to send a team of experts to get down to the brass tacks of plant location, type, size, and such. This team—Thomas, then an economic analyst for Central Farmers Fertilizer Company (which is owned by 22 fertilizer-producing co-ops in the United States and Canada); John Wiley, marketing specialist for Central Farmers; and Soddy—worked in India six weeks in June and July.

On October 19 the Indian government formally accepted the plan, the cooperatives already having done so.

Meanwhile, on September 25 at a meeting in Washington the interested organizations had formed Cooperative Fertilizers International (CFI) to handle the U.S. side of the operation. CFI elected Thomas president and Lundberg chairman of the board. And during the summer the U.S. cooperatives had formally committed the \$1 million, to be paid in four equal parts over four years.

The Agency for International Development in Washington found that, because of cutbacks in funds, it could not lend the \$55 million needed to build the plant. It could, however, guarantee the loan; and on that basis a private lender was found: the Bank of America.

In April, 1968, CFI arranged for Ernest C. Davis, manager of the fertilizer plant of Central Nitrogen, Inc., at Terre Haute, Ind., to go "on loan" to India as its representative during the detailed planning and construction of the plant. He will work with Shri Paul Pothen, managing director of the plant.

Thomas, accompanied to India by O. Roy Wiebe, secretary-treasurer of Central Farmers, told his inauguration-day audience that the cooperative fertilizer plant will create "healthy competition" among plants in the private and public sectors of the industry, thereby benefiting all farmers.

In Chicago, Stanley Dreyer, president of the Cooperative League, described the India project as "a wonderful example of cooperation among cooperatives—both within this country and between the two countries."

He said the League staff is proud of the part it has been able to play and is genuinely appreciative of the support of its own board and members as well as the cooperation of other organizations.

THE ARNHEITER CASE

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, during the recent ad hoc hearings on the matter involving Lt. Comdr. Marcus A. Arnheiter, U.S. Navy, a number of high-ranking officers came forward to protest the Navy's handling of the case. They protested not out of concern for a single officer, but because of their love for the Navy and its traditions or honor and integrity.

The reaction of many of these officers was the same as that of Capt. Richard G. Alexander, U.S. Navy, when he investigated the Arnheiter matter:

How in ---- could this happen in the United States Navy?

Captain Alexander was removed from one of the Navy's prime commands for asking this question, but he felt the principles involved were too important for him to remain silent.

Rear Adm. Daniel V. Gallery, U.S. Navy, retired, served in the U.S. Navy for 43 years, and his reaction to the Arn-

heiter case was virtually the same as Capt. Alexander's:

The Navy doesn't do things like that! Or does it?

Mr. Speaker, so far the Navy still refuses to hold a court of inquiry into the Arnheiter matter. Until it holds such a hearing and gives Lt. Comdr. Arnheiter the day in court to which he is entitled, the Navy's credibility will be questionable.

At this point, I insert into the RECORD a letter from Rear Adm. Gallery to Secretary of the Navy Ignatius asking that the entire Arnheiter matter be brought before a court of inquiry so that the many questions that have arisen can be settled once and for all:

OAKTON, V.A.
May 16, 1968.

Hon. PAUL R. IGNATIUS,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I served in the Navy for 43 years, retiring in 1960 after 15 years in the rank of Rear Admiral. During this time, I grew to love the Navy, including even the barnacles on its bottom. On the rare occasions when we seemed to made stupid mistakes, I could usually say, "There must be some good reason—otherwise we wouldn't do it." I find that now, in the Arnheiter case and other matters associated with it, I can no longer do this.

The case itself boils down to a question of credibility, and is, in itself, relatively unimportant. It may be a tempest in a teapot, involving, perhaps, merely a possible miscarriage of justice to one individual.

The Navy's public presentation of the case has been bungled and, the credibility gap in Washington being what it is these days, it is impossible for the public to judge the case on the evidence made available to it so far.

My natural impulse in the beginning was to accept the Navy's version. When the case began getting national publicity making the Navy look bad, my first reaction was, "It's a damn lie—the Navy doesn't do things like that." I still hope I was right. But I now have serious doubts.

Whether Arnheiter should have been relieved or not is now a relatively minor question involving merely one officer's right to a square deal. But the Navy's handling of the case is becoming a national scandal.

The big question at issue now has become the right of a commanding officer to run his ship without taking a Gallup poll among his junior officers to see if they like the way he is doing it. There is a widespread feeling now that Arnheiter was torpedoed by a group of mutinous, disgruntled officers, and that a skipper nowadays had better be damned careful about how he treads on the toes of his junior officers trying to straighten out a ragtime ship.

It is my earnest hope that this is not true. It never was so in the Navy that I spent my life in.

However, the case of Commander Cheek, who was summarily relieved from command of the Ault because 4 disgruntled sailors wrote letters to Congressmen, adds weight to this feeling.

So does the case of Captain Alexander, who lost command of the New Jersey because he came to Arnheiter's defense and because of his unfortunate blunder in failing to give CNO a copy of his letter to you about Arnheiter. Although I feel this letter was in some respects too outspoken, I am beginning to feel the same sense of outrage that prompted it, and to understand why such a brilliant young officer as Alexander would sacrifice his career for the principles involved.

Downgrading the authority of a ship's

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

commanding officer strikes at the very root of the traditions that made our Navy great. It may have had a lot to do with the Pueblo fiasco.

I therefore respectfully request that Arnheiter be given the formal court of inquiry or court martial which he wants. I feel that if the Navy's position in this matter is right, we have nothing to lose and a great deal to gain in a formal public legal hearing.

Respectfully,

D. V. GALLERY,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy, Retired.

WISCONSIN'S BUSINESSMAN OF YEAR SPEAKS OUT ON COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Hubert R. Murphy, of Fond du Lac, Wis., recently was named Wisconsin's Small Businessman of the Year.

In his acceptance speech, Mr. Murphy gave some sound advice to small businessmen. He said the small businessman should take an active part in his community's development as his time and energy permit. Mr. Murphy has done much to practice his credo, and the SBA award is well deserved.

I am proud of Mr. Murphy for his service and his leadership and include for the information of my colleagues a newspaper account of his speech:

HUBERT MURPHY AT AWARDS EVENT—"SMALL BUSINESSMAN" WINNER URGES COMMUNITY ACTION

Small businessmen were advised by Wisconsin's Small Businessman of the Year to today to take an active part in their community's civic, economic and political activities—no matter how controversial they may be.

Hubert R. Murphy, Fond du Lac, gave this advice in his speech accepting the Small Business Administration's award at a luncheon at the Retlaw Motor Inn at Fond du Lac.

In fact, Murphy declared he'd like to see every community have a Ralph Nader, the young attorney "crusader who woke up the Congress and shocked the big business auto makers into much needed safety devices."

Murphy said the small businessman should take an active part in his community's development as his time and energy permit.

"The public," said Murphy, "looks to the small businessman, as well as the large businessman, for leadership and responsibility in community growth. Besides helping in fund raising drives and civic-social functions, I believe a small businessman has a serious responsibility to help elect honest, public spirited government officials, attend council and school board meetings, and above all, to tackle the controversial questions that spring up from time to time."

Murphy cited the "fair share of these controversial question's in which he has been involved at Fond du Lac—changing from a commission city government to council-manager form, lake water versus ground water supply, school issues and city re-assessment.

Holding that the "real danger lies in being neutral" because the person who will not take a stand invites persecution from those who are assertive and determined to have their own way," Murphy declared.

"All really important questions are controversial and I believe the small businessman

must tackle them if he is to secure equal treatment and survive. It seems to me there is greater risk to small businessmen in sticking to the 'status quo' just to avoid controversy, since the free, competitive enterprise system will soon cease being free and competitive."

Murphy declared that the "fight with apathy is an essential part of the revolution taking place right now in our country; the civil rights struggle, the struggle between big business and small business, the struggle for qualified public officials."

"We must tear down, build anew, accept change, work hard and take responsibility for rebuilding our economic and social life," Murphy declared.

Murphy and his partner-wife established "Edith's," a women's apparel store in 1937. The store has grown to employment of 85 persons. Murphy attributed the growth to specialization, training programs for employees, a bonus and profit sharing pension plan for employees, and advancement to supervisory positions from the ranks of the employees, rather than hiring outsiders.

NEW HAND AT PAN AM CONTROLS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times recently carried an article on the retirement of Juan T. Trippe as chairman and chief executive officer of Pan American World Airways, and on his successor, Harold E. Gray.

Unlike many other airline executives, Mr. Gray comes into his job as a pilot—trained and experienced in the techniques of careful aircraft handling. His predecessor was similarly oriented. This tradition of concern for aircraft and passenger safety has unquestionably played a part in permitting Pan Am to amass the impressive safety record that it has.

Mr. Gray's experience is considerable, and of long standing; he was the 10th pilot hired by Pan Am in its early days, and was sitting at the controls of the first Pan Am clipper to cross the Atlantic in the summer of 1939.

I place the Times interview with Mr. Gray in the RECORD. The article follows:

AT PAN AM, A PIONEER REPLACES A PIONEER

(By Robert E. Bedingfield)

A recurring theme in comments on the executive realignments of major airlines in recent years is that the fliers and pioneers are leaving, and the businessmen are taking over.

When Harold E. Gray replaced retiring Juan Trippe 10 days ago as chairman and chief executive officer of Pan American World Airways, a pioneer replaced a pioneer—and hardly anyone noted the fact.

Mr. Gray not only flew airplanes back when the industry was emerging from the fir-and-linen stage, he designed and built them. He flew in the primitive commercial flying of the first post-World War I years—sightseeing for \$5 a hop and charter jumps from Miami to Havana.

Mr. Gray is proud of his more than 40 years in aviation. He has been with Pan American since 1929, only two years after it was organized. He first became a vice president of the company in 1949 and president in 1964.

Even his own associates think of him as primarily an executive rather than a flier. This attitude reflects his temperament. When

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

his executive duties kept him out of the cockpit so long he would have to be fully checked out each time he wanted to fly, he simply gave it up "and haven't particularly missed it at all. There are too many other interesting things to do," he said in an interview last week. An incident the day after his promotion is illustrative. The next thing to do, as Mr. Gray saw it, was to move himself into the chairman's office, and the retiring chairman's desk into an office occupied up to then by the vice president for public relations. Mr. Gray didn't send someone with a tape measure; he looked over the rooms involved and began shifting the furniture and desks by himself.

He will confess that he didn't always move in that direct left-to-right manner. A native of Gutenberg, Iowa, when he first went to college, he wanted to be an engineer. One day in the spring of 1925 when he left classes at the University of Iowa where he was studying, instead of taking the short route back to his dormitory for no reason particularly he took the long route.

"It is small instances like that that show how life patterns are changed," he commented, as he was recalling his college days. He continued:

"On my walk I met a fellow student who told me he was going into the U.S. Army Flying Cadet Corps that summer at San Antonio. As soon as I reached my room I had a letter in the mail asking for an application form. So I got into this aviation business solely by walking around the block the long way."

The Army taught Mr. Gray to fly. It did not, however, graduate him from flight school. Beyond noting that he had not failed in flight training, whatever the reason, he refused to discuss it further. After a year at San Antonio, Mr. Gray enrolled at the University of Detroit.

"I still had a great interest in building bridges," he said, "but now I was much more interested in building airplanes." Among his reasons for selecting Detroit was that it had a reputation then of having a good aeronautical school, "at that time one of the few in the country. Another reason was that Detroit had the advantage of being a cooperative school, where you could go to class for two weeks and work for two weeks."

While most students at the university worked at polishing auto bodies at the Packard Motor Car plant, Mr. Gray and some of his friends "were a little more ambitious to do something more rewarding." As a result, one of the first commercial jobs the head of Pan American held was in the Stinson airplane plant in Detroit.

His career as an aeronautical engineer was cut short by another pronounced Gray characteristic—he is a perfectionist. He designed six airplanes. In all six projects, according to an associate, the sponsors insisted on telling the engineer how to design the airplane. Rather than continue to argue with them, he let himself be talked into working for the Ford Motor Company as a pilot for its famous Ford Trimotor airplanes.

"Working for Ford, the pilot's salary was relatively low, as it should have been," Mr. Gray said. "But every Ford customer looked to Ford to get it a pilot." He hadn't flown for Ford very long, "it was a matter of months," when Sky View Lines bought a Ford Trimotor. Mr. Gray went to work for the company at \$400 a month, initially flying vacationers over Niagara Falls at \$5 a flight.

It was while working for Sky View on sightseeing hops over Miami in 1928 that Mr. Gray first met the staff of the newly organized Pan American, which then was flying Fokker F-7's out of Miami and out of Key West to Cuba. Mr. Gray recalled that he took a group of people on a charter flight to Havana "and found it rather an exciting experience flying over water outside of the sight of land."

By the end of 1928, the Sky View plane needed servicing and an overhaul, and Mr. Gray flew it back to Detroit. He met some of the same people from Pan Am whom he had known in Miami. They were purchasing a plane for their new line for use between Brownsville, Tex., and Mexico City.

His Pan Am friends told him they would need a pilot for the run and asked him if he would like the job. "By then," Mr. Gray said, "I had already made up my mind that barnstorming wasn't something with a long-term future. When I heard that Pan American was planning to fly over mountains and jungles to a foreign city I couldn't resist. Several days later I was asked to report to Brownsville."

He was the 10th pilot hired by Pan American. It was shortly after going to Brownsville that he met and married his wife, the former ExaBell Sublett, a San Benito girl whose grandfather was one of the early settlers of East Texas. "He was the man who nominated Sam Houston for President of Texas," Mr. Gray said.

The Grays had two sons. Their second son, Frank, is an electronics engineer. Their older son, Lieut Commander Harold E. Gray Jr., was killed in a carrier-based air strike against a target in North Vietnam in August 1965.

In discussing Mr. Gray's Spartan philosophy, a friend told how the airline executive had been informed of the tragedy midway in a speech he was giving at Teterboro Airport in New Jersey. "He stoically finished his address without any emotion visible to us who were there," this man said.

While Mr. Tripple waited until he was 68 years old to step down in favor of Mr. Gray, his successor said he had every intention of retiring by the time he reaches 65, which will be on April 15, 1971. There are many things he is looking forward to doing when he retires, he said.

"I'd like to be creative in some form or other. There is so much creativeness needed in this world to solve the problems we have," Mr. Gray observed. He said that while he has spent 43 years in aviation, he still gets "a lot of fun out of things related to engineering. I like to do things and make things with my hands. I like to think of better ways of doing things."

PAUL BROOKS AND WORDS WE WORK WITH

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN OF NEW YORK IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the April 1968 issue of the Sierra Club Bulletin reprints an extremely interesting talk by Paul Brooks entitled "The Words We Work With," which is much more than an exercise in semantics.

In the most provocative and interesting ways, Mr. Brooks looks at words like "wilderness," "national park," "recreation," and "conservation" and defines these terms in a way to make Americans proud of their heritage and even more interested in preserving it.

I commend this talk to my colleagues:

THE WORDS WE WORK WITH

(By Paul Brooks)

In the last issue of *Daedalus*, the journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, there is an excellent article on the politics of conservation by Robert Patterson, a leading landscape architect and conservationist from the state of Maine. He

June 3, 1968

writes: "If all the lips that serve conservationists were laid end-to-end, there would be a lot of fixed smiles, for in spite of the seriousness of our environmental problems, the conservation effort still consists largely of words." When so many wise words have already been spoken, what is to be gained by adding a few more. I should like to grasp this nettle firmly by devoting a few words to the subject of *words themselves*, as we use them in our business as conservationists.

The stock criticism of any conference is that it merely generates a lot more words, most of which the participants have already heard before, but that nothing much happens as a result. The reason for this criticism, I suppose, is that the connection between the words spoken at the conference and later concrete action may be tenuous and difficult to trace; or when it is very clear and specific, as in the case of the Wilderness Conferences and the Wilderness Act, the time lapse between the birth of the idea and its final fruition is so great that the public at large forgets where it all started.

The fact is, of course, that any action—at least in a democratic society—starts with words. It may be a flood of words from a multitude of sources, as is represented by the seemingly endless hearings required for any federal legislation. It may be a book like *Deserts on the March* by Paul Sears, or *Road to Survival* by William Vogt, or *Silent Spring* by Rachel Carson, where eloquent words, backed by irrefutable scientific fact, have been used to shock us into realization of what we are doing to our environment. It may be a short magazine article. The evidence shows that words are effective. Even the most monolithic power-structures are sensitive to public opinion—indeed one sometimes feels that this is the only thing they are sensitive to.

We need words because what we are trying to do is to enlighten and inform; to change fundamental attitudes, not because they say so, but because we have the facts that will command such change on the part of any reasonable man. Our objective is to bridge the gap between an informed minority (and I am talking here specifically about conservation issues) and an uninformed majority. The people we are trying to reach—the people whose voices "count when it comes to a showdown—are neither ignorant nor thoughtless. They are intelligent, generally well-informed people who happen to be uninformed in this area. They have never thought about these matters one way or the other. For example, despite the publicity received by the Wilderness Act, how many people outside conservation circles know what it is all about, or even that it exists? How many know the difference between a national park and a national forest? Or coming down to a central issue of this conference, how many people east of the Mississippi have even heard of the North Cascades?

During the war when I was with the Office of War Information in Europe, the Government had a slogan "words are bullets." To anyone who has been exposed to the language known as "Washingtonese" or "governementese," a Washington bureau seems a strange source for such a slogan: at the least, the slogan-writer might have used the analogy of a sawed-off shotgun. But how well off is the conservation movement itself when it comes to using words as bullets? We suffer, I think, from a severe handicap. Scarcely one of the key words we use in our business has been defined with precision. Some of them have mutually exclusive connotations, depending on the background of the person we are addressing. In short, we lack an accepted vocabulary to express a set of values which need to be presented precisely and persuasively. This is particularly serious because these values are often in fundamental contradiction to the cherished clichés of the society in which we live.

Obviously there is no easy way out of this predicament. We can't provide a glossary with every speech we make or every article we write. But I think that we can communicate more clearly if we are constantly aware of the ambiguity of the words we are using. We may know exactly what we mean by a certain term, but to assume that everyone understands us is a mistake. Perhaps by examining these words we can sharpen our outside communications and clarify our own objectives.

What are these words? A few of the commonest are "conservation," "national park," "national forest," "wilderness," and "recreation." Since this a wilderness conference, let's start with the word "wilderness."

WILDERNESS

For legal purposes it has been defined, quite eloquently, in the Wilderness Act. Yet it remains literally one of the most ambivalent words in the language; it has two contradictory meanings representing two diametrically opposed values. The Biblical meaning of wilderness, which was brought to America by our Puritan forebears, was "desert." It was a hostile environment, a last refuge for outcasts, the place into which you drove the scapegoat laden with the sins of mankind. It could be made to bloom only through man's toil. In that song familiar to some of us in the Boston area, *Fair Harvard*, the college is described as the "first flower of our wilderness." It was not a wildflower, you may be sure, that the writer had in mind. He was thinking of a cultivated spot in a surrounding desert. So deeply ingrained was this concept, that heavily forested country continued to be referred to as "desert"—going back to the original meaning of simply an unoccupied area. Wilderness was unholy ground inhabited largely by devils; noisy devils, apparently, since the stock phrase was "howling wilderness." Presumably a "wilderness conference" in those days would have been a sort of witches' sabbath.

To the frontiersman the wilderness was, of course, an adversary. Only after it had been largely subdued could the surviving fragments be enjoyed. Not till the period of the Romantic Movement in European literature, till the time of Thoreau and the transcendentalists in America, did the term itself become generally respectable.

As recently as the 1920's, when the first wilderness areas were established by the Forest Service, there was serious question as to whether the word "wilderness" would have unfortunate repercussions. Now it has gone to the other extreme and we hear about the "wilderness mystique" and the "wilderness cult." (Personally, I prefer honest devils.) The curious thing is that both meanings of the word continue to be used right up to the present moment. For example, in a recent speech about the dangers of pollution, President Johnson warned that our countryside might become "a wilderness of ghost towns." Some modern uses of the term are very odd indeed. A ballet put on in New York this winter was entitled "Wilderness." According to the review in *The New York Times*, it "was clearly about a beautiful girl, a man with leprosy and a slave driver"—the relationship between the three of them being somewhat confused. This sort of thing may be covered by the Mann Act, but certainly not by the Wilderness Act.

So what? Does this confusion matter? I believe it does. After all, we think in terms of words, and centuries of folklore and prejudice cannot be changed overnight. To take a parallel example, would the senseless poisoning and shooting of wolves be tolerated by the public if wolves were not still associated with evil? Wilderness, though no longer considered unholy, is still identified in many people's minds with land that is good for nothing else, with wasteland. Mining, lumbering, and grazing interests of course take this view. The Forest Service is occasionally guilty of such thinking. I trust

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that the National Park Service is not, though I feel sure that in some people's minds the wilderness areas of our parks are those portions not suitable for recreational development. And it is a curious fact that the White House Conference on Natural Beauty gave scarcely any consideration to the most natural and beautiful areas of all, the wilderness areas.

NATIONAL PARK

Let us turn now to another of the words we work with. The term "national park" is less than a hundred years old; unlike the word "wilderness," it does not carry with it the accumulated prejudice of centuries. Its connotations, except to such special groups as the Georgia-Pacific Lumber Company, are entirely pleasant. Yet the confusion in the meaning of the term is almost as great as in the case of wilderness; from the point of view of practical politics and administration it may be even more serious. Let me illustrate. Several years ago I was privileged to take part in an international conservation conference in Bangkok, one session of which was devoted to "national parks." We quickly realized that the American delegates understood one thing by this phrase and the Thai delegates (with one notable exception) quite another. To the latter, a park was primarily a place for rural recreation—a sort of national country club. Its administration was under the National Tourist Bureau. The first thing to do was to improve the roads, landscape the area, plant flower beds, build a restaurant and a bar and a golf course. Naturally enough. To them the term "wilderness park" would have been a contradiction in terms.

Nor is this semantic difficulty confined to the so-called "developing countries" in which the national park concept comes as a new idea. In England, for example, a national park is defined in the booklet of the Nature Conservancy as "a thinly inhabited region where the natural scenery is safeguarded for amenity and recreation." To us in America "national park" suggests something very different. But exactly what does it mean?

The word "park" has meant many things to many people. The history of such a word is the history of a concept, and its meanings grow and proliferate over the years. The more widely a concept is approved, the more likely the word itself is to be debased. "Home" and "park" are such words. The "split-level home" and the "funeral home" have now been joined by the "industrial park" that sustains the one and the "memorial park" that sustains the other. Yet if the word "park," like the word "home," didn't stand for something we believe in, there would be no cash value in exploiting it. It does, in fact, denote two different ideas, each admirable in itself, but each in conflict with the other. The fact that we have only one word for both is the source of much agony and confusion.

"Park" comes from the Old English "par-rock" or "paddock"—an enclosed space of ground. In English law it originally referred to lands held by royal grant, principally as hunting reserves. It also applied to the large ornamental grounds of a country estate. By the late seventeenth century, the term was being used to describe open landscaped areas within or near cities set aside for public recreation. But not until recent times was it applied to tracts of wilderness saved by government action from private exploitation. The revolutionary idea of the national park was born in America, about a hundred years ago. The concept was new, and the old word had to be stretched to fit it. As a matter of fact, it stretched rather slowly, since the first parks were established for the sake of their "natural curiosities," rather than to save wilderness as such. Wilderness preservation was, at first, a byproduct of the national parks movement. Today it has become a principal

objective. But is the public at large aware of the change?

More and more people are swarming to our national parks. What do they expect to find when they get there? What do they expect to do there?

RECREATION

This leads us to another key word in the conservationist's vocabulary, the word "recreation." The term is so broad as almost to defy definition. It was a lovely word to begin with meaning "re-creation," creating anew. Today it suggests anything you do when you are not working, including, according to the advertisements for retirement funds, sleeping in a hammock in Florida with a newspaper over your face. If we narrow the question down to recreation in the national parks, we can be a bit more precise. One criterion would be that the activity, whatever it is, should not alter the natural landscape. Another is that it shouldn't hog the environment for itself. For instance, speedboats and waterskiing can drive out canoes, but not vice-versa. If we want to talk in terms a businessman can understand, we can evaluate recreation in terms of consumption. The parks provide a limited space for the use of an increasing number of people. A man in an automobile consumes space many times faster than a man on foot. A speedboat at thirty miles an hour consumes ten times as much space as a canoe at three miles an hour, for the same number of hours of recreation.

If we can't define recreation, we can at least make clear what we mean by it in the context of national parks and wilderness areas. We may even claim that the forms of recreation that involve outdoor skills, scientific knowledge, artistic appreciation, and one's own muscles—as opposed to those that depend on second-hand entertainment or the internal combustion engine—come closest to the original sense of this much watered-down word.

To the uninitiated, much of our official jargon is also misleading. When the man on the street sees the words "national forest" on a map, he assumes that the area is covered with trees. When he sees the words "national monument," he has every right to visualize a granite obelisk or a bronze statue of a general on horseback. Least of all can we expect him to appreciate the technical distinctions between "roadless area," "primitive area," and "wilderness area." He is, to use a fine old English word, "jargogled."

CONSERVATION

Finally, we come face to face with that all-inclusive word that takes in everything we have been talking about; the word "conservation." Today it is an O.K. word. As Fraser Darling has written, "the idea of conservation is easy and emotionally satisfying." This is true, and it can be a source of weakness rather than of strength. To the strip-miners who are murdering the Southern Appalachians, conservation is a nice hobby for old ladies in tennis shoes, but it must not be allowed to interfere with the practical business of the country, which, as Calvin Coolidge once reminded us, is business.

The word conservation inevitably suggests the word conservative. It has a negative connotation, as if our only object was preservation of the *status quo*. We know otherwise. It is a positive concept. And though the idea of conservation may be easy, the practice of conservation, as we have all learned, is very difficult indeed.

We face an obvious dilemma. Ours is a monetary society, based on private enterprise and financial profits. But the values of the wilderness conservation movement cannot be expressed in terms of dollars. Thus for many people—including the Kentucky strip-miner—they do not exist. This gives an overwhelming advantage to the exploiter. The battle between two standards of value has of course been going on at least since the turn of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the century. Yet one is continually struck with the endurance of the old standards. During the fight to save Hetch Hetchy, the conservationists were described as "hoggish and mushy esthetes." Today's strip miner calls them "bleeding hearts and do-gooders who don't understand the real issues." For him, the cheapest coal is the best coal no matter what its exploitation may do to the landscape. To adopt any other criterion would be to violate "the good old American free enterprise system and, frankly, I hope I never see the day that happens."

"Wilderness," "national park," "recreation," "conservation"—properly understood, these are all dynamic words. The validity of what they stand for is shown by the phenomenal growth of the conservation movement. You may remember that, by extrapolating from the present rate of growth of the Sierra Club, a recent president came up with the comforting thought that in the year two thousand and something the entire world would belong to the Sierra Club. Meanwhile, however, we have work to do. In doing it, we shall be effective in direct proportion to our understanding of the words we work with.

(NOTE.—Paul Brooks, a Director and Vice President of the Houghton Mifflin Company, is also President of Trustees for Conservation and a Director of the Sierra Club. He is author of *Roadless Area* (winner of a John Burroughs Medal for nature writing) and many articles published in national magazines. Among his articles, two published by Atlantic are particularly significant to conservationists: "The Plot to Drown Alaska" exposed the folly of the Rampart dam project on the Yukon, and "The Fight for America's Alps" (later condensed in Reader's Digest) helped attract support for a national park in the North Cascades. Mr. Brooks' "The Words We Work With" is adapted from a speech he made at the Seventh Biennial Northwest Wilderness Conference, held in Seattle, Washington, on March 30 and 31, 1968.)

THE 22D ANNIVERSARY OF ITALIAN REPUBLIC DAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, June 2, 1946, was a landmark day in Italy's modern history. For on that day an almost destitute people, in a country ravaged by war, took their destiny into their hands and in a free and fair election voted for a republican form of government. Thus, they abandoned the constitutional monarchy which had existed since 1861; more importantly, they rejected all traces of the Fascist dictatorship that ruled their country in tyranny for more than two decades.

Two months ago the Minister of the Budget reported on how Italy's economy fared in 1967. The results were even more gratifying than the most optimistic Italians had predicted.

In real terms the national income grew by 5.9 percent over the 1966 figure, as compared with the average increase of 3.9 percent for the previous 3 years. Thus, Italy's recovery from the 1964-65 recession has been more rapid and more successful than many had anticipated would be possible. Also, the Italian econ-

omy is expanding at a greater rate than that of any other country in the European Economic Community.

Of particular interest and significance is the 5.2 percent increase in agricultural production. This is the highest rate of increase experienced during any year in the past decade, and offers impressive testimony that the immense investments in agriculture made in southern Italy's depressed and underdeveloped areas have finally begun to pay economic dividends. There are indications, too, that this agricultural production growth rate will be maintained for some time to come, provided there is no repetition of the natural disasters of the kind that struck the country in November of 1966.

The 7.9 percent increase in industrial output was very largely due to a phenomenal expansion in the motor vehicle industry. About 1.4 million private cars were produced—an increase of nearly 14 percent over 1966. Trucks manufactured exceeded 103,000, or 24 percent more than the previous year's output.

Complementing increased productivity was a remarkable growth in investments, particularly in the area of direct production facilities. An immediate and salutary effect was the arrest of what had been since 1962 a slow but continuous decrease in employment. During 1967 some 223,000 new jobs were found, primarily in the highly productive industrial sectors.

And so today, 22 years since the establishment of the Republic, Italy stands strong and firm, and we salute her remarkable growth and progress in the face of continued harassment by a strong Communist minority. May she continue to thrive and prosper as one of the bastions of democracy in Europe and one of our most valued and trusted allies.

HOW TO DESTROY THE UNITED STATES IN 16 EASY LESSONS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that one finds in one concise reference a summary of most of the things that are helping to destroy the United States of America. Such a reference, however, is found in the recent article by Henry J. Taylor appearing in the *Rocky Mountain News* of May 6, 1968.

While each American has the right of free speech to argue any point of view, short of incitement to overt acts of violent overthrow, there is no doubt but what Mr. Taylor's summary is of material truth. Each and all of the 16 points that he makes need attention and sharp revision on the American scene.

In a very real sense, Mr. Taylor's column presents a thumbnail sketch of what the elections of 1968 will offer to the American voter as alternatives for the road ahead.

The article follows:

June 3, 1968

SIXTEEN RULES FOR DESTRUCTION

(By Henry J. Taylor)

A 16-point program for the destruction of the United States:

(1) Pound home the preachment of individual rights instead of individual responsibility. Preach the sick sentimentality that condones criminality as society's fault and dismisses the individual from responsibility.

(2) Go easy on anarchy.

(3) Glorify cowardice as intellectualism and appeasement as enlightenment. Steal the liberal label and falsify the contents of the bottle.

(4) Sneer at patriotism. Teach the youth to shun the battlefield. "Be a lover—not a fighter." And if the enemy is a fighter, not a lover? The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. repeatedly stated: "The Vietnam War must be stopped and one way is to have 'peace rallies' like we have 'freedom rallies.'" But would Ho Chi Minh allow those parades in the place that is holding up the peace—Hanoi?

(5) Claim the aggressor can be bought off. The Carthaginians gave their sons and daughters to the Roman aggressor to prove and guarantee Carthage's nonaggressive intent. History means nothing?

(6) Do not require the study of American history. Two-thirds of our institutions of higher learning fail to require—require—students to study American history. One out of four of our teachers' colleges do not require any course in it; more than half do not require any preliminary knowledge of it. Yet good citizenship and progress in American ideals are admittedly impossible without an appreciation of our unique American heritage and the great sacrifices it took to establish and preserve them.

(7) Breed distrust of the military; belittle the men who have advanced in this responsible career. Make them seem ignoble and to lie about their democratic purposes long enough, and the military establishment on which a nation's security must depend becomes only a hollow shell, incompetent for a country's defense.

(8) Be patient with hippies who disrupt the universities and other established institutions. Let their protests take the form of sit-ins, lie-ins, Flag-burnings, draft-card burnings and mayhem along with missiles and stink bombs. The first business of good government is to provide safety for its citizens. Destroy this.

(9) Pound home to the population that discrimination and lack of opportunity account for all who are "underprivileged." Ignore individual capability and personal application entirely. The IQ of the American population varies from about 50 to 180. The national dropout rate for college students, reflecting both incapacity and failure to apply one's self, exceeds 50 percent.

(10) Teach all "underprivileged" that somebody else owes them a living. Preach this long enough and it is sure to create a "march of the poor" on the nation's capital, government by city-burning, government by blackmail. It is also sure to create a great many loafers who wouldn't do a day's real work under any conditions whatever. In just New York City, during history's biggest boom, 816,699 people (as of February 1968) are drawing relief, some for the second and third generations.

(11) Emphasizing the "curing" of poverty as the cure for civil disorders. The report of the President's National Advisory Commission on civil disorders found that the average rioter did hold a job, was not unemployed and was better educated than his nonrioting neighbors. It completely demolished many of the usual contentions regarding the "causes" of the looting and disorders.

(12) Sponsor unlimited Government spending. Said Lenin: "The surest way to destruction is to debauch the currency."

(13) Preach "permissiveness." If "anything goes" then, of course, everything goes. Every internal and external enemy knows the advantages of destroying a nation's standards. The rewards are as old as the Trojan horse. See that the TV, drama and movie critics, book reviewers, etc., accept the immoral as moral, the abnormal as normal, the obscene as valuable. Countries that praise the pigs in the pasture don't last very long.

(14) Infiltrate or confuse the teaching-talking-writing intelligentsia, especially those who work behind a prominent man as ghost writers.

(15) Draw the churches into politics. See that the churches gradually liquidate their influence as a spiritual power, and thus as a stabilizing force, having ministers and church leaders make the historic mistake of using the church itself as a political lever.

(16) Manipulate the news.

DUTY-FREE MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, while we are all aware of our men fighting in Vietnam there are also American military men serving in other areas throughout the world in defense of freedom. There are more men overseas than at any time of our history except in the times of declared war and they are required to be in a high state of readiness. The performance of this duty to their country requires our servicemen to be separated from their families and loved ones for long and repeated periods.

It is my purpose at this time to inform Members of this House that unless quick and decisive action is taken by the President of the United States, our fighting men overseas, and at sea, are going to suffer an unjustified financial penalty for performing such services in defense of our country.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, here are the circumstances of this alarming situation:

The Treasury Department is proceeding with plans to deprive our servicemen overseas, and at sea, other than those involved in the Vietnam war, of the present, very modest privilege to mail home duty-free gifts not exceeding \$10 in value. I would like to explain that those serving in Vietnam have a \$50 duty-free gift mailing exemption, which is not involved in the present issue.

As Members of this House well know, hundreds of thousands of our fighting men are doing duty outside the United States, other than in the Vietnam war. These dedicated men cannot defend their own interests and protect themselves from what the Treasury Department plans to do to them.

This matter is already receiving nationwide attention and protest.

As an example of the reaction against the bureaucratic indifference of the Treasury Department, I refer to the public protest by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. The VFW is recognized in this House, and throughout the Nation, as an alert, informed, and

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

faithful spokesman for the men in service.

On May 22, 1968, VFW Commander in Chief Joseph A. Scerra, of Gardner, Mass., issued a statement protesting, on behalf of the 1,400,000 overseas combat veterans comprising the membership of the VFW, the Treasury Department's plan to deprive our overseas military personnel, other than those in the Vietnam war, of their \$10 duty-free gift mailing exemption.

Commander Scerra had the facts. He knew what he was talking about. He had an exchange of correspondence with Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Joseph M. Bowman. The Treasury Department confirmed, in effect, that the Department intends to curtail the present duty-free gift mailing privilege of servicemen overseas and at sea.

Commander Scerra wrote a letter to the President of the United States, dated May 17, 1968, in which he pointedly asked:

How much more sacrifice does our government expect from those in our armed services?

I join with the VFW in asking, also, how much more sacrifice does our Government expect from the men in our armed services?

There is one thing that we should all remember—that in planning to take away the \$10 duty-free gift mailing exemption from our servicemen, the Treasury Department is lumping these gallant servicemen in the same category, as far as gift mailing from overseas is concerned, as the tourists who are traveling abroad. I submit there is a difference.

Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to urge the executive branch of the Government, and the Treasury Department, in particular, not to take away from our fighting men their present right to send home to their loved ones a modest duty-free gift of the value of \$10. When we are sending billions of dollars overseas in aid to foreign governments, when U.S. investments are still being made in tremendous amounts overseas, this proposed action by the Treasury Department against our servicemen will not have any great effect on the dollar deficit and the gold flow. It will, however, be an insult to our fighting men by a Nation which should be manifesting, instead, its gratitude.

I hope legislation to prevent this action on the part of the Treasury Department will not be necessary.

CRIME AND VIOLENCE IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago I began responding to my constituents that their Nation's Capital was not safe to visit, based upon the soaring crime rate and the uncertainties posed by the threats of "civil disobedience" by leaders of the Poor People's Campaign.

Since my original statement, I have

personally been shocked by the continuing reports of the high incidence of crime in Washington, D.C.

There is almost daily verification of my position that the streets of this Capital City are not safe at the present time, and I found the report interesting that leaders of Resurrection City had advised their followers not to walk the streets alone at night.

Mr. Speaker, my reports on the crime situation here in Washington, D.C., have caused considerable comment, and in this connection, under unanimous consent, I include the following articles from Washington, D.C., newspapers and a report on my earlier remarks by Adele Ferguson in the Bremerton Sun:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]

RIOT BOOSTS ANNUAL DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME RATE

(By Alfred E. Lewis)

Somewhat warped by the reporting of 1717 burglaries during April's riot, Metropolitan Police Department crime statistics show crime rose 24.5 percent in Washington in the last 12-month period ending April 30.

The statistics, released yesterday, show 41,111 serious crimes occurred during the year. In the similar period ending April 30, 1967, 33,031 serious crimes were reported.

Robbery, which was up 37.8 per cent, showed the biggest gain. The only crime to decline was aggravated assault, dropping 7.6 per cent.

Burglary increased 29.3 per cent. A spokesman for Public Safety Director Patrick V. Murphy pointed out that even the 1717 burglaries reported in April did not take into account stores which looters raided again and again—with the looting rated as a single burglary.

There were 183 homicides reported in the year ending April 30, as opposed to 142 for the previous 12-month period, an increase of 28.9 per cent.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 3, 1968]

FIFTEEN STREET ROBBERIES REPORTED

Fifteen people were victims of holdup men who made off with loot ranging from 30 cents to \$79 in the early hours before dawn yesterday, police report.

Among the victims in Northeast was Bowden Bodrick, listed at 1100 F st. ne., who told police five men approached him while he was walking in the 700 block of E st. ne. around 5:15 a.m. The men began hitting him in the face and took his wallet, containing \$79, before running off.

James Seward, of 231 9th st. ne., was walking in the 600 block of 10th st. ne. around 3:30 a.m., police said, when two men asked him for cigarettes and then started hitting him in the face with a stick. They ran off with his wallet and \$45. Seward was treated for bruises at Casualty Hospital.

James L. Bryson, 53, of 6200 Hillview ave., Alexandria, told police he was driving south on 7th Street nw. around 2 a.m. when four youths jumped into the car after he had stopped for a traffic light at N Street. They told him to keep driving for two blocks, made him stop, and fled with his wallet, containing \$20.

A man carrying a revolver approached Sibyl Schubert of Flanders, N.J., around 3:45 a.m. while she was waiting to get gas at a service station at 6th Street and Florida Avenue ne., police said. They said the man grabbed her wallet containing \$5 and ran.

Anderson Wright, 27, of 1607 Montana ave. ne., told police two hitchhikers he picked up at 30th Street and Naylor Road se. around 12:10 a.m. got out at 19th Street and Alabama Avenue se. and ran off with \$43 of his money.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, June 3, 1968]

CRIME SOARS; CONGRESS DALLIES

In the District the Transit Commission has ordered the bus company to use "scrip" on night runs so the drivers won't have to carry money.

The city has been without night bus service more than two weeks because the night drivers refuse to tote cash, the result of the hold-up murder of one driver and more than 500 robberies of drivers in the last year.

In Madison, Wis., a co-ed was stabbed to death in broad daylight, another of some 40 attacks on students this year at the University of Wisconsin. Is so bad the students have had to organize their own patrols.

In New York City, cab drivers are demanding more police protection as a result of the fourth holdup-murder of a driver in the last 17 months.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover produces evidence that while the national population has gained 10 per cent since 1960, serious crime has increased 88 per cent. The answer to the crime problem, he said, lies in "direct, positive action, not by waiting and hoping the problem will go away."

In Congress, a few key members are haggling over a tough anti-crime bill passed by the Senate but so far blocked in the House by sentimentalists who object to clarifications the bill proposes in some soft Supreme Court decisions.

The bill before Congress will not prevent or cure crime. But it would give law enforcement agencies new weapons. And it would stiffen the deterrents by hiking more penalties on criminals.

But Congress quibbles. While rapists, murderers, robbers, burglars, muggers, and hoodlums increasingly trample the public's right to safety and security.

[From the Bremerton (Wash.) Sun, May 28, 1968]

ANGRY PELLY FLAYS LEADERS OF POOR PEOPLES CAMPAIGN

An angry U.S. Rep. Thomas M. Pelly today flayed the leadership of the Poor Peoples Campaign in Washington, D.C., for "increasing militancy, insult and harassment."

"The leaders of this nonviolent demonstration continue to assert that they hope they do not have to resort to civil disobedience to obtain their goals, but this statement is a contradiction," Pelly told The Sun. "There is a gradual escalation of their protest which already is resorting to unlawful civil disobedience."

Members of the campaign gathered outside the House Office Building last Thursday singing and chanting and refused police orders to move or disband. Eighteen were arrested.

Pelly said he completely defends any person's right to assemble peacefully and present a grievance "but the moves made by the Poor People's Campaign so far have been ones of increasing militancy, insult and harassment."

The protest is timed wrong, he said, coming in the wake of rioting, looting and arson so widespread that he urged any of his constituents planning to visit the capital to forget it.

"Right now it is a dangerous place to visit and it is even more a dangerous place to live," Pelly said.

"I am saddened to make this statement. This has always been a city which every American could be proud to visit. Nor am I an alarmist, but night after night the criminals burn and kill at a rate far above what could be considered in any mind as normal."

Four merchants and one bus driver have been murdered during robberies in the last 30 days, he said, causing merchants' associations to place pleas for police protection in the newspapers, and bus drivers have cur-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tailed bus service in the capital by refusing to drive after 6:30 p.m.

Arson is a night affair, he said, with as many as a dozen suspicious fires each night, and criminal assault is shockingly high.

"All the while the Administration terms these acts of crime 'disturbances' and refers to the riots as connected with civil rights," Pelly said. "The fact is, however, that this is gangsterism. When bands of youths bully their way into a market or liquor store, grab what they want from the shelves and threaten to burn the store down if there is any protest from the owner, that has nothing to do with civil rights. Or when young toughs tell a merchant he has to buy a picture of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., for \$100 and place it in the window or face reprisal, that is extortion, not social protest."

Added to the rising crime rate is the uncertainty of the conduct of the Poor People's Campaign marchers, he said, so persons planning visits to the capital should delay them until law and order is restored.

HELIX STUDENTS COLLECT \$3,000 FOR SMALL VILLAGE

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in these days when so many people are willing to let big Government or big business deal with the problems that beset so-called little people, it is gratifying to know that some are still willing to become involved in other people's problems on a personal basis.

Some high school youngsters in San Diego County, Calif., have given recent evidence that they care for people more than pot, for friendship more than flowers.

On their own initiative, the students of Helix High School have raised and turned over to the Peace Corps more than \$3,000 to be used for the construction of a school in a small and remote South American village. The efforts of these boys and girls should not go unnoticed.

The Lemon Grove Review has described their achievement in the following report of May 23:

HELIX STUDENTS COLLECT \$3,000 FOR SMALL VILLAGE

Dividends that will come for years will start in the very near future. Students at Helix High School have helped students in a remote South American village by collecting some \$3,000 to help them in school construction.

Of the total, some \$2,000 will be used to buy the building materials and local native workers will supply the labor under a program sponsored by the Peace Corps.

"The Peace Corps school-to-school program requires a minimum of \$1,000," according to Howard Hill, C.A.S.H. (Construct a School House) drive chairman.

"We were not sure we could do it in two weeks. But we're more than pleased with the response."

Strong support in the first period class carried this drive through. Highlanders sold peace symbols, bonds, and carnations. A rummage-art sale brought in \$500.

"Miss Mary Garcia's first period class of 23 girls donated \$310.76, or an average of more than \$13 per girl," Mr. Robert Woods, ASB advisor said.

Miss Garcia's class held a swap meet, a

bake sale, collected newspapers, and made and sold flowers to achieve their high percentage.

A highlight of the drive was the appearance of the Gordian Knot, a Hollywood singing group, who performed in a special assembly.

"Proceeds from this drive will be sent to the Peace Corps headquarters in Washington, D.C.," Hill said. "They will select the village where the school is to be constructed."

Money raised in addition to the \$2,000 will be divided between the Red Cross and the support of an orphan.

June 3, 1968

"THE WASHINGTON MARCH: AN OPINION"

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial entitled "The Washington March: An Opinion" appeared in the North Carolina Christian Advocate of March 30, 1968.

The North Carolina Christian Advocate is the official organ of the North Carolina and Western North Carolina Conferences of the United Methodist Church. Rev. James C. Stokes is the editor of the publication.

This editorial very excellently states the views of the editor and should be read by many who are today involved in the type of action to which it refers. I make the editorial a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

THE WASHINGTON MARCH: AN OPINION

Many conscientious Christians are torn by inner conflict over the so-called poor people's march on Washington. They are genuinely concerned about the plight of the nation's poor. They consider it a shame that so much poverty and deprivation exists in a nation which is as affluent as is America. They feel that positive steps should be taken to alleviate the situation.

But about the march on Washington, they have serious reservations. We must frankly place ourselves in this category, and for the following reasons.

First, we believe that this movement represents a threat to the democratic process of government. We recognize the right of citizens to protest all manner of unjust conditions, and to petition Congress and other governmental agencies about matters affecting their welfare. But the purpose of such should be to present facts, describe conditions, and to indicate the concern of the people. Protest, petition and demonstrations should, in a democracy, not develop into an overwhelming show of force, nor should they be coupled with threats of violence, veiled or otherwise. They should not bear insinuations of dire consequences, including disruption of orderly processes, disobedience of laws, and interference with the freedom and rights of others. We disapprove of the march on Washington because these elements seem to be written into its plans and strategy.

In the second place, we object because we have an obligation to be consistent, fair and unprejudiced. We would not want the American Legion, the John Birchers, The Methodist Men, the Democratic Party, or the AFL-CIO to launch such a gigantic pressure movement. Therefore, to be absolutely fair about it, we cannot approve of it being done by anybody else. We would ask those who

support this march, sponsored by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, what their reaction would be if the same thing were to be staged by the Wallace-for-President group or by the DAR? If we give our approval to this march, can we consistently deny any legal and lawful organization the same right, including the privilege of building a large encampment on government property in our national capital? If it is right for the SCLC to use a massive show of force to pressure Congress into doing what it wishes, then is it not equally right for dozens of other organizations to do likewise?

We do not want government directed and controlled by an interminable parade of pressure groups marching on Washington; so to be consistent, we cannot approve of this one.

Furthermore, we see the high possibility that this rather strong-armed tactic will hurt rather than help the very condition it seeks to alleviate. People being as they are, we may well have a strong national reaction which will militate against the welfare of the poor. In the main, the segment of our people who are caught in the toils of poverty and its concurrent evils need sympathy as well as dollars. They need person to person help as well as appropriations. What will it profit a people if they even gain a few dollars more in welfare money, but lose the kind of personal concern and direct supportive relationship which is essential to their building better lives for themselves? We think the money should be appropriated within the reasonable means of the government to pay it. But we think that much, much more is needed if the deprived and depressed people are to be raised to a status of dignity. Not least among the needs is the good will and active undergirding of millions of people in thousands of communities. Actions which will lessen this kind of support are, in our opinion, ill-advised.

Then, we cannot but feel that the use of millions of dollars to bring thousands of "lobbyists" to Washington is inconsistent with the very purposes of the movement to alleviate poverty. Of course, lobbying by various organizations is a much-practiced procedure around Washington. But usually various interests are represented by one person or at most by a staff of persons.

There is already a vast amount of concern for the poor in this nation. We cannot but feel that other propaganda means, at much less cost, would have actually done more to move recalcitrant members of Congress to be sympathetic to this cause.

Finally, we exercise our right to dissent, because of the risk of violence which is involved in this whole operation. We will grant that at times a witness must be made even when there is a chance of strife and disorder breaking out. But reasonable, right-minded people should not be reckless.

Those who have planned and are carrying out this operation, we think, are taking a great chance. We are midway between an ugly series of riots, and a summer which could be hot and violent. Only last month Washington suffered some nights of terror which left scores of buildings in ashes, hundreds of stores looted, people killed, and the populace thrown into great confusion. Only the clamping down of speedy military rule restored order.

We cannot but sense, therefore, the ineptitude of this plan to set up a large encampment in Washington and to bring a million or more people into the national capital in a massive show of physical presence.

How it will all come out we cannot know at the time of this writing. As of now all things seem to be within the limits of law and order. We sincerely trust that they will stay so, and that the whole effort will produce good and constructive results.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WCKT-TV IN MIAMI PROVES PUBLIC APATHY TOWARD CRIME

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of crime on our streets is one that we have all been concerned with for some time. Recent polls seem to indicate that the citizens of our Nation share this concern. However, a documentary film produced by WCKT-TV in Miami, Fla., seems to indicate that to the average man on the street crime is something for someone else to worry about; he does not want to get involved.

This outstanding program, narrated by Wayne Fariss, WCKT news commentator, is a startling portrayal of public apathy. Mr. Gene Strul, news director of the station and executive producer of the program, has written an article describing the program and its results in the March issue of the Quill and I commend it to my colleagues. I also offer my congratulations to Messrs. Fariss and Strul and the producer, Mike Silver, for bringing to the attention of the public the situation with which it must cope.

The article follows:

[From the Quill, March 1968]

WAYNE FARRIS, NARRATES "PARTNERS IN CRIME"—A TV STATION PROVES PUBLIC APATHY

(By Gene Strul¹)

MIAMI, Fla., WCKT-TV.—You and I . . . and our neighbors . . . are partners in crime. Surprised? Indignant? Why?

Because you wouldn't smash a jewelry store window and steal the baubles on display? And you wouldn't think of lifting anything from your neighborhood retail store?

Granted if shoplifting is taboo, purse snatching and assaults on policemen are not among your fun things to do. And that after-dinner drink probably doesn't send you reeling into the street after a 10-year-old girl.

What's more you gave up thoughts of breaking into the neighbors' house for profit or sensual pleasure when you discovered her husband was a linebacker for the Green Bay Packers.

And the only time you fled the comfort of a jail cell was in a psychedelic dream. You boarded a transit bus cradling the fare in hands gripped by handcuffs. But you got out of that one because no one cared. Now that has a romantic ring.

But there's nothing romantic about crime and violence . . . or public apathy to either. Not getting involved is costing the country 27 billion dollars a year in crime loss. And who can equate physical injury and mental anguish in monetary values?

Unfortunately and despite all the brave words recorded on the subject, crime like sex

¹ Gene Strul has been news director of WCKT-TV since September of 1957 and his total broadcast experiences spans 20 years. His journalism career began as a sports writer for the Miami News. Among the television awards received by WCKT-TV for programs written and produced by Strul are the Peabody award in 1960, two Freedoms Foundation medals, the Green Eyeshade Award, three Florida Sigma Delta Chi awards in 1962, Scripps-Howard Foundation Award and the University of Missouri Journalism Honor Medal. He has been a member of Sigma Delta Chi since 1950.

is here to stay. We would like to reduce the former. But to the public its always somebody else's game. The word for it is "apathy." The question is to what extent?

With crime in an inflationary spiral, WCKT-TV news turned the candid camera lens eye on the problem—you. The idea was to stage all the crimes mentioned and more. The purpose—to film public reaction to what for the most part is common everyday crime, and to determine with some finality whether you and I . . . and our neighbors . . . are morally, if not legally, partners in crime.

Appropriately, we called the documentary, "Partners in Crime." Sixty minutes of surprising reaction to our phoney crimes focused international attention on Miami. Ranked third nationally in crime, Miami deserves such attention. A year ago, we were No. 2. Fortunately, some other city cared a little less about law and order.

Let there be no mistake though, crime and apathy are equally at home in your backyard as they are in ours.

WCKT's experiment in crime and apathy had the blessing, if not the immediate cooperation, of local police agencies. They feared one of our actors might get hurt. A get-involved type citizen with a taste for blood could have turned some political chiefs into Indians. And don't think some ambitious braves didn't pow wow over the prospects of raising some scalps.

But as "Partners In Crime" demonstrates there was little ground for fear. There's one thing about apathetic people—they don't get involved.

Accompanied by a plainclothes Miami police captain, A WCKT newsman smashed a jewelry store window. He grabbed some planted beads that Pocahontas wouldn't have traded Manhattan Island for with all its crime and violence.

No one interfered with the escape. A motorist trailed the getaway car but didn't phone the police. Someone recorded a license number. But it was wrong.

Our rookie thief doubled back to the scene of the crime. His hand was cut on the broken window (it cost \$200 to replace, a shattering experience in itself); his pants splattered with blood. He picked up a microphone and talked to a witness.

"Can you identify the man?" he asked.

"I would recognize him anywhere," the witness responded. And he provided a description.

"Do you see him anywhere in the crowd?" "No!"

"Well, would it help if I put on my sunglasses? You see, I was the man you saw."

This was not apathy. It was a credibility gap that eventually comes home to roost in every courtroom. A part of the vicious circle that makes crime pay.

The staged jewelry store break-in was similar to a rash of crimes that have plagued Miami stores in recent years.

We tried a series of purse snatches. In one instance, a bystander made a weak effort to chase a Negro plainclothes officer. Another called out encouragement.

"Keep going, you can make it," he suggested.

In a variation, we snared a pocketbook from the front seat of an automobile stopped for a traffic light. It's a favorite practice in Miami.

One thief virtually sped into the arms of three husky young men.

"What do you have there?" one inquired.

"A purse," answered the startled newsman. "Okay!"

The purse snatch was a success. No two witnesses could correctly identify our thief.

A policewoman playing a purse snatch victim asked six passersby for assistance. None would phone the police. They were too busy to get involved. It happens every day.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

But as in every story there's a hero. In this one, it's the supermarket bagboy. Don't attempt any film flam in his territory. You might get run over or tackled by a nononsense teenager. A police officer and a newsman nearly did in both a purse snatch attempt and a bogus assault on an officer in an attempted stop and frisk.

Attacks on police officers, we're told, happen with surprising frequency. With a crowd of shoppers looking on, a WCKT newsmen resisted arrest, knocking an officer to the ground. A bagboy gave chase, no one else cared.

Our cameras caught one husky gentleman warily watching every move of the fugitive as he loped close enough to take the bad breath test. The witness told us he saw nothing.

Shoplifting in our community is a million-dollar-a-year headache for merchants. We set up a camera in a shoe department storeroom of a large store. In a day of pilfering only one shopper reported a theft.

"I didn't want to get involved," explained another witness.

One woman shopper drew her husband's attention to a shoplifter. His reaction—"Shut your face."

Witnesses generally were not eager to talk to reporters. When they did, the contradictions to save face were alarmingly funny.

What these unwitting partners in crime failed to understand was that shoplifting losses are passed on to them in the rising price of goods.

In another demonstration, we proved how easy it is for a perfect stranger to get into your home. We used the ploy of checking television sets for radiation. A camouflaged police officer armed with a battery charger gained entrance to 11 of 12 homes, all occupied by women. Once inside, he could have robbed or raped.

We returned a week later. One woman who insisted she wouldn't let anyone into her home shamefacedly admitted that she had allowed our con man into the house. A second victim said it was a moment of weakness. The rest wouldn't talk.

When Alexander Graham Bell invented the telephone, he had no idea it would be used as a burglar's tool. The conservative burglar likes to operate in an empty home.

Six of 12 phone calls to women on the pretext of giving them a financial reward for trying a fake product provided the exact hours their homes would not be occupied. The others hedged but provided sufficient information for a burglar to work with.

A majority of citizens apparently stand four square behind apathy. No better example was the handcuffed escaped prisoner who boarded a transit bus across from the Miami police station. In camera range, he paid his fare, ambled down the aisle of the crowded vehicle and sat next to an undaunted passenger.

Two stops later, the fugitive nudged his seat partner to assist him in getting off the bus. She pulled the bell cord.

"Yes, there was something unusual about the passenger, he was wearing handcuffs," said the bus driver. "I was looking for a policeman," he added. An ironic twist is that the escaped prisoner had been picked up near the city jail.

"He knew what he was doing," snapped a passenger. Who can argue with such logic?

We had created the unlikely situation of a prisoner on a bus to give the question of public apathy a real test. It got it.

Child molestation is another matter. We staged four kidnapings at different shopping centers. All involved screaming girls pulled into cars. They were 10 and 14 years old.

We filmed one phase of the action from inside a Salvation Army clothing drop where a surprised donor discovered our photographer and hurriedly departed.

Covered with clothing, our cameraman keyed on witnesses to the abductions. Several

passersby paused but did nothing. One man continued to read a posted restaurant menu. Another continued inside to order his meal. Several girls gave an erroneous description of the kidnapers. But only one man would discuss what he had seen.

Coaxed from his window vantage point inside a restaurant, the husky witness described the abduction in detail.

Asked why he did nothing about it, he replied, "I was eating."

Such scenes packaged in a special presentation for the NBC Huntley-Brinkley Report shocked citizens across the country.

The New York Post said it was a "frightening" demonstration. Columnist Hy Gardner called for more programs of revelation throughout the country.

United Press International, *Broadcasting, Variety, Backstage*, the Mutual Radio Network and others devoted an avalanche of words to "Partners In Crime."

While criminologists, sociologists, psychologists, schools, colleges and universities requested use of the program as a mirror of reality, immediate public reaction was mixed.

"The problem," said some, "is the police. They are equally apathetic."

Courtroom delays were criticized. And there were charges that "defense attorneys can bend the law . . . criminals too frequently are freed on technicalities . . . and the witness becomes the defendant."

Can any of us deny in toto the substance of such charges?

And now you are asking yourself if you would have reacted any different than your friends and neighbors.

As newsmen you might have called the police or taken meaningful notes on the criminal acts. But the bitter truth is that most of you would have done nothing.

A fair question then is what was accomplished by "Partners In Crime?"

If nothing else, the program awakened a latent public conscience.

A Fort Lauderdale couple, for instance, ignored a gunman's demand for money and called police. They recalled seeing the WCKT documentary and decided to get involved. The suspect was picked out of a lineup. He was wanted on a series of charges . . .

London Theatrical Producer Peter Cook also saw the program. He armed himself against whom he thought were phoney autograph seekers and refused to let them into his hotel room. Cook said he would not forget the lesson . . .

An eye witness to a million dollar fire in Pompano Beach, Fla., credited the documentary with his decision to turn in an arson suspect . . .

And Miami police credited the documentary with inspiring usually apathetic bystanders to apprehend some jewelry store thieves.

Hopefully such reaction will proliferate. This is not to suggest that anyone face down a gun or an armed bandit. This would be foolhardy. But it is evident that when you can easily answer a need for help with a phone call to police . . . by taking down a license tag number . . . or providing detailed physical information about a suspect and you don't because you don't want to get involved, this is apathy.

It is true, of course, that some people just don't care what happens to other people. And few are conditioned to witness an act of violence. Even less are willing to subject themselves to bodily harm. All of which is understandable.

But if you are the don't-get-involved type . . . so is your neighbor. Unfortunately, you could also be tomorrow victim's. In fact, you have a 48 per cent greater chance of falling victim to crime than you did seven years ago, according to F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover.

Hoover warns that "either we win the war against crime or the priceless heritage which we cherish will be destroyed."

June 3, 1968

Reporters, editors and broadcasters must therefore accept the challenge to get involved. For public action is needed. And "Partners in Crime" proved that it can be aroused. But it will take the shock treatment article, the imaginative documentary to do the job. This leaves you and I the choice of getting professionally involved or remaining "Partners In Crime."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S REMARKS
IN SIGNING THE CONSUMER
CREDIT PROTECTION ACT, PUB-
LIC LAW 90-321

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday afternoon a number of us from the House of Representatives was privileged to be present in the beautiful East Room of the White House when President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law the Consumer Credit Protection Act passed by both Houses in final form on May 22. An invited audience of about 350, representing consumer and labor groups which had worked 8 years for the passage of Federal truth-in-lending legislation, and also representing many business organizations without whose cooperation and assistance technical provisions of the measure could not have been worked out satisfactorily, participated in this historic occasion, along with present and former Federal and State officials who had contributed to the development of the legislation.

In his remarks, the President described the occasion as "a day that most Americans have been waiting for for 8 long years." And he paid special tribute to former Senator Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, who first proposed truth-in-lending legislation, and who devoted much of his time and energy in his last 6 years in the Senate in dramatizing and publicizing and promoting this great forward step in consumer protection.

Although the bill as finally enacted goes far beyond the original Douglas bill by including many provisions initiated in the House of Representatives, I think all of us who had any share in the development of Public Law 90-321, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, will forever acknowledge that without Paul Douglas' pioneering work and untiring leadership on this issue, no legislation could have been enacted.

The President also cited the leading roles played by the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, who has spent nearly 40 years battling for the public interest in the Congress of the United States, and Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, who succeeded Senator Douglas as chairman of the Senate subcommittee handling truth-in-lending legislation last year, and succeeded for the first time in getting a truth-in-lending bill out of subcommittee; then proceeding to pass it through the full Senate Banking and Currency

Committee and through the Senate on a remarkable rollcall vote of 92 to 0.

President Johnson paid particular credit to the career civil servants in the Department of the Treasury who devised the actuarial tables which removed much of the controversy over the practicability of determining annual percentage rates for the finance charges on installment loans and purchases. We are all indebted to Under Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr, a former member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, who was assigned by President Johnson to coordinate the executive department's legislative work on this legislation, and who put the best technical brains in the Treasury to work on the task of devising clear and simple tables demonstrating how the bill's disclosure requirements on installment credit could be carried out.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AND AMBASSADOR VANCE ON PARIS TALKS

Before proceeding to his remarks on the Consumer Credit Protection Act last Wednesday, the President talked about the negotiations now going on in Paris between representatives of the United States and North Vietnam, and expressed his heartfelt hope that "we can get peace in the world." Among those present was Ambassador Cyrus Vance, who is assisting one of our greatest Americans, the Honorable W. Averell Harriman, at those talks. Ambassador Vance also spoke briefly at the White House bill signing.

Mr. Speaker, the President's remarks about the Paris talks and also those by Mr. Vance are included in the transcript of the proceedings in the East Room last Wednesday in connection with the signing of the Consumer Credit Protection Act. Under unanimous consent, I submit the White House release of the full text of President's Johnson's remarks and those of Ambassador Vance, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AND AMBASSADOR CYRUS VANCE UPON SIGNING S. 5, THE TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL, THE EAST ROOM, THE WHITE HOUSE, MAY 29, 1968

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Vice President, Members of the Cabinet, Members of the Congress, my beloved friend Senator Douglas, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I ask your indulgence for being late. We had a rather extended briefing on a subject that means more to all of us than any other subject, and that is how we can get peace in the world.

I have been talking to Mr. Vance since before 8:00 o'clock this morning, reviewing all the developments of the past two weeks. He is preparing to return to Paris. He has been briefing our Cabinet and evaluating for us the developments there.

I assume it is not inappropriate here to observe that back last August we searched our minds and our hearts and our principles and laid down a program which was subsequently announced in San Antonio that we were hopeful would lead to the peace table.

That program was rejected outright and we searched many other avenues and many other conferences.

On March 31st, I reached a decision that if we would take the unusual step of exercising great restraint on our own part by eliminating our offensive efforts over 90 percent of the population in North Vietnam and 78 percent of the territory, if we did that unilaterally, without expecting anything from them or asking anything from

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

them, that might lead to the talk table where we could discuss this matter. If we could talk, that might lead to some agreement sometime.

It was an adventure. There were no guarantees involved about what it would do. But we thought it offered new hope. I didn't feel that it was a matter that could be involved in partisan-year politics or personal ambition. For that reason, I said that we will do this to try to get to the table and to convince not only everyone abroad, but everyone at home that it is no election year gimmick, I made the additional decision not to seek re-election.

We have gone part of the way. We are at the table. It took us a month to get there. Some people were not helpful to us in getting there but we are there, thank goodness.

The next question is: What do we do there? We hope we make progress. We don't know. We have not made much up to date. We can't see the future, but we are going to try. That is why we are late. Thank you for your understanding.

Today is a day that most Americans have been waiting for for eight long years. With this bill, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, we are entering an era of honesty in the marketplace.

At long last the consumer will receive the treatment he deserves when he borrows money. The buyer will be allowed to know what the seller has always known—that is, how much interest he will have to pay on a credit purchase.

This bill, I think, is an example of Government working at its best—Government responding to the growing and the changing needs of the people. Good Government does respond to change.

Here is just one example of how those needs have grown: In 1946, one year after the end of the war, consumer credit amounted to \$8 billion.

This year the figure will be not \$8 billion, but well over \$100 billion.

Yet all during those 22 years of great growth, our laws did not grow. They have not changed at all to meet these new demands.

The old argument was that telling a man exactly how much interest he would be called upon to pay would confuse him.

Well, today we know better. We know that our consumers should be able to shop for credit as knowledgeably as they shop for groceries or merchandise.

When our parents have to borrow for their children's education or to pay medical bills, they should be told not just how much a month they will be paying, but the total debt that they are pledging themselves to sign up for.

When a housewife opens a charge account at a department store, she will not have to compute how much 1½ percent a month comes to. She will be told that the annual rate is 18 percent, and exactly how much of her total bill goes to finance charges.

When a man takes out a personal loan to pay for a new car, the finance company won't be able to say simply "\$5 down and \$25 a month." The buyer must be told how many months he will be paying, how much of his money pays interest and other carrying charges.

If a man falls into debt, he will not be punished by unreasonable garnishment of his salary. He will not be deprived of food for his family or money for his rent. He will not be fired out of hand.

If a householder or a small businessman falls prey to loan sharks, his body and his property will be protected from extortionists by stiff Federal penalties.

As President, I know of no single piece of legislation which is of more pressing or more personal concern to more of our consumers than this bill. This bill is truly a triumph for truth.

We are establishing today a National Commission on Consumer Finance to continue to study these problems and to make sure we don't again let our actions fall behind our needs.

I don't think any of you know how pleased I am and how happy I am to see Senator Paul Douglas, our old friend, here with us in the East Room today. He is a battle-scarred warrior with many victories and many defeats under his belt. But this is one of his proudest victories. This is his bill. He has been championing it for eight years.

This bill also belongs to many other people. It belongs to our good lady friend, that able Congresswoman from Missouri, Congresswoman Sullivan. She fought—and I say "fought"—for a strong and an effective bill when others would have settled for less. She was supported by her colleagues in the House, particularly her Chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, Congressman Patman, who I am glad to welcome here today.

It is Senator Proxmire's bill, too. He recognized the needs of this Nation and he saw to it that those needs were met.

But most of all, this bill belongs to all 200 million of us—alert, aware and demanding consumers that we are.

I want to particularly thank every Member of Congress, House and Senate, for what you may have done to make this occasion possible.

I particularly want to single out one person in the Executive department, one of our much overlooked individuals, the career public servant, Mr. Cedric W. Kroll of the Treasury Department. Mr. Kroll is the Government's actuary. He is a veteran of more than 25 years of Federal service.

He and his colleagues in the Treasury's Office of Public Debt Analysis had a tough job to do before we could even begin to get a Truth-In-Lending Bill. The lenders had argued that any bill was unworkable because of the variety of credit transactions involved. They said the requirements were just too complicated to be calculated with accuracy.

Well, Mr. Kroll and his associates did not buy those arguments. They put heads together and came up with a set of interest rate tables and schedules that make disclosure of the many varieties of credit transactions relatively simple. They cracked this tough, impossible, big, technical problem that had stalled a Truth-In-Lending Bill for years.

These few men, these quiet, effective men, whom the Government is built on—men and women like them—are called bureaucrats sometimes in the heat of debate in the Congress. I call them real patriots. They were working backstage and they proved that this bill could be made to work. These men, and thousands like them, are living proof of how our Government works for the people.

We owe this bill and other good bills to our career civil servants who are always working behind the scenes to better our lives and usually doing the things for which we take the credit.

I am proud today to speak for not only our consumers and for all of our people in recognizing our debt and paying our thanks to the public servants who go unheralded, unknown, and unsung, and who make our prosperity and our security better by their careers.

But I want to again pay my compliments and salute the selflessness of Miss Betty Furness, who came here to undertake consumer leadership and who has not only undertaken it, she has provided plenty of it.

Thank you very much.

This is unusual, and I don't want to take much more of your time, but we do have another man who has given eight or nine years of his life to Federal service in many capacities—in the legislative branch of the Government, in the military branch of the Government, in the diplomatic branch of the Government—and he is one of the great public servants of our time. I want him to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 3, 1968

take the next few minutes of your time on the thing that is most in your heart—peace in the world. Cy Vance.

Ambassador VANCE. Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

As a result of the speech of March 31st, and the actions announced therein, we are now at the conference table in Paris.

It took us a month to get to the conference table. How long it will take us to achieve a just and honorable peace at the conference table, we do not know.

The road ahead, I believe, will probably be long and difficult. However, we will persevere in our search for a just and honorable peace so that peace and prosperity may be brought to Southeast Asia and to the world.

Thank you, Mr. President.

GREEN POWER

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the last few months much has been said about black power and more emphasis is being given to "black economic power," or as I prefer to call it, "green power."

An excellent editorial on this subject was recently aired by radio station WHBL in Sheboygan, Wis.

In order to share this editorial with my colleagues, it is included here as part of my remarks:

BLACK ECONOMIC POWER

In this period of discontent, the pessimists in our society seem to be most vocal. They seem obsessed with finding the faults and weaknesses of the nation upon which they blame all our problems, including the racial situation.

We believe it is necessary to call to the attention of the fault-finders certain facts and figures that explain much of the strength of this nation.

In the area of economics, the income trend is a dramatic case in point. Consider the fact that a generation ago, only five percent of America's families had annual incomes of \$5,000 or more; by 1967, more than 50 percent had incomes of \$5,000 or higher.

Between 1959 and 1967, the number of families below the \$5,000 mark decreased by four million; in the same period, families of \$10,000 or better doubled from 17 percent of the total to 45 percent.

As for the future, Fortune Magazine estimates that by 1975 the percentage of families with annual incomes of more than \$10,000 will be above 50 percent.

It should be emphasized that the trend applies to all income groups.

How is this possible? Why has this encouraging trend occurred? The answer can be found in the soundness of our free enterprise economy. Despite the restrictions and handicaps placed upon it by government during the last 30 years, our economic way of life has provided these dramatic income increases.

The success of our economic system, relates directly to the problems facing minority groups in our country today.

In recent weeks, at least one major Negro organization has come to the realization that the future of the Negro, just as the White, is tied directly to economic factors. That group is the Congress of Racial Equality, better known as CORE.

In a six-page proposal, CORE said, "We seek to harness the creative energy of private

enterprise to achieve a solution of America's crisis."

"Handouts are demeaning," said the CORE proposal. "They do violence to a man, strip him of dignity, and breed in him a hatred of the total system." CORE's answer is a community development program to "draw funds from many sources and promote self-generating growth with the aim in time of ending reliance upon the taxpayer."

We strongly believe that this proposal will most quickly and effectively begin to lift the Negro out of many of his problems. Furthermore, it demonstrates a faith in our system and a desire to solve problems within the framework of a system which has worked in the past. He wants a piece of "the action," for which we cannot blame him.

Many negroes, such as those leading CORE, desire to work for the benefits of our economic way of life. A strong, free and competitive economic system has worked wonders in this country . . . it can work wonders for the Negro . . . it has made the United States the envy of every other nation in the world . . . and it is economic freedom that must be a part of human freedom.

The economic advancement as indicated by the income statistics we cited, can apply to all segments of our population provided they demonstrate a confidence and a willingness to help strengthen and preserve the free enterprise system.

Not the "Black Power" of violence, but "Black Economic Power," will help to solve our racial inequities.

L. CPL. ROBERT C. WILSON, U.S. MARINE CORPS, KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report that one of my constituents, L. Cpl. Robert C. Wilson, U.S. Marine Corps, of Dobbs Ferry, N.Y., has died 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 the White Plains (N.Y.) Reporter Dispatch, May 24, 1968]

VIET DEATH OF MARINE IS CONFIRMED

DOBBS FERRY.—The Marine Corps has confirmed the death of a young man who has been missing in Vietnam and presumed dead for several months.

The family of Lance Cpl. Robert C. Wilson, 21, of 117 Bellair Drive, received confirmation that the youth was killed Jan. 8 in a crash of a large transport helicopter near Da Nang.

Cpl. Wilson was one of six children of Mr. and Mrs. Robert G. Wilson.

At the time of the crash, Cpl. Wilson was assigned to delivering personal effects to wounded men and was en route to Da Nang Hospital when the helicopter, with 45 aboard, crashed into a mountain peak. Before that assignment, he had seen combat action.

On Feb. 27 his family received word that he was missing and presumed dead.

His family received word today that their son was dead.

Mrs. Wilson said she received a telegram, delivered by two officers of the Marine Corps unit in New Rochelle stating that a search of the wreckage was made by military and civilian experts and all aboard the helicopter were now assumed dead.

A spokesman at the Marine Corps unit in

New Rochelle said the telegram about the deaths was dated April 30.

Cpl. Wilson was a graduate of Dobbs Ferry High School and attended C. W. Post College for a year before enlisting in the Marines in September 1966. He arrived in Vietnam March 3, 1967, after completion of training at Parris Island, S.C. and Camp Lejeune, N.C.

He was the third Dobbs Ferry man to die in Vietnam.

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT—
REVIEW OF EVENTS AND SOME
SOUND ADVICE

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it often happens that folks back home can view the spectrum of events with amazing clarity and understanding. An instance of that kind is contained in a remarkably intuitive letter written to me by Mrs. Dorothy Capps Anderson, of Del Rio, Tex.

The letter follows:

Hon. O. C. FISHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As an average citizen, I feel there is very little that I can do concerning current events but I must say that some one needs to be heard. Indifference among Americans to the present problem is alarming. The greatest enemy of America is inside America engaged in un-American activities.

Statistics shout to high heaven about crimes and riots on our streets, the criminal code and Courts are coddling the criminal. Encouragement to subversion is unparalleled in our history. If we do not move against this wave of destruction from within—and soon, it may be too late—too late to stop the Communist menace inside America. Leaders of mobs and movements may deny any Communist influence or affiliation but their actions betray them. When we see something which looks like a mule, has ears like one, has the shape of one—it is a mule. When men act and talk like Communists—they are helping the Communist cause.

In a concern for the state of the "welfare" we have endangered the welfare of the States. No country in the world ever rewarded as many of its people for unemployment born of laziness and the realization that the federal government would feed them. No nation has ever paid so many for the practice of illegitimacy—the more births the more beans and beef by a government check. The principle "If a man does not work, neither let him eat" cannot continue to be ignored without penalty. The government has not solved the problem, it has subsidized the problems of the poor. Those who will work, those who will show initiative, are being asked to take more and more of the load as the number of the irresponsible multiplies. It is difficult to motivate men to work when they feel they can always look to the government.

The advocates of civil disobedience are endangering the security of the very country under whose protection they are allowed to act. Disobedience to any of our laws is not "civil" and no cause is so worthy as to warrant some members of society picking out the laws they dislike and disobeying them. The thief does not like laws against stealing and the murderer does not like the law against murder. This does not make the robber righteous or the killer kind. Each one

becoming a law unto himself and doing what is right in his own eyes will make actions of early day American vigilantes look like child's play.

The demonstrator who shouts "police brutality" would be very quick to report his stolen car to the police. The marcher who criticizes police, would be the first to complain if his march were not police protected.

The right to debate gives no one the right to disturb. The right of dissent should not be perverted to mean the right to destroy. People are using our freedom as a cloak to cover their sins of subversion. The slogan "police brutality" is being taught to mob members so they can gain the sympathy of the public against law enforcement officials in a movement to destroy law and order in America.

The Communist party is using the poor and protestors to divide our country. Never since the days of the Civil war, has our Nation's people been so divided. We all need to stand up and be counted or lie down and be run over by the ruthless rulers of other lands.

If at any time, we can do anything for you, please let us know.

Yours very truly,

MRS. W. W. ANDERSON.

WHO MUTILATED THE DOCUMENTS?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 2, the Chicago Tribune's veteran newsman Willard Edwards, dealt at length with the case of Otto F. Otepka, the State Department security officer whom the State Department tried unsuccessfully to dismiss for giving information to a Senate investigating subcommittee. Otepka seeks to be exonerated of the charges brought by State and returned to his former position in the Office of Security. For those who have not had the opportunity to follow this celebrated case closely, the Edwards' article provides a capsule treatment of this long and complex case.

For those who have followed Otepka's battle with State, the seemingly impossible attempt to wring any vestige of justice from this agency is all too familiar. The mutilation of documents aspect of the Otepka case is a good case in point.

It will be remembered that State originally charged Otepka with 13 specific counts, charges 4 through 11 having to do with the declassification and mutilation of documents. Charges 5, 7, 9, and 11 begin with this statement:

You have been responsible for the mutilation of a classified document in violation of 18 U.S.C. 2071.

Then, in each of the charges, the State Department identifies each document and proceeds in each charge with this statement:

Specifically: On June 18, 1963, a Xeroxed copy of the tops and bottoms of the pages of the aforementioned document was retrieved from your burn bag. This burn bag was obtained from the Mail Room in accordance with the procedure outlined above. These tops and bottoms which were cut from

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

a Xeroxed copy of the —— document have been matched with a complete copy for identification purposes.

The next paragraph of each of the four above-cited charges reads:

The act of cutting the classification indicators from a document "mutilates" that document within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. 2071. Exhibit D is a statement from Messrs. Shea, Belisle and Rosetti, attesting to the fact that they have identified these clippings as having come from the classified document referred to above.

It would appear from the wording of charges that the State Department had a pretty good case against Otepka. But what happened? Just before Otepka's hearing before State got underway, that agency dropped these charges against Otepka. For some reason the possibility of perhaps convicting Otepka of a Federal offense, which calls for a fine of \$2,000 and a jail sentence of up to 3 years or both, somehow lost its urgency. Otepka denied that he had anything to do with the mutilation of documents and welcomed the opportunity to cross-examine at least 11 persons at the hearings. After State dropped these charges, Otepka's opportunity to question these people was eliminated.

Later, when Otepka appealed the State Department decision to the Civil Service Commission, he requested that the mutilation charges be reviewed by the Commission and the above-mentioned people be made to appear in connection with the mutilations. The Commission denied his request, and the actual perpetrators of the offense have still not been apprehended.

Perhaps it is not too late to catch the culprits. The statute of limitations on offenses under 18 U.S.C. 2071 is a period of 5 years. As the wording in the charges mentions the date of June 18, 1963, as being the date when the mutilated documents were retrieved from the burn bags, the 5-year period has not as yet expired.

Of course, State's strategy is clear. They are stalling until the statute of limitations runs out, thus preventing prosecution of the actual violators. They are doing the very same thing with regard to the perjury charges connected with the case, which charges also have a statute of limitation of 5 years.

I intend to inquire of State what has been done to apprehend those responsible for this violation of a Federal statute. If Otepka is guilty, he should not be allowed to go free. In the same vein, if the State Department clique is guilty, they should be made to face the charges.

One thing is clear: if these violations are not cleared up shortly, the American people must make the Otepka case a campaign issue in this presidential election year.

I include the article entitled, "Otepka Presses Fight To Regain State Department Post," by Willard Edwards, in the RECORD at this point:

OTEPKA PRESSES FIGHT TO REGAIN STATE DEPARTMENT POST

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, June 1—Otto F. Otepka looked up with a smile from the swarm of legal papers and books he was perusing. He was engaged in a familiar practice, the

drafting of a memorandum for his attorney as the basis or his latest appeal in a battle for reinstatement as the state department's chief security officer.

That struggle for vindication now is in its fifth year and seems fated to continue for additional years. Rep. John N. Erlenborn [R., Ill.] today voiced a suspicion widely held in Congress that "Otepka's troubles will continue at least a year until we get a new President and a new secretary of state next year."

Otepka's troubles actually began more than seven years ago, in December, 1960, when he was summoned to a private meeting with two members of the incoming Kennedy cabinet. They were Secretary of State-designate Dean Rusk and Attorney General-designate Robert F. Kennedy. Hostilities brewed at that conference, when Otepka resisted pressures to relax security regulations, continue to this day.

LINES IN FACE

The intervening years have put some lines in Otepka's face and some gray in his hair. Heavy legal expenses have plunged him into debt. But he has no thought of quitting a struggle against federal harassment which some have compared to the circumstances of the infamous Dreyfus case which shook France at the turn of the century. Twelve years passed before Dreyfus won exoneration.

Some friends of Otepka have urged him to accept the partial victory he won last December when Rusk vacated the original order dismissing him from office, entered in November, 1963, and substituted a demotion in grade, a reprimand and an order barring him from security duties.

Otepka conceded that he sometimes had thought of giving up. His legal costs thus far have totaled \$26,000, most of them supplied thru contributions to the American Defense funds headed by James M. Stewart, 391 N. Walnut st., Wood Dale, Ill. But Otepka has been obliged to borrow \$7,000 from a relative. The demotion is costing him \$6,160 a year in income and he is at present on a leave-without-pay basis.

"I CAN'T QUIT"

"But I can't quit," he said. "Thousands of people have supported me and contributed to my fight. I would be betraying them and both Congress and all government employees if I gave up. There's just one issue involved—the right of federal workers to give information to congress when they see wrongdoing in their departments."

He had just finished a study of the latest finding against him and found it full of errors and omissions. This was the ruling of James Masterson, chief, appeals examining office, Civil Service commission, rejecting Otepka's petition for vacation of Rusk's demotion and reprimand order.

Otepka and his attorney, Roger Robb, who has just won a \$75,000 libel judgment for Barry Goldwater, will file a formal appeal from Masterson's findings to the board of appeals and review of the Civil Service commission.

CITES 2 MEN

"Why has the commission shied away from investigating the strange immunity to prosecution of John F. Reilly and David Belisle, two of the principal instigators of wrongful actions against me?" asked Otepka.

Reilly and Belisle, director and deputy director of the office of security, state department, were exposed as principals in the vendetta against Otepka. Reilly, forced to resign for having testified falsely, was quickly employed by the Federal Communications commission at a high salary. Belisle was transferred to a high post in the American embassy in Bonn. The justice department ignored suggestions by the Senate internal security subcommittee that their conduct be examined.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 3, 1968

In their appeal, Otepka and his lawyer will strongly attack Masterson's finding that a Presidential directive takes precedence over an act of Congress. Otepka contended he was within his rights in furnishing information to the Senate subcommittee under a law guaranteeing "the right of employees to furnish information to either house of Congress or to a committee or member thereof." Masterson decreed that an order by President Truman in 1948, forbidding employees to give Congress information about the loyalty of government workers' overrode the law.

LINKS TO RUSK

Otepka is resigned to the fact that he will never be restored to duty as a security officer as long as Rusk remains in office.

"The secretary of state might have ignored my case if I had given information to the Senate subcommittee on persons in whom he had no special interest," he said. "But that information did involve good friends of his and he was undoubtedly incensed that the documents I produced, making a liar out of Reilly, contained adverse information on these good friends."

Otepka had served the government since 1936 and was deputy director, office of security, in 1960 when there was a change of administration. His efficiency ratings had been uniformly high and complimentary and the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles gave him a meritorious service award for "outstanding performance."

PEAK OF CAREER

He was at the peak of his career when summoned to the fateful meeting with Rusk and Robert Kennedy in December, 1960. They wanted him to ease the security requirements for a number of prospective state department appointments. He insisted upon full field investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the case of all appointments to the rank of assistant secretary or higher. One of those temporarily barred by Otepka's stand was Walt W. Rostow, now special assistant to President Johnson on national security affairs.

By early 1962, Otepka had become aware that Rusk had granted 152 security "waivers" to high-ranking department personnel, compared to five such waivers during eight years of the Eisenhower administration. He strenuously objected to these and other security decisions.

On Jan. 20, 1962, his office was abolished and he was downgraded to chief of the evaluation division. Early in 1963, his telephone was tapped, he was put under surveillance, locked out of his office, and placed in isolation. On Nov. 5, 1963, he was fired for conduct unbecoming a state department officer.

APPEALS FOR HEARING

Otepka appealed for a hearing before the state department panel set up for that purpose but more than four years passed before he got it. Ten of the 13 charges against him then were dropped but after a long and exhaustive hearing, conducted in secret over Otepka's protests, he was found guilty of having delivered "two memoranda and an investigative report" to the Senate subcommittee.

No attention was paid to Otepka's defense—that he had delivered this evidence only when called upon to prove that he had not lied in sharply disputing statements made by his superiors. On Dec. 9, 1967, Rusk set aside Otepka's discharge but directed that he be "severely reprimanded," reduced in grade, and forever barred from security duties. This is the decision, upheld by a Civil Service commission examiner after another secret hearing, which Otepka is now seeking to reverse.

On Oct. 31, 1963, just before Otepka was fired, the full Senate internal security subcommittee formally advised Rusk that "we would consider it a great tragedy if the services of this exceptionally able and experi-

enced security officer were lost to the United States government on the basis of alleged technical violations growing out of his cooperation with this subcommittee."

On Jan. 6, 1968, the same subcommittee officially labeled Otepka as "a dedicated and loyal patriot who has suffered extraordinary, calculated harassment because he attempted conscientiously to carry out the national security program." This verdict was based on an inquiry lasting four years which required a million words of testimony.

VIETNAM WAR CLAIMS FOUR FROM MARYLAND

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pvt. William R. Bissell, Sgt. Antoni B. Purwin, Sp4c. Reid T. Stylers, and Sp4c. Benjamin N. Goldberg, four fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their bravery and honor their memory, by including the following article in the RECORD:

VIETNAM WAR CLAIMS FOUR FROM STATE—MONTGOMERY MARINE, THREE GI'S FROM CITY ARE KILLED

A Montgomery county marine and two Baltimore soldiers have been killed in Vietnam, and another Baltimore soldier has died in a Texas military hospital of burns received in Vietnamese action, the Department of Defense has announced.

The Maryland servicemen were:

Marine Pvt. William R. Bissell, 19, son of Mrs. Dorothy M. Bissell, of 6507 Seventy-eighth street, Cabin John, Md.

Army Sgt. Antoni B. Purwin, 22, son of Alexander Purwin, of 26 South Durham street.

Spec. 4 Reid T. Stylers, 24, son of Mrs. Anna S. Saunders, of 5326 Wright avenue.

Spec. 4 Benjamin N. Goldberg, 37, brother of Mrs. Florence Coplan, of 2423 Lightfoot drive.

Private Bissell, a native of Cabin John, was a graduate of the Walt Whitman High School, in Bethesda, Md. While there, he was a member of the school's baseball team.

Employed at Decatur Press, in Bethesda, he also served with the Cabin John Volunteer Fire Company and in 1966 was awarded a trophy as being one of the "top men" in the company.

Enlisting in the Marine Corps in August, he took his basic training at Parris Island, S.C. and advanced training at Camp Lejeune, N.C. Attached to the 1st Marine Division, he shipped out from San Francisco January 27 with a rifle platoon of the 27th Marine regiment, according to his mother.

Private Bissell was killed May 22, in the Da Nang area, his mother said. Death was attributed to hostile rifle fire.

NATIVE OF POLAND

Besides his mother he is survived by his father, Walter J. Bissell, of 6 Throne road, Cabin John, and two sisters, Miss Carolyn Bissell and Miss Judy Holt Bissell.

Sergeant Purwin, a native of Poland, came to the United States in 1961 and attended the Patterson Park High School. He also attended a night school which specializes in English instruction.

He enlisted in the Army three years ago and trained at Fort Bragg, N.C. as a paratrooper. He left for South Vietnam with the 82d Airborne Division.

SEVERE BURNS

The family was notified by the Army that Sergeant Purwin was killed May 13 some-

where in South Vietnam but the Army has not released the details of his death.

He is survived by his father, a brother, Edmund K. Purwin, of Baltimore, and a sister, Mrs. Marie Martin, who recently returned to Poland.

Specialist Stylers, a Baltimore native, was called up from the reserves and arrived in Vietnam September 13, 1967.

His mother said he was an artilleryman stationed with Battery A, 3rd Battalion, 13th Artillery Brigade.

She said he was burned over 60 per cent of his body on May 9 and died of an infection May 26 at Brooks General Hospital, San Antonio, Texas.

"He wrote that he'd like to have some soft drinks and that Vietnam was an unpleasant place," Mrs. Saunders said.

Besides his mother, Specialist Stylers is survived by two half-brothers, Spec. 4 Thomas Saunders, with the Army in Germany, and Philip M. Saunders, of the home address; and a grandfather, David Stylers, of Berkely Springs, W. Va.

A 15-YEAR VETERAN

Specialist Goldberg, a native of New York who came to Baltimore in 1935, was a veteran of 15 years in the Army.

He was killed by hostile fire May 15. He had been in Vietnam since January 12 with the 1st Division.

Specialist Goldberg was a veteran of the Korean War and had been frequently decorated during his military career.

Besides his sister, he is survived by two other sisters, Miss Lillian Goldberg, of Baltimore and Mrs. Ida Haven, of Albuquerque, N.M., and a brother, Sam, of Baltimore.

Services will be held at 2 P.M. tomorrow at the Levinson funeral establishment, 6010 Reisterstown road.

DISILLUSION AND THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1968

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call the attention of the House to the second of what may be a series of editorials appearing in the Peoria Journal Star discussing the serious shortcomings of our electoral college system and the great need for revamping the system. The latest editorial, "Disillusion and Electoral College," appeared in the May 23 edition of the Peoria Journal Star and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

DISILLUSION AND ELECTORAL COLLEGE
(By C. L. Dancey)

Chances are that a lot of young people who are now out enthusiastically working their heads off for various presidential candidates in the primaries are going to be shocked, disillusioned, and bitter when the conventions meet.

Their reaction then is apt to be that it is a dirty, crooked, and evil system for selecting a candidate, when the big state political chieftains sit down and figure it out for themselves—and the actual primary voting results are apt to become, once again, something of a joke.

If they examine the system closer, however, they'll find it isn't that bad. It has its merits.

The people who really make the key decisions at the convention will be interested in results. Their motives will be to pick the best candidate with the best chance to win.

They will look at primary votes, and they

will look at political polls, but from long experience they will not stop there.

They will analyze them far beyond the mere total results. They will look at circumstances, splits, and choices. They will study them in the light of probable events to come and probable reactions.

Then, they will try to pick a man who can win in a general election in the fall.

That is not the same thing as trying to pick a man who can win in a party election in the spring.

The requirements, the voting segments and the circumstances are different, much different!

So, it isn't such a stupid system after all.

Indeed, a straight primary in the spring might be less effective for the parties and for the people of the U.S. It might be more stupid, because the conditions of a primary are far different than those which involve the whole electorate—and spring developments are not always the same as fall. Durability of popularity depending on its base is important.

And they will look at where the tilt is

that makes some districts much more important than others.

That is the unequal element that is dirty, dishonest and evil.

But that is not their fault. That is a fact of life that they have to deal with.

The fact of life is the Electoral College system.

It makes hairline victory in key big states more important than "decisive" support in others, regardless of the numbers.

It grossly distorts the value of voters in a more shocking violation of the "one-man-one-vote" principle than those the Supreme Court has "corrected."

The Supreme Court cannot correct this one.

It requires a Constitutional Amendment.

The time has long come when all our eager "crusaders" took up that massive distortion of democracy and the "cause" of getting it fixed.

But most of them are strangely silent on this obvious and basic evil.

Why?

Because they have long been using the special advantages of this cheating system for their other "causes" which center precisely where the dice are loaded by the Electoral College—in the big cities of states with big totals.

They can exploit the fact that if a big city provides a slight tilt in its big state, it becomes more important than twice its number of voters not so strategically located for Electoral College purposes!

There is an evil for which there is no excuse.

It ought to be attacked.

It ought to be fixed.

And where, oh where, are all our saintly reformers on this one?

And where, for goodness sakes, are all the state legislators, congressmen, and senators representing all of us in all the districts being rooked by the Electoral College system?

All downstate and suburban legislators, for starters, right here in Illinois!

And who could oppose reform if it were pushed?

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 4, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit ye like men, be strong.—1 Corinthians 16: 13.

O Thou whose light follows us all our ways, amid the tumult of these trying times we bow a moment at the altar of faith and freedom to listen to Thy still, small voice which speaks forever to our human hearts.

Give to us a real consciousness of Thy presence as we live through these hours that in doing Thy will, in serving our country, and in ministering to our people we may have abounding courage, abundant wisdom, and abiding faith.

Upon all Members of Congress who carry heavy burdens through these decisive and disturbing days grant a double measure of Thy strengthening spirit. As we determine our decisions and as we make our moves may we keep our minds clear and our hearts clean. By the power of Thy spirit may we meet great needs with great deeds, and match lofty professions with lively practices. Thus may we march forward to a better city, a better nation, and a better world.

In the Master's name 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 without amendment a joint and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 1224. Joint resolution to authorize the President to reappoint as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for an additional term of 1 year, the officer serving in that position on April 1, 1968;

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution

authorizing the printing of additional copies of a veterans' benefits calculator;

H. Con. Res. 614. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 1,000 additional copies of anticrime program hearings; and

H. Con. Res. 702. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain printing for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1581. An act to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 584);

S. 2178. An act for the relief of Dennis W. Radtke; 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.

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

S. 3504. An act to amend section 11 of an act approved August 4, 1950, entitled "An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress."

THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE CONTROL ACT OF 1968

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, next week the House, and through us the Nation, faces a crucial vote on the conference report on the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. The legislative road that has brought us to this final crucial vote has been a long one. But we are now at the point where we must face the final question—Will the House support the conference report on this bill?

My position on this final question is

clear: I am for this conference report. I am supporting it completely as it is. I urge the House to support it completely as it is.

The legislative road has been a long one because this measure covers both taxes and expenditures—matters of vital concern to this House and matters on which differences of opinion always exist. But the lengthy legislative consideration has given this body and all concerned the opportunity to express and weigh these various views. The issues and all the possible answers have been fully explored and debated.

The conference report embodies the solutions that have been forged through this lengthy consideration. Naturally each of us will not see his views fully reflected in that report. Some of us may want less expenditure control, some more. Some may want a lower surcharge; some may want tax reform measures as a part of this bill. But I submit that these are no longer the issues.

The one clear issue now before us is whether we are resolved to move decisively to protect the economic and financial stability of the United States.

We are no longer debating the means and methods of achieving that protection. We have had those debates. Out of them has come this conference report with its solutions of how best to assure that protection. Under our legislative procedures and traditions, the only practical way to move now and to move decisively is to approve that report.

So I repeat, realistically the only issue now before us is the goal itself—the fiscal responsibility of the United States.

Under these circumstances, a failure to support the conference report is unthinkable.

For failure of that report would mean—for the Nation:

To bring the risk of financial and economic chaos to the United States;

To reject responsibility in the management of our fiscal affairs and to substitute instead a swollen budget deficit